INTRUSIVE OBLIQUE INFINITIVES IN HERODOTUS[1]

GUY L. COOPER, III

University of North Carolina at Asheville

INTRODUCTION

The technical means of expressing Oratio Obliqua (Indirect Speech) in Classical Greek are richly varied. Yet the question as to whether any of these alternative means may serve in some way to suggest the subjective relationship of the reporter to the person and/or speech reported has hitherto been avoided, or the position has been taken flatly that

---

[1] Citations in Herodotus are given according to the traditional books, chapters, and paragraphs, and, when this would seem useful to the reader, to the page-lines in Hude's Oxford edition. The following abbreviations have been used for volumes cited more than once: Arndt-Gingrich = W. F. Arndt and W. F. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago and Cambridge 1959⁴); Blass-Debrunner = F. Blass u. A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechischen* (Göttingen 1954⁹); Denniston = J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Cambridge 1954²); Immerwahr = H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland 1966); Jacoby = F. Jacoby, "Herodot" in *RE* Suppl. II (1913) 205–520; *KB* = R. Kühner u. F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Elementar– und Formenlehre, in zwei Bänden (Hannover 1890³ u. 1892³); *KG* = R. Kühner u. B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Satzlehre, in zwei Bänden (Hannover u. Leipzig 1898³ u. 1904³); Krüger, *KA II* = K. W. Krüger, *Kritische Analekten II* (Berlin 1867); Krüger, *R* = K. W. Krüger, "Grammatisches Register" in *ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ ΞΥΓΓΡΑΦΗ*, II 2 (Berlin 1861²) 305–21; Krüger, *S I* = K. W. Krüger, *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen*, Attische Syntax (Berlin 1873⁵); Krüger, *S II* = K. W. Krüger, *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen*, Poetisch-dialektische Syntax (Berlin 1871³); Laird, *Intr.* = A. G. Laird, "Introduction," in *Herodotus, Books VII and VIII*, edited by C. F. Smith and A. G. Laird (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago 1908) 1–73; Legrand, *Intr.* = Ph. -E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Histoires. Introduction* (Paris 1956); Powell, *Lex.* = J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge 1938 and Hildesheim 1960); Rehdantz-Blass = C. Rehdantz u. F. Blass, "Indices," in *Demosthenes, Neun Philippische Reden I 2* (Leipzig 1886⁴); *SCG* = B. L. Gildersleeve and C. W. E. Miller, *Syntax of Classical Greek*, Parts I and II (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago 1900 and 1911); Schmid-Stählin = W. Schmid u. O. Stählin, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* I 2 (München 1959²) u. I 5 (München 1964²); Schwyzer = E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion (München

Classical Greek possesses no means to suggest reserve or comment on the part of the reporter.[2]   I have in a recent publication attacked this position systematically, and with the aid of a copious collection of examples made the point that the intrusion of oblique infinitives into certain O.O. constructions where they do not regularly occur indicates an attempt on the part of the reporter to indicate reserve vis-à-vis the reported speaker, to put distance between himself and the report, to avoid responsibility for the matter or opinion therein represented.[3] This principle will, if it can be rigorously proven, amount to a valuable new tool for the exegesis of Classical authors, for it will establish that many passages contain an expression of critical reserve on the part of the authors which has hitherto been overlooked.[4]   It will also—as has

---

1953[2]); Schwyzer-Debrunner = E. Schwyzer u. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik (München 1950); Stahl = J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der Klassischen Zeit* (Heidelberg 1907 u. Hildesheim 1965); Stein, *Einl.* = H. Stein, "Einleitung," in *Herodotos erklärt von H. Stein*, Buch I (Berlin 1962[7]) III-LXXXIII; *STT* = G. L. Cooper, III, *Zur Syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren* (Zürich 1971).

[2] So for instance *KG* 2.543.4.1: "Während also das Deutsche in dem Konjunktiv ein Mittel besitzt, den Zweifel des Berichtenden an der Wahrheit des Berichteten anzudeuten fehlt der griechische Sprache ein derartiges Mittel durchaus; sie beschränkt sich darauf, die Aussage rein objektiv wiederzugeben."

[3] Cf. *STT* 65–74: "O.O. Infinitive in Nebensätzen und in der Mischkonstruktion nach ὅτι bzw. ὡς" and 75–83 "Übergänge zwischen O.O. und O.R. in lebendiger Darstellung."

[4] Doubtless Herodotus stands especially to benefit from such a development. Immerwahr 7 has well stated: "The best method of studying Herodotus seems . . . a close investigation of narrative structure, and of the stylistic means by which this structure is wrought."   The particular difficulty on which the study of intrusive infinitives gives leverage has been well explained by Immerwahr 5: "Herodotus . . . differs from Thucydides in constructing his account not directly on the basis of evidence, but by combining existing traditions which incorporate such evidence.   When he began to collect information, such traditions were still in good part oral.   Consequently, what he regarded as the principal way of gaining access to the past was in fact oral traditions, and . . . his own contribution . . . consisted in the combining and arranging of traditions, with the result that his own work became henceforth a living tradition for the present and future . . . *This does not mean that Herodotus was uncritical, or that he accepted 'all that was told'*" (my italics).

This last point is almost invariably missed or misunderstood by the beginner, and the situation is not set entirely to rights by the simple citation of the several passages in Herodotus of the same general kind as 2.123.1(10–12) Τοῖσι μὲν νυν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοισι χράσθω ὅτεῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα πιθανά ἐστι· ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα τὸν λόγον ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἑκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω and 7.152.3(27–28) Ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασι ὀφείλω, καί μοι τοῦτο

already been suggested in *STT* 65–74—allow a fresh approach to a considerable number of plaguing textual problems, especially to the extent that the phenomenon admits of precise description.   It must be admitted, however, that what has appeared thus far on the subject is in two important respects short of the ideal.   In the first place it has been limited in the main to Attic authors, where the intrusive infinitives are rather rare as compared to Herodotus.[5]   And also no author has

γε τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα τὸν λόγον (The former citation is given by Jacoby 408—see on this important summary of the positivistic approach to Herodotus Fritz Hellman in *Herodot, eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*, herausgegeben von Walter Marg (München 1965²) 40–41—and by Legrand, *Intr.* 84 ("De la crédulité et du sens critique d'Hérodote"). The latter citation is given by Jacoby 408 and by Legrand, *Intr.* 83). The significance of such statements is hardly borne in upon the student until he or she perceives how this works out in Herodotus' practice.   One good way to approach this practice is through compositional analysis of the sort of which Immerwahr has made himself a leading exponent.   Another would be a close study of the belief-inhibiting effect of Herodotus' use of particles.   Powell, *Lex.*, an admirable work, makes an exhaustive study of Herodotus' particles convenient.   But the beginner might be well advised to confine himself to a review of the 27 carefully culled examples of ironical δή in Denniston 229–34—all gems, to the 12 citations for δῆθεν Denniston 265–66, and the 20 examples of κου(=που) Denniston 491–95.   The approach taken here is neither lexical like Denniston's nor compositional like Immerwahr's, but takes a middle road between the two in concerning itself with sentence form.   In my opinion this method surpasses any other in its particular insistence upon the point of Herodotus' sophistication and critical sense—the very matters which seem so often to cause the serious early student of Herodotus the most difficulty.

⁵ Herodotus' particularly frequent resort to these constructions has been often remarked upon.   Cf. for the infinitive intrusive in subordinate clauses Krüger, *S* I 65.4.3; *KG* 2.550.5; Stahl 665.3: "Das erste Beispiel begegnet uns bei Sophokles, und dies ist in der Dichtung das einzige.   Sonst ist der Gebrauch der Prosa eigen, zeigt sich am haüfigsten bei Herodot, der ihn verhältnismässig am öftesten in synthetischen Neben-sätzen ausser den relativen hat, demnächst, aber schon seltener bei Thukydides, in der späteren attischen Prosa nimmt er ab, von Lysias, Isaios und Isokrates liegt keine derartige Stelle vor"; Laird, *Intr.* 64.   It may be further noted that Krüger, *R* s.v. "Infinitiv 5" 315 lists 12 examples in Thucydides, whereas my examination of Herodotus has revealed 77 examples (Stein on 1.24.11.29 f. gives 14 examples).   Cf. for the infinitive intrusive after ὅτι and/or ὡς Krüger, *S* I 65.4.3; *KG* 2.357.3; Stahl 651.4; Laird, *Intr.* 64 and Stein on 1.207.11.4.   For the free use of the oblique infinitive as a narrative verb form—which seems to be a peculiarity of Herodotus—I know only one mention in a grammatical authority, Krüger, *S* II 65.11.2, who cites two of the five passages with the explanation: "Der oblique Infinitiv tritt ein von einem bloss vorschwebenden λέγουσιν abhängig." Stein's remark on 1.86.13(= Hude 1.86.3(22)) ποιέειν, "erg. ὑπὸ Λυδῶν λέγεται (c. 87,1), ein beim Berichte einer Volkssage natürlicher Übergang in indirekte Erzählung" is almost equally unappreciative, and the parallels he adduces are not only incomplete but also ill-sorted and partly dissimilar.

been as yet treated exhaustively. Naturally there is the question of conventionalization. It would be conceivable that these constructions while often significant would still in other cases be used only loosely. Or it would be thinkable that some particular author might resort to these uses so often that they would become a mere mannerism on his part.[6] If this happens anywhere it would certainly be in Herodotus. Therefore this author has been chosen for closer study. He shows a further advantage for this essay in his use of oblique infinitives as narrative verb forms without any ruling verb or other introductory expression. This usage is apparently confined to Herodotus and seems, like the two idioms already studied in Attic, to be invariably significant of reserve on the part of the author.[7]

[6] A familiar example of such a development would be Isocrates' peculiar use of the plural of abstract substantives. Cf. for an accurate description of the practice usual in most Attic prose *KG* 1.17c: "Die Prosa unterscheidet streng den Gebrauch der Singularform von dem der Pluralform, indem durch jene stets der wirkliche abstrakte Begriff, durch diese stets einzelne Akten, Fälle u.s.w. der abstrakten Thätigkeit bezeichnet werden, oder der abstrakte Begriff auf mehrere bezogen wird...," which, however, needs the corrective codicil of *SCG* I 62 §142: "In Isocrates the plural is so marked a mannerism, and is so often suggested by the avoidance of hiatus, that it is not necessary to insist on sharp distinctions in that author." The present study indicates that the extensive intrusion of the oblique infinitive in Herodotus does *not* necessitate any such proviso to the general theory of the intrusive oblique infinitive set up in *STT* 65–83. Herodotus uses this idiom so often simply because such a large part of his work is based upon semi-historical oral reports, reports which he is too critical to transmit without some indication of the reservations he has about substantial accuracy in the material he must base his history upon.

[7] As was pointed out in note 5 above this phenomenon has received hitherto no kind of adequate description and illustration. It is not to be confused with the free succession of oblique upon dependent imperatival infinitives, which has traditionally been described or rather glossed by supplying ruling verbs suggestive of the appropriate sense for the infinitive. Cf. *STT* 44; Stahl 649.2; *KG* 2.544.2.1 and 2.567.1; Krüger, *S* I 65.11.7 and II 65.11.2. This usage, while it certainly occurs in Herodotus, never has here the harsh dazzling brilliance of the Thucydidean examples, which are no doubt still best documented in Krüger, *R* s.v. "Ergänzung" 311. Still, cf. Herodotus 1.170.2(5) Βίαντα ἄνδρα Πριηνέα, ὃς ἐκέλευε κοινῷ στόλῳ Ἴωνας ἀερθέντας πλέειν ἐς Σαρδὼ καὶ ἔπειτα πόλιν μίαν κτίζειν πάντων Ἰώνων, καὶ οὕτω (sc. ἔφη) ἀπαλλαχθέντας σφέας δουλοσύνης εὐδαιμονήσειν, ... More common in Herodotus than such a switch after a verb of commanding is the gentler reorientation felt when an infinitive plainly representing Oratio Obliqua succeeds upon a semi-imperatival infinitive dependent upon a verb of judgement or opinion, e.g., 2.64.2(4) οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι σχεδὸν πάντες ἄνθρωποι, πλὴν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων, μίσγονται ἐν ἱροῖσι..., νομίζοντες ἀνθρώπους εἶναι κατά περ τὰ ἄλλα κτήνεα· καὶ γὰρ (sc. φασι) τὰ ἄλλα κτήνεα ὁρᾶν καὶ ὀρνίθων γένεα ὀχευόμενα ἔν τε τοῖσι νηοῖσι τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖσι

Although it will involve some repetition of the theory already expounded in *STT* 65–83 it will be necessary to explain each of the three "expressive" forms of the intrusion of the oblique infinitive, before analyzing and discussing the examples which Herodotus offers. The three types are (1) the oblique infinitive intrusive in subordinate clauses, (2) the oblique infinitive intrusive after ὅτι and/or ὡς—which case is only invariably strongly "expressive" when the intrusive infinitive intervenes as the first verb form after the relative adverb, and (3) the oblique infinitive used freely as a narrative verb form. The body of the article is divided into three parts, one part for each of these three forms of intrusion.

PART I   THE OBLIQUE INFINITIVE INTRUSIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

As has been explained in *STT* 65 ff. and as any school grammar makes clear, the usual procedure for turning a complex sentence into infinitival O.O. is to change the verbs of the principal clauses into infinitives while leaving the verbs of the subordinate clauses in finite forms. These may or may not be changed in respect to mood and tense depending on the rules for the sequence of moods and tenses, and otherwise show their oblique character only by shifts in person. There is, however, an alternative procedure—licit but never really regular— according to which the verbs of subordinate clauses also, not just of principal clauses, are changed into infinitives. Two explanations suggest themselves for this facultative construction. Either the infinitive may be thought to have intruded into the subordinate clause in a mechanical way so as to assimilate the verb form of the subordinate clause to the surrounding infinitival verb forms of the principal clauses.

τεμένεσι 2.144.2(5) ῞Ηδη ὦν τῶν αἱ εἰκόνες ἦσαν, τοιούτους (i.e., καλοὺς κἀγαθοὺς) ἀπεδείκνυσαν σφέας πάντας ἐόντας, θεῶν δὲ πολλὸν ἀπαλλαγμένους. τὸ δὲ πρότερον τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων θεοὺς εἶναι (sc. ἔλεγον) τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἄρχοντας, . . . The oblique infinitive used as a narrative verb form, which is discussed further in Part III of this paper, differs from these infinitives (i.e., from εὐδαιμονήσειν, ὁρᾶν, εἶναι) inasmuch as *no* preceding direct verb form initiates Oratio Obliqua, and also because the ironic or withdrawn attitude of the author is, if anything, still more pronounced in these other examples.

Or the intrusion may be considered as being an intensification of the oblique relationship of the whole complex sentence, an intensification which is effected by the use of that verb form, the infinitive, which is most characteristic of O.O. in *all* the clauses of the sentence, both principal and subordinate, not just in *part* of the sentence, i.e., in the principal clauses only.   This alternative is the explanation advocated in *STT* 66: "Skepsis, Distanz, Reserve hat man mit dieser Konstruktion mitherauszuhören." The reporter shrinks from identifying himself sympathetically with the original speaker even to the extent that use of the personal verb forms in the subordinate clauses would imply.[8]

---

[8] It is this matter of the *sympathetically* or *psychologically* acceptable character of the reported speech which is decisive for Herodotus.   Naturally it is often the fantastic or incredible turn of a report which causes the historian to turn away from the most usual forms of O.O., but it may be merely a sense of offended delicacy—whether this be real or merely affected—which causes the author to make the switch.   It must also be emphasized that Herodotus is capable of reporting something which he plainly quite disbelieves in Oratio Recta.   Straightforward belief and straightforward disbelief are psychologically and therefore stylistically far more closely related to each other than irony is to either.   Cf., e.g., 7.214.1(27 ff.) Ἔστι δὲ ἕτερος λεγόμενος λόγος, ὡς 'Ονήτης τε ὁ Φαναγόρεω ἀνὴρ Καρύστιος καὶ Κορυδαλλὸς Ἀντικυρεύς εἰσι οἱ εἴπαντες πρὸς βασιλέα τούτους τοὺς λόγους καὶ περιηγησάμενοι τὸ ὄρος τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι, οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστός· . . . Ἀλλ' Ἐπιάλτης γάρ ἐστι ὁ περιηγησάμενος τὸ ὄρος καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀτραπόν, τοῦτον αἴτιον γράφω.

There are a number of speeches and dialogues in Herodotus also, most of which the author cannot possibly believe he is reporting with strict literal accuracy, and which he nevertheless reports in O.R.   The reason for this is simply that such speeches and dialogues have an inherent dramatic and artistic believability which does not depend upon their literal accuracy.   It is no doubt a condition of the acceptability of O.R. in these passages that the reader or audience understands that Herodotus cannot possibly have known the actual words of the supposed original discourse.   Stein, *Einl.* XXXVIII–XXXIX brings this out very nicely: "Im Gedankengehalt wie im Ausdruck sind sie (d.h. die Reden und die Gespräche) . . . eine freie Ausdichtung Herodots . . . Indes . . . geben sie der Erzählung jenen reizvollen Anschein wahrhaften Lebens, der den prüfenden Leser immer fesselt ohne ihn taüschen oder taüschen zu wollen.   Denn wie der 'allhörende' Dichter weiss dieser Erzähler das intimste zeugenlose Gespräch wie die längst verklungene Rede fernwohnender Barbaren, als wie von ihm selbst erlauschte, mit dem treuherzigen Tone eigenen Glaubens vorzutragen.   Er darf eben bei seinen Zuhörer eigenen Unterscheidung voraussetzen zwischen der Wahrheit der Geschehnisse und der Dichtung der zugefügten Reden." Actually Stein may with this further remark, "In Ton und Sprache halten sich diese Reden auf der gleichen Linie volkstümlicher Gemeinverständlichkeit, ohne sich der besonderen Weise der redenden Person je nach Volksart, Stand und Gemütsart mit charakteristischen Zügen anzupassen," go a shade too far.   It is hard for instance to believe that the speeches exchanged between the Athenian ambassadors and Gelon of Syracuse in Book 7 are entirely uncharacteristic.   *SCG* I 5–6 §15 and I 7 §20 notes the regular use of ὦ with the vocative at 7.160.1(23) and

The argument offered to support this view is in the main material, i.e., passages with intrusive infinitives are cited in which it plainly is the case that the reporter would wish to avoid responsibility. These examples fall into two groups. In the first division (*STT* 66–67) fall relations of dreams, myths, and unlikely reports. This first category is thus made up of reports for which the reporter feels no hostility but only a certain bemused and incredulous detachment. In the second group fall the reports to which the reporter experiences reaction, they are retellings of accounts given by the speaker's opponent (*STT* 67–68). Now these two principal categories were set up originally merely to illustrate the sense of the construction under discussion. Yet they do turn out to be quite close to being a satisfactory framework for dealing with all of the examples one encounters even in a systematic and exhaustive study of Herodotus. Naturally a certain elasticity and readiness to adapt to the purposes and practices of the individual author are called for. This would be true for Attic authors and it applies to Herodotus also. Turning first to some of the less obvious examples in Attic we will see what sort of difficulty might be expected in the most awkward cases. First consider Plato, *Republic* 6.490c (Σωκράτης)

7.161.1(8) and the passionate omission of ὦ in 7.158.1(19) and 7.162.1(28). And it may be further remarked that in dialogues between persons who stand in a formal hierarchical relationship to each other the distinction is frequently insisted upon by a form of the personal pronoun supported by γε. (For γε attached to pronouns suggesting a contrast between persons, cf. KG 2.171 and 2.174.6 as well as Denniston 121–23 and esp. 122, on the range of this function of γε in dialogue.) So, e.g., 1.42.1 (Adrastus to Croesus) Ὦ βασιλεῦ...ἔγωγε...σύ...σπεύδεις...τοι 5.106.3–4 (Histiaeus of Miletus to Darius) Βασιλεῦ,...ἐφθέγξαο...σύ εἴρηκας...ἔγωγε...σύ...ἀκήκοας, ὦ βασιλεῦ, μάθε ...ἐργάσαο... 5.111.3 (Attendant to Onesilaus) Ὦ βασιλεῦ,...σύ ἐπιτάσσῃς... ἔμοιγε 7.9.γ (Mardonius to Xerxes) σοι...ὦ βασιλεῦ,...ἔγωγε 7.11.1. (Xerxes to Artabanus) Ἀρτάβανε,...εἷς...σε...τοι...ἔμοιγε...σεο 7.103.1–4 (Xerxes to Demaratus) Δημάρητε,...ἐφθέγξαο...ἄγε, εἰπέ...σύ φῄς...σύ...σέ...σέ...σύ... τοι...ἔγωγε...σύ λέγεις 9.79.1–2 (Pausanias to Lampon of Aegina) Ὦ ξεῖνε Αἰγινῆτα, ...σευ...ἡμάρτηκας...σύ...προσέλθῃς ἔμοιγε...συμβουλεύσῃς...ἴσθι. While these parallels may be profitably consulted by the student as illustrations of the fundamental dialogue principle in Herodotean narration (exhaustive treatment in Schmid-Stählin I.2.644), they are also of interest to the textual critic as showing the correct reading at 3.35.3–4 (Cambyses to Prexaspes) εἰπεῖν (sc. τὸν Καμβύσην) πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδὸς γελάσαντα καὶ περιχαρέα γενόμενον· "Πρήξασπες, ὡς μὲν ἔγωγε οὐ μαίνομαι...δῆλά τοι γέγονε· νῦν δέ μοι εἰπέ, τίνα εἶδες ἤδη πάντων ἀνθρώπων οὕτως ἐπίσκοπα τοξεύοντα;" (ἔγωγε codd. Krüger S II 44.3.10 ἐγώ τε Dobree, Dindorf, Krüger, Stein, Hude, Godley, Legrand).

