CHAPTER

3 Map, Catalogue, Drama, Narrative: Representations of the Aegean Space 🔓

Paola Ceccarelli

Abstract

This chapter looks at how perceptions of the Aegean space change as they are conveyed across different 'genres' (visual images, such as the map attributed to the Milesian philosopher Anaximander; catalogue texts, as represented by the Periegesis of Hecataeus; drama, and in particular Aeschylus' *Persians*; and prose narrative, specifically Herodotus' *Histories*) and across time (from the mid-sixth century to the end of the fifth century BC, a period marked by a significant recalibration in the balance of power in this area). What emerges is the strong influence of genre, as well as the contingent historical situation, on the perception (and presentation) of this disputed space.

Keywords: Herodotus, tragedy, map, symbolic mapping, catalogue, periegesis, Aegean Sea, borders, East–West polarity

Subject: Classical Literature

Collection: Oxford Scholarship Online

Introduction: representing space

Between the land masses of Europe and Asia lies the Aegean Sea.[1] This space is neither homogeneous nor blank: the Aegean is framed by highly fragmented coastlines, and dotted with islands, which in turn are perceived as forming groups, such as the Cyclades or Sporades. Culturally, there is no distinction between the two sides of the Aegean, and the islands in-between: 'in the internal structure of the sea-faring Hellenic society in its pre-Alexandrine age, the waters of the Aegean proved themselves to be, not a barrier, but a bond by knitting together an Asiatic and a European half of an indivisible Hellas'.[2] Politically, however, this has been a highly charged, and highly contested, space, not least because the maritime space defies the imposition of a clear-cut boundary, of the kind that rivers seem to provide:[3] while the 'strong' point of

division between the two continents is the Hellespont, which ↳ resembles a river, the Aegean Sea has width (as Herodotus says, 'the Hellespont flows into an expanse of sea, χάσμα πελάγεος, which is called Aegean', 4.85.4), and a width that is populated.[4] In such a situation, the notion of 'border' becomes problematic; concepts of contiguity, in principle relatively easy to apply on land, have a different import when used for islands.

In this chapter I look at how, in the period from the mid-sixth century to the end of the fifth century BC, a period marked by a significant recalibration in the balance of power in this area, perceptions of the Aegean are conveyed in four different genres: (1) visual images, such as the map attributed to the Milesian philosopher Anaximander; (2) catalogic texts, as represented by the *Periegesis* of Hecataeus; (3) drama, and in particular Aeschylus' *Persians*; and (4) prose narrative, specifically Herodotus' *Histories*. These documents are not contemporaneous. Thus, two lines of enquiry merge here, which it is impossible to keep distinct: change over time, and differences in genres. I would therefore like to begin with some general reflections on how various genres constitute and shape the perception of space.

Maps, to cite Harley and Woodard, are 'graphic representations that facilitate a spatial understanding of things, concepts, conditions, processes, or events in the human world [...] As images they evoke complex meanings and responses, and thus record more than factual information on particular events and places.'[5] A sense of space, as well as of the location and connotation of specific places, may also be conveyed by a geographical catalogue (whether embedded in a larger narrative or not). Itineraries and lists highlight discrete places; these places are arranged sequentially within a larger frame of reference, so that the main relationship is a linear one, of spatial contiguity. This contiguity may of course yield other implications than mere physical proximity.[6]

Maps and catalogues may seem two very different modes of apprehending space. But in ancient Greece, the catalogic mode of imagining space is intimately linked to the cartographic, symbolic mode: this, at any rate, seems to be the implication of the words for 'map', πίναξ and περίοδος τῆς γῆς. The first term is non-specific: it denotes a plank or board, which could be used as a support for painting or writing, and hence for a map or

for a catalogic list.[7] As ↳ for the second term: the idea of movement, of 'walking around', is built into the phrase περίοδος τῆς γῆς (literally 'itinerary around the earth'), one of the terms most frequently used for maps;[8] such a definition implies completeness (περι-), but also a series of discrete successive moments in the construction, and perhaps even the reception, of the symbolic representation. Indeed, when viewed 'in action', maps often function as prompts for catalogues, or more generally as the spur for rhetorical attempts at persuasion.[9] The similarity between maps and catalogues is apparent also from their respective functions. A catalogue, a long list, may be a manifestation of power: the power of the narrator, who is able to put together correctly a long string of names, the power of the person who claims control, in terms of knowledge or in brutal political terms, of the people/places listed. Similarly, maps are instruments of power: they propose an authoritative view of the organization of the territory, and as such, they may inspire acknowledgment of limits, curiosity for margins, a sense of the order of the cosmos, or desire of conquest.[10]

Dramatic and narrative genres may incorporate catalogues and verbal representations of visual images (drama may even bring maps on stage);[11] in addition, these genres can organize space in other ways. Drama plays on the combination of the visual and the aural, as well as on the overlap of background, scenic space, and described spaces and places: thus, within the frame of the scenic space, further spaces and places may be evoked and enacted.[12] And any narrative plays itself out in space and involves place(s), which are not only interconnected, but also qualitatively differentiated.[13] All these 'mappings' can be seen as mediated processes of social communication: the viewers/readers/listeners will construe a mental image, by piecing together references in the text or extrapolating from the image, and understanding ↳ the data against any other pre-existing knowledge they may have.[14] But this process is clearly shaped to some extent by genre.

p. 64

Anaximander: capturing the world order in lines

The very first Greek map, going back to the early sixth century, was attributed to Anaximander of Miletus;[15] it should be viewed not as an attempt at graphically representing the world, but rather, in contrast to possible earlier practical and localized maps for the use of merchants and sailors, as a depiction of ideological relationships, a graph that reflected a more general sense of the order of the world. This attempt at finding a new way of looking at the world must at least in part be a consequence of the increase in geographical knowledge that resulted from colonization (Anaximander himself is said to have led the Milesians in the colonization of Apollonia Pontica: Ael. *VH* 3.17 = DK 12 A 3). The new theoretical interest in the cosmos, attested in the titles of Anaximander's other works, as well as in Thales and the Milesian philosophers, will also have played a role, as well as, arguably, the change in the balance of power in Anatolia, with the rise of Lydia as a power with ambitions of universal empire.[16] We do not know much of Anaximander's map; it was probably built symmetrically, just as Anaximander's cosmological model. Symmetry after all is a characteristic of other early maps: its excess in the Ionian maps will provoke the scorn of Herodotus (4.36).

In all likelihood, then, in this earliest Greek map a circular world was divided in two symmetrical continents, encircled by the Ocean, and divided ↳ by the waters of the Mediterranean.[17] Unluckily, we do not have any means to ascertain the centre of gravity of Anaximander's map: Delphi, Delos, or Ionia are all plausible candidates.[18] It is possible, as Munn has recently suggested, that Sardis/Sparda on the one side and Sparta on the other side of the Aegean constituted the two central points of the map, the axis of power around which the balance rested at the time of the drawing of the map.[19] Such a map would have given to its readers only a very limited idea of the respective positions of most peoples and cities of the ancient Mediterranean (due to the uncertainties surrounding its reconstruction, it is not even clear whether the axis would have been North–South or East–West);[20] it could easily have conveyed a sense of the potential for interaction of some specific places through their respective location, and of the position and role of the continents, the land masses that formed the world. In the context of an axis of power, the two continents would have appeared as equally important. It is actually unlikely that the two continents of Anaximander's map were already named 'Europe' and 'Asia'. The two names are attested from early on for Nereids and other mythological figures; but as a geographical name, 'Asia' is found for the continent only from the end of the sixth century onwards, while earlier, it refers to the region around Sardis, and more generally to Lydia and Ionia; similarly, initially 'Europe' refers to central Greece only, or to Thracia.[21] Significantly, Herodotus makes fun of the world-divisions and of their names, and cannot find an authority for them:

p. 65

> I cannot guess for what reason the earth, which is one, has three names, all women's, and why the boundary lines set for it are the Egyptian Nile river and the Colchian Phasis river (though some say that the Maeetian Tanaïs river and the Cimmerian Ferries are boundaries); and I cannot learn the names of those who divided the world, or where they got the names which they used.[22]

For Anaximander's map, then, it is probably best to assume two continental land masses, not yet marked by any value, and in-between, on the map, an absence, corresponding to the modern Aegean and the islands that populate it.

