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It is the claim of this dissertation that Herodotus uses the characters of fathers and sons throughout his work deliberately and consistently. The importance of fathers and sons transcends their familial roles, and their relationship may be seen as a symbolic plane on which Herodotus reveals his views on the nature of human relations and, ultimately, the historical process. His use of fathers and sons is artistic, and is a significant feature of his compositional technique. The evidence and arguments which are used to prove these claims in this dissertation are presented in a direct and unobscure manner. A few introductory remarks on the contents and methodology will make the reader's path smoother.

In a work as vast in length and scope as the Histories, set in a patriarchal world in which the prime players most often are men engaged in struggles for power in the broadest sense, we expect to encounter stories of fathers and sons. Accordingly, throughout Herodotus' work are ranged countless mentions of genealogy, with specific references to characters' paternity, as well as scores of
stories in which fathers and sons are major characters.\textsuperscript{1} It would be folly to attempt to analyze every incident in which fathers and sons appear; indeed, Powell's Lexicon lists several hundred occurrences of the terms pater and pais. With respect to the questions of the unity of Herodotus' work and the order of composition of the various logoi, we shall see that Herodotus' interest in fathers and sons extends from the earliest sections of his investigations to the works of his maturity.\textsuperscript{2} From seemingly gratuitous mentions of fathers and sons within ethnographic discourses to the highly-wrought didacticism of the Croesus-logos, from passages of "background material" to incidents of "hard history," throughout the work Herodotus continually focuses on a wide variety of phenomena implicit in the relationship of fathers and sons. To be sure, the great variety of stories in which fathers and sons appear makes it difficult to determine at what points they are there simply because they happen to be party to the actions he is obliged to describe as part of his investigations, at what points Herodotus is investing these characters with perhaps symbolic or

\textsuperscript{1} See Appendix A for a catalogue of selected passages in which fathers and sons are significant.

metaphorical attributes, at what points he is molding fathers and sons into models of human behavior in whom he finds certain universals played out on the personal scale, and, inevitably, at what points these distinctions blur and yield altogether to the suppleness of Herodotus' narrative technique. In this last category we would obviously find the Croesus-logos, as well as the treatment of Cyrus and Cambyses, and it is in stories such as these, in which fathers and sons are heightened from mere characters to a theme in and of themselves, that we shall look for Herodotus' most powerful and artful manipulation of his material. Necessarily there are fewer of this type of story throughout the Histories than of the former types; and I should like to stress here that the "theme" of fathers and sons is but one of the many "themes" that present themselves in a work as rich as the Histories. Fathers and sons are not by any means the "dominant" theme in the Histories, but rather, as we shall see, they are a sustained theme to which Herodotus turns very, very often.

The first chapter of this dissertation is an exegesis of the Croesus-logos which reveals how the relationship between Croesus and his sons is at the crux of the philosophical and historical value of his characterization. Our sense of perspective reminds us that the Croesus-logos serves larger purposes than simply acting as a medium for the development of purely Lydian
issues: Herodotus is setting the stage for the juggernaut of Eastern power, and offering us a preview of the ways and means of the moral forces which, in his conception, guide the universe. To illustrate these points, I deal with events in the first book from the prooemium through the Lydiaka, as well as certain incidents from the life of Croesus from the later books.

The second chapter is a survey of logoi from the entire Histories demonstrating the consistency of Herodotus' use of fathers and sons. Five significant passages from various points in the work are excerpted on the strength of their particular and generic qualities, and a commentary following each explains the function of fathers and sons in the context of the particular story. (I again refer the reader to the list in Appendix A for a broad overview of the multitude of father-son passages.) This is to demonstrate that not only is the theme of fathers and sons pervasive in the work, but also that Herodotus uses fathers and sons in several distinct and different applications. (Additional passages featuring fathers and sons are similarly treated in Appendix C.)

The third chapter is devoted to recognizing and classifying the broad variety of father-son stories. These classes are based on specific narrative and thematic features which are shared by certain numbers of father-son stories. In this chapter the deliberateness and depth of
Herodotus' father-son artistry are shown to be the factors which warrant the conviction that the father-son theme is a major element in the thematic organization of the entire Histories.

The fourth chapter examines the closing books of the Histories, and thus may be seen as a complement to the first chapter. First, the opening events of Xerxes' reign from Book Seven are brought into focus and shown to be thematically underlined by the father-son motif. It is pointed out that the gradual build-up of significance of this motif in the preceding six books contributes to the dramatic climax of the Xerxes-logos. Clearly, the reader, made more and more cognizant of the importance of the father-son theme, anticipates the Darius-Xerxes pair. Then I examine the so-called epilogue of Book Nine. A correct understanding of the father-son theme is the key to the function of these oblique four final episodes of the book. Their thematic relation both to the beginning of the Persian expedition and to the entire work becomes apparent. Further, the chapter ends by demonstrating that the lessons of the father-son theme, as evidenced in the epilogue, have implications for the years following the period treated in the Histories.

A short conclusion puts the ideas of these four chapters into a perspective of Herodotus' artistry and historical approach. The premise of this discussion is that there is
a compositional unity to the work, based on the consistent thematic program that functions as early as the first book, and which reaches its natural conclusion in the epilogue.

The reader of this dissertation will find that many issues are raised in many places, but that the focus clearly remains on Herodotus' text itself. (There is also a lot of Herodotus himself reproduced in the chapters, but I hope that my necessary retelling of many passages will be at least not tedious.) This is because the purpose of this dissertation is to understand a particular literary feature of a work whose value to the classicist is primarily literary. It is hoped that as the reader gains an understanding of Herodotus' use of fathers and sons, there follows a broader appreciation of Herodotus' aims and techniques.

The text is from the 1927 Oxford edition of Hude. In largest part, the translations are borrowed from the 1942 Modern Library edition of George Rawlinson's translation. At several points throughout, however, I have made slight adjustments to Rawlinson's text in order to bring certain features to the fore.
The significance of the character Croesus as a vehicle by which Herodotus illustrates his philosophy of history is undisputed. The story of a man who comes grievously to learn that he is not as blessed as he has overconfidently believed himself to be serves Herodotus not only as a means of describing the fall of the Lydian empire to the growing power of the Persians, but also as a parable exemplifying the right and wrong ways to live one's life. Moreover, the life of Croesus functions on several levels as a paradigm for characters in the entire Histories, and to prefigure the extensive treatment of the Persian monarchs, especially Xerxes.

After the departure of Solon from the Lydian court, Herodotus writes that nemesis from god took Croesus, because, as we have witnessed in the previous scenes, he considered himself to be the happiest of men. "A dream visited Croesus, which showed him the truth about the approaching evils kata ton paida." (1.34.1) Thus begins the story of Croesus' profound come-uppance, in which he
sustains such great losses. If we ask ourselves what manner of deity would punish a man kata ton paida, we are left with the answer "an efficacious god." Now there is some ineffable bond between parents and children, of course, and the Greek audience no doubt would have shuddered at these words as they recalled their own losses of parents and children. But it is not enough to be content with this commonplace sentimentalism at the crux of a story of such significance. We must look to Herodotus himself for further explanation of why it is kata ton paida that Croesus is to be punished. When we consider what has preceded this turn of the story, we shall find that Herodotus has exercised his greatest subtlety in already having directed his audience's attention to the relationship of parents and children, more specifically, fathers and sons, in order to render these passages more convincing and to establish a theme upon which he can draw throughout his work.

To catch our first glimpse of the topic of this dissertation, the theme of fathers and sons, we may turn to the very beginning of the Histories and observe certain features of the narrative which show Herodotus' skill as a weaver of stories; the expedition with which he dispenses of all "ancient" history (i.e., history that precedes the periods he is to treat) does not yield simply a random pastiche of events. Rather, from the first rape, of Io
daughter of Inachus, to the reprisal in the rape of Europa
dughter of the king, thence to Medea's kidnap, and
finally to the rape of Helen and its dire consequences, we
can see tisis functioning as a force in human affairs. Indeed, just before the
famous declamation on the rise and fall of nations and the
mobility of human happiness with which he ends his
prooemium (1.5.3-4), he ties up the mytho-historical
precis by reintroducing the rape of Io, this time
recounting the Phoenician version of the story. The
Phoenicians deny, Herodotus says, that Io was violently
carried off by them to Egypt. Rather, she voluntarily
left Argos because she became pregnant by the captain of
the visiting Phoenician merchant vessel, and felt shame
before her parents (aideomene tous tokeas, 1.5.2). Now
this version of the story is just that—another version;
and it is perfectly natural, given the strictures of
Mediterranean morality, for Io to have been ashamed of


3 For the use of ring-composition, see I. Beck, "Die Ring-Composition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik," Spudasmata 25 (Olms, Hildesheim 1971).
herself in front of her parents for having acted as the Phoenicians claim. What interests us here is the effect to which Herodotus puts this version, as he places it prominently at the close of the "ring" of stories of his prooemium, instead of directly following his original version. Perhaps this version of the story is especially quaint to him, as it reduces to an absurdity a sequence of events which starts with the shame felt by a promiscuous "girl" and leads to the clash of continents—and this ridicule of course tallies with the spirit of Herodotus' notorious dicta on women and rape (1.4.2). 4 In any case, the theme of parents and children has been markedly introduced: Herodotus has notified his audience of the parentage of the victims of the rapes (Iou ten Inachou 1.3, tou basileos ten thugatera Europen 1.2, tou basileos ten thugatera Medeien 1.2); further, he remarks that the father of Medea sent to Greece demanding the reparation of his child—a natural enough recourse for the parent, of course, but one which, when explicitly stated, brings a particular to the fore which might easily have been omitted in recounting the simplest and most familiar course of events—the course to which Herodotus is, in

other regards, deliberately reducing all these events of the dim, "unhistorical" past.  