Ἡβουμένης δὴ ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἄν ποτε, οἶμαι, φαῖμεν αὐτῇ χορὸν κακῶν ἀκολουθῆσαι.—(Ἀδείμαντος) Πῶς γάρ;—(Σωκράτης) Ἀλλ' ὑγιές τε καὶ δίκαιον ἦθος, ᾧ καὶ σωφροσύνην ἔπεσθαι.—Ὀρθῶς, ἔφη (sc. ὁ Ἀδείμαντος). Now Socrates does not here have reference to any particular tragic tale such as he refers to in the example from *Republic* 3.408c, cited in *STT* 67, which clearly falls into the first category "dreams, myths and unlikely reports." But Socrates has allowed his language to become so figurative and his personification so plastic that he feels called upon to treat his own expression ironically as a poetic fancy and so he allows the infinitive ἔπεσθαι to intrude into the relative clause where ἔπεται would be expected. Looking at it another way, however, one could find that he was rejecting his own argumentation as far fetched. In that case the example would fall under the second category of "contentious and casuistic argumentation."

An example which might well fall under the second category would be Thucydides 4.98.1-5 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι... ἔφασαν...Βοιωτοὺς... ἀλλοτρίοις ἱεροῖς...ἐπελθόντας...οἰκεῖα νῦν κεκτῆσθαι. καὶ αὐτοὶ (i.e., Ἀθηναῖοι) εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ πλέον δυνηθῆναι τῆς ἐκείνων κρατῆσαι, τοῦτ' ἂν ἔχειν·...ὕδωρ τε (sc. ἱερὸν) ἐν τῇ ἀνάγκῃ κινῆσαι, ἣν οὐκ αὐτοὶ ὕβρει προσθέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐκείνους (i.e., τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς) ἐπὶ τὴν σφετέραν ἐλθόντας ἀμυνόμενοι βιάζεσθαι χρῆσθαι. (δυνηθῆναι codd. pl., edd. pl. δυνηθεῖεν recc. ali. Krüger). It is not that Thucydides really cares to treat the Athenians as the enemy. It is only that the argument they offered in answer to the Boeotians who had alleged Athenian profanations during hostilities of the temple at Delium is so shoddy and in every respect self-seeking that Thucydides suffers a collapse in his sympathetic capacities with the result that he puts his report into a form (δυνηθῆναι for ἐδυνήθησαν and προσθέσθαι for προσέθεντο) which registers the alienation he feels for the thought.[9] It would, to be sure, be possible to choose to take the whole thing as a kind of degenerate mythology of the kind in which imperialistic policies involve states, and so to classify the passage under

---

[9] Any thoughtful and decent person would have to feel this way about the Athenian argument—Gomme refers to it in his commentary on the passage on one page (568) as "highly sophistical (and unnecessarily long-drawn out)," on the next (569) as "this sophistical stuff," on the next (570) as "not the whole truth," and on the next (571) as "this argument of words."

the first heading. When the sense of the construction is so patent it is not helpful to argue too much about alternative classifications.

Indeed there will always be some examples which more or less defy classification, and are nevertheless for all that still perfectly comprehensible. So, for instance, Aristophanes, *Aves* 1677–82 (Πισθέταιρος) 'Εν τῷ Τριβαλλῷ πᾶν τὸ πρᾶγμα. Τί σὺ λέγεις; / (Τριβαλλός) Καλάνι κόραυνα καὶ μεγάλα βασιλιναῦ / ὄρνιτο παραδίδωμι. ('Ηρακλῆς) παραδοῦναι λέγει. / (Ποσειδῶν) μὰ τὸν Δί'οὐχ οὗτός γε παραδοῦναι λέγει, / εἰ μὴ βαδίζειν ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες (sc. οὐ βαδίζουσιν). / (Πισθέταιρος) οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι ταῖς χελιδόσιν λέγει. (βαδίζειν RVΦ Ald, Hall-Geldart βαδίζοι γ' B βαδίζει γ' Willems, Coulon-Van Daele ex schol. βαβάζει γ' Bentley, Kock) Does Poseidon prefer the infinitive to any of the alternatives suggested by scribes and scholiasts because he is arguing against the Triballian? Perhaps, although his interpretation of the strange utterance makes the Triballian out to be supporting Poseidon's position. More likely the infinitive expresses general alienation and incredulity at the outlandish person and speech of the tribesman.[10] The striking and important point is this: whatever the awkwardness which may attach to the classification of specific examples—and in Herodotus there is amazingly little of this—there is simply no example of this idiom which does not upon examination convince as to the fundamental point. When a Classical Greek author uses this form to report speech he is seeking to avoid responsibility for what he or his assumed character reports. Moreover, any chance that

---

[10] Doubtless the Triballian's statement was understood by the audience as = τὴν καλὴν κόρην καὶ τὴν μεγάλην βασιλείαν τοῖς ὄρνισι παραδίδωμι. Poseidon however interprets μεγάλην βασιλείαν tortuously as = μή γε βᾶσαν or μή γε βαδίσασαν or some such thing (see the scholastic commentators *ad loc.*) and resolves the participle, considered as conveying a stipulation, into a conditional clause, taking it that the Triballian consigns ἡ βασιλεία to the birds only if she has the swallow-like characteristic of not being able to hop—these birds being popularly supposed to perch and fly only, but not to hop. Since she is not as a matter of fact to be thought of as restricted in her locomotive potential in any way, Poseidon thus secures an interpretation which is favorable to his side of the argument as to whether the gods should surrender rule to the birds. The most substantial difficulty in the passage is the explanation of the final remark of Pisthetairos quoted. I think it does not essentially respond to or derive from Poseidon's remark at all. Rather I take it that the Triballian has been illustrating the meaning of his statement by means of barbarously obscene gestures intended to suggest the fate of ἡ βασιλεία in Cloud-cuckoo-land, and it is with reference to these that Pisthetairos makes his remark and thereby simply trumps Poseidon's desperate and befuddled exegesis.

this is merely a fortuitous impression, which is without demonstrative force, is precluded by the mass of examples.   Consider just those from Herodotus.   They are arranged here according to formal criteria and provided with a few textual remarks where these seem called for:

Infinitives in subordinate clauses in O.O. arranged alphabetically according to the introductory adverb or pronoun.

διότι   3.55.2(3) ταφῆναι   3.156.2(20) συμβουλεῦσαι [11]

εἰ [12]   2.64.2(5) εἶναι   2.172.5(9) εἶναι   3.105.1(22) προλαμβάνειν
         3.108.1(3) γίνεσθαι

---

[11] 3.156.2(20) κατοικτίζετο, φὰς ὑπὸ Δαρείου πεπονθέναι τὰ ἐπεπόνθεε ὑπ᾽ἐωυτοῦ, παθεῖν δὲ ταῦτα διότι συμβουλεῦσαί οἱ ἀπανιστάναι τὴν στρατιήν, . . .(συμβουλεῦσαί codd., Stein, Legrand, Godley συμβουλεῦσαι Stephanus, Dindorf, Krüger, Hude). Nothing could be paleographically easier than Stephanus' change to an optative by a mere switch of accent.   But there is no reason to make even such an easy departure from the MSS when the reading they give is, as is the case here, a construction which is defended by so many parallels.   Notice also that the speech of Zopyrus which Herodotus here reports is known by him and by his readers to be an absolute fiction.

[12] A further possible, yet quite uncertain example is 1.129.3–4(9–14) Ἀστυάγης δέ μιν ἀπέφαινε τῷ λόγῳ σκαιότατόν τε καὶ ἀδικώτατον ἐόντα πάντων ἀνθρώπων,. . .εἰ γὰρ δὴ δεῖν πάντως περιθεῖναι ἄλλῳ τέῳ τὴν βασιληίην καὶ μὴ αὐτὸν ἔχειν, δικαιό-τερον εἶναι Μήδων τέῳ περιβαλεῖν τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἢ Περσέων· (δεῖν PDRSV, Dindorf, Krüger, Legrand, Hude δέον ABC, Stein) There is certainly nothing the matter with the infinitive in a conditional clause.   Moreover in the semantic analysis of these passages which follows in the text of the article this passage would fall clearly under the same argumentative or casuistic rubric as, e.g., 5.84.1(20–22) οἱ δὲ (sc. Ἐπιδαύριοι) ἀπέφαινον λόγῳ ὡς οὐκ ἀδικοῖεν· ὅσον μὲν γὰρ χρόνον εἶχον τὰ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ἐπιτελέειν τὰ συνέθεντο, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐστερῆσθαι αὐτῶν, οὐ δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποφέρειν ἔτι,. . .In addition the association of γάρ with the infinitive, if correct, is also a familiar phenomenon, which comes up often in the examples of Part III of this paper.   But on the other hand δέον has a lot to be said for it too.   It has a better MSS group behind it than δεῖν, which gives what is actually almost a banal construction in Herodotus.   And δέον is as Krüger *ad loc.* correctly remarked, citing Krüger, S I. 56.3.2 and I. 62.1.4, entirely defensible.   One would only have to take it predicatively with περιθεῖναι and ἔχειν so that it would have the same relation to these as οἰκός and δίκαιον have to ἔχειν at 7.3.3(13) οὔτε οἰκὸς εἴη οὔτε δίκαιον ἄλλον τινὰ τὸ γέρας ἔχειν.   The only difference is that in the passage under discussion the copula is not ex-pressed.   That is no problem—especially when the predicative word is a participle. See in Herodotus directly above at 1.129.3(11) εἰ παρεὸν αὐτῷ βασιλέα γενέσθαι. It has seemed best, because of the uncertainties which attend this passage, to exclude it from consideration.

Another passage which would come here if the most commonly printed text were followed is 7.229.2(11) εἰ μέν νυν ἦν μοῦνον Ἀριστόδημον ἀλγήσαντα ἀπονοστῆσαι ἐς Σπάρτην ἢ καὶ ὁμοῦ σφεων ἀμφοτέρων τὴν κομιδὴν γενέσθαι, δοκέειν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἂν

ἔνθα   3.23.4(11) δεδέσθαι   9.41.2(1) ἐσενηνεῖχθαι
ἐνθεῦτεν   4.8.3(26) [13] ἀπικέσθαι
ἐπεί   4.10.1(6) ἀνδρωθῆναι   4.33.4(4) ἀπονοστέειν   5.84.1(22)
            ἐστερῆσθαι   7.3.3(15) νομίζεσθαι   7.150.3(5) παραλαμ-
            βάνειν   8.111.3(11) εἶναι
ἐπειδή   3.26.3(10) ἰέναι
ἐπείτε   1.94.5(8) ἀνιέναι   2.42.3(25) λιπαρέειν [14]   2.118.3(15)

σφι Σπαρτιήτας μῆνιν οὐδεμίαν προσθέσθαι· νῦν δέ...(νῦν ἦν μοῦνον ABCP, Excerpta
Constantiniana, Krüger νυν μοῦνον DRSV, Legrand νυν ἦ μοῦνον Stein, Hude, Godley
νυν συνέβη ἦ μοῦνον Richards).   But there is no need to desert the better tradition here.
As Richard's conjecture and Krüger's remark ad loc., "ἦν stattgefunden hätte, geschehen
wäre; sonst nicht leicht so" show, the difficulty which has been felt is the interpretation
of ἦν.   However the use of forms of εἰμί especially in the third person as substantive
verbs and the wide range of translation possibilities which result are well enough known.
Cf. KG I.38.4; Krüger, S I 62.2.2, and, most especially SCG I 31-32 §§62-63 (position
at head of sentence).   In English we would best render: "if it had been the case that, if
it were in fact the case that."   But even if there were need for some change the infinitive
alone could not be left in the εἰ clause here, because there is no example of an infinitive in
a subordinate clause anywhere in Herodotus, or any other author so far as I know,
dependent on a form of δοκέω; nor is there any case of such an infinitive after a first—or
a second—person verb form or a virtual first person verbal phrase such as δοκέειν ἐμοί.
(Stein's interesting note on this passage says nothing about this difficulty.)   The reason
for these limitations in usage is simple.   Herodotus uses the infinitive in subordinate
clauses in O.O. in retelling semi-historical accounts, and then the verb which initiates
O.O., if there is one—the construction sometimes occurs in association with the free
narrative infinitive—is a third person form, personal or impersonal, of λέγω, (λέγουσι,
ἔστι λόγος, λόγος λέγεται, κτλ.) or, rarely, a third person form of φημί, or, in isolated
instances, a third person expression.   Never does Herodotus, or any other author, use
this idiom in the relation of his own thought.   Dubiety may be well expressed by making
one's thoughts succeed upon an initial verb or expression of opinion.   But the attempt to
give one's own thoughts at the psychological remove which the infinitive in subordinate
clauses in O.O. implies would simply be a kind of literary schizophrenia which does not
lie in the Classical scheme of things.
    [13] 4.8.3(26) Ἐνθεῦτεν τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν νῦν Σκυθικὴν χωρὴν
καλεομένην (Ἡρακλέα ἀπικέσθαι ABCP, Dindorf, Krüger, Stein, Godley ὡς
ἀπικέσθαι DRSV, Hude, Legrand) The pregnant construction of ἀπικέσθαι with
ἐνθεῦτεν and ἐς c. acc. is made tame by the addition of ὡς which is less well transmitted
and must be accounted the lectio facilior.   Ἐνθεῦτεν is used with an intrusive infinitive
only here and ὡς is so used 26 times.   Ὡς was probably introduced as a normalizing
gloss.
    [14] There is a very revealing textual problem not in, but in association with this
subordinate clause, cf. 2.42.3(23-25) Θηβαῖοι,...λέγουσι...τέλος δέ, ἐπείτε λιπαρέειν
τὸν Ἡρακλέα, τὸν Δία μηχανήσασθαι· κριὸν ἐκδείραντα προέχεσθαί τε τὴν κεφαλὴν
ἀποταμνόντα τοῦ κριοῦ καὶ ἐνδύντα τὸ νάκος οὕτω οἱ ἑωυτὸν ἐπιδέξαι (μηχανή-
σασθαι· κριὸν codd. (interpunctionem omisit Dindorf, Krüger) μηχανήσασθαι τάδε·
κριὸν Herold, Hude (τάδε ante τὸν Δία Stein, Godley) μηχανήσασθαι τοιόνδε· κριὸν

Frisch, Legrand μηχανήσασθαι κριόν, ἐκδείραντα δὲ Powell (versionis app. crit. p. 693))
Krüger removed the semi-stop so he could construe "μηχανήσασθαι προέχεσθαι habe
das Mittel, den Ausweg, ergriffen sich vorzuhalten." It will not do. Not because an
infinitive may not depend on another infinitive which stands in the oblique relation—
that is a common occurrence, cf., e.g., 2.162.5(10–11) περιταμεῖν προστάξαι where the
dependency relation is just like that at 1.80.2(14) προσέταξε...προϊέναι, and so similarly
comparable are 2.42.3(23–24) θελῆσαι...ἰδέσθαι beside 2.2.1(12) ἠθέλησε εἰδέναι and
6.84.2(3) πειρᾶν...ἐσβάλλειν beside 8.57.2(14) πειρῶ διαχέαι—no, not for that reason,
but because no infinitive anywhere, in any syntactical situation depends upon any form
of μηχανάομαι. What does happen is that a neuter pronoun depends upon μηχανάομαι
and then an infinitive stands in epexegetic relationship to this, cf. 2.73.3(11) μηχανᾶσθαι
τάδε,...κομίζειν 2.121a.1(28) τάδε μηχανᾶσθαι·...παρασκευάσασθαι, et passim
(Powell, Lex. 225–26 s.v. μηχανῶμαι). The modern editors who add a pronoun in our
passage have no difficulty citing parallels. In fact that is what one objects to about the
change considered as such. The resulting construction is simply too commonplace.
Why should such an easy construction be changed in all the MSS? Why, if it had been
changed, and the result was an intolerable text, did no scribe make the obvious conjecture?
It must be that the scribes found the MS reading acceptable. There is no reason why they
should not. Μηχανάομαι stands quite absolutely in two other places, cf. 3.85.2(22) Εἰ
τοίνυν τι τοιοῦτον ἔχεις σόφισμα, ὥρη μηχανᾶσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι and
5.30.4(21) μηχανήσομαι δὲ πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιεύμενος. If μηχανήσασθαι is taken so
here in our passage also then it is simply another O.O. infinitive succeeding to the pre-
ceding O.O. infinitive λιπαρέειν, representing, as does λιπαρέειν, a finite form of the im-
plicit O.R. Powell's conjecture must be interpreted in this way. But he feels that he
must give the infinitive an accusative object—which is as we have seen not required—and
introduces a particle δέ. Wrong as this last change is, it has considerable heuristic value.
The traditional text leaves the two successive infinitives in an asyndetic or pseudo-asynde-
tic relation to each other. (For the meaning of the term "pseudo-asyndetic" as here
employed, cf. Krüger S I 59.1.5: "Asyndeton von Sätzen sind im allgemeinen bei
Dichtern viel haüfiger als bei Prosaikern. Kaum als solch zu betrachten sind die Stellen
an denen der zweite Satz eine Erklärung oder Erläuterung des ersten enthält." It may
be remarked here that the rather sparse treatment of asyndeton in standard grammars,
e.g., Krüger S II 59.1.5 and KG 2.342–344, may be most usefully supplemented by
Rehdantz-Blass 10–11 s.v. "Asyndeton.") And the editors object to this asyndetic
relationship of the infinitives. Why so? Herodotus is a virtuoso exponent of every
variety of asyndeton and parataxis, as consultation of the index to any competent school
edition s.v. "Asyndeton" will sufficiently demonstrate (e.g., Merriam for VI and VII,
Smith and Laird for VII and VIII, and esp. Powell for VIII—for a favorite individual
passage see the speech of Periander's daughter at 3.53.3–5 (probable hyper-feminine
parody)). Not only that, but he definitely uses O.O. infinitives in the same asyndetic
relationships for which he elsewhere uses finite forms in O.R. See the asyndeton after
οὔκων = ἐπειδὴ οὐκ at 1.11.4(27–30) οὔκων δὴ ἔπειθε (sc. Γύγης) ἀλλ' ὥρα ἀναγκαίην
ἀληθέως προκειμένην ἢ τὸν δεσπότεα ἀπολλύναι ἢ αὐτὸν ὑπ' ἄλλων ἀπόλλυσθαι·
αἱρέεται αὐτὸς περιεῖναι, which is exactly like the asyndeton in O.O. at 1.59.3 (12–13)
οὔκων ταῦτα παραινέσαντες Χίλωνος πείθεσθαι θέλειν τὸν Ἱπποκράτεα· γενέσθαι
οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν Πεισίστρατον τοῦτον... Why then do the editors insist upon alter-
ation? Simply because they are insensitive to Herodotus' ironic play with the zöomor-
phic aetiology which underlies the passage, and because they do not realise that the "hard"
asyndeton and the intrusion of the infinitive after ἐπείτε both serve this same stylistic end.

ἐσελθεῖν   6.84.2(27)   ἐμβαλεῖν   6.137.2(17)   ἰδεῖν
8.135.2(25)   παρελθεῖν

ἔστε   7.171.1(4)   νέμεσθαι

ἕως   no clear example [15]

Any lingering doubt about this point will be removed by a second look at 1.59.3(13–14) which has just been cited. The asyndeton there occurs in association with a free narrative infinitive, i.e., with another form of the intrusive oblique infinitive. The expressive purpose of the simultaneous occurrence of both these stylistic phenomena in this latter passage is discussed below in its proper place under Part III, II(1).

[15] The one passage which has often been reckoned as showing an intrusive infinitive after ἕως is better explained otherwise. Cf. 4.42.2.(17–20) (sc. Νεκῶς ὁ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς) ἀπέπεμψε Φοίνικας ἄνδρας πλοίοισι, ἐντειλάμενος ἐς τὸ ὀπίσω δι' Ἡρακλέων στηλέων διεκπλέειν ἕως ἐς τὴν βορηίην θάλασσαν καὶ οὕτως ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπικνέεσθαι (διεκπλέειν ἕως ἐς codd., edd. pl. διεκπλέειν ἐς Powell, Legrand). Both the translation of Powell—"The Egyptian King Necos . . . sent certain Phoenicians forth in ships, commanding them to sail back into the northern sea through the Pillars of Heracles and so to return to Egypt"—and of Legrand—"Nécos, le roi d'Égypte, . . . fit partir sur des vaisseaux des hommes de Phénicie, avec ordre, pour leur retour, de pénétrer en passant les Colonnes d'Héraclès dans la mer Septentrionale, et de revenir par cette voie en Égypte"—show that they construe ἐντειλάμενος. . .ἐκπλέειν. . .καὶ οὕτω. . .ἀπικνέεσθαι, taking both infinitives as parallel and representing imperatives or imperatival expressions of the implied O.R. This is certainly the natural and correct construction. Infinitives are also so conjoined in parallel construction at 3.146.2(25–26) ἤθελε ὡς ἀσθενέστατα ποιῆσαι τὰ Σάμια πρήγματα καὶ οὕτω παραδιδόναι, as are also participles at 4.22.3(12–13) ἀπὸ τῶν βασιληίων Σκυθέων ἀποστάντες καὶ οὕτως ἀπικόμενοι ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον, and finite verb forms at 1.171.5(4–6) Δωριέες τε καὶ Ἴωνες ἐξανέστησαν ἐκ τῶν νήσων καὶ οὕτως ἐς τὴν ἤπειρον ἀπίκοντο and at 4.168.1(13–14) τοὺς φθεῖρας ἐπεὰν λάβωσι τοὺς ἑωυτῆς ἑκάστη ἀντιδάκνει καὶ οὕτω ῥίπτει. But this does not necessarily mean that Powell and Legrand are right to remove ἕως. Stein has very correctly remarked: "ἕως hier Adverb, 'bis.'" This is an Herodotean anticipation of the use of ἕως in double prepositional expressions which are later so frequent in Polybius, as, e.g., 3.37.9 Κελτοὶ νέμονται μέχρι τῶν προσαγορευομένων Πυρηναίων ὀρῶν, ἃ διατείνει κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς ἀπὸ τῆς καθ'ἡμᾶς θαλάττης ἕως εἰς τὴν ἐκτός 5.14.6 τὸ μὲν πολὺ μέρος αὐτῶν ἕως εἰς τὰς πύλας καὶ πρὸς τὰ τείχη συνεδίωξαν, and so often in various connections, as also ἕως ἐπί and ἕως πρός, cf. A. Mauersberger, Polybius-Lexikon I.2 (Berlin 1961) 1086 s.v. ἕως C, and J.-A. de Foucault, Recherches sur la Langue et le Style de Polybe (Paris 1972) 116–18, and, for later citations, Arndt-Gingrich 335, s.v. ἕως 2.b. This usage should be no surprise in Herodotus, for it is well known that he admits double prepositions which are not found elsewhere in prose in the Classical period, cf. Schwyzer II 429; KG 1.528–29; Krüger S II 68.2(4) and Herodotus 3.116.1(17) λέγεται δὲ ὑπὲκ τῶν γρυπῶν ἁρπάζειν Ἀριμασποὺς 3.97.5(20) ταῦτα μὲν οὗτοι δῶρα πάρεξ τοῦ φόρου βασιλέϊ ἐκόμιζον. The reason why Herodotus resorted to the particular double preposition ἕως εἰς in this place was most likely his perfectly correct apprehension that the coasting voyage from the Red Sea to the mouths of the Nile by way of the Cape of Good Hope and the Pillars of Hercules is a long, long way around.