Hecataeus: cataloguing the world

Let us now turn to Hecataeus. Author of *Genealogies*, but also of a 'Description around the earth' (*Periegesis*), his activity is dated to the end of the sixth/beginning of the fifth century BC.[23] Hecataeus' *Periegesis* is lost; numerous fragments survive, none longer than two lines. As connections between fragments are rare, our notion of the overall shape of the work rests on the testimonia concerning the *Periegesis*, and on comparison with later similar works. It seems on the whole certain that the *Periegesis* was divided in two parts, corresponding to two rolls, one describing the European continent, the other Asia and Africa; already in the Hellenistic period, these rolls were named *Europe* and *Asia*.[24] The titles of the rolls may not have originated with Hecataeus; but the division in two may have been original. It is certainly earlier than the Alexandrian period, for a passage of Athenaeus shows that the *Asia* (and only this part) was of uncertain attribution, with Callimachus attributing it to a certain Nesiotes.[25] If trustworthy, the statement implies, as pointed out by Jacoby, an early divided tradition for the work. But even admitting the possibility of later reworkings, additions, and modifications, it should be uncontroversial that when Stephanus of Byzantium says, in his *Ethnika*, that a passage of Hecataeus comes from the *Europe*, or the *Asia*, this reflects, if not the original titles given to the two books, at least the book-roll and the general context in which the specific places were described.[26]

If we accept this, then a number of fragments show that Hecataeus discussed most of the islands of the Aegean Sea, including some which are extremely close to the Anatolian coast, in the part of his work dedicated to Europe. Thus, Stephanus of Byzantium affirms that Hecataeus had mentioned Mytilene, Chios, and the Oenoussai in his *Europe*; similarly, the small island of Corseai was mentioned in the *Europe* (its position was, however, determined in relation not to the continent, but to another island, Samos).[27] Also Lemnos, more to the north, and its cities Hephaistia and Myrina had been positioned against the Thracian coast, and discussed in the context of the *Europe*.[28]

The fact that these islands were discussed in the roll concerning Europe acquires significance when we consider that Hecataeus nonetheless determined their position in respect to cities of the Asiatic mainland, themselves discussed in the book on Asia. Thus, Stephanus' *Ethnika* offers under 'Chios' the following: 'the most illustrious island of the Ionians, with a city of the same name; Hecataeus in the *Europe*: "Chios opposite Erythrai (Χῖος κατὰ Ἐρυθράς); in it, a city Chios."' Erythrai was, however, discussed in the part concerning Asia, as the corresponding entry of Stephanus shows: 'Erythrai: city of the Ionians. Hecataeus in the *Asia*.'[29] The distinction is not a cultural one (both Chios and Erythrai are explicitly characterized as Ionian cities): Hecataeus was undoubtedly fully aware of the closeness, both geographical and cultural, of the islands and the Asiatic mainland (most of these islands, and at any rate Lesbos, Chios, and Samos, until the moment of the Persian conquest controlled the *peraia*, the strip of land opposite them on the mainland).[30] Nonetheless, he put the above-mentioned islands in his *Europe.* In contrast, the small island of Lade was mentioned in the *Asia*, if we are to trust Stephanus: evidently because of its strong connection to Miletus (the island was located immediately outside the harbour; it is today part of the mainland).[31] As for the island of Tenedos, just off the Aeolian coast, it is not known in what part it was discussed: the
corresponding entry in Stephanus (s.v.) simply states, 'island of the Sporades, as Hecataeus, in the ↳ Hellespont'.[32] The reference to the Sporades should probably be discounted as a later intrusion, as the name 'Sporades' is formed in contrast to that of 'Cyclades', and thus may be a relatively late formation;[33] what is interesting here is that the island is not located in respect to a city on the coast, or to another island, as

usual, but in relation to a sea, the Hellespont (it is highly unlikely that 'Hellespont' here refers to a part of Hecataeus' work).[34]

But to say that most islands (counting Lade as an exception) were mentioned in the *Europe* is not enough: at what point was the mention of the islands introduced, with what part of the continent were they linked? How was the overall treatment organized? The two most detailed discussions are still those of Jacoby and von Fritz. Jacoby assumed that Hecataeus would have discussed each specific island in connection with the respective closest stretch of mainland.[35] Thus, Helene nesos (*FGrH* 1 F 128) would have been discussed in connection with Attica, and so probably also Euboea (*FGrH* 1 F 129 and 130, dealing with the Euboean cities of Chalcis and Oreste, respectively); Lemnos might have been mentioned in connection with either Attica, or more probably, as in later authors, Mount Athos;[36] some of the Cyclades would have been mentioned in connection with the stretch of land between Attica and Boeotia, others when discussing the Thracian coastline; as for the islands located in the oriental part of the Aegean, Jacoby hypothesized that they might have been grouped together, at the end of the part of Hecataeus' *Periegesis* dealing with Europe.[37] Hecataeus would thus have been working in what would become the tradition of the *periploi* (accounts of a coasting voyage, as opposed to *periodos,* a land journey); but there would have been a marked difference in respect to the way Skylax's *periplous* (the closest comparandum) is organized, since in the latter the big islands of the oriental Aegean are discussed in connection with the Anatolian coast.[38] The uncertainty is even more marked in Jacoby's (later) commentary on the fragments ↳ of Hecataeus: 'I do not know where exactly Hecataeus inserted the islands, and particularly the Ionian islands, which he attributed to Europe in strict observance of the sea limit.'[39]

Kurt von Fritz has proposed a different interpretation. While accepting that Hecataeus' work could be compared to the later *periploi*, and that it was structured in big units ordered in a linear way around the Mediterranean following the principle of contiguity, von Fritz argued that within the units, the description of the various cities and *ethne* was arranged in a non-linear way, with a bi-dimensional sense of space, according to the points of the compass (and this not only for the areas distant from the sea, where the 'linear' reference offered by the coastline was missing).[40] Furthermore, the fact that all of the islands were discussed in the book concerning Europe, even if Hecataeus occasionally specified the exact location with reference to opposite places on the Asiatic mainland, led von Fritz to advance the hypothesis that the islands of the Aegean were arranged as a separate unit, at the end of the *Europe*, in complete separation from the rest.[41] Although the evidence from the fragments is too scanty to allow the case to be proven—or disproven —this is a fascinating hypothesis.