In the opening chapters Herodotus not only fulfills his immediate task of dismissing some flawed popular beliefs about history, he also makes some suggestive implications about the nature of these events on the largest scale.  

For the purpose of this discussion, let us keep in mind what I have just pointed out about the significance of the relationships between parents and children. We will soon find that this relationship is of signal importance to our understanding of the thematic development of Book One. 

By the sixth chapter, Herodotus has come to "real" history, for, as opposed to accounts of which he can give no assurances (ego de peri men touton ouk erchomai ereon... 1.5.3), he is now well within the realm of certainty (houtos ho Kroisos ... protos ton hemeis idmen . ... 1.6.2). A careful reading of the next several

---

5 A. E. Wardman believes that Herodotus makes no distinction between the "mythical period" and the "historical period," and "is not distinguishing between what did not happen (or probably did not) and what did; instead, he is saying that events need a certain degree of importance or magnitude before they can be relevant as causes of the great events of his own time." ["Herodotus on the Cause of the Greco-Persians Wars," AJP 82, no. 2 (1961) 133] This is perhaps plausible; we are concerned with the particular emphases Herodotus provides for these [quasi]historical events. 

6 See Wardman, op. cit., for a discussion of Herodotus' use of the events described in the opening chapters. Also M. E. White, "Herodotus' Starting Point," Phoenix 23 (1961) 39, for the distinction between the mythical and the historical.
chapters reveals a slight inconsistency in Herodotus' narrative that may provide us with a key to understanding one aspect of Herodotus' philosophy of history, an understanding that in turn renders the inconsistency conceivable.

In building up to the story of Croesus and Solon, Herodotus recounts Lydian history from earliest times and states in no uncertain terms that it was Croesus who was the first foreigner to reduce some Greeks to tribute-payers and to treat others as allies (tous men . . . tous de . . . 1.6.2). In 1.26-27, we read of Croesus' conquests and reduction to tributaries of many Greeks in Asia, and of the story of the wise advice of the Greek Bias or Pittacus, by which Croesus was convinced to make the Ionian Greeks his allies. Was this the first occasion on which Greeks and Lydians were allied, as Herodotus declares in 1.6.2? We read in 1.18.2-1.22 of Croesus' father Alyattes, who applied himself to the conquest of Miletus, but never achieved his goal. Herodotus tells the story of how Alyattes accidentally burned the temple of Athena at Assesus, and then applied to the Delphic oracle for advice on how to rid himself of the disease sent as punishment for his unintentional impiety. The oracular response was overheard by Periander and relayed to Thrasybulus, who was then tyrant of the besieged Miletus. By a clever ruse Thrasybulus was able to trick Alyattes
into concluding a treaty of friendship with the Milesians (1.22.4). This is a direct contradiction of Herodotus' original claim that Croesus was the first to make Greeks allies! Additionally, when we examine more closely the sequence of events behind these two separate alliances, we notice a similarity which, given the legendary nature of these stories, may be attributed to Herodotus' design. Both Croesus and his father are taken in by the cleverness of Greeks: in the historically earlier incident, Alyattes by Thrasybulus' feigned surfeit of grain in besieged Miletus; in the latter, Croesus by the clever turn of speech of Pittacus (or Bias), which persuades him to give up his plans to attack the islanders with his newly-constructed navy.

In a work as vast as the Histories we may forgive, even expect that Herodotus' memory may fail, and that slight inconsistencies may crop up from time to time. When, however, an inconsistency arises at so prominent a locus in the narrative, in a series of passages expressly intended to expound the origins of the great struggle which is the major theme of the work, we can hardly dismiss it as a harmless peccadillo. Why has Herodotus contradicted himself, or at least been so ambiguous? The

7 For contradictions as early as 1.5-14, see A. Heuss, "Motiv von Herodots lydischen Logos," Hermes 101 (1973) 387.
answer lies in our observation of Herodotus' construction of the two stories of Alyattes and Croesus. Herodotus has deliberately drawn a fairly specific parallel in his description of an event of significance in the life of the father with one in the life of his son. It remains to use this observation of a literary feature to reconcile the historical problem of who was first to conclude an alliance with the Greeks. We must recognize that for Herodotus, the importance of historical events is not only to be found in the unique actions of an individual such as Croesus, but may also be discerned through an appreciation of the continuity of events in which certain unique episodes stand out as particularly momentous. It is true that Croesus' imperialism proved to be of greater significance to the course of "world" history than, say, his father's, for Croesus was the one who was to clash with Cyrus. In recognizing this greater significance, Herodotus devotes the lion's share of his Lydian history to Croesus. But by way of suggesting his view of the manner in which history works, Herodotus constructs these introductory stories along parallel lines, even going so far to make his point as to lapse into what a modern reader who is unaware of these aims might term an inconsistency.

To the contrary, we can now begin to appreciate how consistent Herodotus is in presenting this model of the
continuity of historical events through the vehicle of the theme of fathers and sons. At several points in his narrative of the history of Lydia, Herodotus directs at least part of our attention to this theme. Of course, such a technique is obviously unavoidable, or is at least the most direct, when the subject is the history of a patrilineal dynasty. This we must admit for passages such as 1.6.2, 1.15.1, 1.16.1, and 1.26.1, where Herodotus is simply providing us with the names of the sons who succeeded their fathers to the throne. In such cases Herodotus uses simple patronymics, for his purpose is no more than to certify lineage. Elsewhere, when some special aspects of the father-son relationship are highlighted, we may infer a distinct motive. For example, at 1.17.1 (paradexamenos . . patros) and again at 1.18.2 (hoi paradexamenos . . entetameno), Herodotus emphasizes that a significant historical event, the long war against Miletus, was inherited by Alyattes from his father Sadyattes. As this war was waged against a Greek city, we can expect Herodotus to have shown greater interest in its background than in some other Lydian conquests. It is by virtue of the generational link that he expresses this interest.

Even when we turn back to the somewhat cursory history of the Heracleidae who preceded Candaules, we see evidence of Herodotus' interest in this particular aspect of
historical continuity. After a catalogue of kings, in which patronymics are used throughout (1.7.2-3), Herodotus stresses, perhaps too obviously, that the crown passed from father to son down through the generations (pāiš para patros ekdekomenos ten archen 1.7.4). Now that we have begun to understand that patriliny was in and of itself an integral feature of Herodotus' understanding of the historical process, we recognize the motivation behind this tautology. By restating, in the specific terms of a father-to-son linking of generations, Herodotus assures us of the continuity of the Heracleidae, beyond the certainty already afforded by the list of kings.

We can now turn our attention back to the episode of Solon and Croesus. It has long been recognised that for reasons of chronology this interview can never have occurred. Thus the entire story must have been fabricated by Herodotus with specific literary and historical purposes in mind. Among these no doubt is to provide his audience with an understanding of why a man such as Croesus is so manifestly punished by the gods. The proverbial wisdom of Solon, as everyone knows, is rejected by the Lydian despot, and to Herodotus' audience it must have logically followed that for his rejection of

the Greek’s superior knowledge Croesus deserved whatever he got. We may also look to Solon’s speeches, entirely composed by Herodotus, for an insight into Herodotus’ own world-view; indeed, we find throughout the Histories stories which bear out Solon’s various contentions about the mutability of fortune, a view which we recall was propounded by Herodotus sua voce as early as the prooemium (1.5.4).\(^9\) We can, therefore, understand that Herodotus’ audience was very much meant to take to heart the advice of the sage when he urges Croesus, so obviously blessed, against considering himself happy. To be sure, the curious sympathy one might feel for Croesus, whose own evident happiness is so thoroughly contemned by Solon, almost begs one to apply even greater scrutiny to Solon’s advice. This advice Solon gives explicitly (1.32) as well as in the famous exhortation to "look to the end" of things, in his third speech. But why did Solon launch into this third speech? It was in response to Croesus’ inability to understand the ainoi of Tellus and Cleobis

---

\(^9\) For conflicting opinions on how much of the real Solon, or at least what Herodotus knew of him, is in the Histories, compare Jacoby’s observation, re. Solon, that Herodotus included "alles was er hatte" [RE Supp.1.2 (1913) 350], with Immerwahr’s important, broader remarks that "Herodotus does not always give a complete and evenly balanced account of all the events in a king’s reign which are known to him. ...[he] did not critically include every piece of information that had come to his attention. ...one is struck by his selectivity more than his inclusiveness. This selectivity furnishes several clues to the unity of the subject of the work" [Form and Thought in Herodotus, APA Monograph 23 (Cleveland 1966) 28].
and Biton, the two sets of nominees Solon has provided in answer to the question whom did he consider the happiest of mortals. In these exempla we evidently have Herodotus' own models of human happiness, and we must look to these stories for insight into Herodotus' views.

It is fitting that these models should treat particular lives in their entirety, for Solon's ultimate points have to do not with immediate concerns and satisfactions, such as are answered for Croesus from his ample treasury, but rather with the whole of life. Thus it is that in both cases, of Tellus and of Cleobis and Biton, their entire lives are contained within the scope of the vignettes.