ὁ (= οὗτος = ὅς)   1.94.5(14) τῷ(= ᾧ)...εἶναι   2.32.7(17) ἐν τῇ(= ᾗ)
  ...εἶναι   2.121α.1(24) τόν(= ὅν)...δύνασθαι   2.121α.1(27)
  τοῦ(= οὗ)...ἔχειν 2.141.1(20) τῷ(= ᾧ)...εἶναι 2.141.1(21)
  τοῖσι(= οἷς)...δεδόσθαι   2.172.4(7)   ἐς   τόν(= ὅν)...
  ἐνεμέειν...ἐνουρέειν...ἐναπονίζεσθαι   3.18.1(10) ἐς τόν
  (= ὅν)...τιθέναι   4.5.1(5) τῷ(= ᾧ)...εἶναι   4.7.3(12) ἐν
  τῇ(= ᾗ)...φυλάσσεσθαι   6.117.3(12)   τοῦ(= οὗ)...σκι-
  άζειν   6.137.2(21) τήν(= ἥν)...εἶναι   7.148.3(14) τῶν
  (= ὧν)...πέμπειν 7.232.1(27) τῷ(= ᾧ)...εἶναι

ὅκως   2.140.1(13) φοιτᾶν

ὅς   1.94.6(18) εἰς ὅ...ἀπικέσθαι 1.202.2(11–12) ἐς ὅ...ἀνί-
  στασθαι...ἀπικνέεσθαι   2.102.2(9)   ἐς ὅ...ἀπικέσθαι
  3.105.1(24) ἐν ᾧ...συλλέγεσθαι   5.85.2(9) ἐς ὅ...ἀνακο-
  μισθῆναι   5.86.3(21) ἐς οὗ...ποιῆσαι

πρίν   1.165.3(6) ἀναφανῆναι   4.9.2(10) μειχθῆναι[16]   9.93.4(24)
  δώσειν

ὡς   1.24.7(23) παρεῖναι   1.86.3(26) προσστῆναι   1.94.3(27)
  παύεσθαι 1.141.2(15) ψευσθῆναι   2.99.4(2) γεγονέναι
  2.107.2(2) μαθεῖν   2.121β.1(14) τυχεῖν   2.121β.1(18)
  φαίνεσθαι   2.121β.2(24) γνῶναι   2.121δ.2(25) ἰδεῖν
  2.121ε.3(26) ποιέειν 2.121ζ.1(13) ἀνηνεῖχθαι 2.140.1(10)
  οἴχεσθαι 2.140.1(13) προστετάχθαι   2.162.5(8) ἀπικέσθαι
  3.35.3(14) εὑρεθῆναι   3.87.1(15) μέλλειν   4.9.1(13) ἐγερθῆ-
  ναι 4.11.4(8) δόξαι   4.179.2(20) γενέσθαι   6.137.2(20)
  ἰδεῖν 7.148.3(19) ἐλθεῖν   7.170.2(7) γενέσθαι   8.94.2(11)
  γίνεσθαι 8.94.2(16) γενέσθαι   8.118.4(6) ἐκβῆναι

---

[16] There is a lectio facilior here. Cf. 4.9.2(10) Τὴν δὲ (sc. μιξοπάρθενόν τινα ἔχιδναν
διφυέα) φάναι ἑωυτὴν ἔχειν (sc. τὰς ἵππους πλανωμένας) καὶ οὐκ ἀποδώσειν ἐκείνῳ
(i.e., τῷ Ἡρακλέι) πρὶν οἱ μιχθῆναι (μιχθῆναι ABCP, Dindorf, Hude, Powell Lex. 317
s.v. πρίν B II 2 b γ μιχθῇ Krüger, Stein, Godley, Legrand).   Retention of the subjunc-
tive is the most regular construction, cf. 6.133.2(15–18) Μιλτιάδης...αἴτεε ἑκατὸν
τάλαντα, φάς, ἢν μή οἱ δῶσι, οὐκ ἀπαναστήσειν τὴν στρατιὴν πρὶν ἢ ἐξέλῃ σφέας
and 1.19.3(11–12).   But the intrusive infinitive is licit as the parallels above demon-
strate—despite the fact that 9.93.4(24) has been commonly changed from δώσειν to δῶσι
on no better authority than the Aldine edition.   And the infinitive is preferable because
of its meaning.   It brings a note of coy or genuine αἰδώς which is found often in pas-
sages containing the intrusive infinitive.   Cf., e.g., (infinitives in subordinate clauses)
2.121ε.3(26) ὡς...ποιέειν 2.172.4(7) ἐς τόν...ἐνεμέειν...ἐνουρέειν...ἐναπονίζεσθαι,
and (free narrative infinitive) 2.162.4(2) ἀξιοῦν κτλ. after and in reaction to 2.162.3(30)
ἀπεματάϊσε (fuller discussion below in Part III, II(3)).

Such a tabulation made according to formal criteria can only show the frequency and paleographical respectability of the construction. It can do little to explain.[17]   A semantic analysis of the occurrences in

[17] This comes as something of a surprise. One might well have supposed as a preliminary hypothesis that the intrusion after relatives would provide a key to the whole set of cases where the infinitive intrudes in subordinate sentences. Krüger *S* I 54.13.1 and again *S* II 54.13.2, *KG* 2.429.5 and 2.434.2, *SCG* I 156 §397 and I 167–168 §422, and Schwyzer II 322.6 and II 344.6 support their position that the syntax of the moods in relative sentences can be much like that of independent sentences with copious examples. It is moreover at least a logical step to proceed from Krüger's incontrovertible position, "Relative Nebensätze sind der verschiedenen Formen des selbständigen Satzes empfäng-lich," to the formulation of *KG*: "Das Relativpronomen dient...zur Anknüpfung solcher Sätze, welche eigentlich als beigeordnete Hauptsätze hätten ausgedrückt werden sollen." Certainly no one would hesitate to say that relative sentences can function in some respects as virtual equivalents of independent sentences. Thus Herodotus can use an imperative or a wish optative in relative sentences. For the former, cf. the advice given by Croesus to Cyrus at the sack of Sardis 1.89.3(3) κάτισον τῶν δορυφόρων ἐπὶ πάσῃσι τῇσι πύλῃσι φυλάκους, οἳ λεγόντων πρὸς τοὺς ἐκφέροντας τὰ χρήματα ἀπαιρεόμενοι ὡς σφεα ἀναγκαίως ἔχει δεκατευθῆναι τῷ Διί. For the latter, cf. the encouragement given by Onesilus' Carian squire to his master before the former's duel with the Persian general Artybius 5.111.4(17) βασιλέα μὲν καὶ στρατηγὸν χρεὸν εἶναί φημι βασιλέϊ τε καὶ στρατηγῷ προσφέρεσθαι (ἤν τε γὰρ κατέλῃς ἄνδρα στρατηγόν, μέγα τοι γίνεται, καὶ δεύτερα, ἢν σὲ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ (= ὃ) μὴ γένοιτο, ὑπὸ ἀξιοχρέου καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἡμίσεα συμφορή),... From this usage, which is so strange to our ears, or at least to our literary practice, a specious explanation of the intrusive infinitive in subordinate sentences in O.O. might seem naturally to follow. If relative sentences are virtual equivalents of independent sentences, the infinitive could be used at least in relative sentences in extended O.O. simply to bring them into conformity with the mood used in surrounding sentences which are independent in form as well as in effect. Having gained a foot-hold in relative subordinate sentences, one might well go on to suppose, the infinitive might then be extended by analogy to subordinates of other forms, although they are not usually equivalents of independent sentences.

Sensible as I am to the attractions of this theory, which I myself formerly seriously entertained, I must nevertheless reject it. For this I have three reasons: firstly, I do not believe that relative sentences are at all commonly really perfect equivalents of independ-ent sentences. The position of *KG* cited above is more useful as a short and catchy formulation which covers a multitude of fairly diverse phenomena than as a basis for developmental theories of syntactical usage. Take as examples the commonly cited Herodotean sentences quoted above. The imperative in the first is simply a brilliant alternative for the expected future verb of a relative purpose clause οἳ λέξουσιν. This change characterizes the advice as coming from a man—Croesus—who is accustomed to rule. But this nuance is lost without the presence of the expected relative purpose clause in the mind of the hearers. The relative is therefore essential to the effect of the passage. The second example is not entirely comparable because the relative sentence with a wish optative comes here in the middle of a tightly constructed period consisting of full-dress conditional sentences. There is no place for the sentence with the wish optative foreseen. As the instant deprecation of a horrible thought—the defeat of his

master—which has thrust itself into the mind of the speaker who does not wish to abandon his carefully formulated argument the optative sentence is cast in relative form so as to somehow get it into the pre-conceived frame with minimal rupture. The syntax is deliberately jumbled in order to suggest a conflict of thoughts. Both of these relative sentences are therefore, from Herodotus' point of view, anything other than artless equivalents of independent sentences. There is a special literary or rhetorical reason in both cases why the conscious artist prefers in the first example a mood which is only commonly expected in independent sentences, and in the second example the relative form for what must be considered otherwise effectively an independent sentence. The same thing applies when the verbal mood and tense do not depart markedly from con-cinnity with their surroundings, the relative form simply being adopted in order to recoup on compromised continuity of thought. An example of this is the sentence, also commonly cited, 7.205.1–2(17–21) ἐς Λεωνίδην ἀνέβαινε ἡ βασιληίη...ὃς τότε ἤιε ἐς Θερμοπύλας ἐπιλεξάμενος ἄνδρας. The relative sentences which can be logically interpreted as equivalent to independent sentences but which do not after all correspond to some particular expressive need which an independent sentence could not satisfy are few. Therefore the point of departure of the rejected theory—an easy equivalence of relative and independent sentences—is not really given.

Secondly, the suggested theory must be rejected because of its consequences. If the construction began in relative clauses and extended from there to the other subordinates it should as a corollary of this proposition be both *more common* and *less expressive* in relative sentences, which were its original home. But neither of these expectations is borne out by the usage actually observed. The expressiveness of the usage in relative sentences is, to the best of my understanding of the passages, *quite the same* as in other subordinate sentences. Furthermore the infinitive is used *less commonly* in relative sentences than in several other kinds of subordinates. Powell, *Lex.* s.v. lists 7123 examples of pronominal ὅ, but I find only 14 examples of pronominal ὅ followed by infinitives in O.O. For the relative pronoun ὅς the corresponding figures are 2039 and 6. Contrast ὡς with only 1461 occurrences in all, but followed in 26 instances by intrusive oblique infinitives. Both ἐπεί and ἐπείτε are followed by the intrusive infinitives as often as ὅς, namely 6 times each. Yet the former only occurs 143 times in all and the latter 229 times. Cf. further εἰ with the figures 441 and 4, πρίν with 86 and 3 διότι with 14 and 2. These comparisons show that the infinitives are both absolutely and relatively speaking *less commonly* intrusive after relatives than after other subordinat-ing words. Naturally the argument is less objectively certain when it comes to estimat-ing relative expressiveness. Nevertheless the only way I can interpret the material above displayed according to formal categories is that there is no real distinction in expressive sense corresponding to this analysis. In fact the analysis I go on to offer below in the text, which proceeds according to the criteria of literary usage, seems to me to thrust itself upon the close student of the material and I believe that it represents the only meaningful analysis possible. It will be noted that the categories of this analysis cut nicely across the distinctions which the formal analysis introduces.

Thirdly, follows the argument which is perhaps most conclusive of all. The proposed explanation *does not cover all the material.* Oblique infinitives do not intrude merely in subordinate sentences in infinitival O.O. They also intrude in O.O. after ὅτι and/or ὡς—both in direct succession to these (relative) adverbs and after intervening finite forms. And they can even intrude without any formal introduction whatsoever directly into O.R. and there function freely as narrative verb forms. All of these kinds of intrusive oblique infinitives are copiously illustrated below, and the proposed theory cannot explain any of these passages.

Herodotus does not seem to involve the difficulties which sometimes turn up in Attic examples. The original analytic scheme of *STT* 66–68 applies here without any unreasonable adaptations. Corresponding to the Attic usage in retelling of dreams, myths and unlikely accounts is the Herodotean use in retelling semi-historical accounts which the author does not wish to vouch for, and yet does want to report. The material in this category is here presented with brief comment.

Infinitival subordinate clauses in O.O. arranged according to their use in semi-historical accounts—the subject of each narrative being accompanied by the words initiating O.O. and the intrusive infinitives being grouped under each heading in order of occurrence.

Book 1

Arion and the Dolphin, cf. 1.24.1(24) τοῦτον τὸν Ἀρίονα λέγουσι...
    ἐπιθυμῆσαι 1.24.7(23) ὡς...παρεῖναι

Croesus on the funeral pyre, cf. 1.86.3(22) τὸν μὲν δὴ (sc. Κῦρον)
    ποιέειν ταῦτα 1.86.3(26) ὡς...προσστῆναι

Lydian invention of gambling, cf. 1.94.3(24) ὧδε περὶ αὐτῶν λέγοντες
    (sc. οἱ Λυδοί) 1.94.3(27) ὡς...παύεσθαι 1.94.5(8) ἐπείτε...
    ἀνιέναι 1.94.6(14) τῷ...εἶναι 1.94.6(18) ἐς ὅ...ἀπικέσθαι

The parable of the flute-player and the fish, cf. 1.141.2(14) ὁδὲ (sc.
    Κῦρος)...ἔλεξέ σφι λόγον, ἄνδρα φὰς...αὐλέειν 1.141.2(15)
    ὡς...ψευσθῆναι

Smoke intoxication of the dwellers on the islands of the Araxes, cf.

We are therefore forced to find a new hypothesis for the explanation of the observed phenomena and I suggest it should be this: as the result of an essentially pre-historical process of development the availability of the infinitive for O.O. became established. But at the same time conventions were established as to where the oblique infinitive could be regularly used. It could not be regularly used in subordinate sentences, after ὅτι and/or ὡς, nor without introduction as a free narrative verb form in alternation with O.R. finite forms which conceal an actual O.O. relationship. When, by way of exception and irregularly, the oblique infinitive was so used the *disappointment of normative expectation* which resulted caused sensitization of the hearer to reserve on the part of the speaker. The result was an expressive form of O.O. which was used— certainly by Herodotus and the Attic authors discussed in *STT* 65–83—when the speaker reporting (author) wished to avoid responsibility for the discourse of the speaker reported.

1.202.1(1) νήσους δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ... συχνάς φασι εἶναι   1.202.2(11)
ἐς ὅ ... ἀνίστασθαι ... ἀπικνέεσθαι

Book 2

Nasamonian discovery of west-central-African black populations, cf.
2.32.3(22) τοὺς ... Νασαμῶνας ... φάναι 2.32.7(18) ἐν τῇ ...
εἶναι

Aetiology of Egyptian Thebes' abstention from mutton, cf. 2.42.3(23)
Θηβαῖοι ... καὶ ὅσοι ... ὀΐων ἀπέχονται, διὰ τάδε λέγουσι τὸν
νόμον τόνδε σφίσι τεθῆναι 2.42.3(25) ἐπείτε ... λιπαρέειν

Hieratic Egyptian archaeology:[18] 1. Min the dike builder, cf. 2.99.2(18)
Μῖνα ... οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον τοῦτο μὲν ἀπογεφυρῶσαι 2.99.4(2)
ὡς ... γεγονέναι

2. Sesostris' expedition along the Red Sea, cf. 2.102.2(6) τὸν (sc.
Σέσωστριν) ἔλεγον οἱ ἱρέες ... τοὺς παρὰ τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασ-
σαν κατοικημένους καταστρέφεσθαι 2.102.2(9) ἐς ὅ ...
ἀπικέσθαι

3. Sesostris' return, cf. 2.107.1(24) ἔλεγον οἱ ἱρέες ... τὸν ἀδελφεὸν ...
ἐπὶ ξείνια αὐτὸν καλέσαντα ... περινῆσαι ... τὴν οἰκίην ὕλῃ
2.107.2(2) ὡς ... μαθεῖν

---

[18] In the course of the hieratic archaeology of Egypt which extends from 2.99.1(14)
to 2.147.1(15) Herodotus is forced to renew the O.O. framework repeatedly with
formulae such as οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον until, as at the beginnings of sections 4, 5, and 6 as
distinguished below in the article text, he omits ἱρέες. When even such shortened
formulae become boringly repetitious he goes over in sections 5 and 6 to allowing the
idea of O.O. to be reinforced—rather than actually reinitiated with new verbs of
speaking—by the use of intrusive infinitives. This might be taken to indicate some
conventionalization of the significance of the intrusive infinitive. More likely it simply
indicates that Herodotus was to such an extent on his guard against his priestly informants
that οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον itself suggested to him a certain appropriateness of critical awareness—
and it was for this reason that the intrusive infinitives suggested themselves to him as an
alternative. Moreover it should be noticed that the priestly recitals in 5 and 6 are such
as in themselves might excite a disbelieving reaction or the suspense of an easy credulity
on the part of hearer as well as re-teller. Therefore there does not seem in fact to be
much weakening of the special significance of the construction in these passages. Rather
it is probable that the immunity from strict criticism which Herodotus feels his intrusive
infinitives guarantee him allows him freely to unfold a raconteur's zest which makes of
these pages—especially, of course, in the tale of Rhampsinitus and the thief—some of
the most delightful in all of the Histories. What is given in the text of the article above
is not intended to be anything like a complete summary-analysis—it would serve no
purpose to repeat Jacoby 283-326—but only a key to the intrusive infinitives. The
extent to which what is given above approximates to an outline for this section offers a
certain insight into Herodotus' critical attitude towards the hieratic archaeology.

4. Egyptian Iliad and cyclical supplementa, cf. 2.118.1(10) ἔφασαν
   (sc. οἱ ἱρέες)...τάδε
   2.118.3(15) ἐπείτε...ἐσελθεῖν
5. Rhampsinitus and the thief, cf. 2.121.1(14–15) ἐκδέξασθαι τὴν
   βασιληίην 'Ραμψίνιτον ἔλεγον (sc. οἱ ἱρέες) 2.121α.1(24) τόν...
   δύνασθαι 2.121β.1(14) ὡς...τύχειν 2.121β.(18) ὡς...φαίνεσ-
   θαι 2.121β.2(24) ὡς...γνῶναι 2.121δ.2(25) ὡς...ἰδεῖν
   2.121ε.3(26) ὡς...ποιέειν 2.121ζ.1(13) ὡς...ἀνηνεῖχθαι
6. The restoration of and the succession to Anysis the Blind, cf.
   2.139.1(26) ὧδε ἔλεγον (sc. οἱ ἱρέες) γενέσθαι 2.140.1(10) ὡς...
   οἴχεσθαι 2.140.1(13) ὅκως...φοιτᾶν 2.140.1(13) ὡς...προσ-
   τετάχθαι 2.141.1(21) τῷ...εἶναι 2.141.1(24) τοῖσι...δεδόσθαι
Patarbemis' return to Apries after his mission to Amasis, cf. 2.162.4(2)
   ὁμῶς δὲ αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν 2.162.5(8) ὡς...ἀπικέσθαι

Book 3
Account of the Ethiopian "table of the sun," cf. 3.18.1(7) ἡ δὲ...τοιήδε
   τις λέγεται εἶναι 3.18.1(10) ἐς τόν...τιθέναι
Marvels of Ethiopia (golden fetters), cf. 3.23.3(4) ἔλεγον εἶναι οἱ
   κατάσκοποι 3.23.4(11) ἔνθα...δεδέσθαι
Ammonians' version of Cambyses' expedition against them, cf.
   3.26.3(9) λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε ὑπ' αὐτῶν Ἀμμωνίων 3.26.3(10)
   ἐπειδή...ἰέναι
Novelle of Prexaspes and Cambyses, cf. 3.34.1(11,14) λέγεται γὰρ
   εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν πρὸς Πρηξάσπεα,...εἰπεῖν δὲ λέγεται τάδε and
   3.35.1(5) ὀργῇ λέγειν πρὸς τὸν Πρηξάσπεα [19] 3.35.3(14) ὡς...
   εὑρεθῆναι

[19] The indirect discourse in this Novelle is repeatedly interrupted by O.R. dialogue.
As has been observed above in note 8 this O.R. does not in Herodotus, as it would in
Thucydides, posit any kind of historicity. Rather it stands intermixed with O.O. as an
alternative technical means with which the author can insulate himself from full historical
responsibility which he is not in a position to accept. Therefore intermixture of O.R.,
especially O.R. dialogue, is not inconsonant with the use of the intrusive infinitive as an
intensifying form of O.O. This whole technical procedure of Herodotus may strike
one at first blush as intellectually dubious, or even simply quaint. But some reflexion
will force the conclusion that it is at least as intellectually defensible, considered as
historiographical method, as the inherently contradictory practice of Thucydides which
is really only made to work in his case by the brilliance of that author's personal powers.
Cf. Schmid-Stählin I 5.764: "...die thukydideischen Reden (sc. sind) ein Mittelding
zwischen Wahrheit und Dichtung, mit der Wahrheit insofern verbunden, als sie der

Oebares' trick with Darius' stallion, cf. 3.87.1(11) Οἱ μὲν δή φασι τὸν
Οἰβάρεα ταῦτα μηχανήσασθαι, οἱ δὲ τοιάδε (καὶ γὰρ ἐπ᾽ἀμφό-
τερα λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων) 3.87.1(15) ὡς...μέλλειν

Gold hoarding ants of India, cf. 3.105.1(22) ὡς δὴ λέγεται ὑπὸ
Περσέων 3.105.1(22) εἰ...προλαμβάνειν 3.105.1(24) ἐν ᾧ...
συλλέγεσθαι

Serpents of Arabia, cf. 3.108.1(2) λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τόδε Ἀράβιοι
3.108.1(3) εἰ...γίνεσθαι

Book 4

Myth of Targitaus, founding hero of the Scythians, cf. 4.5.1(3) ὡς
δὲ Σκύθαι λέγουσι 4.5.1(5) τῷ...εἶναι

Hearsay concerning Scythian institutions (the kingdom of the gold-
hoard), cf. 4.7.2(7) οὗτος λέγεται ὑπὸ Σκυθέων οὐ διενιαυτίζειν
4.7.3(12) ἐν τῇ...φυλάσσεσθαι

Hercules and the mother-monster of the Scythian race, cf. 4.8.1(18)
Σκύθαι μὲν ὧδε...λέγουσι, Ἑλλήνων δὲ οἱ τὸν Πόντον
οἰκέοντες ὧδε 4.8.3(26) ἐνθεῦτεν...ἀπικέσθαι 4.9.1(3) ὡς
...ἐγερθῆναι 4.9.2(10) πρὶν...μειχθῆναι 4.10.1(6) ἐπεί...
ἀνδρωθῆναι

Reciprocal self-destruction of the Cimmerian nobility, cf. 4.11.1(18)
Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ
αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι [20] 4.11.4(8) ὡς...δόξαι

Ausdruck der Gesamtlage sind, die richtig erkannt zu haben der Historiker für sich in
Anspruch nimmt, *also etwas wesentlich Anderes als die Reden des Herodotus, denen geschicht-
licher Zeugniswert weder zukommt noch in der Regel vom Verfasser zugedacht ist*" (my
italics).