We may wonder whether this finds a reflection in the historical connections between the various island worlds. The early buildings and dedications in Delos have been interpreted as attesting the existence of an insular network, different from the wider Ionian one, and centred on Delos as a place of common worship. Some links between the Ionians of the coast of Asia Minor and the islanders cannot be denied; but notwithstanding the famous Thucydidean passage on the early gatherings of the Ionians in Delos (Thuc. 3.104), it would seem that the first *thesauroi* and the most important dedications in Delos come from islands.[42] One should probably also distinguish between the various islands: the large islands close to the coast of Asia Minor (Lesbos, Samos, and Chios) do not seem to be part of the network, which would have included the main Cyclades (notably Naxos), and also Paros, located in an area without strong links to the mainland, an area likely to look towards other Cycladic islands. It is therefore all the more a pity that we cannot be certain of how Hecataeus' work was organized, because we might compare it with the archaeological data—Jacoby's organization would fit the ↳ data best, von Fritz's would offer an interesting contrast—but we must leave this question open.

In any case, the fact remains that Hecataeus covered the islands off the Asiatic coast, with one exception, in the roll concerning Europe. Clearly, the notional dividing line ran along the shoreline of Anatolia. A geographical boundary does not necessarily have political implications; but Hecataeus' experiences in

(narrated) life suggests otherwise. Herodotus' account of the Ionian revolt presents us a Hecataeus deeply involved in it, who twice intervenes in a council. The first time, he makes his point with the support of a catalogue (Hdt. 5.36); as for his second intervention (Hdt. 5.125), Herodotus states that while the alternatives of leaving for Sardinia or for Myrkinos in Thracia were being debated, Hecataeus proposed to fortify the island of Leros, making it a base for biding their time, until the moment when they might return to Miletos.[43] Leros had probably been mentioned in the *Europe*: for the island is certainly not closer to the mainland than Lesbos or Chios, or Corseai. Hecataeus' proposal is thus in line with the division of the Aegean space proposed in his *Periegesis*, since it implies a clear-cut separation between Asia on the one side, and Europe with the islands on the other.[44]

Herodotus' narrative allows us to see Hecataeus' catalogic activity in action. Although Hecataeus' works were certainly much richer than the meagre extant fragments would lead us to think, and although they certainly went beyond simple lists (this applies to both *Genealogies* and *Periegesis*), the catalogic approach seems to have marked the persona of Hecataeus: remarkably, in two of the three times he appears as an agent in Herodotus' *Histories*, he is represented as giving lists, catalogues.[45] The first time, he gives a list of his ancestors (mapping time) to the Egyptian priests in Thebes; the second time, he presents Aristagoras and his council, at the time of the Ionian revolt, with a list of the lands and peoples controlled by the Great King (mapping space).[46] Contiguity (of time and space) seems to be the key word; the catalogue (or rather, its length) is used as a rhetorical tool, to impress the interlocutor and support one's proposed plan. The Herodotean Hecataeus is not necessarily a portrait of the real Hecataeus (Herodotus might have used him to
p. 71   project the image of the wise man who learns through his travels), nor should we ↳ necessarily assume that Hecataeus reflects more generalized perceptions of space; but it is reasonable to assume that Hecataeus was chosen because his real character offered the necessary elements. That the vision of space he proposed was a shared and, at the same time, disputed one is supported by the key role that the notion of contiguity (this time, the complete absence of contiguity) plays in how Sardinia is presented in the *Histories*: Sardinia's utter isolation and non-contiguity are the premises for the freedom it promises to the Ionians who are facing the arrival of the Persians.[47]

Dramatizing space(s): Aeschylus' *Persians*

Persians, produced in 472, eight years after the battle of Salamis and the destruction of the Persian fleet, marks an important moment in the conceptualization of the division between Greece and Asia. Space has an important role in this play. Two poles are in evidence: Athens and Persia, the Greeks and the Persians. In terms of scenic space, the spectators would have been looking at an action taking place in Susa; but the (Persian) actors, located in Susa, would have been talking about the distant spaces of Salamis and Athens. Meanwhile, the Acropolis at the back of the theatre (theatrical space), still bearing the signs of the destruction wreaked by the Persians, will have caused some spectators at least to wonder about the actual distance, both geographical and cultural, of these two poles.[48] This sense of uneasy distance-and-closeness would have been reinforced by the narrated (and in part enacted) movements of the messenger, and of Xerxes himself, from the heartland of Persia to Greece, and back.

The play makes it clear that the Persians were defeated at Salamis, notwithstanding their numerical superiority, because of the ὕβρις and lack of experience of Xerxes, who, in desiring to join Greece and Persia, went beyond the limits allowed.[49] The issue of the limits of Persian control is addressed more than once in
p. 72   the play, and the limit is the sea, as the insistence on the bridge ↳ over the Hellespont shows. But if the sea is a thin line at the Hellespont, it is a wide expanse elsewhere, an expanse sprinkled with islands. It is precisely on this space that the second stasimon focuses (vv. 852–907). In it, the chorus of old Persians lament the loss, after the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis, of territories previously conquered by Darius, and in particular the islands 'linked' to their continent (νῆσοι […] τᾷδε γᾷ προσήμεναι, 879), as well as the islands

positioned between the two coasts (τὰς ἀγχιάλους [...] μεσάκτους, 889): their conquest is not marked as ὕβρις (throughout the play, Darius appears as the respectful, good monarch, in opposition to the daring Xerxes).

This passage is of paramount importance to understand the notion of Aegean insular geography that an Athenian around 472 BC could entertain. The vision offered by the chorus departs so radically from what we see on our modern maps that some critics have argued for outright ignorance on the part of Aeschylus (and his public).[50] Islands are indeed, up to a point, floating entities; but this is, I suggest, a misleading way of looking at this text. It is clear that Aeschylus attributes here to the Persians the opinion that most of the Aegean islands belong naturally to Asia, and that the divinity is not opposed to such a division: for even the Cyclades, which are not so close to the Asiatic mainland, are part of the islands 'linked' to the Anatolian continent. How much this opinion was shared by Aeschylus and his audience may be debated: the play glosses over quite a few deeds of Darius, which could have been considered as breaking the equilibrium. But, on a reading of the play which accepts that it hints at the potential dangers of Athenian imperialism, such a stress on the closeness of the islands to Asia would make sense.[51]