With his eye ever on "the end," Solon tells of the patriotic death of the Athenian and the final slumber of the two Argive brothers. They all died happy, and this answers to the letter of Solon's law. But what more of their lives can we understand to be exemplary? For life is as important as death in the tallying of happiness. In both cases the answer is significant.

For Tellus, Solon calls Croesus' attention to his paternity in the opening sentence of his first speech.

Τέλλω τούτο μὲν τῆς πόλεως εὖ ἦκούσης παίδες ἦσαν καλοὶ τε κἀγαθοὶ, καὶ σφὶ εἴδε ἀπέστειλε τέκνα ἐκγενόμενα καὶ πάντα παραμείναντα, τούτῳ δὲ τοῦ βίου εὖ ἦκοντι, ὥς τὰ παρ’ ἡμῖν, τελευτὴ τοῦ βίου λαμπροτάτῃ ἐπεγένετο· γενομένης γὰρ Ἀθηναίους μάχης πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας
Tellus, first because while his country flourished he had excellent sons, and he saw children born to them all and survive; secondly, after a life spent in comfort, at least by our standards, his death was exemplary. For during a battle between the Athenians and their neighbors...

The construction of the opening sentence gives syntactical prominence to the sons of Tellus, who are in the nominative case, with Tellus himself appearing as is appropriate in first position, but relegated to the dative of possession. The sentence stretches on, describing these sons as fine gentlemen, to whom were born sons in their turn, whom Tellus, now subject of the verb eide, lived to see. All of this information Herodotus casts in the men clause, giving it equal weight to the de clause (in which Tellus again appears in the dative case) which introduces the story of Tellus' celebrated teleute, described at length in the entire next sentence. This stylistic symmetry points up the importance of sons, for in the equivalence of life and death, it is his sons who are used to illustrate Tellus' life. But to understand fully this strangely memorable obituary, we must reconcile Tellus' life, so curiously described, with his death; and we do this in the terms of the narrator's eye toward "the
end" of things. What made Tellus' death exemplary is not difficult to discern: he died a hero, defending his country, and, recognised as such by his countrymen, received a hero's burial. His life? His fine sons were the most important aspect of his life, as were his grandsons, whom he lived to see. To Solon, his exemplary telos resides in his participation in a kind of continuity. What is more, Tellus witnessed and, by implication, appreciated his part in the continuity. His sons and grandsons were surviving him, he knew it, and so, when he did die in glory, he died happily and to Solon's approval. By virtue of these factors his life and death serve as a paradigm for the sage. All these lessons are lost on Croesus, however, who is unable to figure out the ainos, and Solon must recount another story to make his points.

The tableau of Cleobis and Biton also deals with the whole of life and death, but here, as if in answer to Croesus' dull-wittedness, Solon makes his lessons somewhat more transparent. That the brothers were blessed in life is made clear - strong, well-enough off, victorious at the games (1.31.2); and their peaceful death in the temple of Hera, a gift of the goddess, was the greatest reward for their exceptional devotion to their mother. But whereas the blessing of death is granted to all, Croesus included, Solon's story makes it clear that it is in the connection
between life and death that we must look for the paradigmatic telon. As with Tellus, so, too, in this story we must observe continuity established from one's life to whatever lies beyond. That is why these Argive boys are models: the greatest deed of their short lives was in service to the person who brought them into life, their mother. And now it is with their progenetrix' blessing that they depart so comfortably from this life.

The Argive men standing around marvelled at the strength of the boys, and the Argive women at their mother, to have borne such children. The mother, thoroughly overjoyed at the deed and at the telling of it, standing in front of the statue, prayed that god should give to Cleobis and Biton, who had honored her greatly, the greatest thing that there is for man.
After her prayer, as they performed sacrifices and held their banquet, the boys, laying down to rest in the temple itself, never again rose up, but met such an end.

1.31.3,4,5

Here, too, we observe the continuity reflected in Herodotus' construction of the narrative: in the men sentence the Argive men celebrate the vitality of the brothers, the women celebrate the mother who bore them (hoion teauton ekurese). They are celebrating birth, and life, and we may go so far as to suggest that in thus rejoicing, Greeks here as always had an eye to kleos and its concomitant immortality (which in the case of Cleobis and Biton is proven per se by the very telling of the story by Solon). At the same time, the de sentence, of equal syntactic gravity, describes the mother of these, her children (toisi heoutes teknoisi), praying for "the greatest thing that can happen to man" for them - death. It is in this continuity, of the cycle of birth, life, and death, that Cleobis and Biton, and their mother, too, find their telos (all' en telei toutoi eschonto), which for Solon is paradigmatic.

The secret of the ainos is again lost on Croesus, and when Solon is at last forced to be blunt, he insists to Croesus that a man's death is as important as is his life when it comes to reckoning happiness. This we have
already understood from his two sets of exempla, but now for Croesus' benefit he explicitly describes the inherent continuity between life and death, where in his parables he had been implicit. He now directly exhorts Croesus to an awareness of this continuity, for through this awareness the king might find satisfaction in his own life and the prospect of its end, like Tellus, and likewise be content with the course of life and its inevitable end for other, even loved ones. We will find that Croesus' tragedy is twofold, with its parts corresponding to these two related considerations.

Whereas for the third speech Solon must openly admonish Croesus, in the previous stories he cast these views on life's entirety in the foreground, in their most natural setting—that is, in the contexts of parents and children. The continuity of generations, and consciousness of this continuity, is at the heart of these stories. The stories themselves, if somewhat apocryphal, nevertheless serve Herodotus' literary purpose as perfect foils to the story of Croesus himself—and that is why Herodotus puts them in the mouth of his credible peripatetic sage, at this critical point in the narrative.

Now that we have posited a reason for Herodotus having set the ensuing tragedy in the context of the relationship between father and son, we must focus our attention on the intricacies of the construction of the plot and how they
answer to the implications of Solon's visit. We will expect—as Solon has certified two discrete components of happiness, life and death—that the story of Croesus' punishment will correspond in some way with both of these. By the very words used to describe why Croesus is to be punished (hoti enomise... olbiotaton 1.34.1), Herodotus implicitly introduces both life and death into the inevitably sad story of Croesus, for they both featured in the epexegetical stories of Tellus and Cleobis and Biton which illustrated successful representatives of olbiotatoi. We shall also find that here, too, Herodotus addresses the issue of one's attitude not only toward one's own life and death, as in the story of Tellus, but also toward the life and death of others, of loved ones, of a son. It is therefore fitting that to set the scene Herodotus resumes the narrative after the foreboding introduction with a description of Croesus' two sons:

(Conv, ἴπαν ὄε τῷ Κρολσῷ δύο παῖδες, τῶν σύνερος μὲν διέφθαρτο, ἥν γὰρ ὃθη κωφός, ὁ ὅε ἐτερος τῶν ἠλίκων μακρῷ τὰ πάντα πρῶτος.

Croesus had two sons, the one crippled, for he was mute, the other by far the first among his peers in all things. 1.34.2

Let us notice the unprejudiced description Herodotus uses to introduce these two sons. He makes no "value judgments" on the voiceless son, and similarly is content
to report with a studied journalistic indifference that
the latter son was preeminent among his contemporaries.
Indeed, the men and de clauses, each describing one son,
are virtually balanced, with fourteen and sixteen
syllables respectively.\(^\text{10}\)

As Herodotus makes it clear that nemesis is upon
Croesus, the audience may confidently anticipate that the
dream, which visits the king, is a true omen. Thus, some
measure of precaution is to be expected on the part of the
worried father. It serves to build sympathy for Croesus,
as well as to illustrate his ignorance of the wisdom
prescribed by Solon, that Croesus so thoroughly, even
comically overreacts to this premonition of his son's
death by an iron-tipped weapon: in the space of one
sentence he marries off his son, prohibits him even from
participation in the hunts he formerly led, and removes
all the weapons "which men use in war" (toisi chreon tie es
polemon anthropoi) from the men's quarters to the
bedchambers! (1.34.3)

It is at this point, now that Herodotus has highlighted
their relationship and has introduced a measure of tension
between father and son, that the refugee Adrastus arrives
at Sardis. Coming at this point in Croesus' life, just as
he has yielded to a fear for his son's life, this sub-

\(^{10}\) There is certainly some antithetical impact in
this juxtaposition which belies any apparent casualness in
the description.
episode functions as another "ainos," behind which is a kernel of wisdom which Croesus is implicitly challenged to comprehend. This small tragedy is also to be viewed from the perspective of the father-son relationship. Adrastus has committed a grave crime by killing a man; by presenting us with specifically a fratricide, Herodotus invests this criminal with a special significance. Adrastus has upset a particular balance, a balance which in the previous stories, discussed above, has been scrupulously maintained: in Herodotus' impartial description of Croesus' two sons, in the story of Cleobis and Biton, where neither was singled out in any way, and in the story of Tellus, where the sons were left anonymous and equal. It is within the provenance of humans in their capacities as fathers and sons to maintain this balance, provided that fortune is agreeable. But, as Solon said, fortune is mutable, and it frowned on Adrastus—he upset the balance. Thus his tragic death will be viewed in the context of fickle fortune. He is nothing more than a symbol in this story, the tool of fortune, hence his name Adrastus, "the man who cannot escape." In the same way, Croesus' son Atys, "blinded by "ate," is Herodotus' symbol, used as a tool in the larger tragedy of Croesus. In both the smaller and greater story, the father is the more significant character. In the Adrastus story Herodotus emphasizes this by the words he puts in Adrastus' mouth:
O king, I am the son of Gordias, son of Midas, I am called Adrastus, and having unwittingly killed my own brother I am here, having been driven out by my father and stripped of everything.