[20] It is a bit surprising to find Herodotus resorting to the intrusive infinitive in an
alternate account which, he specifically states, he is personally inclined towards. But it
must be remembered that it *is* an *alternate* version. (On Herodotus' practice of giving
two-fold and three-fold alternative versions see Jacoby 400–401 and Schmid-Stählin I
2.630 n. 5.) The dubiety which this implies often brings the use of the intrusive infinitive
with it, so, e.g., 3.87.1(15), 4.8.3(26), 5.86.3(21), 6.84.1(24), 7.150.3(5). In this case the
intrusive infinitive δόξαι is used of that part of the account which might arouse objections
in the hearers—to wit the passage and initial implementation of the mutual suicide
motion in the Cimmerian nobles' council. The impression is rather that Herodotus
feels he is strengthening his case for his favored version by understating it. This
characteristic of Herodotus' presentation is familiar from other idioms. Denniston
491 n. 1 remarks: "Herodotus is fond of divesting himself of the historian's omniscience,
and assuming a winning fallibility. Cf. 1.119.7(19–20) ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω. This often

The fate of the Hyperborean delegation to Delos, cf. 4.33.3(25)
ἀπικνέεσθαι...οὕτω ταῦτα τὰ ἵρα λέγουσι ἐς Δῆλον   4.33.4(4)
ἐπεί...ἀπονοστέειν
Jason's North-African adventure, cf. 4.179.1(16) Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὅδε
λόγος λεγόμενος   4.179.2(20) ὡς...γενέσθαι
Book 5
Thunderstruck Athenian disaster in Aegina, cf. 5.85.1(26) Ἀθηναῖοι
μέν νυν λέγουσι   5.85.2(9) ἐς ὅ...ἀνακομισθῆναι
Miracles of the statues of Damia and Auxesia, cf. 5.86.1(10) Ἀθηναῖοι
μέν νυν οὕτω λέγουσι γενέσθαι. Αἰγινῆται δὲ...ἀπικέσθαι
Ἀθηναίους   5.86.3(21) ἐς οὗ...ποιῆσαι
Book 6
Spartan explanation of Cleomenes' madness, cf. 6.84.1(24) Ἀργεῖοι
μέν νυν...φασι...αὐτοὶ δὲ Σπαρτιῆταί φασι...μανῆναι
Κλεομένεα...Σκύθας γὰρ τοὺς νομάδας[21]   6.84.2(27) ἐπείτε
...ἐμβάλειν
Tale of the vision of Epizelus at Marathon, cf. 6.117.3(10) λέγειν δὲ
αὐτόν...ἤκουσα τοιόνδε τινὰ λόγον   6.117.3(12) τοῦ...σκιάζειν
Hecataeus' story of the exile of the Pelasgians from Attica, cf. 6.137.1(15)
εἴτε...δικαίως εἴτε ἀδίκως...οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι πλὴν τὰ
λεγόμενα ὅτι Ἑκαταῖος μὲν ὁ Ἡγησάνδρου ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι
λόγοισι λέγων ἄδικως· ἐπείτε γὰρ ἰδεῖν[21]   6.137.2(17) ἐπείτε
...ἰδεῖν   6.137.2(20) ὡς...ἰδεῖν   6.137.2(21) τὴν...εἶναι
Book 7
Argive explanation of their neutrality in the Persian War, cf. 7.148.2(6)
Ἀργεῖοι δὲ λέγουσι τὰ κατ' ἑωυτοὺς γενέσθαι ὧδε   7.148.3(14)
τῶν...πέμπειν   7.148.3(19) ὡς...ἐλθεῖν

---

comes out in his use of κου. Cf. 1.113.3(16), 1.114.2(24)." Similarly in our passage the
intrusive infinitive is only a kind of litotes which does not necessitate a reevaluation of
the proper significance of the idiom.

[21] (bis) At both 6.84.1(24) and 6.137.1(16) the O.O. is initiated by forms of φημί,
which suggest that what follows might be classified under the second rubric of this
section, i.e., as strong statements of personal opinion. However in both cases this strong
form of statement is altered and converted so that what actually succeeds after the
intervention of γάρ is approximately equal to discourse dependent upon a form of λέγω,
and at 6.137.1(15) forms of λέγω are explicitly associated with the form of φημί. The
repeated intrusive infinitives in this last section are all of a piece with Herodotus' generally
negative attitude towards Hecataeus.

"Hellenic" or widely accepted explanation of Argive neutrality,
    cf. 7.150.3(3) Ἀργείους λέγεται πρῆγμα ποιήσασθαι 7.150.3(5)
    ἐπεί...παραλαμβάνειν
The report of Minos' death and the Cretans' expedition to Camicus in
    Sicily, cf. 7.170.1(26) λέγεται...Μίνων...ἀποθανεῖν 7.170.2(7)
    ὡς...γενέσθαι · 7.171.2(4) ἔστε...νεμέσθαι
Pantites' survival and fate after Thermopylae, cf. 7.232.1(25) λέγεται
    δὲ καὶ ἄλλον...περιγενέσθαι 7.232.1(27) τῷ...εἶναι

Book 8
Athenian account of the comportment of the Corinthians at Salamis,
    cf. 8.94.1(6) Ἀδείμαντον δὲ τὸν Κορίνθιον στρατηγὸν λέγουσι
    Ἀθηναῖοι...οἴχεσθαι φεύγοντα 8.94.2(11) ὡς...γίνεσθαι
    8.94.2(16) ὡς...γενέσθαι
Xerxes in the Strymonian gale, cf. 8.118.3(1) Ξέρξην λέγεται·...εἰπεῖν
    (and also 8.118.1(17) ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος)
    8.118.4(6) ὡς...ἐκβῆναι
The oracle in the Carian tongue of the Ptoan Apollo to Mys of Europus,
    cf. 8.135.1(18) θῶμά μοι μέγιστον γενέσθαι λέγεται ὑπὸ
    Θηβαίων 8.135.2(25) ἐπείτε...παρελθεῖν

Book 9
The oracles concerning Evenius given at Delphi and Dodona to the
    Apollonians, cf. 9.93.2(21) αὐτοῖσι ἔφραζον ὅτι 9.93.4(24)
    πρίν...δώσειν

An examination of these places in context and, if need be, a com-
parison with the passages in STT 66–67 does much to sensitize any
reader to the complex question of Herodotean "believability." At
the same time it goes far to establish that the correct interpretation of
this alternative form of O.O. is that which is advocated in those pages.
But the demonstration will not be complete until the Herodotean
counterparts of the passages cited in STT 67–68 for the intrusive
infinitive used to reflect upon the narration of an opponent in Athenian
orations are also adduced.   The historian recognizes no opponents.
But his sensitivity to special pleading and over-statement is keen to a
degree.   Herodotus is therefore often moved to treat these things with
a gentle persiflage, which the intrusive infinitive serves to convey.

Consider the following presentation of the Herodotean material:

Infinitival subordinate clauses in O.O. used as expressions of personal opinions and dubious contentions—a title suggesting each occasion being accompanied by the words initiating O.O., and the intrusive infinitives being arranged under this heading in order of occurrence.

Book 1

Oath of the Emigrant Phocaeans, cf. 1.165.3(5) ὤμοσαν μὴ... ἥξειν 1.165.3(6) πρὶν ἤ... ἀναφανῆναι[22]

Book 2

Non-Greek and non-Egyptian justification for temple-precinct promiscuity, cf. 2.64.1(2) νομίζοντες ἀνθρώπους εἶναι κατά περ τὰ ἄλλα κτήνεα 2.64.2(5) εἰ... εἶναι

Amasis' proof of his worthiness to be Pharaoh, cf. 2.172.4(5) ὁ ῎Αμασις... ἐξέφηνε φὰς ἐκ τοῦ ποδανιπτῆρος τὤγαλμα γεγονέναι 2.172.4(7) ἐς τὸν... ἐνεμέειν... ἐνουρέειν... ἐναπονίζεσθαι

Amasis' further argument in the same sense, cf. 2.172.5(8) ἤδη ὦν ἔφη λέγων ὁμοίως αὐτος τῷ ποδανιπτῆρι πεπρηγέναι 2.172.5(9) εἰ... εἶναι

Book 3

The Spartan Archias the Younger's justification of guest-friendship with the Samians who killed his grandfather, cf. 3.55.2(3) τιμᾶν δὲ... ἔφη 3.55.2(3) διότι... ταφῆναι

Zopyrus' story to the Babylonians, cf. 3.156.2(19) κατοικτίζετο, φὰς ὑπὸ Δαρείου πεπονθέναι 3.156.2(20) διότι... συμβουλεῦσαι

Book 4

no example

Book 5

Epidaurian justification to the Athenians of tribute discontinuance, cf. 5.84.1(20) οἱ δὲ (sc. ᾽Επιδαύριοι) ἀπέφαινον λόγῳ ὡς 5.84.1(22) ἐπεί... ἐστερῆσθαι

---

[22] The reason for Herodotus' ironical report of this great oath never to return to Phocaea appears in the immediate suite of the text. Herodotus reports that they became homesick presently, ψευδόρκιοι δὲ γενόμενοι ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω ἐς τὴν Φώκαιαν. It has been often remarked that familiarity with his fellow Asiatic Greeks seems to have bred a certain contempt in Herodotus.

Book 6

no example

Book 7

Demaretus' interpretation to Darius of Spartan constitutional practice
in respect to the royal succession, cf. 7.3.3(14) ἔφη ὁ Δημάρητος
7.3.3(15) ἐπεί...νομίζεσθαι

Book 8

Andrian reply to Themistocles' demands, cf. 8.111.2(8) ὑπεκρίναντο
πρὸς ταῦτα λέγοντες   8.111.3(11) ἐπεί...εἶναι

Book 9

Artabazus' opinion as against Mardonius' on correct Persian policy in
Boeotia, cf. 9.41.2(28) βουλευομένων δὲ αἵδε ἦσαν αἱ γνῶμαι,
ἡ μὲν Ἀρταβάζου²³ 9.41.2(1) ἔνθα...ἐσενηνεῖχθαι

This is a complete list of infinitives intrusive in subordinate clauses.
But it does not account for all intrusive infinitives. The next great
category is treated in Part II.

PART II THE O.O. INFINITIVE INTRUSIVE AFTER
ὅτι AND/OR ὡς²⁴

O.O. following ὅτι and/or ὡς after a verb of speaking is regularly
expressed by finite forms with change of person, either in the original

²³ Herodotus closes this speech with the words 9.41.4(8–10) τούτου μὲν (sc. Ἀρταβ-
άζου) ἡ αὐτὴ ἐγίνετο καὶ Θηβαίων γνώμη, ὡς προειδότος πλεῦν τι καὶ τούτου, which
shows that he considered the speech advocated prudent policy from the Persian point of
view. But it also identifies Artabazus' ideas with what was in Herodotus' eyes doubt-
less treachery on the part of Thebes to the Greek cause. The subordinate clause occurs
just at the place where Artabazus is made to refer to this treachery, and it is this shameful
fact which causes Herodotus to back off from the statement by bringing in the intrusive
infinitive. It must be remembered that Herodotus has the sensibilities of his popular
Greek audience to consider.
²⁴ The two adverbs are not perfect synonyms. Ὅτι is more objective and ὡς is more
subjective. Thus ὅτι is phraseological with δῆλα and δῆλον without γέγονε, ἐγένετο,
ἐστί, since, so used, these words report to manifest evidence, cf. 1.4.2(6–7), 1.207.3(2–3),
2.5.1(20–22) δῆλα γὰρ δὴ καὶ μὴ προακούσαντι, ἰδόντι δέ, ὅστις γε σύνεσιν ἔχει, ὅτι
Αἴγυπτος ἐς τὴν Ἕλληνες ναυτίλλονται ἐστὶ Αἰγυπτίοισι ἐπίκτητός τε γῆ καὶ δῶρον
τοῦ ποταμοῦ...3.83.2(12–13), 9.11.2(6). Τεκμήριον on the other hand, which relates to
inferential evidence can only take ὅτι when the ὅτι clause stands in direct apposition to
τεκμήριον and is therefore merely an equivalent, an explanation or definition of the

τεκμήριον. So at 2.43.2(20–23) πολλά μοι καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήριά ἐστι τοῦτο οὕτω ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ καὶ τόδε (sc. τεκμήριόν ἐστι), ὅτι... The regular and indeed phraseological combination with τεκμήριον is ὡς as at 2.13.1(23–24) ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τόδε μοι μέγα τεκμήριον περὶ τῆς χώρης ταύτης οἱ ἱρέες, ὡς...2.104.4(23–24); 3.38.2(21–24). The two idioms combine at 7.238.2(8–9) δῆλά μοι πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλοισι τεκμηρίοισι, ἐν δὲ καὶ τῷδε (sc. τεκμηρίῳ) οὐκ ἥκιστα γέγονε, ὡς ὅτι...(ὡς ὅτι ABC ὅτι PDRSV edd.), and where the editors, failing to grasp the idiomatic superimposition, follow the weaker tradition. Perhaps they consider ὡς ὅτι a pleonasm. If so, Herodotus' text, which contains several seemingly pleonastic combinations of ὅτι and ὡς, or doublets of the one adverb or the other, as, e.g., 1.86.5(7–9) ἔλεγε...ὡς...ὡς...8.22.2(15) μεμνημένοι ὅτι...ὅτι... 9.90.2(1–3) ἔλεγε...ὡς...ὡς...3.71.5(14–15) ἴστε...ὅτι...ὡς...9.6.1(11) προεῖπαί ...ὅτι...ὡς..., does little to support this argument against the received text. The immediate juxtaposition of the two adverbs is not essentially harder than the same combinations with separated elements. This is shown by several passages where the particles are collocated in other authors—for the most part in such authors as show the stylistic influence of Herodotus. Cf. X. HG 3.2.14 ὡς δ᾽ἤκουσεν ὁ Δερκυλίδας ὅτι πάλιν πεπερακότες εἰσὶ τὸν Μαίανδρον, εἰπὼν τῷ Φάρακι ὡς ὅτι ὀκνοίη μὴ ὁ Τισσαφέρνης καὶ ὁ Φαρνάβαζος ἐρήμην οὖσαν καταθέοντες φέρωσι καὶ ἄγωσι τὴν χώραν, διέβαινε καὶ αὐτός. (ὡς ὅτι codd. Hude ὡς Castalio, Krüger, Marchant, Hatzfeld) X. Cyr. 5.4.42. νῦν δὲ εἰ καὶ παρεσκευασμένος τί ἐστιν, ὥσπερ πρὸς σὲ εἶπεν ὅτι παρασκευάζοιτο ὡς μαχούμενός σοι, οἶδ᾽ ὅτι ὡς ἰδόντι αὐτῷ τὴν σὴν δύναμιν πάλιν ἀπαρασκευαστότατα τὰ αὐτοῦ φανεῖται (ὅτι ὡς CAEGH ὅτι DF Marchant, Hug-Miller) Arr. An. 7.3.6 ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ὑπὲρ Καλάνου τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἱκανοὶ ἀναγεγράφασιν, οὐκ ἀχρεῖα πάντα ἐς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτῳ γνῶναι ἐπιμελές, ὅτι ὡς καρτερόν τέ ἐστι καὶ ἀνίκητον γνώμη ἀνθρωπίνη ὅ τι περ ἐθέλοι ἐξεργάσασθαι (ἐπιμελές, ὅτι ὡς codd. Dübner, Robson ἐπιμελές, ὡς Krüger, Roos). (For ὡς ὅτι in the NT and other later literary and non-literary sources, cf. Arndt-Gingrich 593 s.v. ὅτι 1.d.β; Blass-Debrunner 245 §396; E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (Cambridge, Mass. 1887) 1187 s.v. ὡς 7.) It is true that the passages here cited from Xenophon and Arrian have often been emended, or a weaker tradition has been followed so that these collocations are virtually unknown in printed texts of the earlier period. But no better argument than the seeming pleonasm has been brought up to justify this, and the existence of passages where the collocations occur as poorly attested variants, e.g., X. Cyr. 5.3.30 and HG 3.4.20 prove nothing—despite Krüger, KA II 161–62. No one questions ὅτι...ὅτι, ὡς...ὡς, ὅτι...ὡς, or ὡς...ὅτι for other Classical authors, where they occur frequently, cf. KG 2.367–68; Wyse on Isaeus 3.15.3; 7.4.2; 5.3.45; F. W. Sturz, Lexicon Xenophonteum (Leipzig 1801 and Hildesheim 1964) 4.616 s.v. ὡς k and 3.347 s.v. ὅτι m. Passages where ὅτι (= ὅ τι) stands with a superlative are, as Krüger, KA II 161–62 explains, not comparable. Cf., e.g., Pl. Smp. 218d Ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστι πρεσβύτερον τοῦ ὡς ὅτι βέλτιστον ἐμὲ γενέσθαι cited by Krüger S I 49.10.2, cf. S I 49.10 and S II 49.10.1–5. (The passages from Xenophon cited above are not the only places in that author which receive light from Herodotean comparisons. As a further example see the oft cited and oft needlessly emended Anab. 7.1.39 ἐλθὼν δ᾽ὁ Κλέανδρος· Μάλα μόλις, ἔφη, διαπραξάμενος ἥκω· λέγειν γὰρ Ἀναξίβιον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτήδειον εἴη...(ἥκω codd. ἥκειν edd.), cf. Stahl 653.1; KG 2.557; Krüger, S I 65.11.8. The passage becomes perfectly comprehensible when one compares Herodotus' frequent use of γάρ to introduce a contrast between deed and word which involves an intrusive infinitive. See especially the passages collected in the article text Part II, IIIA, and cf. note 20 above, and note 25 below.)

mood and tense or with these changed according to the rules for the sequence of tenses and moods (*STT* 68–69). Contrary to the common usage however the infinitive may intrude.[25] If this happens two cases