Let us look more closely at how this insular geography is construed. In the passage, the islands are divided into two main groups: islands connected with Asia, comprising in this order: Lesbos, Samos, Chios, Paros, Naxos, Mykonos, Tenos, and Andros; and islands located between the two coasts, in the open sea (Lemnos, Icaria, Rhodes, Cnidos, and the cities of Cyprus). Lesbos, Samos, and Chios are indeed close to the Asiatic coast, and could be considered as 'natural appendices' of Asia Minor. However, even though the remark on the closeness of Andros to Tenos is correct, none of the Cyclades is near the continent (interestingly, the string of islands presented here very much resembles that proposed to Artaphrenes by Aristagoras in a famous Herodotean passage, 5.30–2). Furthermore, although Naxos is mentioned, Delos, the centre of the Cyclades, is not: it could hardly have figured in a list of islands 'legitimately' conquered by Darius. As for the second group, it begins to the north with Lemnos, which is indeed farther from the Asian coast; but ↳ next, in a big movement towards the south, come Icaria, which is much closer to Asia than either Andros or Tenos, and Rhodes. From Rhodes, it is only a step to Cnidus; while in terms of contiguity the association is understandable, this represents the greatest inexactitude in the passage, as the islet of Cnidos is part of the Cnidian peninsula, and it is really impossible to consider it as located between two continents (one is reminded, *e contrario*, of another famous Herodotean passage, 1.173–4, narrating how the Cnidians, to defend themselves from the approaching Persians, attempted to render their territory an island—the attempt failed, its failure sanctioned by an oracle of the Pythia, stating that 'Zeus would have made it an island, had he wanted to'). The catalogue closes with Cyprus, as it had to, in order to make the connection between Darius' ability to maintain control of the islands (the first defeat of the Ionian rebels took place at Salamis in Cyprus *c.*497 BC, Hdt. 5.108–16) and the loss of the islands that will be the outcome of Xerxes' defeat around the island of Salamis (in Attica). Thus, this description, while it follows the typical convention of a periplous, by first following the coast and then 'reaching out' for the islands, is also shaped by poetic necessity. This applies not just to the fact that the catalogue closes with Cyprus: for the catalogue's main point surely must have been that these lands, which had been conquered by Darius, as the chorus sings, and which are now under the control of the Athenians, as the audience well knows, are located between the two poles of Athens and Susa; and although their location close to Asia Minor and the legitimacy of their conquest by Darius are presented through words attributed to the Persians (and thus need not be endorsed by the Greek spectators), the play leaves it open whether they should be considered as Greek or Persian. The (narrated, textual, and catalogic) insular geography of the second stasimon thus mirrors the overall effect obtained by the spatial setting of the play as a whole. In this context, the use of the word 'Ionians' to connote the Greeks is also important: covering at the same time the Greeks of Asia Minor and the Athenians, it bridges the Aegean, and contributes to the creation of a complex space, which cannot be fitted into a simple East–West polarity.[52]

p. 73

An elastic space: Herodotus

Let us now turn to Herodotus. The narrator of the *Histories* does not shy away from giving both exact measurements of distances between places and precise descriptions of the shape of large areas, modelling them on geometrical figures: 'interest in rivers, boundaries within peoples, distances, and ↳ itineraries […] is […] consistent throughout the *Histories*'.[53] Thus for instance he gives the length and breadth of the Black Sea and of the Caspian; he measures Egypt (in *schoinoi*, because of the particular scale required by a land as big as Egypt); and gives the exact length of the royal road from Sardis to Susa (in parasangs and *stathmoi*).[54] These linear distances are positioned within space by references to the continent or region in which they are located, to landmarks (rivers, mountains, 'gates'), or by reference to whatever is next, above or below or directly opposite, in a relationship of contiguity (e.g. ἄνω and κάτω, or also κατά, already much used by Hecataeus).[55]

However, the *Histories* do not move systematically in a linear way: it is rather the case that the narrative moves from one linear sequence to the next. Thus, in the grander scheme, the various spaces in which the actors move are held together by analogy; in a grandiose sweep that moves from the extreme east to the far west, the Herodotean narrator compares the situation of the Tauri within Scythia to the hypothetical situations that would obtain in Attica, if another people than the Attic were established on the heights of Sounion, or also, 'for those who have not sailed along that part of Attica', in Iapygia, if a different people from the Iapygians were to occupy the promontory south of the line linking Brundisium and Tarentum (4.99.4−5).[56] Similarly, in describing the flood of the Nile the narrator explains that only the towns emerge, very much like (μάλιστά κη ἐμφερέες) the islands in the Aegean Sea (2.97). Explicit discussions of the internal and external articulations of these spaces, both by the narrator and by the characters in the *Histories*, reinforce the overall sense of a coherent space. And yet, different views are proposed, and only rarely do we get the sense that the narrator disagrees with the perception of space attributed to one of his characters; to put it differently, perceptions are accepted at their face value. As a result, within the overall sense of a coherent and interconnected space, a multitude of different apprehensions of this space are accommodated.

This applies both to the larger vision (the organization of the world) and to specific areas. The *Histories* open by attributing to the Persians the opinion that Asia and the 'barbarian' peoples living there belong to them, while Europe and the *Hellenikon* (Hellenic world) are considered as something distinct.[57] Famously, this finds an echo in the conclusion, where a similar idea is again aired: 'for the Persians consider that all of Asia belongs to them and to whoever is king at the moment'.[58] The *Histories* are thus framed by this opposition, which is mooted also within the work.[59] And yet, there is no authorial endorsement of such an opposition. What of the space between the two, what of the Aegean and its islands? How is it seen, perceived, described in the *Histories*?

The Herodotean narrator does not give any explicit indications as to the continent to which the islands of the Aegean belong. In his geographical excursus (4.36−45), he gives an extended critique of those Ionians who divide the earth in three parts, ridiculing their maps and protesting against the names given to the continents: it is thus tempting to conclude that Herodotus deconstructs here the distinction between land masses that had become traditional by the time he was writing, that he 'sees as meaningless the conventional geographical divisions between continents'.[60] At the same time, numerous passages of the *Histories* betray a belief in a divinely ordered universe and in the importance of respecting natural boundaries—a point of view that seems shared by the narrator.[61] Even within the polemical context of the excursus on the continents, Herodotus traces the borders of Europe and Asia with some precision, and divisions are often marked by water (rivers mainly); but he strikingly does not discuss (nor describe, nor measure) the border on the side of the Aegean. This lack of precision is, I submit, intentional.

The Aegean appears as a problematic space right from the beginning. Croesus' plans for conquest aim at the complete control of Anatolia (Hdt. 1.26), but include also the islands: 'once he had submitted the Greeks inhabiting Asia to the payment of tribute, he began, having built ships, to think of attacking the islanders' (temporal continuity merges into spatial continuity with the adverb ἐνθεῦτεν).[62] Evidently, the Herodotean Croesus sees the ↳ conquest of the islands as the natural complement of his conquest of the continent: in his perspective, the islands are an appendix of the latter. Yet the way in which the sentence is constructed suggests that things are more complex: the Greeks of Asia and the islanders are presented as distinct entities. The anecdote which follows shows that the perspective of Croesus is not shared by all actors of the *Histories*, and emphatically not by the Ionians: the king questions a wise man (Bias or Pittakos), asking 'whether there is any news concerning Greece' (εἴ τι εἴη νεώτερον περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα), and the answer he receives is that the islanders are putting together an impressive cavalry, with which they plan to attack Sardis and avenge the Greeks living in the continent. For Bias/Pittakos, the islands are part of Ἑλλάς.[63] Croesus understands, and respects the limit. Such understanding is in line with his policy of consulting Greek oracles and looking for an alliance with the most powerful among the Greeks, in particular the Spartans; it also fits the interpretation proposed above of the structure and meaning of Anaximander's map, on which Sardis and Sparta might have been the two parallel centres of power.