The structure of this sentence insures that our attention is in large part focussed on the role Adrastus' father has played in his situation: the *men* clause is his extended patriliny, and the second, lengthy *de* clause has only one main verb, the bland *pareimi*, "I am here," the result of the actions described by the colorful participles *exelelamenos* and *esteremenos*. The admission itself of his crime is tucked in the middle of the sentence, and is punctuated by the word *aekon*, "unwittingly." The final part of the sentence is a description, directly following *aekon*, of what Adrastus has suffered at the hands of his father, emphasized by the two *passive* participles and the genitive of agency (*hypo tou patros*).

When we appreciate that Herodotus is directing our attention to the part played in Adrastus' recent tribulations by his father Gordias, we can understand that Gordias' is the greater flaw, for he not only condemned to inevitable death the surviving half of his progeny, but
also thus forfeited his own chance to enjoy the life Solon had presented as the model of happiness—security in the knowledge of generational continuity. Croesus is about to suffer the same losses, and were he not marked by a total ignorance of the ways of fortune, he would be able to understand this, the ainos of Adrastus' story. Herodotus certifies Croesus' ignorance at this point by the response the king gives to Adrastus' self-introduction. At first courtly and hospitable, soon Croesus reveals his obliviousness to the significant emotional aspects of Adrastus' situation: after telling the suppliant that he has arrived among friends, he next assures him that as long as he remains, he will not be without money (entha amechaneseis chrematos oudenos 1.35.4)—as if that were what it takes to ease Adrastus' soul! Croesus' next words to Adrastus continue to indict the king's ignorance—he tells Adrastus that, if he wishes to make the best of a bad show, he must bear his misfortune hos kouphotata, "as lightly as possible." This, the only usage of a kouphos derivative in the Histories, is striking for its insensitivity; it reflects Croesus' ignorance of the solution to the Adrastus-ainos, which would be a proper appreciation of what the exile has suffered leading to a realization by Croesus of how best to manage his own affairs under duress.
After this subtle but ominous beginning to the irreversible catastrophe, the Mysians arrive complaining of the boar that is ravaging their territory. Herodotus turns to pathos in his construction of the story by here staging the agon between father and son. Atys, having overheard his father making excuses for his son's non-participation in the boar hunt, complains of this treatment in terms which recapitulate the ambiguity of gender introduced in Croesus' original prophylactic measure of 1.34.3 (when the king removed all the masculine paraphernalia from the men's to the women's quarters). In the present passage, Atys is discomfited by his father's behests mostly because he is now making a poor impression on his fellow citizens and his new wife, since he is debarred from the traditional masculine pursuits (1.37.2,3). The reappearance of this particular theme recalls our attention to the previous stories of Cleobis and Biton, whose glory rests in their exploits, and Tellus, who was so conscious of his sons' similar glory.

The entire agon between Croesus and Atys is subtly staged by Herodotus. Informed as he was by the traditions of Athenian tragic drama in contemporary Greece, Herodotus puts words in his characters' mouths which were calculated to heighten the dramatic element on the large

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}}\]

scale as well as to predispose his audience's sympathies on the more specific. We observe in this exchange the several usages of the vocative o pater and o pai (1.37.2, 38.1, 39.1, 40.1) which contribute to the intimacy between father and son which Croesus is about to forfeit. Indeed, this intimacy is here directly aimed at by the author. Herodotus is additionally stressing the importance of recognizing in Croesus and Atys an archetypal father and son by his abandonment of the proper noun Atys after its only two occurrences in the narrator's introduction to the story (1.34.2). For the remainder of the story, the characters and the narrator refer to Atys only as "the/my son." But there is a double-edge to this intimacy, as brought out in Croesus' callous dismissal of his other son as "no son of mine" (ton gar de heteron diephtharmenon ouk einai moi logizomai 1.38.2). This repudiation of his other son is the more abominable as it comes from Croesus as he tries to win the indulgence of Atys. Croesus here is guilty of upsetting the balance which, as we have seen, is an integral part of the wisdom which wins happiness for a man. We may again recall that balance, discussed above, in Herodotus' description of Croesus' sons. Croesus here reveals his ignorance of fortune in publishing his preference. And now the sub-plot of Adrastus and his father Gordias grows more ominous, for it also hinged on
this balance, upset by Adrastus, and Gordias' response to it.

Another element of this narrative is the role of the son as antagonist: Atys is presented as the sophist exploiting the niceties of language—to his own peril, as he fatally misinterprets the dream of his father Croesus. Croesus, in yielding to his son's explanation, and allowing him to accompany the hunt, is again presented as a man incapable of understanding. This time he cannot understand his dream, as earlier he could not unravel the ainoi of Solon and Adrastus. This theme will be elaborated in the stories of the ambiguous oracles; we are now observing that Herodotus introduces this theme in the context of father and son, where it is used to especially pathetic effect.

So Croesus allows his son to go hunting, and requests Adrastus to serve as his chaperon. In addition to citing the reason for his concern over his son's safety (there are highwaymen about), Croesus also urges Adrastus to seek glory for himself. Among Croesus' compelling reasons to Adrastus is that it is Adrastus' paternal heritage (patroion) to accomplish great deeds. The irony of this passage (1.41.2,3) is unmistakable: the blind Croesus, unable to appreciate what manner of patroion is Adrastus', urges him to further deeds worthy of his sire. From this perspective, the ensuing scene, in which Adrastus
accidentally kills Atys with his spear, becomes a double tragedy. Both sides are grounded in the perversion of the bonds between fathers and sons. That is, on the one hand Croesus has been severed from his own son through his own ignorance; on the other hand, Adrastus has further abused the bonds first between himself and his natural father (who was acknowledged by Croesus as a guest-friend at 1.34.4), and secondly, albeit unwittingly, between himself and his adoptive father Croesus, by whom he had been received and purified from his earlier misfortune.

It is in his reaction to the news that his son has been killed that Croesus begins to come to terms with his ignorance; for, as Herodotus describes, as much as he was grieved by the loss of his son, he was even more bitter insofar as he himself had been responsible for it (1.44.1). The use of the rare edeinologeeto "he complained indignantly" (only here and, in an unrelated context, at 4.68.3) calls attention to the significance of Croesus' dawning perception. This is also emphasized in his triple oath, in which the actual loss of his son is not stressed. Rather, the three oaths, to Zeus Katharsios, Epistios, and Hetaireios, correspond to Croesus' three errors: purifying, entrusting, and commissioning Adrastus.

We might be left to ask what Croesus should have done, when the dictates of conscience and the rules of xenia
required him to act as he did. We must, however, remember that for Herodotus this is not the question, for all these events were predestined, sent from god. Of greater importance is the way in which men cope with their fate. In this didactic story, the lesson finally comes to Croesus when Adrastus presents himself at his feet, begging to be sacrificed over the body of the dead Atys. It is here that Croesus finally perceives that the actual incidents are of less moment than an understanding of the ways of fortune. The key to Croesus' epiphany is his reaction to Adrastus' pitiful request. Croesus, faced with the opportunity of exacting vengeance, chooses to pity the homicide, as he recognizes that Adrastus is not really responsible, but rather "some god" (theon kou tis, 1.45.2) has been behind it all. Herodotus highlights this change in Croesus, this legitimate gain of wisdom, in his use of the word aekon, by which Croesus forgivingly describes Adrastus. Previously this word was used only when Adrastus first described the accidental murder of his brother, which led to his exile. In this pointed, contrasting use of the same word, Herodotus draws the distinction between the two fathers, Gordias and Croesus. The former condemned his son because of his own inability to accept the caprice of fortune which led his one son to murder the other. The latter, Croesus, has now grown in
wisdom and surpassed the other father (Gordias), and so is able to forgive.

The story ends on a note which further emphasizes these points. Croesus is described fulfilling his responsibility as a father, piously burying his son "as was proper" (hos oikois en, 1.45.3). But Adrastus, son of a father who never acquired the forbearance of the "new" Croesus, and whom Herodotus has used as a tool to serve the greater purpose of the paideia of Croesus, commits suicide over the pyre of his victim Atys. In the lengthy final sentence describing the end of Adrastus' life (1.45.3), Herodotus recalls the abortive patriliny (Adrestos . . . Mideo), and strikingly equates the literal loss of life with the sense of loss of the surviving father: Adrastus is twice labeled by Herodotus as ho phoneus, "murderer," once literally of his own brother, referring to the murder itself, and again metaphorically of Croesus, referring to the effect on a father of losing a son.

Herodotus' introduction to the several chapters devoted to Croesus' reasons for going to war against Persia and his misinterpretation of the oracles continues to exploit the father and son theme.
Croesus, bereft of his son, was consumed by great mourning for two years. But then, when the rule of Astyages, son of Cyaxares, was seized by Cyrus, son of Cambyses, and the Persian power had grown more powerful—this news put an end to Croesus' mourning...