[25] It must not be supposed that this change from finite verb form to infinitive is the only significant shift which can occur. Change from one of the alternative finite verb forms to another is common also. Since these shifts lie outside the area with which this article concerns itself, and are—except for a few cases where the optative is used irregularly in primary sequence (of this more in my forthcoming article "The Pure Optative in Primary Sequence in Greek")—not overtly significant of the critical posture of the reporter, we must restrict ourselves to one illustrative example, which, because it has been misunderstood, is much vexed. The passage comes after a speech of Mardonius, son of Gobryas, in O.R. which represents this intimate and relative of Xerxes as an advocate to the Great King of an aggressive policy against Athens. After the end of the O.R. Herodotus continues 7.5.3(11–14) τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου παρενθήκην ποιεέσκετο τήνδε, ὡς ἡ Εὐρώπη περικαλλὴς εἴη χώρη καὶ "δένδρεα παντοῖα φέρει τὰ ἥμερα," ἀρετήν τε ἄκρη, βασιλέϊ τε μούνῳ θνητῶν ἀξίη ἐκτῆσθαι (εἴη χώρη ABC Merriam, Stein, Godley, Legrand περικαλλὴς χώρη PDRSV Dindorf, Krüger, Hude, Smith-Laird / φέρει codd. Dindorf, Krüger, Merriam, Stein, Smith-Laird, Hude, Godley φέρουσα Legrand) Those who have accepted both εἴη and φέρει have done so because there is often a switch from indicative to optative forms in parallel construction, e.g., 7.151.1(14–15) ἐθέλουσι...νομιζοίατο 7.208.1(20–21) εἰσι...ποιέοιεν 7.233.1(8–11) μηδίζουσι... ἔδοσαν...ἀπικοίατο...εἶεν. Those who have not accepted both are impressed by the fact that, while the optative does to be sure commonly succeed the indicative in parallel construction, the reverse order, indicative after optative, is not known outside of this passage (Stein on 5.13.7 ff. (= Hude 5.13.2(26–1))). Neither group grasps that the anomalous φέρει comes here as a sudden transition from the O.O. back to the preceding O.R., although such a shift—even without preceding O.R.—is fairly common through-out the literature, cf. Krüger *S* I 65.11.8 and *S* II 65.11.1; *KG* 2.556–57; Stahl 565.1. Such insensitivity is perhaps understandable because such a transition from O.O. to O.R. is not particularly common in Herodotus (Schmid-Stählin I 2.643 n. 6)—but it does occur, cf. 4.118.1 (14–20) τῶν Σκυθέων οἱ ἄγγελοι ἔλεγον ἐκδιδάσκοντες ὡς ὁ Πέρσης ..., διαβέβηκε..., διαβὰς δὲ... γεφυροῖ ποταμὸν Ἴστρον,... "Ὑμεῖς ὦν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι περιίδητε ἡμέας διαφθαρέντας, κτλ." See too Hecataeus apud Pseudo-Longinus 27 Κῆυξ δὲ, ταῦτα δεινὰ ποιούμενος, αὐτίκα ἐκέλευε τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας ἐπιγόνους ἐκχωρεῖν· "οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖν δυνατός εἰμι ἀρήγειν. Ὡς μὴ ὦν αὐτοί τε ἀπόλησθε κἀμὲ τρώσητε, ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ δῆμον ἀποίχεσθαι." Moreover it has been shown in *STT* 79–80 that this transition is particularly likely to occur in the καί member of a polysyndetic series—here καί...τε...τε...—the components of which are so many aspects of a typical role which the subject is portrayed as playing. The typicality of Mardonius' role as "war-hawk" is made explicit in our text by the iterative imperfect ποιεέσκετο—and the phrase δένδρεα παντοῖα φέρει (sc. ἡ Εὐρώπη) τὰ ἥμερα represents typical language of Mardonius in this role. The particular reason why this phrase springs forth into O.R. and thus preserves the indicative verb of the (supposed) original without changing it into the optative is on the one hand that the Persians had a special interest in and respect for trees—a fact which is well attested and fascinated the ancients (cf. Stein *ad loc.*)—and on the other hand because Mardonius was talking about Athens which prided itself on its olive groves. The particular interest of

must be clearly distinguished (*STT* 70–71).   If the infinitive intervenes
after one or more finite forms have begun the O.O. in normative
fashion, the effect of the intrusion is not always very marked.   While
in some cases such an intrusion can approximate to the expressiveness
of the infinitive intrusive in subordinate clauses in infinitival O.O.,
sometimes the change seems to be caused in part by a seeking after
variation.   The shift in feeling is only about as strong in some cases
as, let us say, the effect of some formulaic uses of the commonplace
λόγον-ἔργον antitheses.   The expressive intervention of the intrusive
infinitive is much more marked if it follows directly upon ὅτι and/or
ὡς as the first verb form after the relative adverb.   By way of explana-
tion one might suppose that immediately after ὅτι and/or ὡς the
infinitive is felt as a rupture in an established syntactical structure or
expectation—regular O.O. with finite forms after these adverbs—but
after the finite verb form O.O. is established the change to infinitive or
infinitives is only felt as the substitution of one regular, but less precise
and sympathetic, form of O.O., the infinitival, for another regular
form, that with finite verb forms after ὅτι and/or ὡς.   Whatever the
explanation the phenomenon is clear, not only in the examples in
STT 69–70 from Attic authors, but also in the Herodotean repertoire.
The first two occur in sensational hieratic and popular Egyptian tales.
The final exploit of Queen Nitocris:

2.100.4(21–23) ταύτης μὲν πέρι τοσαῦτα ἔλεγον (sc. οἱ ἱρέες), πλὴν ὅτι
αὐτήν μιν, ὡς τοῦτο ἐξέργαστο, ῥῖψαι ἐς οἴκημα σποδοῦ πλέον, ὅκως
ἀτιμώρητος γένηται.

Egyptian version of the death of Cambyses' younger sister-wife:

3.32.3–4(24–4) Ἕλληνες μὲν δὴ διὰ τοῦτο . . . φασὶ αὐτὴν ἀπολέσθαι ὑπὸ
Καμβύσεω, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ (sc. λέγουσι) ὡς τραπέζῃ περικατημένων
λαβοῦσαν θρίδακα τὴν γυναῖκα περιτῖλαι καὶ ἐπανειρέσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα . . .
καὶ τὸν φάναι . . . τὴν δὲ εἰπεῖν . . . τὸν δὲ θυμωθέντα ἐμπηδῆσαι αὐτῇ
ἐχούσῃ ἐν γαστρί, καί μιν ἐκτρώσασαν ἀποθανεῖν.

Persians in trees, and the general interest of all barbarians—at least in the Greek estimate
of the matter—in Greek arboriculture would make this phrase seem to them particularly
characteristic.

The third example occurs in a Greek myth of the foundation of the North African cities—Jason's adventure in the area:

4.179.3(27) τὸν Τρίτωνά...καὶ τοῖσι σὺν 'Ιήσονι σημήναντα τὸν πάντα λογόν, ὡς ἐπεὰν τὸν τρίποδα κομίσηται τῶν ἐκγόνων τις τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ συμπλεόντων, τότε ἑκατὸν πόλιας οἰκῆσαι περὶ τὴν Τριτωνίδα λίμνην Ἑλληνίδας πᾶσαν εἶναι ἀνάγκην.

The situation is distinctly different in the 35 Herodotean passages where the infinitive intrudes only after previous finite forms. The principal categories of the analysis given here, which parallels in its essential points that found in *SST* 70–74, seem clear. But probably no two scholars would agree on the classification of every example. The scheme of analysis is first given in the form of an explanatory outline, and then the actual passages are adduced, with some brief remarks.

Analysis of the passages where an O.O. infinitive intrudes after ὅτι and/or ὡς in succession to at least one finite verb of a principal clause after the relative adverb.

I EXPRESSIVE INTRUSION OF THE O.O. INFINITIVE

A Intrusion on Material Grounds

This corresponds to a change in the author's critical attitude towards the latter part of the reported account. He is willing to accept responsibility or at least to keep an optimistically open mind concerning the first part—but not for what follows. The motivation of the switch is *critical* and *intellectual*.

B Intrusion on Euphemistic Grounds

This corresponds to a change in the author's emotive relationship towards the latter part of the reported account. He is willing to report the first part in a straightforward fashion, but shrinks from what follows thereafter. The motivation of the switch is a *sense of delicacy* associated with modesty, shame, dread, guilt, or the simple feeling that the reported speaker has begun to "get out of line" in some way.

C   Intrusion Because of a Change in the Relationship to the Reported Speaker

By slipping over into modal forms—whether these be (1) futures, (2) show lexically indicated modality, or (3) are in the potential optative in the (modal) sense of complete subjective conviction—the reported speaker asserts mid-speech his independence from or rebellion against the established intellectual or affective attitude between speaker reported and speaker reporting (author). The speaker reporting indicates this change by resort to infinitival report. The motivation of the change in the form of the report is thus *reaction* on the part of the reporter.

II   APPARENT INTRUSION OF THE O.O. INFINITIVE CONSEQUENT UPON DELIBERATE RETENTION OF FINITE VERB FORMS WHERE INFINITIVES WOULD BE APPROPRIATE

A   Retention of the Infinitive Forms on Stylistic Grounds

This occurs when the author only feigns to be ready to accept the responsibility for an account. After he has made a show of reporting with a straight face, he slips over after all into infinitives, thus giving it to be understood that he has been speaking with tongue in cheek all along. The motivation here is a *striving after an effect of gentle irony*.

B   Intrusion Postponed on Religious Grounds

Without being willing to accept full responsibility, the author does wish to emphasize that while what he is retelling is fundamentally a subjective phenomenon it nevertheless has an objective side or aspect. This type of retention of the finite verb occurs when the author wishes to report a religious or pseudo-religious experience such as an apparition or a dream. Certainly unwilling to deny the subjective reality, or even the possible genuine religious significance of such an experience, Herodotus appropriately begins the account with finite verb forms. Still, being too prudent not to realize that what he is dealing with may after all have been mere illusions, he indicates this reserve by finally switching over to the infinititive. The motivation here is the *deter-*

mination of the author to maintain a pious but enlightened attitude towards all religious matters.

III FORMULAIC INTRUSION OF THE O.O. INFINITIVE

A   *Intrusion Accompanied by* γάρ

The Greek has an ingrained preference for contrasting and comparing the objective and the subjective side of things—the frequent antithesis of ἔργον and λόγος is one particular form of the general tendency. This preference frequently causes the substantial matter of an account to be given first, and this then to be followed by the kind of explanations, justifications, and rationalizations which are associated with all conscious human experience.   In an O.O. report this first element or aspect of an account is liable to be expressed in finite verb forms, and the second element or aspect in infinitives.[26]   The fundamental distinction between the two forms of O.O. is not completely lost from view in such cases.   But it is exploited not so much for explicitly expressive purposes as for stylistic liveliness.   Γάρ properly introduces explanations and justifications—it is so used in several of the citations given below under headings I and II also—and so it is frequently associated with the intruding infinitives in this idiom.

[26] This switch need not have the anacoluthic form studied here. A new verb of speaking can introduce the infinitives, cf. the interpretation of the Magi of the eclipse of the sun at Xerxes' departure from Sardis 7.37.3(22–23) οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν ὡς Ἕλλησι προδεικνύει ὁ θεὸς ἔκλειψιν τῶν πολίων, λέγοντες ἥλιον εἶναι Ἑλλήνων προδέκτορα, σελήνην δὲ σφέων. Cf. also Xerxes' reason for not killing but giving safe conduct to certain Greek spies he had apprehended 7.146.3–147.1 ἐκέλευσε (sc. ὁ Ξέρξης)... ἀποπέμπειν ἐς τὴν ἂν αὐτοὶ ἐθέλωσι χώρην ἀσινέας. ἐπιλέγων δὲ τὸν λόγον τόνδε ...ὡς εἰ μὲν ἀπώλοντο οἱ κατάσκοποι, οὔτ'ἂν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πρήγματα προεπύθοντο οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐόντα λόγου μέζω, οὔτ'ἄν τι τοὺς πολεμίους μέγα ἐσίναντο, ἄνδρας τρεῖς ἀπολέσαντες· νοστησάντων δὲ τούτων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα δοκέειν ἔφη ἀκούσαντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας τὰ ἑωυτοῦ πρήγματα πρὸ τοῦ στόλου τοῦ γινομένου παραδώσειν σφέας τὴν ἰδίην ἐλευθερίην, καὶ οὕτω οὐδὲ δεήσειν ἐπ'αὐτοὺς στρατηλατέοντας πρήγματα ἔχειν. And finally, cf. the beginning of the Carthaginian conjecture as to the disappearance of Hamilcar during the battle in Sicily with Gelon 7.167.1(7–8) Ἔστι δὲ ὑπ'αὐτῶν Καρχηδονίων ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος, οἰκότι χρεωμένων, ὡς οἱ μὲν βάρβαροι τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐν τῇ Σικελίῃ ἐμάχοντο ἐξ ἠοῦς ἀρξάμενοι μέχρι δείλης ὀψίης (ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο γὰρ λέγεται ἑλκύσαι τὴν σύστασιν), ὁ δὲ Ἀμίλκας... Without being really quite the same these passages come close to being circumstantial versions of the same shift in thought processes frequently expressed by means of the formulaic intrusive infinitives studied under heading III below.

B Intrusion Accompanied by Expressions Similar in Meaning to γάρ

Other locutions may serve as well as γάρ to accompany or introduce the intruding infinitives, and Herodotus uses καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου, δέ, ἐπεί...γε, καίτοι... γε, τοσοῦτο and οὕτω τε in this way.

The actual passages in each category are listed below. They are numbered successively, and provided with some cross references indicating alternative possibilities of classification, as well as critical remarks where these seem called for.

IA Expressive intrusion of the O.O. infinitive on material grounds

(1) Cf. IIA and IIB. Egyptian doctrine of the transmigration of souls. 2.123.2(19) πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ τόνδε τὸν λόγον Αἰγύπτιοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰπόντες, ὡς ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ ἀθάνατός ἐστι, τοῦ σώματος δὲ καταφθίνοντος ἐς ἄλλο ζῷον αἰεὶ γινόμενον ἐσδύεται· ἐπεὰν δὲ πάντα περιέλθῃ τὰ χερσαῖα καὶ τὰ θαλάσσια καὶ τὰ πετεινά, αὖτις ἐς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα γινόμενον ἐσδύνει, τὴν περιήλυσιν δὲ αὐτῇ γίνεσθαι ἐν τρισχιλίοισι ἔτεσι. (ἐσδύνει ABC Stein, Godley ἐσδύνειν DRSV Dindorf, Krüger, Hude, Legrand) Herodotus is willing to entertain the doctrine as a serious idea of religious philosophy, but balks at ridiculously precise quantification. The correct reading is therefore that which allows the doctrine itself to be related in finite forms.

(2) Cf. IIA. Natural limitations upon the reproduction of Arabian winged serpents, and common vipers. 3.108.1(3) λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τόδε Ἀράβιοι, ὡς πᾶσα ἂν γῆ ἐπίμπλατο τῶν ὀφίων τούτων, εἰ μὴ γίνεσθαι κατ'αὐτοὺς οἷόν τι καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἐχίδνας ἠπιστάμην γίνεσθαι. One senses that Herodotus places very little reliance upon his informer here, and is only willing to go along with him to the extent that the initial indicatives suggest, because he sees in the information some confirmation for a theory of ferocity-related birth-rates in which, he goes on to confess, he finds a good deal of internal conviction.

(3) Cf. IB. Gloss on Gelon's parting shot to the Athenian ambassadors at 7.162.1(3) ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὸ ἔαρ αὐτῇ (i.e., τῇ Ἑλλάδι) ἐξαραίρηται. 7.162.2(5–9)[27] δῆλα γὰρ ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐστι τὸ ἔαρ

---

[27] The accusative of the δέ member implies an infinitival verb form. Stein supplies such an infinitive and explains: "Hier war (sc. der Übergang in den Infinitiv)...ein passendes Mittel den Teil der Erklärung, der keine objektive Geltung hat, sondern

δοκιμώτατον, τῆς δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατιῆς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ (sc. τοῦ
Γέλωνος) στρατιὴν (sc. τὸ δοκιμώτατον εἶναι). The indicative
statement is an inoffensive commonplace, but the statement in terms
of the implied infinitive is a vainglorious boast.

(4) Cf. IIA, IIB, and IIIB. Carthaginians' story of the disappearance
of Hamilcar at the battle in Sicily with Gelon. 7.167.1(7–8) Ἔστι δὲ
ὑπ' αὐτῶν Καρχηδονίων ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος οἰκότι χρεωμένων (i.e.,
with a certain speciousness), ὡς οἱ μὲν βάρβαροι τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐν τῇ
Σικελίῃ ἐμάχοντο ἐξ ἠοῦς ἀρξάμενοι μέχρι δείλης ὀψίης (ἐπὶ
τοσοῦτο γὰρ λέγεται ἑλκύσαι τὴν σύστασιν), ὁ δὲ Ἀμίλκας ἐν τούτῳ
τῷ χρόνῳ μένων ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐθύετο καὶ ἐκαλλιερέετο ἐπὶ
πυρῆς μεγάλης σώματα ὅλα καταγίζων· ἰδὼν δὲ τροπὴν τῶν
ἑωυτοῦ γινομένην ὡς ἔτυχε ἐπισπένδων τοῖσι ἱροῖσι, ὦσε
ἑωυτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ· οὕτω δὴ κατακαυθέντα ἀφανισθῆναι. The
suspicion would naturally be that Hamilcar made his escape somehow.
But Herodotus concedes the believability of the story and in accord-
ance with this concession sticks to the indicatives until the relation of

<hr/>

eben nur Gelon's Meinung enthält, auch als diesem angehörig (daher ἑωυτοῦ) hinzu-
stellen." Whether this whole explanatory section was inserted by Herodotus or by
someone else does not appear to scholars (commentators *ad loc.*). There are peculiarities
in the language as, e.g., the collocation of the objective δῆλα and the subjective ὡς which
causes Stein to explain γάρ = γὰρ εἶναι. But these peculiarities are explicable. The
word δῆλα is applicable as representative of the cocksureness of Gelon and is therefore a
kind of O.R. quotation. (For Herodotus' involvement in Gelon's thought processes
here, see εἴκαζε (sc. ὁ Γέλων) at 7.162.2(8).) Herodotus continues however with ὡς,
since after all Gelon's is just one man's point of view. Stein's explanation γάρ = γὰρ
εἶναι is correct in as much as it is γάρ which shows the character of Gelon's underlying
rationale, which involves presuppositions which he himself does not explain, but which
Herodotus, speaking as it were for him, does specify. Perhaps the most peculiar thing
about this explanation offered by Herodotus for Gelon is that it gives a different inter-
pretation from that which would naturally occur to the reader or hearer. Gelon's words
would seem to be a threat that the Greeks, if they will not accept his leadership, must
accept terrible losses among their men of age to bear arms. The explanation in the text
prefers to understand the words as Sicilian or West Greek jingoism. This may be the
key to the understanding of the passage and its acceptance as Herodotean. Such an
interpretation of Gelon's words would be far more acceptable to West Greeks than the
other which puts Gelon, a great man in the West, in an unfavorable un-pan-hellenic
light. The passage would then join the list of those passages which may reflect a late but
Herodotean revision of the text dating from the period of the author's settlement in
Thourioi and professional activity as lecturer from that city as base. The passage most
commonly mentioned in this connection is 4.99.5 (19–23), cf. the commentators *ad loc.*
and see further Jacoby 243.

the actual disappearance. At this point incredulity finally gets the better of Herodotus' open-mindedness, and the infinitive comes in.

(5) Xerxes in the Strymonian gale on the home route from Greece. 8.118.1–3(17–28) Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος, ὡς ἐπειδὴ Ξέρξης...ἀπίκετο..., ἐνθεῦτεν οὐκέτι ὁδοιπορίῃσι διεχρᾶτο, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν στρατιὴν Ὑδάρνεϊ ἐπιτρέπει..., αὐτὸς δ'ἐπὶ νεὸς Φοινίσσης ἐπιβὰς ἐκομίζετο...Πλέοντα δέ μιν ἄνεμον Στρυμονίην ὑπολαβεῖν...καὶ δὴ μᾶλλον...τι χειμαίνεσθαι,... ἐνθαῦτα...τὸν βασίλεα εἰρέσθαι...τὸν κυβερνήτην...καὶ τὸν εἶπαι·... The certainly historical part of Xerxes' return home is given by indicatives. The infinitives take over to recount the details of the uncertainly historical anecdote. After εἶπαι the narrative then passes over into novellen-dialogue, i.e., into an alternative form of discourse suitable for the avoidance of responsibility.

IB Intrusion of the O.O. infinitive on euphemistic grounds

(6) Cf. IIA. Samian explanation of how the mixing-bowl sent by the Spartans to Croesus got into the temple of Hera on the island. 1.70.3(10) οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι ὡς..., αὐτοὶ δὲ Σάμιοι λέγουσι ὡς, ἐπείτε ὑστέρησαν οἱ ἄγοντες τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τὸν κρητῆρα, ἐπυνθάνοντο δὲ Σάρδις τε καὶ Κροῖσον ἡλωκέναι, ἀπέδοντο τὸν κρητῆρα ἐν Σάμῳ, ἰδιώτας δὲ ἄνδρας πριαμένους ἀναθεῖναί μιν ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον· What follows shows that Herodotus found this version of the story credible. ἀναθεῖναι signals a sense of shame, real or affected, for the all too typical Spartan venality.

(7) Cf. IC3.[28] Prexaspes' confession and accusation from the tower. 3.75.2(1–2) καὶ δὴ ἔλεγε (sc. ὁ Πρηξάσπης) τὸν μὲν Κύρου Σμέρδιν ὡς αὐτὸς ὑπὸ Καμβύσεω ἀναγκαζόμενος ἀποκτείνειε, τοὺς μάγους δὲ βασιλεύειν. The hierocracy of the usurping Magi is a national shame and catastrophe in comparison to which Prexaspes' personal guilt sinks into comparative insignificance. The latter can

---

[28] A common meaning of denominatives in -εύω (cf. *KB* 2.261.3 and Schwyzer I 732 γ) is described by E. Fränkel, *Griechische Denominativa in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und Verbreitung* (Göttingen 1906) 176: "Sie deuten eine *intensive Beschäftigung* mit den Nomina, auf die man sie beziehen konnte, an." This intense preoccupation with being βασιλεύς may be equivalent to such a strongly conative present here that the infinitive should be considered as effectively modal. In that case the suggested alternative IC3 would be the right classification.

therefore be reported straight out, but to convey the former a shocked
infinitive is appropriate.

(8) Cf. IIA.   The less seemly version of Oebares' trickery to secure
Darius' election as Great King.   3.87.1(15–18) Οἱ μὲν δή φασι τὸν
Οἰβάρεα ταῦτα μηχανήσασθαι οἱ δὲ τοιάδε (καὶ γὰρ ἐπ᾽ἀμφότερα
λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων), ὡς τῆς ἵππου ταύτης τῶν ἄρθρων ἐπιψαύσας
τῇ χειρὶ ἔχοι αὐτὴν κρύψας ἐν τῇσι ἀναξυρίσι· ὡς δὲ ἅμα τῷ ἡλίῳ
ἀνιόντι ἀπίεσθαι μέλλειν τοὺς ἵππους, τὸν Οἰβάρεα τοῦτον ἐξεί-
ραντα τὴν χεῖρα πρὸς τοῦ Δαρείου ἵππου τοὺς μυκτῆρας προσενεῖ-
και τὸν δὲ αἰσθόμενον φριμάξασθαί τε καὶ χρεμετίσαι. The
infinitives are called forth by the combination of shoddy electioneering
and equine obscenity.