The story of Polycrates offers another window on the Aegean, which emerges as a richly articulated space, comprising an Ionian network formed by the Greek cities of the Asian coast and the islands just off it, and an insular network around Delos.[64] In introducing the second part of the Samian *logos*, Herodotus presents Polycrates retrospectively as the first among the Greeks who thought of acquiring the mastery of the sea, 'having many hopes of being able to control Ionia and the islands' (ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων Ἰωνίης τε καὶ νήσων ἄρξειν, Hdt. 3.122.2).[65] Thus, in the first phase of Polycrates' reign—a reign based on Samos, one of the large islands just off the coast—Asia Minor and the islands are viewed as two interlinked ensembles; Samos occupies a central position in this scheme (note that the term used is 'Ionia'). This reminder of Polycrates' initial plans is immediately followed by a reference to similar plans of inverted direction: Polycrates meets his end after having been lured by Oroites to Magnesia, on the Asian continent, with the promise that he would receive 'money enough to get control of all Greece' (Hdt. 3.122.4: εἵνεκέν τε χρημάτων ἄρξεις τῆς ἁπάσης Ἑλλάδος). The terminology is similar, but here, the Persian points the tyrant in the opposite direction, ↳ and Polycrates accepts this 'reorientation'; in both situations, Samos plays the role of a central articulation between Ionia and the coastal cities, the insular world, and Greece.[66]

And yet, an authorial comment on the Spartans' expedition against the Samos of Polycrates (Hdt. 3.56.2) implies that Samos is part of Asia: Herodotus affirms that this was the first expedition to Asia by Dorians from Lacedaemon (ταύτην πρώτην στρατιὴν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην Λακεδαιμόνιοι Δωριέες ἐποιήσαντο).[67] Another passage also from the third book, concerning the expedition of Demokedes and 15 Persians, charged by Darius to visit Greece (διεξελθεῖν τὰ παραθαλάσσια τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Hdt. 3.135.1), has the same implications: Herodotus comments that 'first among the Persians they arrived from Asia into Greece' (οὗτοι δὲ πρῶτοι ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίης ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπίκοντο Πέρσαι, Hdt. 3.138.4). This expedition happened at some point before the conquest of Samos in 516 BC, but when the other islands had already accepted Persian control. If this is the first Persian official mission in Greek lands, then the islands are here viewed as part of Asia.[68]

Two speeches by Aristagoras give further definition to the Aegean space, while emphasizing the role played by the perspective of the speaker (and of the addressee). The first speech aims to push Artaphrenes, the satrap of Sardis, towards conquering the islands (Hdt. 5.30–2); the second one, addressed to Cleomenes, attempts to convince the Spartan king to invade Asia (Hdt. 5.49–50).[69] Thus, the two speeches cut right across the Aegean, in opposite directions. The first speech hides, or implicitly denies, the existence of a boundary. Instead, it emphasizes contiguity, by means of an interlinked (ἠρτημένας) chain of islands connecting the two continents.[70] In the second ↳ speech, delivered with the help of a map, the crossing of the sea is taken for granted: even though the map showed, Herodotus says, 'all the seas and rivers' (5.49.1),

Aristagoras' chain starts in Ionia and ends in Susa—either implicitly in order to present the crossing of the Aegean as unproblematic, or because the crossing is actually perceived as unproblematic. In his refusal, Cleomenes will similarly emphasize neither the distance from Sparta, nor the length of the crossing, but the distance from the sea (here, the Ionian coastline, Hdt. 5.50.3): the Aegean does not really count. When he had earlier proposed to Artaphrenes a path of inverted direction, traversing the insular world (Hdt. 5.30–2), Aristagoras had not made use of a map, probably because the scale did not allow representation of the Aegean world; but also, possibly, because the map was felt to be of no use in regard to the sea. In both situations, the principles at play are the same: contiguity, and a promise of wealth at the end (Euboea in the earlier speech, here Susa). But in both cases, the contiguity is assumed, not real: Naxos is not close to the Ionian coast (even less Euboea); Susa is very far from the coast (a three months' journey from the sea, ἀπὸ θαλάσσης: Hdt. 5.50), but the use of a map makes it possible to play with distance.[71]

By now, the Aegean has moved into focus; all sorts of paths cross it, often reaching through the Mediterranean.[72] In some instances, the narrator chooses to comment. Thus, on his way towards Eretria and then Athens, Datis sails through the Cyclades, following the path from Naxos to Euboea that had been traced by Aristagoras; but significantly, after his passage Delos (the ἀκίνητον τέρας of Pindar fr. 33bc S–M) trembled, 'a sign of the evils that were to follow' for three generations (Hdt. 6.98). Whatever the exact relationship between this passage and Thucydides (2.8.3), clearly here Delos is presented as a symbol of stability, of the order of the kosmos; the earthquake is a consequence of the Persians going beyond this island. This may mean that a Persian presence in the Aegean, as long as it remains on the other side of Delos, is within the larger order of the world; and conversely, in particular to an audience of the second half of the fifth century, that an Athenian presence on the other side of the Aegean may not be part of the normal order of the world.

After Salamis, Samos and Delos will jointly articulate the space between Ionia and the coastal cities, the insular world, and Greece: the Persians will ↳ base their fleet in Samos (Hdt. 8.130), choosing it as a base whence to guard against both a revolt in Asia Minor and the possible arrival of the Greeks; the Greeks themselves will stop at Delos (Hdt. 8.132), considering (so Herodotus puts it) Samos to be as far away as the Pillars of Heracles. The choice of the image is not accidental: the Pillars of Heracles marked a gate, the entrance to the ἔξω θάλασσα, the 'outer sea'; but here the symbol of the extreme, mythical West is used as a means of marking an imaginary distance to the East.[73] The space of the Aegean, a space that we must suppose well-known, as it is relatively central, is mapped in a symbolic way, and not just here, but throughout the *Histories*: it is not described, and no distances are given, whether in stades or days of navigation; rather, this space is presented through a contiguity which does not necessarily correspond to reality, or in mythical terms, as the *chasma* between axial points. The Greek fleet will eventually move beyond Delos, to Samos and then Mycale; the decisive factor is, however, not a change in their understanding of the Aegean space, but the name of the Samian ambassador who is asking them to free Samos, Hegesistratus ('army-leader'), a name which the Spartan general, Leotychidas, takes as an omen (Hdt. 9. 90–1).

Conclusion

In the above survey, the Aegean has appeared in various guises. In Anaximander's map, which was mainly concerned with the balance of power between the two continents, it was an absence—and it remained an absence in the notional map of Aristagoras in Herodotus' *Histories.* More or less at the same time of Aristagoras' exploits, the Aegean and its islands had been included in Hecataeus' *Periegesis*, and specifically within the book concerning Europe. Unlike the 'eusynoptic' map, the catalogic structure of the *Periegesis* imposed a choice; Hecataeus probably discussed the islands, or some of them at any rate, as a separate group at the end of the European book, even though he situated them with reference to the closest continent (often Asia). The order of the various islands within this group is unknown; but the arrangement ↳ implies a non-linear conception of the insular space, not organized according to the principle of contiguity. The perceptions of the Aegean space conveyed in Aeschylus' *Persians* and in the *Histories* differ markedly from Hecataeus'. In the former work, the picture of a strong opposition of East and West, Persia and Greece, reinforced by the insistence on a boundary that should not have been passed, the Hellespont, is undermined visually by the contrasting play of location (scenic space), narrated events (concerning the distant space of Athens and Salamis), and Athenian background (theatrical space); within the play, the chorus of elders (who have not joined in the aggression, but have stayed in Persia) presents a geographical picture which problematizes the space between the continents, questioning the idea of a neat division. Similarly, Herodotus' Aegean is not a space, but a place, or better places, shaped by the perceptions of the people who happen to cross it. Located between the two continents, the islands are never directly discussed in the context of world divisions, but are mentioned here and there, qualifying decisions and policies, sometimes linked to the European continent, sometimes to Anatolia, according to the balance of power in the region and to the rhetorical strategies used to further or counteract it; it is this rich sense of a multifaceted and flexible space, subject to time and change, that springs from the *Histories*.[74]

Notes

1   Ancient denominations of the area: Ceccarelli (2012). For the definitions of 'space' and 'place' accepted here see Barker, Bouzarovski, and Isaksen, this volume, 6–7. Theoretical background: Lefebvre (1991 [1974]); Warf (2008); Bouzarovski and Barker in this volume, with further literature. For Greece, Gehrke (2007); Ulf (2008) (water and space); Purves (2010); De Jong (2012) (space in Greek literature); Rehm (2002) 273–96 (ancient Greek theories of space); Frisone and Lombardo (2007) (discussion of the notions of centre and periphery, and of the place of Ionia in this model).