1.46.1

In the first sentence we notice in emphatic final position the words *tou paidos esteremenos*, "bereft of his son," which are immediately contrasted in the next sentence with the dual patronymics *Astyageos tou Kyaxareo* and *Kyrou tou Kambyseo*. By momentarily taking our attention away from Lydia, the state of affairs in Persia is described with the emphasis clearly directed toward the flourishing patrilineal hegemony passed from Cyaxares to Astyages and then seized by Cyrus son of Cambyses. The contrast between the two situations reaches its full rhetorical power in Herodotus' description of the effect of the Persian patrilineal succession on the child-less Croesus. In a phrase which hauntingly echoes the *en penthei megaloï katesto* of the preceding sentence, the 'news from Persia *pentheos men Kroison apepavse*, "it put an end to Croesus' mourning."
We find other more subtle uses of this same father-son theme in various passages following this introduction, in which Herodotus explains Croesus' motivation for going to war against the Persians. Immediately after the description of the succession of Persian power, Herodotus provides us with a plausible explanation for Croesus' original intention: he wished to check the power of the Persians before they could grow too mighty (prin megalous genesthai tous Persas 1.46.1). This reason for the wars between Lydia and Persia is, several chapters later, filled out by Herodotus before the actual clash between the powers, in a flashback which provides a less political, more human background for Croesus' willingness to go to war. After telling of the abortive overtures between Croesus and the Spartans, and of Croesus' rejection of the advice of the "wise advisor" Sandanis, and after providing a brief geographical description of Cappadocia (1.69-72), Herodotus reintroduces the causes of the war by a threefold explanation.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12} Cf. R. Lattimore, "The Wise Advisor in Herodotus" CP 34 (1939); Heinrich Bischoff, "Der Warner bei Herodot" (diss. Marburg, 1932).}\]
Croesus went to war against Cappadocia for these reasons: from the desire of land, he wished to annex in addition to his own property; he was especially reliant on the oracles; he wanted to get revenge for Astyages over Cyrus.

1.73.1

The first reason, territorial acquisitiveness, is understandable enough in terms of Realpolitik. The second, Croesus’ reliance on the oracles, also makes sense, given Herodotus’ interest in the supernatural as well as in the paideia of Croesus vis-à-vis the oracles.

It is in the explanation of the third reason (to which are devoted the remainder of chapter 73 as well as 74), Croesus’ hope to avenge Astyages, that we find further illustration of the features of Herodotus’ composition which we are considering. This complicated story (1.73-74) has several applications to our perspective, and must be referred to in several specifics. The reader is requested to review this passage at this point.14

13 For a discussion of moira and similar terms of nature/theology, see J. Myers, op.cit., 46-59.

14 The text is reprinted as Appendix B at the end of this dissertation.
First, with regard to the larger question of Herodotus' conception of the patterns of history, which was raised earlier in terms of the continuity of generations, we here notice that an incident in which the father-son relationship is brutally severed leads to a large-scale misfortune. This follows the pattern established in a more general form as early as the prooemium, with its stories of daughters separated from fathers and the resulting Trojan War. Specifically, it follows the form of the arrival of Adrastus at Sardis and the ensuing tragedy of Atys. Here (1.73.4,5) Scythians who served Cyaxares, in anger at the unfair treatment they received at their master's hands, murder one of the Medean paides entrusted to them. In the context of this story, I believe it is Herodotus' intention that the audience consider this anonymous paieis as a son of Cyaxares; this immeasurably heightens the drama of the passage and follows the pattern of the Banquet of Thyestes motif to which Herodotus turns on more than one occasion in the Histories. This murder eventually leads to a five year war between the Medes and the Lydians (1.74.1). Thus, on one level Herodotus is maintaining the basic premise that a severing of the father-son bond necessitates dire consequences.

\[\text{15 For the use of the banquet motif, see below, 196ff.}\]
Second, specifically, and more subtly, Herodotus has here presented another ainos, one which Croesus again cannot unravel. The loss of Cyaxares' son, rendered the more bitter by Alyattes' refusal to extradite the guilty Scythians, is at long last requited by Alyattes when he gives his daughter Aryenis to become the wife of Astyages, and thus the daughter-in-law of the bereft father Cyaxares. Herodotus sets up this marriage as a symbol of the balance restored, not only on the specific level of the Medean royal house, but also on a larger scale. This is accomplished in several ways. There is a conspicuous balance in the description of the casualties in the war between Media and Lydia: pollakis men hoi Medoi tous Lydous enikesan, pollakis de hoi Lydoi tous Medous, "often the Medes gained the upper hand over the Lydians, often the Lydians over the Medes" (1.74.1). There is also the supernatural occurrence, the portent of the solar eclipse, during the sixth year of the war, again in the context of balance: diapherousi de sphises ton polemon, "they were waging the war equally on both sides" (1.74.2). This paranormal event, set during the unusual circumstance of a night battle, lends a divine gravity to the balanced resolution of the war, and the balance is reinforced on the human plane by the construction of the narrative describing the truce: hoi de Lydoi te kai hoi Medoi... mallon ti espeusan kai amphoteroi eirenen heoutoisi
genesthai, "the Lydians and the Medes, too ... were both rather eager that there be peace between themselves" (1.74.3). Herodotus enhances the balance by citing in parallel form the names and nationalities of the two ambassadors from either side (Syennesis de ho Kilix kai Labynetos16 ho Babylonios, 1.74.3). Then comes the sentence in which Alyattes gives his daughter, a sentence whose near-chiasmus reflects both the balance and the seminal matter of the lost son restored:

'Αλυάττεα γὰρ ἔγνωσαν δοῦναι τὴν θυγατέρα 'Αρυῆναν 'Αστυάγει τῷ Κυαξάρεω παιδί.

They advised that Alyattes give his daughter Aryenis to Astyages the son of Cyaxares. 1.74.4

Moreover, as if to extol balance in what we would call its platonic form, Herodotus elevates the narrative from the specific to the universal, first on the level of treaties in general (they are not strong without compulsion), and then on the grandest international level, the one with which the Histories are ultimately concerned: horkia de poieetai tauta ta ethnea ta per te Hellenes ..., "both these people and the Greeks take oaths the same way ..." (1.74.6).

It seems, then, that this sub-story, like the Adrastus story, functions as a model, this time, though, presenting

16 Professor Balcer has pointed out to me that this is a textual error. The Babylonian was Nabunidos.
a positive image of resolution. It is of the greatest significance that directly following this αἰνος, as earlier, Croesus signally errs: he crosses the Halys, enters Persian territory, and sets in motion the loss of his kingdom.

As the fall of Sardis draws nigh, Herodotus utilizes the father-son motif in the context of the prodigy of snakes and horses. Of the three oracles delivered to Croesus (1.47.3, 1.55.2, 1.85.2), the latter two, addressed to him directly by use of vocatives, are concerned with some aspect of the father-son theme. Let us for the moment turn our attention backwards in the text to the first of these two cases (1.55.2), in which the oracle answers Croesus' query as to the longevity of his reign by stating that a Median mule (ἡμίωνος) will be Croesus' scourge. This of course refers to Cyrus, whose mixed lineage Herodotus will describe later. We can see Herodotus underlining his rejection of Croesus' literal-minded certainty that since a mule could never rule in place of a man, his reign would be eternal; and we see Herodotus' attitude toward Croesus' arrogant ignorance in the words used to describe Croesus' reaction to the oracle

ἐλπίζων ἡμίωνον οὐδαμὰ ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς βασιλεύσεως Μηδῶν, οὐδ' ὃν αὐτὸς οὖν οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ παύσεσθαι κατε τῆς ἀρχῆς.

[he was] expecting that a mule would never rule the
Medes in place of a man, and that neither he himself nor any of his descendants would ever lose the reign.

1.56.1

Implicit in this description of Croesus’ reaction is a total rejection of the philosophy expounded by Herodotus himself as early as the prooemium, as well as of Solon’s advice to Croesus. Both these views, the author’s and that of his sage/mouthpiece, we have seen to be cognizant of the inevitability of change and fortune’s role in it. To highlight Croesus’ ignorance of this wisdom, Herodotus here shows the unenlightened king failing to understand in the very same arena where he so recently failed with such dire consequences—the arena of the father-son relationship. That is, by using as part of Croesus’ painful education this oracle, with its inherent association to the father-son theme, Herodotus is stressing the consistency and relentlessness of Croesus’ lessons.

To return to the fall of Sardis (in which another oracle figures prominently, and will be discussed presently), the portent of the snakes devoured by the horses in the suburbs of Sardis, explained only too late by the Telmessians, serves as another ainos. Its unraveling again depends on points related to the ones we have been considering: the ignorant Croesus is unable to appreciate
in time that his doom is foreshadowed by the death of the snakes, natural "sons of the earth" (gea paida), at the hands, or rather mouths, of the horses, foreigners (epeluda, 1.78).

Finally Herodotus has arrived at the fall of Croesus' city, and in this climax we must look for a resolution of the tension which has developed around Croesus' story and the theme of fathers and sons. The actual fall of the Lydian capital is described by Herodotus in a way that structurally exploits this theme. Sardis is taken via its one vulnerable approach—the sheer wall of the acropolis. The earlier king of Sardis, Meles, had carried all around the city the lion which he had sired, for the Telmessians had prophesied that by doing this would he render his city impregnable. In this context of myth and religion, Herodotus reveals that Meles did not take his child, the lion, to one specific spot, for he mistakenly reckoned that the cliff overhanging the Tmolus was naturally invincible (1.84.3). So Meles did all he could, short of what he was prevented from doing by either fate or hybris—and therein lay the eventual loss of his city: Hyroiades the Mardian leads the incursion into Sardis via this obscure approach. Croesus' losses are to be understood in the same terms, which are extensively elaborated. Of course Croesus loses his kingdom because of his hybris and fate, but thematically Herodotus has relied on the father-
son relationship to imbue this account with a deeper personal loss alongside the political catastrophe.