(9) Cf. IIA and IIIA.   Response to the Lacedaemonians of Lemnian
exiles after landing in the Peloponnese. 4.145.2(18–20) οἱ δὲ τῷ
ἀγγέλῳ εἰρωτῶντι ἔλεγον ὡς εἴησαν μὲν Μινύαι, παῖδες δὲ εἶεν
τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ πλεόντων ἡρώων· προσσχόντας γὰρ τούτους ἐς
Λῆμνον φυτεῦσαι σφέας. What the Lemnians vaunted was in
heroic times only the begetting of bastards.

*IC1   Intrusion because of a change in the relationship of the reported speaker
to the reporting speaker as indicated by future modality*

(10) Cf. IB and IIA.   Greek reply to the Colchian demand for
restitution of Medea and reparation for her abduction. 1.2.3(16–18)
τοὺς δὲ (sc. Ἕλληνας) ὑποκρίνασθαι ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνοι Ἰοῦς τῆς
Ἀργείης ἔδοσάν σφι δίκας τῆς ἁρπαγῆς· οὐδὲ ὦν αὐτοὶ δώσειν
ἐκείνοισι.   "Well *they* weren't about to make *them* restitution either."
The "smart" and wilful tone of the Greek reply οὐ δώσομεν elicits
the infinitival report as a sort of moderating reaction on the part of
Herodotus.

(11) Cf. IB.[29]   Prooemium to Croesus' advisory speech to Cyrus

---

[29] The comparison to the "intrusion on euphemistic grounds" in group IB lies close
in all of these passages treated under IC simply because the reporter (Herodotus) feels
in such cases that the modal meaning of the future form chosen by the speaker reported
exhibits a certain wilfulness (cf. *STT* 71–74 and 112–22) which calls for some reaction or
characterisation.   That holds even when, as is here the case, the original speaker is only
protesting loyalty.   Protesting loyalty is about the only thing it would be safe to use the
modal future for when speaking to one's Lord and Master as Croesus is.   The omission
of ὅτι in some texts is only an obvious attempt to avoid the anacoluthon of the infinitive

concerning the proposals of Tamyris Queen of the Massagetae.
1.207.1(18–20) "Ὦ βασιλεῦ, εἶπον μὲν καὶ πρότερόν τοι ὅτι ἐπεί με
Ζεὺς ἔδωκέ τοι, τὸ ἂν ὁρῶ σφάλμα ἐὸν οἴκῳ τῷ σῷ, κατὰ
δύναμιν ἀποτρέψειν." (ὅτι ἐπεί codd. pl. edd. pl. τοι ἐπεί recentior
unus, Aldinus, Hude)

(12) Cf. IIB and IIIA. Vision of Sethos, the priest-pharaoh, before
the expected attack of Sanacharibus of Assyria.   2.141.3(3–4)
Ὀλοφυρόμενον δ' ἄρα μιν ἐπελθεῖν ὕπνον καί οἱ δόξαι ἐν τῇ ὄψι
ἐπιστάντα τὸν θεὸν θαρσύνειν ὡς οὐδὲν πείσεται ἄχαρι ἀντιάζων
τὸν Ἀραβίων στρατόν· αὐτὸς γάρ οἱ πέμψειν τιμωρούς. The
reassurance of the god is hearty and certain, perhaps almost harsh and
peremptory.

*IC2   Intrusion because of a change in the relationship of the reported speaker
to the reporting speaker as indicated by lexically indicated modality*

(13) Cf. IB. Amasis' reply to Patarbemis. 2.162.4(4–5) τὸν δὲ
(sc. Ἄμασιν) αὐτῷ (sc. Παταρβήμιδι) ὑποκρίνεσθαι, ὡς ταῦτα πάλαι
παρεσκευάζετο ποιέειν, καὶ αὐτῷ οὐ μέμψασθαι³⁰ Ἀπρίην· παρέ-
σεσθαι γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἄλλους ἄξειν. (μέμψασθαι codd. pl.
μέμψεσθαι A²DR edd. pl.) μέμφομαι is a verb of passionate conviction
and here strengthened by association with a negative. It is spoken
by Amasis with a snarl of hate as, in effect, a threat and occasions the
switch to the infinitive. The future infinitives which follow are closely
comparable to those in passages (10) and (11) above.

(14) Cf. IB, IC1, and IIIA. The counsel of Histiaeus of Miletus to
the Ionians concerning proposals of the Scythians. 4.137.2(15)

---

after ὅτι by simply removing the adverb. On strict formal grounds, this passage should
be accounted as showing an infinitive immediately after ὅτι and so be included with the
three true anacolutha treated at the beginning of this whole section, Part II. But the
relative sentence in τό (= ὅ) with ὁρῶ as its verb is felt as virtually a principal clause
insulating the adverb ὅτι from the infinitive. Therefore the passage is treated here.

³⁰ Whatever form of μέμφομαι is used here it must have at least virtually future sense.
The change from the aorist infinitive to the future infinitive in some texts is caused by a
failure on the part of the scribe or editor to realise that aorist infinitives, when used
expressive of clear conceptions which amount to confident predictions, can be used as
virtual futures. μέμψασθαι is so used here and should be left unchanged. For aorist
infinitives used where future infinitives might be expected, see *STT* 123–44. The
subject of παρεσκευάζετο and that of μέμψασθαι are different and therefore Lycurgus
76 and Herodotus 8.97.2(2) discussed in *STT* 119–20 are not comparable.

Ἱστιαίου δὲ τοῦ Μιλησίου ἐναντίη ταύτῃ, λέγοντος ὡς νῦν μὲν διὰ
Δαρεῖον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τυραννεύει πόλιος, τῆς Δαρείου δὲ δυνάμιος
καταιρεθείσης οὔτε αὐτὸς Μιλησίων οἷός τε ἔσται[31] ἄρχειν οὔτε
ἄλλον οὐδένα οὐδαμῶν· βουλήσεσθαι γὰρ ἑκάστην τῶν πολίων
δημοκρατέεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τυραννεύεσθαι. (ἔσται codd. ἔσεσθαι
Reiz, edd.)   The thought, terrifying to Histiaeus, of the cities getting
out of hand gives rise as reflected in his language to the double modal-
ity of the word βούλομαι and the future form.   This draws the
infinitive form of report with it.

*IC3   Intrusion because of a change in the relationship of the reported speaker
to the reporting speaker as indicated by the use of a potential optative
in the (modal) sense of perfect subjective conviction (STT 208–15)*

(15) Cf. IB and IIIA.   Themistocles' retort tὸ Adimantus and the
Corinthians. 8.61.2(19–22) ἑωυτοῖσί τε ἐδήλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη καὶ
πόλις καὶ γῆ μέζων ἤ περ ἐκείνοισι, ἔστ᾽ἂν διηκόσιαι νέες σφι ἔωσι
πεπληρωμέναι· οὐδαμοὺς γὰρ Ἑλλήνων αὐτοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀποκρού-
σασθαι[32] (ἀποκρούσασθαι codd. pl. ἀποκρούσεσθαι BRSV edd. pl.
ἂν ἀποκρούσασθαι Powell, Legrand).

---

[31] ἔσται is used as a simple future of simple future inevitable fact and is most forceful
so understood.   The switch to the infinitive comes more naturally where the speaker
turns his attention to others, the citizens of the Ionian cities whose wilfulness can make
his own situation impossible.   The text as transmitted brings out the contrast between
ruler and unwilling subjects strikingly.   The editors accept Reiz's conjecture ἔσεσθαι
only out of a mistaken preference for outward concinnity.   For βούλομαι and similar
words which have a lexically indicated modal significance, cf. STT 71–72.

[32] Powell and Legrand have certainly the right thought in interpreting ἀποκρούσασθαι
as representative of a potential optative.   It would have the sense of perfect subjective
conviction which the potential optative so often has when it stands in alternation with
indicatives, especially future indicatives, since εἴη stands in secondary sequence for a
future indicative of the O.R.   See the discussion and examples adduced from Attic
texts in STT 208–15.   This is also good Herodotean idiom.   Cf. Xerxes' speech to
Masistes at 9.111.5(2–4) Οὕτω τοι, Μασίστα, πέπρηκται· οὔτε γὰρ ἄν τοι δοίην ἔτι
θυγάτερα τὴν ἐμὴν γῆμαι, οὔτε ἐκείνη πλεῦνα χρόνον συνοικήσεις,... And
for this alternation represented in O.O. see example 16 just below in the article text.
There is however no need for ἄν to be added to the infinitive for it to be taken as repre-
sentative of a potential optative.   As SCG I 153 §389 points out, there are fixed formulae
in which the optative pure in a potential sense may occur, and these have been, as is
further pointed out in SCG I 153 §389, all too often corrected in a mechanical way.
What these formulae are appears from the collections of examples given in SCG
I 180–82 §450; Krüger, S II 54.3.7–9; H. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin 1870 et
Graz 1955) 41.6–13 s.v. ἄν; KG 1.225–26; Stahl 298–302; Schwyzer II 325.

(16) Cf. IB and IIB.   Speech of the Samian legate Hegesistratus of Delos in favor of intervention in Ionia. 9.90.2(1–5) ἔλεγε Ἡγησίστρατος πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖα, ὡς ἦν μοῦνον ἴδωνται αὐτοὺς οἱ Ἴωνες ἀποστήσονται ἀπὸ Περσέων, καὶ ὡς οἱ βάρβαροι οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι· ἢν δὲ καὶ ἄρα ὑπομείνωσι, οὐκ ἑτέρην ἄγρην τοιαύτην εὑρεῖν ἂν αὐτούς. As example (15) above.

IIA Apparent intrusion of the O.O. infinitive consequent upon deliberate retention of verb forms on stylistic grounds where infinitives would be appropriate

(17) Hercules' vengeance as intended victim of supposed Egyptian religious practices.   2.45.1(29–5) εὐήθης δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅδε ὁ μῦθός ἐστι τὸν περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέος λέγουσι, ὡς αὐτὸν ἀπικόμενον ἐς Αἴγυπτον στέψαντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὑπὸ πομπῆς ἐξῆγον ὡς θύσοντες τῷ Διί· τὸν δὲ τέως μὲν ἡσυχίην ἔχειν, ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ κατάρχοντο, ἐς ἀλκὴν τραπόμενον πάντας σφέας καταφονεῦσαι. Herodotus attacks this story not only by calling it εὐήθης but

---

The most common are third person verb forms used in an ideal or impersonal sense, and sentences with τις or equivalent.   Among such passages which stand in the best tradition with τις but not with ἄν or κε(ν) are Thgn. 382 ὁδὸν ἤν τις ἰὼν ἀθανάτοισι ἄδοι ΔΙΣΣΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ 2.14 (Diels⁸ 2.408) αἴ τις ταῦτα ποιήσαι,...κακὰ ἀποθάνοι A. Choeph. 595 ὑπέρτολμον ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι S. Ant. 605 τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; E. Hipp. 1186 θᾶσσον ἢ λέγοι τις Cratin. 307 K. (= Meineke 2.225) τίς δὲ σύ; κομψός τις ἔροιτο θεατής Pl. Gorg. 448e ποία τις εἴη ἡ Γοργίου τέχνη; Antiph. 1.4 πρὸς τίνας οὖν ἔλθοι τις βοηθούς; Is. 10.18 ἴσως οὖν τις...θαυμάσειε Dem. 61.11 τῷ γὰρ εἰκάσειέ τις Lycurg. 144 τις ἀναμνησθείς... σώσειεν; Din. 2.3 πονηρίαν...κωλῦσαι τάχα τις κολάζων δυνηθείη.   These passages show the right reading at Herodotus 3.127.3(18–19) ὑμέων δὴ ὧν τίς μοι Ὀροίτεα ἢ ζῶντα ἀγάγοι ἢ ἀποκτείνειε; (τίς μοι codd. Godley τίς ἄν μοι Dindorf, Krüger, Hude τίς μοι...ζῶντα ἂν ἀγάγοι Stein, Legrand τίς μοι...ζῶντα ἂν ἄγοι Schäfer)

This formula passes easily and often into the negative form, cf. Od. 14.123 οὔ τις κεῖνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλημένος ἐλθὼν / ἀγγέλλων πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον υἱόν Thgn. 1187–88 οὔ τις ἄποινα διδοὺς θάνατον φύγοι οὐ δὲ βαρεῖαν / δυστυχίην A. Choeph. 172 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πλὴν ἐμοῦ κείραιτό νιν E. IA 1210 οὐδεὶς πρὸς τάδ' ἀντείποι βροτῶν Din. 3.19 οὐδεμία πόλις σωθείη Arist. EN 1229b34 οὐδεὶς δικαίως ἀνδρεῖος λέγοιτο τούτων Herondas 3.75 οὐδεὶς σ' ἐπαινέσειεν (cf. Headlam-Knox ad loc.). This is the form of the idiom represented in the O.O. οὐδαμοὺς...ἀποκρούσεσθαι of our passage in the text above.   The question of idiomatic equivalents of ἄν in pure optative sentences is dealt with in greater detail in my forthcoming article "The Pure Optative in Primary Sequence in Greek."

mocks it with a series of rhetorical questions τοῖσι γὰρ οὐδὲ κτήνεα ὁσίη θύειν ἐστι χωρὶς ὑῶν καὶ ἐρσένων βοῶν καὶ μόσχων, ὅσοι ἂν καθαροὶ ἔωσι, καὶ χηνῶν, κῶς ἂν οὗτοι ἀνθρώπους θύοιεν; ἔτι δὲ ἕνα ἐόντα τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ ἔτι ἄνθρωπον, ὡς δὴ φασί, κῶς φύσιν ἔχει πολλὰς μυριάδας φονεῦσαι; The seriousness which the indicative form ἐξῆγον preceding the infinitives ἔχειν and καταφονεῦσαι implies is thus merely mock seriousness. It does not represent Herodotus' true attitude. This comes out—all the stronger for the contrast— with the later resort to the infinitives.

(18) Cf. IA. The sad tale of the daughter of Mycerinus and the handlessness of her handmaids' statues. 2.131.1–3(17–28) οἱ δέ τινες λέγουσι περὶ τῆς βοὸς ταύτης καὶ τῶν κολοσσῶν τόνδε τὸν λόγον, ὡς Μυκερῖνος ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ θυγατρὸς καὶ ἔπειτα ἐμίγη οἱ ἀεκούσῃ· μετὰ δὲ λέγουσι ὡς ἡ παῖς ἀπήγξατο ὑπὸ ἄχεος, ὁ δέ μιν ἔθαψε ἐν τῇ βοῒ ταύτῃ, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ αὐτῆς τῶν ἀμφιπόλων τῶν προδουσέων τὴν θυγατέρα τῷ πατρὶ ἀπέταμε τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ νῦν τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτέων εἶναι πεπονθυίας τά περ αἱ ζωαὶ ἔπαθον. Herodotus goes on to state specifically that he distrusts this story in its entirety, calling it nonsense, and also to explain why it is just that particular part of the story which finally does pass over into infinitival narration which offends him especially. ταῦτα δὲ λέγουσι φλυηρέοντες, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς χεῖρας τῶν κολοσσῶν· ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν ὅτι ὑπὸ χρόνου τὰς χεῖρας ἀποβεβλήκασι, αἳ ἐν ποσὶ αὐτέων ἐφαίνοντο ἐοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ.

(19) Cf. IB and IIIA. Message for help from the pan-hellenic forces at Thermopylae to the Opuntian Locrians and the Phocians. 7.203.1(22–3) Αὐτοὶ γάρ σφεας οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπεκαλέσαντο, λέγοντες δι᾿ ἀγγέλων ὡς αὐτοὶ μὲν ἥκοιεν πρόδρομοι τῶν ἄλλων, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν συμμάχων προσδόκιμοι πᾶσαν εἶεν ἡμέρην, ἡ θάλασσά τέ σφι εἴη ἐν φυλακῇ ὑπ᾿ Ἀθηναίων τε φρουρεομένη καὶ Αἰγινητέων καὶ τῶν ἐς τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν ταχθέντων, καί σφι εἴη δεινὸν οὐδέν· οὐ γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀλλ᾿ ἄνθρωπον, εἶναι δὲ θνητὸν οὐδένα οὐδὲ ἔσεσθαι τῷ κακὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γινομένῳ οὐ συνεμίχθη, τοῖσι δὲ μεγίστοισι αὐτῶν μέγιστα· ὀφείλειν ὦν[33] καὶ

---

[33] ὦν stands in association with a potential optative (O.O. ὀφείλειν...ἄν for O.R. ὀφείλοι...ἄν) giving the upshot of a preceding recital. So also at 7.150.2(25) οὕτω ἂν

τὸν ἐπελαύνοντα, ὡς ἐόντα θνητόν, ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης πεσεῖν ἄν. (πεσεῖν (πεσέειν) ἄν codd. Dindorf, Stein, Merriam, Godley, Legrand πεσεῖν (πεσέειν) Krüger, Hude, Laird-Smith) With the advantage of his hindsight Herodotus could not have literally believed this message. But he has dignified the passage with finite forms up to the point where it collapses into mere truistic maxims. The irony is not bitter nor ridiculous. It is pathetic and resigned.

IIB Intrusion postponed on religious grounds

(20) Cf. IB, IC, and IIIA. Apparition to the barbarians fleeing from Delphi into Boeotia. 8.38.1(9–12) ἔλεγον δὲ οἱ ἀποστήσοντες οὗτοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ὡς πρὸς τούτοισι καὶ ἄλλα ὥρων θεῖα· δύο γὰρ ὁπλίτας μέζονας ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἐόντας ἕπεσθαί σφι κτείνοντας καὶ διώκοντας. Ever ready to respect the religious experiences of men, Herodotus shows at least the objective side—the visual impact—of this essentially subjective experience in a straight-forward way, i.e., in terms of finite forms. Cf. further under IC1 esp. 2.141.3(3–4) (= passage (12) above) and passage (21) just below.

(21) Cf. IB, IC, and IIIB. The apparition reported before Salamis. 8.84.2(27) Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε, ὡς φάσμα σφι γυναικὸς ἐφάνη, φανεῖσαν δὲ διακελεύσασθαι...

IIIA Formulaic intrusion of the O.O. infinitive accompanied by γάρ

(22) Cf. IC. Paris' understanding that the women of the Greeks might be kidnapped with impunity. 1.3.1(21–22) ἐπιστάμενον

ὧν εἴημεν ὑμέτεροι ἀπόγονοι 7.184.3(8–9) ἤδη ὧν ἄνδρες ἂν εἶεν ἐν αὐτοῖσι τέσσαρες μυριάδες καὶ εἴκοσι. Krüger and others have objected that ἄν is too far removed from ὀφείλειν and too closely adjoined to πεσεῖν for this interpretation to be admissible. But their objection passes over the fact that ἄν is commonly removed to great distance from its verb in order to give rhetorical emphasis to some important word in the sentence. It serves Herodotus' purpose to mark the language here represented in O.O. as rhetorical, and so this is probably the most extreme example of the practice he shows. But there are many others in Herodotus, and the idiom is well established and copiously illustrated in standard syntactical authorities. Cf. 3.119.5(10–11) ἀδελφεὸς ἂν ἄλλος οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ γένοιτο 7.150.2(25) cited just above (NB. ἄν *before* the properly post-positive ὧν) 8.108.2(27) τοῦτ᾽ ἂν μέγιστον πάντων σφεῖς κακὸν τὴν ῾Ελλάδα ἐργασαίατο, and other examples *SCG* I 187–89 §464, *KG* 1.245.5 and 6, and esp. for Attic, C. Short "The Order of Greek Words in Attic" xciii–xciv (prefatory essay in C. D. Yonge, *An English-Greek Lexicon*, edited by H. Drisler (N.Y. 1899).

(sc. τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον) πάντως ὅτι οὐ δώσει δίκας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους διδόναι. The finite verb expresses a falsehood and the infinitive a truth. Still the future is appropriate as expressing what seemed certain to Paris. The infinitive with γάρ gives his explanation of that certainty, and it is therefore that subjective part of the thought which is appropriately expressed with the infinitive.

(23) Epidaurian justification of discontinuance of payments to Athens. 5.84.1(20–22) πέμψαντες δὲ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐμήνιον τοῖσι Ἐπιδαυρίοισι· οἱ δὲ ἀπέφαινον λόγῳ ὡς οὐκ ἀδικέοιεν· ὅσον μὲν γὰρ χρόνον εἶχον τὰ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ἐπιτελέειν τὰ συνέθεντο, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐστερῆσθαι αὐτῶν, οὐ δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποφέρειν ἔτι...

(24) Rumours at Sparta about Ariston's fertility and Demaretus' paternity. 6.68.3(16) ὅ τε λόγος πολλὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ ὡς Ἀρίστωνι σπέρμα παιδοποιὸν οὐκ ἐνῆν· τεκεῖν γὰρ ἄν οἱ καὶ τὰς προτέρας γυναῖκας.

(25) Percalus' response to Demaretus' queries about his paternity. 6.69.4(8–11) σευ μάλιστα κατάπτονται οἱ ἐχθροί, λέγοντες ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρίστων...οὐ φήσειέ σε ἑωυτοῦ εἶναι (τὸν χρόνον γάρ, τοὺς δέκα μῆνας, οὐδέκω ἐξήκειν)...