2   Toynbee (1954) 715. Connectivity in the Mediterranean: Horden and Purcell (2000); in the Aegean: Constantakopoulou (2007).

3   Gianotti (1994). Rivers are not simple boundaries: they often function as points of contact rather than dividers (Frisone 2012); but they provide a line along which a boundary may be imagined (for the notion that the Himera is the ideal boundary between the Carthaginian and the Greek sphere of influence, dividing Sicily exactly in half, see Polyb. 7.4–5 and Livy 24.6.7, with Frisone (2012) 109 n. 52).

4   Detailed discussion of the shifts in the lines drawn through the Aegean in Lewis (1977); see also Stadter (1992) 785–95.

5   Definition: Harley and Woodard (1987a) xv–xvi; see also Jacob (2006) 11–101. On the issue of scale, and for a critical view of the 'map consciousness' of ancient Greeks and Romans, see Brodersen (1995); Brodersen (2004).

6   This space may present itself as 'hodological', traversed and experienced by the narrator (Janni 1984), or not. More on (Herodotean) itineraries in Harrison (2007) 45–6; epic itineraries: Clare (2000); Thomas, this volume. For Akkadian and Babylonian precedents—not necessarily informing the Greek developments—see Millard (1987); Horowitz (1998); Rochberg (2012); for how these precedents inform the Persian apprehension of space, Haubold (2012); Murray in this volume.

7   Cf. Jacob (1988) 284–6; (2006) 18–19; Prontera (1984b) 243–5.

8   Romm (1992) 26–31.

9   The first attested use of a map is Aristagoras' attempt to convince the Spartan king Cleomenes to invade Persia, as narrated in Hdt. 5.49.1: cf. Jacob (1985); Pelling (2007); Branscome (2010); de Bakker, this volume (see Brodersen (1995)

78–80 for the notion that this was not a bi-dimensional map). Maps are mentioned elsewhere in fifth-century literature: e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 206ff., with Brodersen (1995) 71–2; Purves (2010) 112–15. Later anecdotes highlight the use of maps for supporting an argument: e.g. Plutarch, *Nic.* 12.1 and *Alc.* 17.4 (in the context of the Sicilian expedition); Aelian, *VH* 3.28 (an anecdote concerning Alcibiades and Socrates, on which see Prontera (1984b) 244 n. 111). Cf. also the survey in Dilke (1985); Harley and Woodard (1987b); Irby (2012).

10   Maps and power: e.g. Wood and Fels (1992); Wood, Fels, and Krygier (2010); Pelling, this volume (p. 327).

11   Cf. the cloaks of Demetrius Poliorcetes, on which the universe with golden stars and the 12 signs of the zodiac were woven, or the depiction of the same Demetrius riding the *oikoumenē*, painted on the *proskenion* on the occasion of the Athenian *Demetria* (Athen. 12. 535e–536a=Duris *FGrH* 76 F 14).

12   Rehm (2002) 20–4.

13   The space resulting from a text like Herodotus' *Histories* is a 'lived', networked space: see de Bakker in this volume; Barker et al. 2013.

14   Thus producing maps such as those proposed for the Homeric world by Ballabriga (1986) 176 and (1998) 111 fig. 3. Various stories may be put to contribution to represent a shared space, as in the Spartan myths studied by Calame (1987). Earlier (or shared) knowledge (the 'horizon of expectation'): Jacob (2006) 36–7; Thomas in this volume. In the context of archaic Greece, this shared knowledge will often be a hazy notion, not likely to resist whatever is being propounded at the moment (cf. Ceccarelli (2012) 27–8 on Hes. *Theog.* 337–70).

15   Agathemerus 1.1: 'Anaximander […] was the first who ventured to draw the inhabited world on a tablet', πρῶτος ἐτόλμησε τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν πίνακι γράψαι. Cf. Strabo 1. 1. 11 (first to have drawn a 'geographical tablet', γεωγραφικὸν πίνακα); Diog. Laert. 2.1 (first to have written a γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης περίμετρον, a title that presents the same 'encompassing' nuance as the map). *Suda* α 1986 (Anaximander 'wrote *On Nature, Circuit of the earth* (Γῆς περίοδον), *On the fixed stars, The sphere*, and other works') may refer with Γῆς περίοδον to the map, or to a treatise, which might itself have been a part of the περὶ φύσεως dedicated to the Earth: cf. Nicolai (1986) 20; Purves (2010) 108–9. List of all testimonia: DK 12 A 6.

16   Jacob (1988) 274–84, Heilen (2000) 35–6, and Romm (2010) 21–8 stress the theoretical character of Anaximander's map. Munn (2006) 184–5 highlights the change in the balance of power; Mazzarino (1947) 66–71 locates the important change later, with the arrival of Persia. The story about Thales predicting the solar eclipse at the battle of the Halys (Hdt. 1.74) offers another example of how political history is linked to world order.

17   Romm (2010) 216–18. Very different reconstructions have been advanced of Anaximander's map: see Heilen (2000) 37.

18   Delphi: Heilen (2000) 37–8; for the other possibilities, see Munn (2006) 193; Nile Delta: Naddaf (2003) 34–5 and 52–5 (but cf. Waterfield's review, *BMCR* 2002.12.03).

19   Munn (2006) 196–203, based on the tradition of a visit of Anaximander at Sparta to build a sundial, which, on the hypothesis of a flat earth, would have shown Sparta to be at the centre of the universe (DL 2.1); on the closeness of the names (the name of the Lydian city opened with a consonantal cluster *'sfar-*, preserved in its Persian name Sparda), which is echoed in the traditions concerning Alcman's origin, from Sardis or Sparta; and on Croesus' attempt to secure Spartan alliance (Hdt. 1.56–70).

20   On the issue of East–West v. North–South orientation, see e.g. Bowersock (2005).

21   Nereids: Hes. *Theog.* 357 and 359, with West (1966) 266–7; see also Zenodotos *BNJ* 19 F 3 (= schol. [Eur.] *Rh.* 29) and Andron *FGrH* 10 F 7 (= schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 188, Tzetz. *Lycoph.* 894 and 1283), with the commentaries of Nünlist and Toye *ad loc.*, and Jouanna (2009) 17–35. On the history of the name 'Asia', see Mazzarino (1947) 45–101; Munn (2006) 179–81. Europe: *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 251, 291; Hdt. 6.43 and 7.8, with Price and Thonemann (2010); Jouanna (2009) 61–101.

22   Hdt. 4.45 (transl. Godley), with Thomas (2000) 80–6.

23   Cf. Nicolai (1997). Two titles of a geographical nature are transmitted in association with Hecataeus' name, Περιήγησις and Περίοδος γῆς. It is disputed whether the first title refers to the geo-ethnographical treatise Hecataeus wrote, and the second to a map (so Jacoby (1912) 2690; Jacoby, *ad FGrH* 12 a and b; Mazzarino (1947); Nenci (1954) xv–xxiii; Munn (2006) 179–80; Purves (2010) 110); or whether Hecataeus wrote only a geo-ethnographical treatise and no map, in which case the two titles both refer to the treatise (so Prontera (1984b) 232–9; Nicolai (1986); Dorati (1999–2000)).