Even as Sardis is on the verge of capture, with dramatic surprise Herodotus reintroduces Croesus' other son, whom we recall from Herodotus' balanced description of him and his brother Atys (1.34.2) and from Croesus' agon with Atys (1.38.2). We recall that in the latter passage Croesus coldly dismissed this son: *ton gar de heteron dephtharmenon ouk einai moi logizomai*, "that other one, the cripple, I do not consider to be mine." Yet in this current passage, Croesus is described as having previously lavished attention on his poor boy: *entei on parelthousei euestoi ho Kroisos to pan es auton epeiekee...", "in better times, Croesus had done everything he could for him" (1.85.1) Herodotus is evidently guilty of another inconsistency, of the type exemplified in the question of who was first to make Greeks allies, discussed above. The solution again rests on our understanding of the father-son motif: as Sardis is falling, and Croesus' losses are manifest, Herodotus is interested in winning for Croesus the sympathies of his audience, and so manipulates the father-son relationship to suit this purpose.

The foreshadowing of Meles and his son (the lion), and the Telmessian prophets, is reflected further in the oracular context of this current passage. Like Meles for his city, Herodotus points out that Croesus did all he
could for his son. It is at this point (1.85.1) that Herodotus recalls the last of the three oracles delivered directly to Croesus from Delphi years ago, in answer to the king's inquiries about his mute son. The oracle told him that he would find the triumph over his son's shortcoming only on his doom-day: *audessei gar en emati proton anolboi* (1.85.2). The word *anolboi* here echoes the lessons of Solon and the ensuing tragedy of Atys, and on this "first day of the rest of his life," Croesus is clearly described by Herodotus as smitten by the severest *anolbia*: the king utterly yields himself to death: *Kroisos men nun oreon epionta hypo tes pareouses sumphores paremelekee, oude ti hoi dephere plegenti apothanein,* "Croesus now, in the midst of his trouble, saw his attacker coming at him, but did not care" (1.85.3).

Herodotus uses the mute son as a tool for Croesus' eventual salvation. Now that Croesus is spiritually dead, it is the duty of the son to save the father. This intimate connection may be seen in the closeness of the words in this critical passage: *apothanein, ho de pais.* In the description of the son uttering his first words, especially the placement of the final word of the description, he seems to be entering into life itself: *houtos men de touto proton ephthegxato, meta de touto ede ephoneee ton panta chronon tes zoes,* "he thus spoke for the first time, and afterwards he had a voice for the rest of
his life" (1.85.4). The ordeal of Croesus' life is
contrasted with that of his "reborn" son in the next
sentence, too, where the Persians are described taking
Croesus with a verb, ezogresan, that mocks the zoes of the
previous sentence.

Now that Croesus had indeed lost it all, it remains for
him to have the epiphany on the pyre, where he is bound
along with fourteen "sons of the Lydians" (dis hepta Lydon
par'auton paidas, 1.86.2), and to emerge from this "death"
with a reborn spirit, one endowed with the wisdom which he
has suffered so much to acquire. This paideia of Croesus
reaches fruition while the pyre is burning, and, as is
well known, he is saved from immolation.

Next Herodotus certifies the renaissance and new-found
wisdom of a saved Croesus. In the interview conducted
between Cyrus and Croesus after the latter is removed from
the pyre, Croesus is asked why he undertook a war against
Cyrus rather than befriend him. In his answer he displays
his new knowledge of the role of fate, as he attributes
his choice to his kakodaimonia and to ho Hellenon theos
(1.87.3). But it is in his explanation of his supreme
folly that he cites a truism which resounds as the surest
proof of his emergent wisdom:

οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὖτω ἀνωτέρως ἐστὶ ὅσις πόλεμον πρὸ
eἰρήνης αἰρέται· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ ὁι παῖδες τοὺς πατέρας
θάπτουσι, ἐν δὲ τῷ ὁι πατέρες τοὺς παιδας.
No one is so foolish as to prefer war to peace. For in peace, sons bury their fathers, but in war, fathers bury their sons.

1.87.4

The whole of life and death, as exemplified in fathers and sons, the continuity of generations, and the proper balance of things, is summed up in this smoothly turned antithetical statement, a most fitting anthem to Croesus' spiritual progress. Herodotus insures that this pious, enlightened attitude be appreciated for all its worth by describing how all of Croesus' listeners, including his conqueror, the strongly positive character Cyrus, upon hearing these words stood in awe of him.

We need not read into this profound sentiment expressed by Croesus a rejection of the ancient code of warfare, for Herodotus' world was one in which the greatest events were in this arena determined.17 But in this pessimistic context—in which the greatest scenes in the entire Histories are to be played out—the model of Croesus' wisdom may stand as a reflection of Herodotus' insight into life.

To restate, then, in clearer terms: Herodotus' Croesus-logos narrative exhibits a distinct literary feature which

is, to a marked degree, consistent with and possibly reflective of the author's conception of history. In the relationship between parents and children, specifically fathers and sons, there exists a sense of balance, one which is related to the concept of generational continuity. When this balance is upset, which is in itself tragic, there follows further tragedy, either directly resultant of the imbalance (Homer story), foreshadowed by it (Adrastus sub-story), or both (former war of Alyattes).

As this father-son theme is just that—a literary theme—we cannot expect Herodotus to apply it too rigorously to all the events in his history. We have seen, however, that it functions on several levels: as a feature of the historical narrative, both straightforwardly and as foreshadowing; as a didactic technique (an ainos); and as a means of philosophical expression.

Many of Croesus' reappearances in the remainder of the Histories strengthen our premise that a large part of Herodotus' conception of this character is intrinsically bound up with the theme of the relationship between fathers and sons. In several of these appearances, it is obvious that Croesus is inserted into the narrative with this theme foremost in the author's mind.

---

18 For a good historical discussion of the events of Croesus' life, see J. A. S. Evans, "What Happened to Croesus?" CJ 74 (1978) 34-40.
The first example occurs at 1.153-156, when the Lydians, left by Cyrus in the charge of his deputy Tabalus, revolt against the Persians. When Cyrus is apprised of the uprising, he voices his dissatisfaction over the clemency he granted the Lydians:

Кро́ис, ти́ е́сть тέлос тων γνωμένων τούτων ἐμοί; οὐ παύσονται Λυδοῖ, ὡς οἰκασί, πρήγματα παρέχοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔχοντες. φροντίζω μὴ ἄριστον ἢ ἐξαιρετικός ἢ σφαεις. ὡμοίως γὰρ μοι νῦν γε φαίνομαι πεποιηκέναι ὡς εἰ τις πατέρα ἀποκτείνας τῶν παιδῶν αὐτοῦ φεύσαιτο. ὡς δὲ καὶ ἔγὼ Λυδῶν τῶν μὲν πλέον τι ἢ πατέρα ἑντα σὲ λαβὼν ἄγω, αὐτοῖς δὲ Λυδοῖσι τὴν πόλιν παρέδωκα καὶ ἐπείτα ὁμάζω εἰ μοι ἀπεστάσι.

Where will all this end, Croesus? It seems that these Lydians will not cease to cause trouble both to themselves and others, I wonder if it were not best to sell them all for slaves. Perhaps what I have now done is as if a man were to 'kill the father and then spare the child.' You, who were something more than a father to your people, I have seized and carried off, and to that people I have entrusted their city. Can I then feel surprise at their rebellion? 1.155.1-2

It has been more than fifty chapters since Croesus and Cyrus have appeared together in conversation (1.91). In that time, Herodotus has recounted Median and Persian
history, told the story of the foundling Cyrus, and described Persian manners and customs. He has also provided background material on the Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians of Asia Minor, and has arrived at a point in his narrative where he must describe the Persian annexation of the Greek cities in Asia Minor. It is a signal point in the large-scale course of events, one in which all of his Greek listeners would have the keenest interest, and one which is ideally suited to the dramatic form in which Herodotus casts it. Thus it seems a bold stroke, after the fashion of the conversation between Cyrus and Croesus at 1.87 ff., to make the conquering and conquered kings renew their intercourse suddenly and without further introduction (Kroise...), and to explain the ensuing course of Ionian history as a result of their conversation. By having Cyrus speak in terms of fathers and sons, Herodotus resumes the dominant theme of the earlier conversation after nearly one thousand lines of text. This remarkable consistency not only strengthens the force of the present conversation itself, by means of utilizing a motif that rings in the ears of the audience which would well remember the terms of the earlier conversation, but it also naturally strengthens the force of the motif itself—a force to which, as we will see, Herodotus will turn as the conversation progresses. In Cyrus’ words we can see how Herodotus uses fathers and
sons on several levels. First, by having a worried Cyrus quote a Greek proverb, Herodotus invests the Persian with a measure of sympathy for things Greek—which in turn renders the Greek audience more sympathetic toward Cyrus. That is to say, whereas the content of the proverb is anything but sentimental, involving as it does the act of killing fathers and children, nevertheless it speaks to the bond between them, one which, it is implied, would seem to endure beyond the death of one or the other. This particular sensitivity on the part of Cyrus is understandable enough, given his birth and childhood as described earlier in Book One (1.107-122, which is discussed below, pp.135ff.). What it does here is to draw the two characters Cyrus and Croesus closer together in the minds of Herodotus' audience, just as Herodotus himself seems to have equated the two kings in their capacity as father-figures. This point is made the clearer by citing Herodotus' much later remark: λέγουσι Πέρσαι ὃς Δαρείος μὲν ἦν κάπηλος, Καμβύσης δὲ δεσπότης, Κυρος δὲ πατήρ, ο μὲν ὅτι ἐκατέλευεν πάντα τὰ πρήγματα, ο δὲ ὅτι χαλεπός τε ἦν καὶ ολίγωρος, ο δὲ ὅτι ἤπιως τε καὶ ἀγαθά σφι πάντα ἐμηχανίσατο.