(26) Cf. IB examples (6) through (9). Artabazus' as opposed to Mardonius' opinion of proper Persian policy in Boeotia. 9.41.2–3 (28–8) βουλευομένων δὲ αἵδε ἦσαν αἱ γνῶμαι, ἡ μὲν Ἀρταβάζου ὡς χρεὸν εἴη ἀναζεύξαντας τὴν ταχίστην πάντα τὸν στρατὸν ἰέναι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος Θηβαίων, ἔνθα σῖτόν τέ σφι ἐσενηνεῖχθαι [34] πολλαὸν κὶ χόρτον τοῖσι ὑποζυγίοισι κατ' ἡσυχίην τε ἱζομένους διαπρήσσεσθαι ποιεῦντας τάδε· ἔχειν γὰρ χρυσὸν πολλὸν μὲν ἐπίσημον,...πολλὸν δὲ ἄργυρόν τε καὶ ἐκπώματα· τούτων φειδομένους μηδενὸς διαπέμπειν ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, Ἑλλήνων δὲ μάλιστα ἐς τοὺς προεστεῶτας ἐν τῇσι πόλισι, καὶ ταχέως σφέας παραδώσειν τὴν ἐλευθερίην, μηδὲ

---

[34] ἐσενηνεῖχθαι in the relative adverbial sentence with ἔνθα is a true intensive oblique infinitive (see text of article in Part I at note 22) and must be distinguished from ἰέναι and διαπρήσσεσθαι which are dependent upon the phrase χρεὸν εἴη. None of these infinitives affects the formulaic shift which occurs with ἔχειν γάρ. The alternative interpretation would be that the shift occurs with ἐσενηνεῖχθαι which stands for the finite form for euphemistic reasons, and that the infinitives which follow with ἔχειν γάρ κτλ. stand for the O.R. forms for the same reason. If this interpretation is preferred this example would be classed above in IB(6–9).

ἀκινδυνεύειν συμβάλλοντας . . . Μαρδονίου δὲ . . . οὐδαμῶς συγγινω-
σκομένη (sc. ἡ γνώμη)· δοκέειν τε γὰρ κτλ.

(27) Cf. IA and IIB.   Oracular utterances concerning Evenius made
to the Apollonians at Dodona and Delphi.   9.93.4(20–2) πρόφαντα δέ
σφι ἔν τε Δωδώνῃ καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἐγίνετο, ἐπείτε ἐπειρώτων
τοὺς προφήτας τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ παρεόντος κακοῦ, οἱ δὲ αὐτοῖσι
ἔφραζον ὅτι ἀδίκως τὸν φύλακον τῶν ἱρῶν προβάτων Εὐήνιον
τῆς ὄψιος ἐστέρησαν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ (sc. οἱ θεοί, ἤτοι Ζεύς τε καὶ
Ἀπόλλων) ἐπορμῆσαι τοὺς λύκους, οὐ πρότερόν τε παύσεσθαι
τιμωρέοντες ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ δίκας δώσειν τῶν ἐποίησαν ταύτας τὰς
ἂν αὐτὸς ἕληται καὶ δικαιοῖ· τούτων δὲ τελεομένων αὐτοὶ δώσειν
Εὐηνίῳ δόσιν τοιαύτην τὴν πολλούς μιν μακαριεῖν ἀνθρώπων
ἔχοντα. (ἔπειτε(ν) . . . ἔφραζον Reiske, Dindorf, Legrand ἔπειτα . . .
ἔφραζον codd., del. Krüger, Powell τοὺς προφήτας et οἱ δὲ αὐτοῖσι
del. Stein, Hude (ἔπειτε pro ἔπειτα ret.))[35]

---

[35] Krüger very rightly saw that αὐτοί must be = οἱ θεοί.   But he mistakenly concluded
that excisions are necessary—"Denn auf solche Weise konnten die Propheten den
Göttern sich nicht substituieren."   Stein argued cogently against this that the gods are
often represented as speaking in their own persons in oracles.   His parallels are 1.47.3(7–8)
οἶδα δ᾽ἐγω(= Ἀπόλλων) ψάμμου τ᾽ἀριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης, / καὶ κωφοῦ
συνίημι καὶ οὐ φωνεῦντος ἀκούω and 7.141.3(3) σοὶ δὲ τόδ᾽αὖτις ἔπος ἐρέω, ἀδάμαντι
πελάσσας (sc. ἐγὼ = Ἀπόλλων) (NB. masculine participle despite the fact that presum-
ably the priestess is speaking).   He might also have cited for αὐτός used in O.O. repre-
senting ἐγώ in similar connection 2.141.4(4) αὐτὸς γάρ (sc. ὁ θεὸς = "Ηφαιστος) οἱ
πέμψειν τιμωρούς 8.36.1(9) ὁ δὲ θεός σφεας οὐκ ἔα κινέειν, φὰς αὐτὸς (i.e., ὁ
Ἀπόλλων) ἱκανὸς εἶναι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προκατῆσθαι.   But Stein then turned around and
made his own less extensive excisions, arguing that the language here was too obscure
for some early scribe who introduced the supposedly objectionable passages by way of
explanation of αὐτοί.   It is hard to believe this because no such explanatory material
crept into the text in the other passages cited.   Both Stein and Krüger before him seem
to object to τοὺς προφήτας and the concordant masculine expression οἱ . . . ἔφραζον too,
because they believe it to be in Krüger's words a "ganz untechnische Ausdrucksweise,"
i.e., probably that priestesses not priests should be referred to, cf. 2.55.1(6) Δωδωναίων
. . . αἱ προμάντιες, or if a priest is mentioned then it should be only one person, the chief
priest who is spoken of elsewhere as an authority at Delphi, cf. 8.36.2(15–16).   Since
neither Krüger nor Stein elaborates in any detail here, or with any obvious immediate
relevance elsewhere (see Stein on 7.111.8 = Hude 7.111.2(11)), it is hard to tell exactly
what preconceived notion about sanctuary practice and associated technical language
they find these words in conflict with.   However Legrand ad loc. seems to have met
all such objections very nicely—"La mention de 'prophètes' est surprenante; peut-être
cela doit-il s'entendre ici, d'une façon générale, sans précision ni de nombre ni de sexe,
des interprètes d'une divinité; aussi bien, le rôle des προφῆται à Delphes est-il mal
défini; . . . et les rites de Dodone sont trop imparfaitement connus pour qu'on puisse

IIIB   *Formulaic intrusion of the O.O. infinitive accompanied by expressions*
        similar in meaning to γάρ

(28) Cf. IA.   Explanation why Amasis' monolithic shrine at Sais
was left in the temple yard.   2.175.5(14) Ἤδη δέ τινες λέγουσι ὡς
ἄνθρωπος διεφθάρη ὑπ' αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ στέγῃ τῇ μουνολίθου) τῶν τις
αὐτὴν μοχλευόντων, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου οὐκ ἐσελκυσθῆναι.

(29) Cf. IA.   The conditions under which the Argives agreed to
take part in the defensive alliance against Persia.   7.148.4(22–26)
τοὺς δὲ (sc. Ἀργείους) πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα (sc. ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλλων τῶν
Ἑλλήνων) ὑποκρίνασθαι ὡς ἕτοιμοί εἰσι Ἀργεῖοι ποιέειν ταῦτα
τριήκοντα ἔτεα εἰρήνην σπεισάμενοι Λακεδαιμονίοισι καὶ ἡγεόμενοι
κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ πάσης τῆς συμμαχίης· καίτοι κατά γε τὸ δίκαιον
γίνεσθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίην ἑωυτῶν, ἀλλ'ὅμως σφι ἀποχρᾶν κατὰ τὸ
ἥμισυ ἡγεομένοισι.

(30) Cf. IIA.   The theory that Leonides discharged the non-Spartan
Greeks   from   Thermopylae   without   prompting.   7.220.1(9–12)
Λέγεται δὲ ὡς αὐτός σφεας ἀπέπεμψε Λεωνίδης, μὴ ἀπόλωνται
κηδόμενος· αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ Σπαρτιητέων τοῖσι παρεοῦσι οὐκ ἔχειν
εὐπρεπέως ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν τάξιν ἐς τὴν ἦλθον φυλάξοντες ἀρχήν.
In the following Herodotus states his preference for another version.

(31) Cf. IA and IIA.   Prompting of Dieneces' *bon mot* before
Thermopylae.   7.226.1(20–22) πυθόμενον (sc. τὸν Διηνέκεα) πρός
τευ τῶν Τρηχινίων ὡς ἐπεὰν οἱ βάρβαροι ἀπίωσι τὰ τοξεύματα,
τὸν ἥλιον ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθεος τῶν ὀϊστῶν ἀποκρύπτουσι· τοσοῦτο
πλῆθος αὐτῶν εἶναι...

(32) Cf. IB.   Themistocles' threat to the Andrians if they should
fail to meet demands for new imposts.   8.111.2(6–8) προϊσχομένου
Θεμιστοκλέος λόγον τόνδε, ὡς ἥκοιεν Ἀθηναῖοι περὶ ἑωυτοὺς
ἔχοντες δύο θεοὺς μεγάλους, Πειθώ τε καὶ Ἀναγκαίην, οὕτω τέ
σφι κάρτα δοτέα εἶναι χρήματα.

(33) Cf. IB and IIA.   Andrian answer to Themistocles' demands for
more contributions to the Athenian war chest.   8.111.2–3(8–16)

affirmer qu'il n'y avait pas des ministres masculins de l'oracle." As for the language
ἔφραζον ὅτι, there can hardly be any objection to it as such, cf. 8.75.2(5), 8.110.3(22),
and 9.12.2(22).

ὑπεκρίναντο πρὸς ταῦτα λέγοντες ὡς κατὰ λόγον ἦσαν ἄρα αἱ Ἀθῆναι μεγάλαι τε καὶ εὐδαίμονες, καὶ θεῶν χρηστῶν ἥκοιεν εὖ· ἐπεὶ Ἀνδρίους γε εἶναι γεωπείνας ἐς τὰ μέγιστα ἀνήκοντας, καὶ θεοὺς δύο ἀχρήστους οὐκ ἐκλείπειν σφέων τὴν νῆσον ἀλλ'αἰεὶ φιλοχωρέειν, Πενίην τε καὶ Ἀμηχανίην, καὶ τούτων τῶν θεῶν ἐπηβόλους ἐόντας Ἀνδρίους οὐ δώσειν χρήματα· οὐδέκοτε γὰρ[36] τῆς ἑωυτῶν ἀδυναμίης τὴν Ἀθηναίων δύναμιν εἶναι κρέσσω. (γὰρ codd. Dindorf, Krüger, Stein, Godley γὰρ ἄν Dobree, Hude, Laird-Smith, Powell, Legrand)

As the consideration of the O.O. Infinitive intrusive after ὅτι and/or ὡς has now been completed, the next subject is the O.O. Infinitive intrusive in O.R. narratives and accounts.

PART III THE O.O. INFINITIVE INTRUSIVE IN O.R. NARRATIVE AND ACCOUNTS: THE FREE NARRATIVAL INFINITIVE

Traditional teaching fails to make an important elementary distinction in the matter of the relationship between verbs of speaking and thinking and associated O.O. infinitives. Verbs of speaking and thinking are the most common method of initiating O.O., and most commonly the first sentence of the O.O., if it is infinitival O.O., is

[36] When editors feel that an O.O. infinitive should be future in sense but believe that its form stands in the way, they can alter the infinitive itself to bring it into line, or when, as is often the case, this involves excessive changes in the word form, they can add the particle ἄν. This allows the infinitive to be interpreted as the representative of a potential optative and thus to count in the analysis of the sequence of tenses as a future, since the potential optative often has a future sense, cf. STT 123–44 and esp. 142 n. 4. and KG 1.240. Since Dobree many editors have undertaken such a correction here, thinking thus to preserve concinnity between δώσειν and ἄν...εἶναι. This change is unnecessary, since εἶναι stands in an argumentative maxim, exhibiting many characteristics of its class of sentences. Thus it is introduced by γάρ, cf. 3.127.2(17–18) ἔνθα γὰρ σοφίης δεῖ, βίης ἔργον οὐδέν 7.50.3(9–10) μεγάλα γὰρ πρήγματα μεγάλοισι κινδύνοισι ἐθέλει καταιρέεσθαι. It stands at the end of the speech as a clinching argument, cf. 7.9.γ(3–4) αὐτόματον γὰρ οὐδέν, ἀλλ'ἀπὸ πείρης πάντα ἀνθρώποισι φιλέει γίνεσθαι 7.157.3(16–17) τῷ δὲ εὖ βουλευθέντι πρήγματι τελευτὴ ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν χρηστὴ ἐθέλει ἐπιγίνεσθαι. It has a form of εἰμί as verb, cf. 5.24.3(8–9) κτημάτων πάντων ἐστι τιμιώτατον ἀνὴρ φίλος συνετός τε καὶ εὔνοος 9.16.5(7–9) ἐχθίστη δὲ ὀδύνη ἐστι τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι αὕτη, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν. Nor does the fact that it stands in O.O. affect the matter significantly, cf. 7.203.2(27–28) οὐ γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀλλ'ἄνθρωπον 9.122.3(15–16) οὐ γάρ τι τῆς αὐτῆς

also directly dependent upon the verb of speaking or thinking, and stands in the relationship of the object.   There is however no necessary connection or association between the two things.   This is shown by the fact that new sentences in O.O. may follow with infinitives as their principal verbs.   These are understood to have an oblique sense because the verb of speaking or thinking upon which the first O.O. infinitive depends grammatically sets up a frame of O.O. narration. But the new infinitives do not depend grammatically upon the verb of speaking.   The grammatical dependency of the first O.O. sentence is merely coincidental.   It may seem precious or pedantic to insist upon the grammatical independence of successive infinitival sentences in O.O.   But failure to do so involves so many awkward consequences that it is far better to seek exactness.[37]   Consider the practice well known in other authors (KG 2.346.2), but especially common in Herodotus' infinitival O.O., according to which the author intersperses comments and explanations in indicative sentences throughout the course of the narrative—after each of which the infinitival O.O. picks up again as though nothing had happened.   Sometimes these

γῆς εἶναι καρπόν τε θωμαστὸν φύειν καὶ ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς τὰ πολέμια.   Common to all these examples is the present tense of the verb.   It is the universal present found in statements which apply to all time, and therefore it stands aside from considerations of temporal sequence, cf. SCG I 80 §§189–90; KG 1.132.1.c; Stahl 87.4; Krüger I 53.1.1; Schwyzer II 270–71.   For this kind of sentence as characteristic of Herodotus' speeches, cf. Schmidt-Stählin I 2.652 n. 2, and for Attic parallels see Rehdantz-Blass 20–21 s.v. Γνώμη.

[37] There is always a certain onus involved in concerning oneself with such elementary matters.   A favorite passage from Diderot's dialogue "Le Neveu de Rameau," Ouvrages Choisies, ed. J. Voilquin (Paris 1934[10]) I 31, comes to mind by way of an apology.   Rameau's nephew attempts to dissuade Diderot from his plan of seeing that his young daughter receives an intellectual formation: "Lui.—Mais je m'en tiendrai pour le moment à une question: ne lui faudra-t-il pas un ou deux maîtres? Moi.—Sans doute.   Lui.—Ah! nous y revoilà.   Et ces maîtres, vous espérez qu'ils sauront la grammaire, la fable, l'histoire, la géographie, la morale, dont ils lui donneront des leçons? Chansons, mon cher maître, chansons; s'ils possédaient des choses assez pour les montrer, ils ne les montreraient pas.   Moi.—Et pourquoi? Lui.—C'est qu'ils auraient passé leur vie à les étudier; il faut être profond dans l'art ou dans la science pour en posséder les éléments.   Les ouvrages classiques ne peuvent être bien faits que par ceux qui ont blanchi sous le harnais, c'est le milieu et la fin qui éclaircissent les ténèbres du commencement; demandez à votre ami, M. d'Alembert, le coryphée de la science mathématique, s'il serait trop bon pour en faire des éléments.   Ce n'est qu'après trente à quarante ans d'exercice que mon oncle a entrevu les premières lueurs de la théorie musicale."

parentheses take the form of relative sentences, or are at least initially introduced as relative sentences, so, e.g., 7.170.1(26)–2(6) (Cretan expedition to Sicily in vengeance of Minos) λέγεται...Μίνων... ἀποθανεῖν...πολιορκέειν...πόλιν Καμικόν, τὴν (=ἣν) κατ᾽ ἐμὲ Ἀκραγαντῖνοι ἐνέμοντο...ἐλεῖν...οἴχεσθαι.   2.100.2–3(14–17) (Egyptian Nitocris' vengeance for her brother) τὴν ἔλεγον...τὸν (=ὃν) ἀπέκτειναν...ἀπέδοσαν...διαφθεῖραι   2.121.1(14)–α(22) (Rhampsinitus' statues of the seasons) ἐκδέξασθαι...Ῥαμψίνιτον ἔλεγον,...ὃς...ἐλίπετο...ἔστησε...καλέουσι...καλέουσι...προσκυνέουσι...εὖ ποιέουσι...ἔρδομαι...γενέσθαι. Thus these sentences are drawn more or less inoffensively into the course of the infinitival discourse. But other times there is nothing of the sort to ease the break.[38] Cf., e.g., 2.99.2–4(18–7) (The dispositions of

---

[38] Considering the ability of narratives carried on with O.O. infinitives to reconstitute themselves without new specific reinitiation of the oblique relationship by a verb of speaking, and considering the fact that dialogue often and everywhere produces apparent anacoluthon, it seems difficult to accept any variation of Krüger's popular emendation at 3.22.4(16)–23.1(24) πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Αἰθίοψ ἔφη...θωμάζειν...δύνασθαι...ἐσσοῦσθαι. ἀντειρομένων δὲ τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων τῆς ζόης καὶ διαίτης πέρι, ἔτεα μὲν ἐς εἴκοσί τε καὶ ἑκατὸν τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἀπικνέεσθαι, ὑπερβάλλειν δέ τινας καὶ ταῦτα, σίτησιν δὲ εἶναι κρέα ἐφθὰ καὶ πόμα γάλα. (μὲν ἐς codd. Dindorf, Godley μὲν εἶπε ἐς Krüger, Hude μὲν ἔφη ἐς Stein πέρι, εἶπε ἔτεα Legrand) Krüger's comment is: "ἔτεα μέν. εἶπε μέν. εἶπε oder ein ähnliches Wort ist wohl ausgefallen. Denn es zu ergänzen wäre hier sehr hart." There does not seem to be any question but that the passage is "hard." But it was probably intended to be so. Immediately successive free narrative infinitives as at 3.23.2(1–3) ἡγήσασθαι...ὄζειν (—example II(5) below) make such deliberate "hardness" of the oblique relationship credible here, just as they make "hard" asyndeton credible in example II(1) below. It should be remembered too that these infinitives convey the information that Ethiopians live on the average 120 years. How much easier it is to transmit such a report than to believe it implicitly. Herodotus' method of giving the report without throwing his authority behind it is, precisely, the cultivation of that very "hardness" to which so many editors object. It should also be noted that what intervenes between ἐσσοῦσθαι and ἀπικνέεσθαι is a genitive absolute—that construction which among all others is least able to affect sentence structures into the midst of which it is introduced. This genitive absolute represents the interposition of a speech-partner. There is, therefore, within the frame of the dialogue, no real question about which speaker is represented by the infinitives ἀπικνέεσθαι, ὑπερβάλλειν and εἶναι. Krüger's mistake and the mistake of those who follow him is his failure to appreciate the capacity of the infinitive to function as an equivalent for finite verb forms where the oblique relationship is fundamentally clear, whether the immediate grammatical support of a verb of speaking is available or not. See for the hyperbaton involving the interposition of a speaking partner in the middle of an infinitival period Pl. *Rep.* 5.469b, which is cited in *STT* 62, and 6.490c, which is cited in the introduction to this article.

Min around Memphis. For the meaning of the parentheses, cf. 2.99.1(16–17) προσέσται δέ τι...καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος.) ἔλεγον... ἀπογεφυρῶσαι...ῥέειν...ἀποξηρῆναι...ὀχετεῦσαι...ἔχεται... ἐστι...γεγονέναι...ἐστι...περιορύξαι...ἀπέργει...ἱδρύσασθαι 2.140.1(1)–141.1(24) (The lost island of Elbo) (sc. ἔλεγον οἱ ἱρέες) ἄρχειν...κελεύειν...ἐδυνάσθη...οἷοί τε ἦσαν...ἐστι...βασιλεῦ- σαι 3.23.3–4(4–10) (The Ethiopian fountain of youth) ἔλεγον εἶναι... χωρέειν...ἂν εἶεν...ἀγαγεῖν 4.8.1–3(18–1) (Hercules reaches the Ocean) λέγουσι...ἀπίκεσθαι...οἰκέειν...λέγουσι...ἀποδεικνῦσι ...καταλαβεῖν...κατυπνῶσαι 4.11.1(18)–2(23) (Accession of the Scyths to old Cimmeria) Ἔστι δέ...λόγος ἔχων ὧδε· ...οἴχεσθαι ...λέγεται...βουλεύεσθαι 8.135.1(19)–2(25) (Mys of Europus at the temple of Ptoan Apollo) θῶμά...λέγεται...ἐλθεῖν...καλέεται... ἐστι...κεῖται...ἔπεσθαι. Supposing what seems unlikely, that some kind of strict grammatical dependency could be preserved over long numbers of infinitives, each functioning as the principal verb of a new sentence in O.O., it is certainly without meaning to speak of grammatical dependence in infinitives which resume O.O. after such long parentheses in finite forms. It is credible however to speak of an extra-grammatical idea of citation or quotation, i.e., an idea of O.O. which allows such infinitives to function in an O.O. sense.