24   Jacoby (1912) 2672–3, 2703–7. It is uncertain whether for Hecataeus the earth was divided in two or in three continents: see Munn (2006) 179–80 n. 1, with bibliography.

25   In mentioning Hecataeus' *Periegesis of Asia*, Athenaeus (2.70a) adds 'if indeed the book is really by that writer—for Callimachos attributes it to Nesiotes' ('Ἑκαταῖος δ᾽ ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐν ᾽Ασίας Περιηγήσει (F 291), εἰ γνήσιον τοῦ συγγραφέως τὸ βιβλίον—Καλλίμαχος γὰρ Νησιώτου αὐτὸ ἀναγράφει). See *FGrH* 1 F 15a, 15b, and 15c = Ath. 2.70a, Ath. 9.410e, and Arrian, *Anab*. 5.6.5.

26   Heilen (2000) 47–9 follows Jacoby (1912) 2703 in thinking that Hecataeus posited one main North–South division, along a water line running from the columns of Heracles across the Mediterranean through the Black Sea and the Phasis until the Ocean: Asia Minor would have been south, Greece north of this line. Hecataeus' image of the world was further subdivided

vertically, to form four quadrants, with Europe double the length of Asia and Libya (attempt at a reconstruction of Hecataeus' map—or worldview—in Heilen (2000) 50).

27   Respectively, *FGrH* 1 F 140, 141, and 142; and *FGrH* 1 F 143: Κορσεαί· νῆσος τῆς Ἰωνίας ἀντικρὺ Σάμου. Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ. Cf. Stadter (1992) 794; Ceccarelli (1996).

28   Steph. Byz. s.v. Λῆμνος = *FGrH* 1 F 138a; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἡφαίστια and Μύρινα = *FGrH* 1 F 138b and 138c. The overall position of Lemnos was determined in relation to Thrace.

29   Respectively, *FGrH* 1 F 141: ἡ ἐπιφανεστάτη νῆσος τῶν Ἰώνων, ἔχουσα καὶ πόλιν ὁμώνυμον. Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπη «Χίος κατὰ Ἐρυθράς· ἐν δὲ πόλις Χίος», and *FGrH* 1 F 228: Ερυθρα<ί>· πόλις Ἰώνων. Ἑκαταῖος Ἀσίᾳ.

30   Carusi (2003) offers a detailed analysis of the strong links between the islands of Asia Minor and their 'peraia', from the archaic period until the Roman conquest.

31   Steph. Byz. s.v. Λάδη = *FGrH* 1 F 241: Λάδη· νῆσος Ἰωνίας [a correction by Meineke: the codices have Αἰολίδος]. Ἑκαταῖος Ἀσίᾳ, with Jacoby's commentary.

32   *FGrH* 1 F 139: Steph. Byz. s. Τένεδος· νῆσος τῶν Σποράδων, ὡς Ἑκαταῖος, ἐν Ἑλλησπόντωι. Both Jacoby and Nenci order the fragment in the *Europe*.

33   So Jacoby, *FGrH* 1 *ad* F 139; Pind. *Pae*. 5.38–40 (καὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους/ἔκτισαν νάσους ἐρικυδέα τ' ἔσχον/Δᾶλον) may allude to an existing name, or may be the point of departure for such a name. Both 'Cyclades' (certainly established by the time of Herodotus) and 'Sporades' require a sense of the spatial organization of the islands so named.

34   On the issue of the extension of the Hellespont, which in some texts comprises the Aegean Sea, see Strabo 7 fr. 22 Radt (= 57 Jones), probably based upon Demetrios of Skepsis, with Radt (2007) 372–3; Ronconi (1931) 225–42; Burr (1932) 11–19. On the names of the sea, see also Cordano (1991); Ceccarelli (2012).

35   Jacoby (1912) 2713.

36   Cf. Jacoby's commentary *ad FGrH* 1 F 138, with reference to the treatments of Ps. Scymn. 643f.; Mela II 106; Plin. *NH* IV 73 (and Ap. Rhod. 1.601f.)

37   Jacoby (1912) 2713.

38   Ps.-Skylax 95 (Tenedos) 97 (Lesbos) 98 (Chios), then mainland, then Samos, all introduced with 'and opposite this/these places/in front of it', and followed by 'and I return again onto the mainland'. Cf. Jacoby (1912) 2694–5; Shipley (2011); and n. 55 in this chapter for the 'geographical style' with which location is conveyed.

39   *FGrH* 1, *ad* F 143.

40   Von Fritz (1967) 1:54–5; cf. Prontera (1984b) 219. Danek (2004) 68–70 points out that in the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* the poet strings together spaces (the regions and two or three cities from which each contingent usually hails), rather than lines. For the issue of uni-dimensional v. bi-dimensional description of space, see von Fritz (1967) 1:54–69. See also the discussion of hymnic networks by Thomas in this volume.

41   Von Fritz (1967) 1:54.

42   Constantakopoulou (2007) 38–60. The archaeological documentation is, however, far from straightforward: most of the *thesauroi* discussed are of uncertain attribution.

43   Hdt. 5.125: ἐν Λέρῳ δὲ τῇ νήσῳ τεῖχος οἰκοδομησάμενον ἡσυχίην ἄγειν, ἢν ἐκπέσῃ ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου· ἔπειτα δὲ ἐκ ταύτης ὁρμώμενον κατελεύσεσθαι ἐς τὴν Μίλητον.

44   Hecataeus here builds on an Ionian tradition, represented already, in Herodotus' *Histories*, by Bias of Priene (see below): cf. Tozzi (1963) 220; Ceccarelli (1996); Nicolai (1997) 161–2.

45   On the construction of Hecataeus' persona in the *Histories* see West (1991); Nicolai (1997) 149–50.

46   Respectively, Hdt. 2.143; and Hdt. 5.36: καταλέγων τά τε ἔθνεα πάντα τῶν ἦρχε Δαρεῖος καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ. The second list may have been accompanied by a map: a (not very reliable) tradition attributes to Hecataeus the drawing of a map. For the political aspects of Hecataeus' geographical (and genealogical) work see Nicolai (1997) 160–2.

47   Hdt. 1.170. For the presentation of Sardinia in the Ionian tradition exemplified within the *Histories* by Bias, Pittacus, Hecataeus, as well as Aristagoras and Histiaeus, see Ceccarelli (1996).

48   For the articulation of dramatic space in theatrical, scenic, extra-scenic, distanced, self-referential, and reflexive, see Rehm (2002) 20–4; on space in Aeschylus' *Persians* see Rehm (2002) 239–41 and (2012) 307–10; Rosenbloom (2006) 47–8; Seaford (2012) 206–10; Futo-Kennedy (2013).

49   Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 65–7; 130; the very explicit 722–4; 736, where the topic of the union of the two continents is touched upon again (γέφυραν γαῖν δυοῖν ζευκτηρίαν); and 745–8. The insistence on the folly of joining the two continents will have been reinforced by the superposition of scenic and theatrical spaces; in such a context, the mention of distant and not clearly defined spaces (the islands) opens a possibility for reflexive thinking.