The Persians say that ... Cyrus was a father ... he was gentle, and procured them all manner of goods.

3.89.3

In our present passage, though, we have the first introduction to the metaphorical concept of the "father of his country" in Cyrus' sentence which follows his use of Stasinus' proverb. By having Cyrus himself recognize Croesus as a father figure, Herodotus certifies his own projection of Croesus as such, and in turn certifies Cyrus as a man of insight. This insight is of a twofold nature: into the familial relationship of fathers and sons which, in his case, will be travestied by his son Cambyses; and insight into the relationship of rulers and their subjects, which, as the passage above from Book Three as well as the overall presentation of Cyrus in the Histories show, was, in Herodotus' view, an appropriate one.

The advice Croesus tenders in response to Cyrus continues in this vein, and recalls the terms of Croesus' tragic flaw which was examined above. Croesus advises Cyrus to impose sanctions against the Lydians whose effects will be to turn them from men into women.

Λυδοῖσι δὲ συγγινώμην ἐχὼν τάδε αυτοῖς ἐπίταξον, ὡς μὴτε ἀποστέωσι μήτε δεινοὶ τοῖς ἔωσιν ἀπειπε μὲν σφι πέμψας ὅπλα ἀρίμα μὴ ἐκτήσθαι, κέλευε δὲ σφέας κιθώνας τε ύποδύνειν τοῖς εἴμαι καὶ κοθύρνους ύποδεέσθαι, πρόειπε δὲ αὐτοῖς κιθαρίζειν τε καὶ ψάλλειν καὶ καπηλεύειν παιδεύειν τοὺς παιδας. καὶ ταχέως σφέας, ὦ βασιλεῖ, γυναῖκας ἀντ' ἀνδρῶν ὤψεαι γεγονότας, ὥστε οὐδέν δεινοὶ τοῖς ἐσονται μὴ ἀποστέωσι.
Forgive the Lydians, and arrange the following, so that they will neither revolt from you nor be a cause for worry: command them not to possess weapons of war, and order them to wear skirts under their cloaks and to wear booties. Bid them raise their sons in playing the lyre and harp and in the retail trade. You will quickly see them, o king, become women instead of men, and thus they will no longer be a cause for worry to you, nor will they revolt.

Thus far in this present discussion, we have observed how Herodotus uses fathers and sons on the literal level, using the words and metaphors to exploit the theme. In this passage, however, we see Herodotus using the theme at a deeper level, rendering the action resultant of the literal theme. As was suggested earlier in this chapter, part of the complexity of Herodotus' portrayal of Croesus as a father figure lies in the gender ambiguity he as a father tries to foist upon his son Atys in his own fear over the portended loss of his son. It will be recalled that Croesus prohibits his son from participating in the manly pursuits which are his livelihood, and "removed out of the male apartments all the spears and javelins . . . and laid them in heaps in the chambers of the women." (I.34.3) Furthermore, he quickly marries off his son, and
then, by his prohibitions, makes Atys resent him because he isn’t allowed to be "man enough" (to borrow an unfortunate modern term) for his own and his new wife’s taste (1.37.3). Here Herodotus again turns to this same pair of motifs, Croesus the father and gender ambiguity, and artfully manipulates them to explain the historical inconsistency familiar to all Greeks of his time: how to reconcile the ancient reputation of the Lydians as powerful horsemen with their contemporary unwarlike, even effeminate spirit. Herodotus relies on the same behavior Croesus showed earlier, here having Croesus, whom Cyrus has called the father of the Lydians, suggest that the gender of his Lydians be refashioned, through a sort of crude behavior modification technique, from rebellious masculinity into docile femininity. And just as in the earlier incident where Croesus undertook the attempted feminization of Atys out of fear for his son’s life, so here he makes his suggestion out of fear for his imputed children, the Lydians, lest they continue to revolt and someday bring themselves to ruin. The highest relief is reached in the ironic recollection of the tragic fatherhood of Croesus himself in the phrase paideuein tous paidas.

It is helpful here to recall that this conversation between Croesus and Cyrus, like the previous one, is entirely the invention of Herodotus. Given that the
historian's immediate task in the present passage is to explain the subsequent course of Ionian history as well as the "national' character" of the Ionians, I think that Herodotus would have felt the need to control very carefully the use and force of the literary motif with which we are concerned. In the ring structure of hos mete aposteosi mete deinoi toi eosi and hosteouden deinoi toi esontai me aposteosi, we can see the care Herodotus has put into calling attention to the special properties of this passage.

This same gender confusion, along with the picture of Croesus as father-figure, combine in the final scenes of Cyrus' life, in the end of Book One. At the banks of the Araxes, Cyrus is urged by his ministers to await an attack of the Massagetae, but Croesus' advice is to cross the river and attack,\(^2\) for not only is this strategically the wiser choice, but also:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{τε} & \text{το} \text{ν} \text{ἀπηγγέλων} \text{αἰσχρόν} \text{καὶ} \text{oὐκ} \text{ἀνασχέτων} \text{Κυρὸν} \text{γε} \\
& \text{τότον} \text{Καμβόσεω} \text{γυναῖκ} \text{εἰςαντα} \text{ὑποχωρήσαι} \text{tῆς} \text{χώρης.}
\end{align*}\]

Besides what I've said, it would be disgraceful and

\(^2\) It is interesting to note that H.-P. Stahl ("Learning through suffering? Croesus' conversations in the history of Herodotus" YCS 24 [1975] 1-36) believes that in giving this advice, Croesus forfeits the wisdom he has gained, and reverts to his former ignorance. Regardless of this, we see that Croesus' advice is thematically consistent with what he has said previously.
unbearable for Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, to yield and give ground before a woman. 1.207.5

In addition to portraying Croesus as the only person to point out explicitly the matter of gender, Herodotus' arrangement of Croesus' words also attests to the Lydian's special thematic association. The juxtaposition of Cyrus' patronymic, which is calculated to inspire the Persian's high spirits, with the simple word gynaiki (instead of her name, Tomyris), exploits the gender theme by pitting the "male chauvinism" of the king against his female opponent.

In the following chapter, Herodotus returns to Croesus the father-figure by having Cyrus, once he has decided in favor of Croesus' plan, entrust his own son Cambyses to Croesus' care (1.208). Thus Croesus is put in the position of adoptive father.

It is in this capacity that Croesus reappears in Book Three, now as a member of Cambyses' court. During the advancement of Cambyses' madness, when Croesus is forced by his lord to render his opinion of him in comparison to his father Cyrus, Herodotus invests in Croesus' response all the cleverness to which his former 'tragedy and its resultant wisdom entitle him; the answer, moreover, continues in the same thematic vein as we have thus far observed:
Now to me, O son of Cyrus, you don't seem to be the match of your father, for you have not yet left behind such a son as did he.

The flattering patronymic, followed by *toi patri*, as well as the sentiment of the entire *bon mot* combine to show Croesus wisely playing to the psychological needs of the neurotic king. Similarly, in the next vignette of Cambyses' lunacy, Croesus reappears to chastise the king after he has slain the son of his friend Prexaspes.

'O king, don't yield entirely to your youthfulness and anger, but hold back and control yourself. Forethought is a good thing, and it is wise to plan ahead. You are killing men, your own fellow citizens, and for no good reasons - you even kill their sons. If you continue to do such things, watch out lest the Persians revolt from you. It was your
father, Cyrus, who strongly bid me to give you advice

... 3.36.2

It is of course fitting that Herodotus should use Croesus as the mouthpiece in this particular outrage against decency, for Croesus possesses the unusual authority of having endured a similar loss as Prexaspes. But beyond this, Herodotus has put into this speech several phrases which recall the journey Croesus has made to get to this stage of wisdom, and the special role of Croesus in the lives of the Persian kings. Thus, coming from the former reprobate Croesus, the truisms about forethought and planning ahead ring especially true, and surprisingly gain additional strength in the pleonasm *pronoon* and *promethie*. Indeed, the rhetoric in the litany of imperatives (*epitrepe, ische, katalambane*) and datives (*helikiei, thumoi*), taken in conjunction with the platitudes, acquires a tone of mixed resignation and strength on the part of one who was grievously unable to comprehend these lessons when he should have. Then, the closing words, reminding Cambyses of the former close connection between Croesus and Cyrus (stressed in the placement of *emoi de pater sos Kyros*), sound an ominous note. The closeness between the late great Persian king and the formerly glorious Lydian was founded on their spiritual sympathy, and we recall that Croesus was genuinely concerned lest Cyrus' subjects revolt from him. In the present passage,
however, far different from Cambyses' father, the gulf between Croesus and Cambyses himself is stressed and stretched, as Croesus points out Cambyses' crimes, punctuating them with kteineis de paidas, by far the most serious of the offenses. His projection of what will happen should Cambyses continue on his present course (seu apostesontai Persai) echoes the concern Croesus held for Cambyses' father. The whole speech by Croesus the father-figure points up the distinction between the father Cyrus and the son Cambyses, and this distinction is brought home in the differing reactions of the two Persians to Croesus' advice: where Cyrus took Croesus' advice (on the matter of feminizing the Lydians as well as attacking the Massagetae), Cambyses immediately shows just how great the difference is between himself and his father by rejecting it. In fact he abuses Croesus as if he were the cause of the death of Cyrus, and then tries to kill him with his bow.