Thus the conception that grammatical dependence upon a verb of speaking or thinking is the only way an O.O. sense can be imparted to an infinitive does not really suffice to explain extended and/or interrupted ordinary O.O. But where this traditional explanation really falls down is in cases where there is an O.O. infinitive *without* any verb of speaking upon which it can grammatically depend. This is the case when the verb of speaking is contained in a parenthetical expression. There are many such cases, and it is impossible to distinguish O.O. infinitives after such initiation of O.O. from any other O.O. infinitives.[39]   Cf. 1.65.4(17) ὡς δ᾽αὐτοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι,

---

[39] The frequently occurring case of O.O. being initiated in separate clauses which contain a word pointing outside the clause is not quite the same. Cf. 1.94.3(24) ὧδε περὶ αὐτῶν λέγοντες·...γενέσθαι...ἐπιμηχανᾶσθαι...ἐξευρεθῆναι and 2.139.1(25), 4.8.1(17), 4.11.1(18), 7.148.2(7). Similarly 3.26.3(9) Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε ὑπ᾽αὐτῶν Ἀμμωνίων·...γενέσθαι...ἐπινεῦσαι...καταχῶσαι...ἀφανισθῆναι and 2.42.3(23), 2.118.1(9). Similarly 6.117.2(6) Συνήνεικε δέ...θῶμα γενέσθαι τοιόνδε...στερηθῆ- ναι...διατελέειν...λέγειν, cf. 3.18.1(7), 6.117.3(10), etc. *et passim.*   But it should never-

...ἀγαγέσθαι   1.191.6(18) ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων,...
μανθάνειν...τυχεῖν...χορεύειν...εἶναι   2.8.1(5) ὡς ἐγὼ ἐπυνθα-
νόμην...εἶναι...εἶναι 2.125.6(10) ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνῆσθαι τὰ ὁ ἑρμηνεύς
μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη,...τετελέσθαι 3.14.11(25) ὡς
δὲ λέγεται ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων, δακρύειν...δακρύειν...ἐσελθεῖν...
κελεύειν 3.56.2(7) ὡς δὲ ὁ ματαιότερος λόγος ὅρμηται λέγεσθαι,...
δοῦναι...ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι 4.5.1(3) ὡς δὲ Σκύθαι λέγουσι,...εἶναι
...εἶναι 4.76.6(12) ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα Τύμνεω τοῦ Ἀριαπείθεος
ἐπιτρόπου, εἶναι...εἶναι 4.95.1(19) ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι,...
δουλεῦσαι...δουλεῦσαι...κτήσασθαι...ἀπελθεῖν...κατασκευά-
σασθαι...ἀναδιδάσκειν 5.44.1(19) ὡς λέγουσι Συβαρῖται,...μέλλειν
...δεηθῆναι...συστρατεύεσθαί...συνελεῖν 6.137.3(24) ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ
Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι...ἐξελάσαι...ἀδικέειν...φοιτᾶν...εἶναι...
βιᾶσθαι...ἀποχρᾶν...φανῆναι...γενέσθαι...ἐθελῆσαι...προει-
πεῖν...σχεῖν 7.171.1(24) ὡς λέγουσι Πραίσιοι, ἐσοικίζεσθαι...
γενέσθαι...φαίνεσθαι 9.85.2(12) ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι...χῶσαι.

The only way these expressions can be dealt with in the framework
of traditional doctrine is by the supposition of elaborate and uncon-
vincing ellipses (*KG* 2.581.6, esp. note 1).   But the difficulty disappears
if one simply considers that the infinitive has a capacity to function as a
narrative verb form in an O.O. sense, when the context by any means—
not necessarily by dependency upon a verb of speaking, but in any way
whatsoever—establishes a frame of second-hand narrative.

Initiation of O.O. by parenthetic expressions alone would necessitate
this extension or rather simplification of doctrine.   But there are a
number of O.O. infinitives which are not prepared in any way.
Standard treatments such as those of *KG* and Schwyzer do not find it

theless be remarked that these pointing words have *general* meanings.   They do not con-
nect the subsequent O.O. infinitives with the verbs of speaking and thinking in a strictly
grammatical way.   They simply serve to transmit a general oblique frame of reference
and expectation which the verb or speaking or thinking implies, and in which the oblique
potential of the infinitive reveals itself.   This frame-setting function of the verb of speak-
ing or thinking which in the case of clauses with pointing words is transmitted specifically
in its proper general sense is what allows subsequent infinitives to reveal an O.O. force
even in cases where the subsequent infinitives are grammatically dependent as standing
in an object relation to the verb of speaking or thinking.   This grammatical connection,
the dependency in object relationship of O.O. infinitives upon a verb of speaking or
thinking, should be regarded as essentially *incidental* to the O.O. function of the subse-
quent O.O. infinitive or infinitives.

convenient to mention these cases.   These infinitives, since they intrude
themselves directly in O.R. narratives, give the same impression of
distance, doubt and reserve which all intrusive O.O. infinitives give,
and are thus distinguished in sense from the infinitives prepared for by
parenthetical expressions.   But there is an interesting intermediate
group.   Here an O.R. account is interrupted by a parenthetical expres-
sion containing a verb suitable for initiating O.O.   However, the O.R.
continues with finite forms as though the parenthesis had not appeared,
and only then after intervening finite forms do the infinitives intrude.
This postponement makes all the difference.   Such infinitives are
prepared for by the parenthetic expression to some extent.   But they
intrude themselves among finite forms and this gives them their
expressive force.   This peculiar idiom occurs four times in Herodotus.

I The O.O. Infinitive intrusive in Finite-Form Narratives and
     Accounts After Preparatory Parenthetical Expressions

    (1) The gold-digging ants of India (O.R. from 3.102.2(14) ἐν δὴ ὦν
τῇ ἐρημίῃ ταύτῃ... γίνονται μύρμηκες).
    After his highly creditworthy account of the political subdivisions
of the Persian empire (3.89.1(7)–96.2(27))—which is given as an
indicative account—Herodotus goes on to append many interesting
details about the peoples of districts of the empire which are remoter
from Europe.   They too are given in direct form until he reaches the
explanation of the details of native methods of exploiting the gold-
bearing sands about the mouths of the ant-hills 3.105.1(19) ἐπεὰν δὲ
ἔλθωσι ἐς τὸν χῶρον οἱ Ἰνδοὶ ἔχοντες θυλάκια, ἐμπλήσαντες ταῦτα
τῆς ψάμμου τὴν ταχίστην ἐλαύνουσι ὀπίσω· αὐτίκα γὰρ οἱ μύρμηκες
ὀδμῇ, ὡς δὴ λέγεται ⌊ὑπὸ Περσέων⌋, μαθόντες διώκουσι. εἶναι δὲ
ταχυτῆτα οὐδενὶ ἑτέρῳ ὅμοιον, ...προλαμβάνειν...συλλέγεσθαι...
ἀποσῴζεσθαι...εἶναι...παραλύεσθαι...ἐνδιδόναι...
    The reason for the construction is a conflict which Herodotus
finds between the usual credibility of his Persian sources and the
credibility of this particular tale, or rather this particular part of the tale
of the gold-digging ants.   He is sufficiently encouraged by the general
reliability of his source to report the story, but he is unwilling to treat
his audience with callousness when it comes to something which might
be taken as an affront to the critical sense.   He guards against this by the

intrusion of the infinitives which serves at once to put his audience on guard and to safe-guard Herodotus himself against charges of gullibility.

(2) Information about the lands north of Thrace beyond the Danube. (Cf. 5.9.1(23) τὸ δὲ πρὸς βορέω ἔτι τῆς χώρης ταύτης οὐδεὶς ἔχει φράσαι τὸ ἀτρεκές,...) After the report of his scanty gleanings on the subject Herodotus offers what seems to be an alternative account at 5.10.1(11) ὡς δὲ Θρήικες λέγουσι, μέλισσαι κατέχουσι τὰ πέρην τοῦ Ἴστρου, καὶ ὑπὸ τουτέων οὐκ εἶναι διελθεῖν τὸ προσωτέρω. He then goes on immediately in effect to explain the special construction: ἐμοὶ μέν νυν ταῦτα λέγοντες δοκέουσι λέγειν οὐκ οἰκότα.

(3) The genealogy of Perseus. This matter was found by Herodotus to be exceedingly complicated. He reports Greek, Egyptian, and Persian accounts, which are by no means consistent with each other, or even internally with themselves, cf. 2.91.1(7)-6(4), 6.53.1(23)-55.1(17), 7.61.3(12-17), 7.150.2(22-25). At the point where the intrusion occurs in Herodotus' account he is just relating a peculiar similarity in the Persian account, according to which Perseus was only a naturalized Greek, and the Greek version: Perseus' mother Danäe was, according to both accounts, Egyptian by connection through her father Acrisius. 6.54.1(9) ὡς δὲ ὁ παρὰ Περσέων λόγος λέγεται, αὐτὸς ὁ Περσεὺς ἐὼν Ἀσσύριος ἐγένετο Ἕλλην, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἱ Πέρσεος πρόγονοι· τοὺς δὲ Ἀκρισίου γε πατέρας ὁμολογεόντας κατ᾽οἰκηιότητα Περσέι οὐδέν, τούτους δὲ εἶναι, κατά περ Ἕλληνες λέγουσι, Αἰγυπτίους. The intrusion is due to a collapse, real or affected on Herodotus' part, of the author's belief in his own ability to sort out all the complicated conflicting genealogical reports perfectly.

(4) Vision of Pan seen by Phidippides on his way from Athens to Sparta seeking help before the battle at Marathon. 6.105.1(26) οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀποπέμπουσι ἐς Σπάρτην κήρυκα Φειδιππίδην Ἀθηναῖον μέν ἄνδρα, ἄλλως δὲ ἡμεροδρόμην τε καὶ τοῦτο μελετῶντα· τῷ δή, ὡς αὐτός τε ἔλεγε Φειδιππίδης καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ἀπήγγελλε, περὶ τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγέης ὁ Πὰν περιπίπτει· βώσαντα δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ Φειδιππίδεω τὸν Πᾶνα Ἀθηναίοισι κελεῦσαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι, δι᾽ὅτι ἑωυτοῦ οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμελείην ποιεῦνται ἐόντος εὐνόου Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ πολλαχῇ γενομένου σφι ἤδη χρησίμου, τὰ δ᾽ἔτι καὶ ἐσομένου. There is a strong contrast here between the comparative objectivity of the encounter and the subsequent rationalization

delivered originally by Pan and so by Herodotus second-hand. Thus there are grounds for comparing the passages cited above under Part II, IIB (citations (20)-(21)) and Part II, III(28)-(33), and for arguing that the intrusion here is entirely conventional. That would be to go a step too far, for Herodotus as much as admits with the words at 6.105.3(7-9) καὶ ταῦτα...Ἀθηναῖοι,...πιστεύσαντες εἶναι ἀληθέα that the report was such as to be received by some with incredulity. Merriam chose this passage well for his comment that "easy change to indirect discourse (sc. is) sometimes due to a desire to shift the re-sponsibility of the story from the writer's own shoulders."

Clear as it is that the infinitives already adduced have no grammatical connection with the verbs which initiate O.O., the capacity of the infinitive to function independently as a narrative form in O.O. becomes even more manifest in the final construction to be discussed—the strictly free narrative O.O. infinitive. In this construction a narrative or account hitherto in O.R. suddenly switches into O.O. by means of a completely unprepared intrusion of the infinitive. There are five examples of this in Herodotus, and all have plainly expressive character.

II The O.O. Infinitive Without Preparation in Finite-Form Narratives and Accounts

(1) The marvel at Olympia of Hippocrates' fireless boiling pots. 1.59.1-3(5-13) Ἱπποκράτεϊ...τέρας ἐγένετο μέγα...οἱ λέβητες... ἄνευ πυρὸς ἔζεσαν καὶ ὑπερέβαλον. Χίλων δὲ...συνεβούλευε... μὴ ἄγεσθαι...ἐκπέμπειν...ἀπείπασθαι. οὐκ ὧν ταῦτα παραινέ-σαντος Χίλωνος πείθεσθαι θέλειν τὸν Ἱπποκράτεα· γενέσθαι οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν Πεισίστρατον τοῦτον, ὃς...ἤγειρε...στάσιν,... καὶ...μηχανᾶται τοιάδε·... The underlying thought pattern in this example is familiar from the preceding example (I(4) above) and from Part II, IIB(20-21). The religious phenomenon itself is reported with strict objectivity. The human interpretations and political applications of the religious phenomenon then come in for more cavalier treat-ment—being related in terms of infinitives. In this case the speech and dialogue principle discussed in note 8 intervenes with the word συνε-βούλευε which has accordingly been kept in the finite form. After the subsequent infinitives which represent the imperatival content of

Chilon's counsel, the account takes an overtly political turn and the infinitives which follow θέλειν and γενέσθαι are narratival infinitives which are introduced with no more ado—the hardness of the switch is even underlined by the asyndeton (cf. note 14 above). The finite forms ἤγειρε and μηχανᾶται which ensue then mark a return to plain historical reporting of matters which the author considers uncontroversial.

(2) Croesus on the funeral pyre. 1.86.1–6(11–27 and 1–22). This brilliant and justly famous piece shows all three narrative possibilities in Herodotus' repertoire apart from O.O. initiated by a verb of speaking or thinking, i.e., direct finite-form narration, unprepared infinitival narration, and—due to the operation of the speech and dialogue principle—O.R. and O.O. of any form which represents the words of the participants in the action. The account opens with material which is undoubtedly historical, or which is so represented by Herodotus: the capture of Sardis and Croesus by the Persians, and Cyrus' placing of Croesus upon the pyre. This is conveyed with finite forms 1.86.1–2(11–16) ἔσχον...ἐζώγρησαν...ἤγαγον...ἀνεβίβασε. Thereupon Herodotus expresses dubiety about Cyrus' motivation for this act in a compound indirect question which depends upon a participle 1.86.2(15–23) ὁ δὲ (sc. Κῦρος)...ἐν νόῳ ἔχων εἴτε δὴ...εἴτε δὴ...εἴτε καὶ...εἴτε καὶ... Whether this represents actual divergent versions of the story or is merely one aspect of the story which "sticks" for Herodotus, this question is immediately followed by O.O. infinitives 1.86.3–4(22–27 and 1–4) τὸν μὲν (sc. Κῦρον) δὴ ποιέειν ταῦτα τῷ δὲ Κροίσῳ...ἐσελθεῖν...ὀνομάσαι...κελεῦσαι...ἐπειρωτᾶν...ἔχειν...εἰπεῖν. Hereafter follow finite forms according to the speech and dialogue principle. Not only the verbs of Croesus' first O.R. speech and of his second finite-form O.R., but also the verbs which convey Herodotus' own explanation and connection of the speeches are in finite forms; so 1.86.4(4) (Croesus) προετίμησα and 1.86.5(6–7)(Herodotus) ἔφραζε...ἐπειρώτων...ἔλεγε...1.86.5(7–10) ἦλθε...ἀποφλαυρίσειε...ἀποβεβήκοι... Herodotus takes up the narrative with unprepared O.O. infinitives again at 1.86.6(19) κελεύειν ...δύνασθαι. All of this is a perfect paradigm of the meanings of the various narrative means employed: historical narrative in O.R., material the author does not want to vouch for unconditionally in the O.O. infinitives, which are interrupted by finite forms representing the

psychological and artistic conviction of the anecdote as such in its primarily dialogue-form presentation.

(3) The conflict between Apries and Amasis, and the encounter between Amasis and Patarbemis. Herodotus' sources for the reign and exploits of Amasis (accession *c.* 569, death before 525), who was still alive only a few decades before Herodotus' birth (*c.* 490–480), and who was served by many Greek mercenaries, are good. This account is accordingly not seriously questioned by the historian. Finite verb forms carry the account from 2.161.4(12) to 162.3(28). And this continues for four verb forms more: ὡς δὲ ἀπικόμενος τὸν "Ἄμασιν ἐκάλεε ὁ Πατάρβημις, ὁ "Ἄμασις (ἔτυχε γὰρ ἐπ᾿ ἵππου κατήμενος) ἐπάρας (sc. τὸ σκέλος) ἀπεματάϊσε (= ἀπέπαρδε), καὶ τοῦτό μιν ἐκέλευε Ἀπρίῃ ἀπάγειν. This crudity induces a kind of αἰδῶς in Herodotus, who chooses to put the responsibility for the tastelessness, if not for the veracity of the tale, on his source by continuing with completely unprepared intrusive infinitives, 2.162.4–6(2–11) ἀξιοῦν... ὑποκρίνεσθαι...ἀγνοέειν...προστάξαι. There is some O.O. with both infinitives and finite forms after ὑποκρίνεσθαι (cf. Part II, IC2 (citation 13)) from the conversation between Patarbemis and Amasis, but otherwise Herodotus apologetically carries out the rest of the anecdote with narrative infinitives. When the finite forms do recur at 2.162.6(14–15) ἀπιστέατο...ἐδίδοσαν it is to report great and indubitably historical facts of the account.

(4) Immediate consequences of the famous response of Psammenitus to Cambyses 3.14.10–11(24–26,1–4) καὶ ταῦτα ὡς[40] ἀπενειχθέντα ὑπὸ τούτου (sc. Ψαμμηνίτου), εὖ δοκέειν σφι εἰρῆσθαι. ὡς δὲ λέγεται

---

[40] ὡς goes with the participle only, not with the following infinitive, cf. 3.27.3(25–2) ὁ Καμβύσης ἔφη ψεύδεσθαι σφέας καὶ ὡς ψευδομένους θανάτῳ ἐζημίου 3.52.7(6) ὁ Περίανδρος ἐστρατεύετο ἐπὶ τὸν πένθερον Προκλέα ὡς τῶν παρεόντων οἱ πρήγματων ἐόντα αἰτιώτατον 3.136.2(12–13) Ἀριστοφιλίδης...τοὺς Πέρσας εἶρξε ὡς κατασκόπους δῆθεν ἐόντας. Semi-stops are not always introduced after such participles (cf. Powell, *Lex.* 391, s.v ὡς D 2). But where, as is here the case, modern readers have difficulty, it is quite in order to follow Hude's example and introduce one. The fundamental difficulty has been the failure to recognise the free narrative function of δοκέειν. This then results in incomprehension of the following adversative δέ. Translate: "And these (words) as having been fetched up by that man (i.e., the admirable Psammetichus in his dire plight) are *supposed* to have seemed to them to have been most excellently spoken. Nay, but as the Egyptians tell the tale..."

ὑπ'Αἰγυπτίων, δακρύειν μὲν Κροῖσον..., δακρύειν δὲ Περσέων
τοὺς παρεόντας, αὐτῷ τε Καμβύσῃ ἐσελθεῖν οἰκτόν τινα καὶ αὐτίκα
κελεύειν... (ὡς secl. Matthiae, Krüger Incisum inter τούτου et εὖ
misit Hude, qui verba ὑπὸ τούτου addubitavit. Pro his coni. Legrand
ἤκουσαν σφι codd. pl., edd. pl. οἱ Dindorf ὡς δὲ codd. pl., Hude,
Legrand ὡς λέγεται DRSV Stein, Godley) The plural form of the
pronoun σφι instead of the singular οἱ referring to Cambyses alone must
apply to the members of Cambyses' suite as well, here called Περσέων
οἱ παρεόντες. This makes it seem likely that one of these lieutenants of
the Persian King is the original source of Herodotus' information. That
would be quite possible since at least one man is known to us, that
Zopyrus who deserted to Athens (3.160.2(22–23)), who might well have
recounted the tale to Herodotus as family tradition—his forebears had
stood high in the esteem of the court for three previous generations.
Accordingly Herodotus seems to have no qualms about recounting the
story in O.R. But at just this point he is faced with a pathetic Egyptian
variant of the tale—introduced by the adversative δέ—according to
which Croesus and the other Persian courtiers at hand not only won-
dered at and admired Psammenitus' words, but actually broke down
and wept because of them. Herodotus' hesitation between the two
forms of the anecdote causes him to slip into the O.O. infinitive. As
soon as this one particular point is passed he returns to finite forms
3.15.1(4–6) εὗρον...ἦγον...διαιτᾶτο κτλ.

(5) The Ethiopian King takes the Ichthyophagi, ambassadors, or
rather spies, from Cambyses, to the Fountain of Youth.   3.23.2–3(1–14)
θῶμα δὲ ποιευμένων τῶν κατασκόπων περὶ τῶν ἐτέων ἐπὶ κρήνην
σφι ἡγήσασθαι, ἀπ'ἧς λουόμενοι λιπαρώτεροι ἐγίνοντο, κατά περ
εἰ ἐλαίου εἴη. ὄζειν δὲ ἀπ'αὐτῆς ὡς εἰ ἴων. For an account of the
dialogue form section immediately preceding this citation see note 37.
That form of report keeps Herodotus from going over into infinitives
sooner. However when he reaches the part of the narrative which
deals with the fountain of youth he no longer wishes to accept full
responsibility, and two free narrative infinitives ensue before the
original speakers, the Ichthyophagi, who were known to Herodotus
only mediately, are reintroduced in association with a verb of speaking.
This verb of speaking comes as so much of an after-thought that it can
only explain but not change the acceptance of the infinitives at the

time they are spoken 3.23.3(3–4) ἀσθενὲς δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς κρήνης
ταύτης...ἔλεγον εἶναι οἱ κατάσκοποι.

A consideration of the above examples, which are not comprehended
in the standard treatments of syntax, nor comprehensible in terms of
the analysis they present, shows that infinitives can function as O.O.
verb forms without preparatory verbs of speaking, either grammatically
related to the O.O. infinitives or associated in parenthetical expressions.
Only the idea of narrative or account itself is necessary as a frame
within which the O.O. potential of the infinitive may be revealed.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

O.O. infinitives may intrude themselves in subordinate clauses in
infinitival O.O. and after ὅτι and/or ὡς after verbs of speaking or
thinking in Herodotus as well as in Attic authors.   When they do so
intrude, they serve the purpose of allowing the reporter to distance
himself from responsibility for the speech of the speaker reported.
Traditional syntactical doctrine which teaches that the O.O. of Classical
Greek has no means to allow the reporter to take up such a posture
in relation to the speech he reports is incorrect.   In Attic such intrusion
is limited to the mentioned constructions which are properly O.O. in
sense, but in Herodotus such intrusion may occur even in O.R.
constructions when these conceal an O.O. relationship in fact.   The
consideration especially of these last examples shows that it is not true
that infinitives must stand in a grammatical relationship to some verb
of speaking or thinking if they are to reveal their oblique potential.[41]