50   Aesch. *Pers*. 879–95. Ignorance: Roussel (1960); Bernand (1985) 82 strives to find a geographical logic in the arrangement.

51   Cf. Nenci (1958) 35. Rosenbloom (2006) 115–21 maps the list onto the Athenian tribute-paying districts.

52   Ionians: Rosenbloom (2006) 53–4. Deconstructing the East–West polarity: Pelling (1997).

53   Harrison (2007) 45.

54 Black Sea: Hdt. 4.85–6 (measured in stades, converted from length of navigation); Caspian: Hdt. 1.203.1 (length and width correspond to a journey of fifteen and eight days respectively in a rowboat); Egypt: Hdt. 2.6–9 (measured in *schoinoi*, stades, length of journey, and analogy); road from Sardis to Susa: Hdt. 5.52–4. Cf. Harrison (2007); de Bakker in this volume. For the way Darius' interest in the Black Sea mirrors that of the historian, see Barker et al. (2013a).

55 For the terminology (the 'geographical style'), see Jacoby (1912) 2692–4; Nicolai (1984); Purves (2010) 128–32; Rood (2012) 127–30.

56 Other instances of explicit analogy are at 1.202.1 (islands in the Araxes compared to Lesbos); 2.7.1 (distance from the Egyptian coast to Heliopolis compared to that from the Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens to the temple of Zeus at Pisa); see further Rood (2012) 130; Corcella (1984) 68–91. For analogy as the tool that, in line with contemporary developments, allows Herodotus to look into the ἀφανές, both on the temporal and on the spatial level, see Corcella (1984).

57 Hdt. 1.4.4: τὴν γὰρ Ἀσίην καὶ τὰ ἐνοικέοντα ἔθνεα βάρβαρα οἰκιεύνται οἱ Πέρσαι, τὴν δὲ Εὐρώπην καὶ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἥγενται κεχωρίσθαι.

58 Hdt. 9.116.3: τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν νομίζουσι ἑωυτῶν εἶναι Πέρσαι καὶ τοῦ αἰεὶ βασιλεύοντος. This is of course the *interpretatio herodotea* of the Persian view; on the latter, see Haubold (2012); Murray in this volume.

59 On the complexities of the Europe–Asia division in Herodotus, see Barker and Pelling in this volume; Bouzarowski and Barker in this volume.

60 Thomas (2000) 75–101, here 79; cf. Zimmermann (1997). The conventional geographical divisions often do not correspond to cultural units: the Aegean is a case in point.

61 Harrison (2007); see also Romm (2006); Scullion (2006).

62 Hdt. 1.27: ὡς δὲ ἀρα οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ Ἕλληνες κατεστράφατο ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγήν, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἐπενόεε νέας ποιησάμενος ἐπιχειρέειν τοῖσι νησιώτῃσι.

63 The main contrast here is, however, between islanders and continentals: Herodotus wants to underline the diversity between land powers and naval powers.

64 A picture corresponding to the situation sketched by Constantakopoulou (2007) 38–60 (see above). 'Ionians and islanders', νησιώτάς τε καὶ Ἴωνας, also join for the cult on Delos, Hdt. 4.35.3. It may be significant that the very name 'Aegean', defining the area more specifically, first appears in the poem of Ibycus for Polycrates, *PMGF* S 151: Ceccarelli (2012) 31.

65 Cf. the initial presentation at 3.39.3–4: τοῦ Πολυκράτου τὰ πράγματα ηὔξετο καὶ ἦν βεβωμένα ἀνά τε τὴν Ἰωνίην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα […] συχνὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων αἱρήκεε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄστεα.

66 So also later in the *Histories*: cf. below.

67 See Stadter (1992) 785. The *Histories* has opened with a major clash between Greece and Asia: but it was Achaeans from the Peloponnese, not Dorians, who had participated in the Trojan War.

68 The goal is, however, Ἑλλάς, not Εὐρώπη; the accent is on culture rather than geography. The Persians are to explore those areas of Europe inhabited by Greeks, and reach Taras and Croton: if southern Italy is part of Ἑλλάς, then a fortiori so are the islands. The same cultural value is active in Hdt. 1.152: when Cyrus took Sardis, the Lacedaemonians sent an embassy, requesting that Cyrus not touch any city 'of Greece' (γῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος); paradoxically, Asia Minor is here said to be Ἑλλάς.

69 On Aristagoras' role in the *Histories* see Pelling (2007). One may wonder whether the discursive organization of the *Histories*, presenting Sardis and Sparta as the two centres of power first visited by the tyrant, reflects the notion of an equilibrium of powers across the Aegean discussed above; certainly within the *Histories* the travels of Aristagoras to Sardis, Sparta, and Athens reflect Croesus' search for allies in Book 1: then, Athens had failed the test, and the Lydian had settled for Sparta; now, Sparta refuses, and Aristagoras convinces the Athenians.

70 Aristagoras presents Naxos as 'close to the Ionian coast', ἀγχοῦ Ἰωνίης (misleadingly: Naxos is halfway between Greece and Asia Minor), just as earlier the Persian Mitrobates had pushed Oroites into action against Polycrates through pointing out the closeness of Samos to Oroites' own *nomos* (νῆσον Σάμον πρὸς τῷ σῷ νομῷ προσκειμένην […] Hdt. 3.120.3). Cf. Ceccarelli (1996); Pelling (2007); Purves (2010) 128–38 (but a map does not figure in Aristagoras' successful attempt at persuading the Athenians). I am not certain that the story of Aristagoras points to Herodotus' divergence from the Hecataean tradition (so Purves (2010) 137): Hecataeus presents in the *Histories* a catalogue very similar to that of Aristagoras, but without making use of a map. The distance between the two is elsewhere.

71 Aristagoras abstains from giving exact distances: they are given afterwards, by the narrator, with extraordinary precision (Hdt. 5.52–4, with Purves (2010) 144–5). The passage reads as a strong statement against maps: Bichler 2007. See also de Bakker in this volume, and the Introduction.

72 Two examples: after the failure of the Ionian revolt, the Samians leave for Sicily (Hdt. 6.22–3); conversely, the king of Zancle, Skythes, escapes from Inykos in the Sicilian hinterland, reaches Himera, and thence 'makes his way to Asia' (ἐκ δὲ ταύτης παρῆν ἐς Ἀσίαν καὶ ἀνέβη παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον), where Darius will consider him the most just of men, because with his permission Skythes goes back to Sicily, and then returns to Persia, where he dies μέγα ὄλβιος ἐών, 6.24.

73 Munn (2006) 247 argues that the Spartans were unwilling to pursue further the confrontation, because they took Delos as

'the boundary marker of the natural and separate dominions of European Greece and Asia; to the Athenians it was the central gathering place and link that connected these two parts of the world'. This may have been the case; but Herodotus here speaks of 'Greeks', and the fracture has not yet arisen (the *Histories* end when the balance is changing again). Stadter (1992) 787–94 sees Delos as a symbolic gateway between East and West; he points out (1992) 791 n. 27 that also in Hdt. 4.33–5 Delos, as the end-point of the offerings of the Hyperboreans, represents the edge of Europe. The passage certainly also was meant to resonate with more recent events, in particular the failure of the Peloponnesians to intervene at the time of the Samian revolt from Athens: see Irwin (2009).

74   I would like to dedicate this essay to the memory of Donald Murray.