This same experience of Croesus is used by Herodotus a bit earlier in Book Three (3.14), where at Memphis Cambyses subjects the vanquished Egyptian king to a particular punishment: when the procession of new slaves passes in review before Cambyses and the royal entourage, Psammenitus is forced to witness his own daughter being led off into slavery. And yet this sight does not have any effect on the old king. Next, Psammenitus must watch
his own son being led to execution, and not even this sight brings the Egyptian to tears. Finally, when he is confronted by an old boon-companion now reduced to beggary, Psammenitus breaks into weeping, and when he explains why this particular sight has so affected him, all the Persians nearby wept, too, and

\[ \text{δακρύει μὲν} \]

\[ \text{Κροῖσον (ἐπεπεῦχε γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ἐπισπόμενος Καμβύση} \]

\[ \text{ἐπ’ Ἀἰγυπτοῦ) } \]

Croesus wept, too (for he happened to have accompanied Cambyses to Egypt).

3.14.11

In the very next sentence, Cambyses, moved by a pity which is thematically introduced and enhanced by its juxtaposition with Croesus' tears, releases the son of the Egyptian king. Herodotus makes no mention of the daughter's fate.

The final appearance of Croesus which interests us occurs in Book Six, where, in a flashback to the days of his Lydian reign, Croesus demands of the Lampsacenians that they release their captive Miltiades from imprisonment. The sureness with which Herodotus manipulates his characters and situation is here in full evidence, for the threat of his pre-tragic Croesus is as much a plain reminder of the Lydian's former greatness as it is a subtle hearkening back to the flaw which was at the root of his suffering. Croesus says that, should the Lampsacenians refuse to do his bidding,
He threatened to cut them down like a fir.

6.37.1

Herodotus goes on at length to clarify the nature of this threat—that the fir alone of all trees does not send up new shoots once it has been cut down. In this reference to Croesus' former willingness to sever the Lampsacencians from their potential posterity, some hundreds of pages after the Croesus-logos, Herodotus reminds us that, in large part, the spirit of the character Croesus is intimately bound up with the theme of fathers and sons throughout the Histories.21

21 In the latter books of the Histories, the correlation of Croesus and the father-son theme is abandoned, as Croesus' name comes up often in other contexts: his great wealth and generosity to the oracles (5.36, 8.35, 8.122) and to individuals (6.125, 127); the abortive Spartan gift (3.47); builder of a boundary stele (7.30).
CHAPTER TWO

A SURVEY OF FIVE SIGNIFICANT PASSAGES FROM

THE HISTORIES WITH COMMENTARIES ON HOW

FATHERS AND SONS ARE USED IN EACH

In this chapter I shall examine five passages selected from the Histories which demonstrate the pervasiveness of the father-son theme. To complement these five, the reader is directed to Appendix A, a catalogue of selected passages throughout the work in which fathers and sons are significant. In addition to proving their pervasiveness, I shall comment on the specific functions to which fathers and sons are put, as evidence of Herodotus' artistic flexibility and of the malleability of the theme.

In the Croesus-logos Herodotus introduced and expanded the father-son theme so fully that his audience would have reasonably expected this particular theme to be resumed throughout the Histories. It is indeed a feature of Herodotus' art that his themes are integrated into the development of the larger narrative; the father-son theme is a major part of the narrative at many significant turns. To demonstrate this, which is a partial aim of this chapter, for each of the five passages from the
remainder of the *Histories* I provide a commentary illuminating the uses to which Herodotus puts its father-son component. Additional passages and commentaries detailing the applications of the father-son theme are found in Appendix C.

As one observes the various uses of fathers and sons as a theme, one must also be mindful that, as a literary theme, it is, for Herodotus the historian, bound to be subservient to the greater purposes of explicating historical events and moral conditions. In light of this appreciation, it is wise to comment again on the force of Croesus' words to Cyrus:

"No one is so foolish as to prefer war to peace. In peace, sons bury their fathers, but in war, fathers bury their sons."

As has already been suggested, the theme of fathers and sons is exploited to its full effect in this utterance, coming as it does after the string of events between Croesus and his son. At the same time, Herodotus leaves no doubt of the larger purpose of this remark, the wholesale condemnation of the perversity of war. Fathers and sons in this passage serve as symbols in which Herodotus invests a universal. In a similar fashion, and on a larger scale, we must appreciate the father-son theme throughout the work as it functions on two levels: first, its varying usages within the context of the specific
logoi, and second, its purpose in solidifying the thematic foundation on which is being built the pinnacle of the narrative, the story of the great Persian invasion. In the first section of this chapter, we shall examine how Herodotus fashions the characterization of Cambyses, one of the five selected passages, on both these levels. It is important to recognize that, with regard to the compositional unity of the work, the father-son pair of Cyrus and Cambyses functions as a link between the Croesus-Atys pair of Book One, and the Darius-Xerxes pair of the second half of the Histories. Most of the discussion of Cyrus and Cambyses in this dissertation focusses on aspects of their individual portrayals vis-a-vis the father-son theme, but in this first section their relationship is discussed in the context of the entire work.

In the remainder of the chapter we shall consider how the father-son theme functions within certain specific logoi. The scope of Herodotus' narrative is remarkably wide, and it is a measure of the value he assigns to the father-son theme that it appears in such diverse environments as the five logoi I have selected: I) his account of the madness of Cambyses, II) his consideration of the story of Priam, III) the virtual aside on how Democedes came to be the court physician for Darius, IV) the anecdote telling of the Macedonians
ensnaring the Persian embassy, and V) the lengthy disquisition on the Spartan basileis. In these passages individually the father-son theme functions on varying levels. As a group representing the great variety of separate stories in the work, they show the pervasiveness of the theme throughout.
From the beginning of the depiction of Cambyses’ reign, Herodotus utilizes father-son themes in ways that contribute to a strongly critical characterization. The various accounts of Cambyses’ parentage and the reasons for his fatal Egyptian expedition are deliberately confounding; by his choice of introductory stories Herodotus foreshadows the confusion and disarray of this king’s rule.

In the first chapter of Book Three Herodotus casts an indelible shadow over the upcoming Egyptian campaign by telling of the dubious circumstances under which Cambyses decided to make his attack. The king had asked for the hand of a daughter of the Egyptian king Amasis, but when Amasis, reluctant to send his daughter off to virtual concubinage, was discovered trying to fob off a substitute woman, Cambyses resolved to take vengeance by invading Egypt. Thus Herodotus puts Cambyses’ ill-founded attempt to separate the father Amasis from his daughter for political gain at the foundation of this initial characterization. This negativity is reinforced with the

---

1 Cf. Immerwahr Form and Thought In Herodotus (168) for general statements on how Cambyses’ madness and many of the events associated with him tie in with Immerwahr’s “dynastic motif.” We shall see (Immerwahr does not) that there is a thematic connection between the king’s murders and his destruction of customs.
disclosure that Cambyses was duped into suing for the daughter's hand by a wily court physician! In the explanation of this bit of trickery, the parent-child separation theme is stressed: the deception of Cambyses was due to the physician's frustration at having been forcefully separated from his own wife and children and sent off to Persia by Amasis, on whom he wished to take revenge.²

An alternative explanation for the attack against Egypt, given in chapter 3, is similarly marked by a sense of mean-spiritness on the part of Cambyses, and, further, begins to focus specifically on the father-son relationship which is to play such an important part in the Cambyses character. Herodotus gives the account of the reaction of Cassandane, wife of Cyrus and mother of Cambyses, to praise of her children:

Toióvde méntoi éme
pайдων μητέρα λούσων Κύρος εν ἀτιμή ἔχει, τὴν δὲ ἀπ'
Αιγύπτου ἐπίκτητον ἐν τιμῇ τίθεται.

Even though I born him such sons, still Cyrus slights me and hold his Egyptian wife in honor. 3.3.2

² There is a striking similarity between this story and that of Democedes of Croton, Darius' court physician, who also indirectly "causes" a war—the invasion of Greece—because of his emotional disturbance over a familial separation. The Democedes story is discussed in detail later in this chapter, pp.88ff.
Here attention is drawn to Cyrus and his sons ostensibly to point out the dissatisfaction on the part of Cambyses’ mother. The further purpose, however, is to establish the father-son relationship as a context for the ensuing action, in which the tone is darkened considerably by the reaction of the young Cambyses to his mother’s words: "Then when I am a man, mother, I will turn Egypt upside down." This wanton predilection for irresponsible violence, as evidenced in this childish outburst, must be understood in stark contrast to the positive portrayal of his father Cyrus, especially with respect to Cyrus’ Scythian campaign. In that war—functionally the equivalent of Cambyses’ Egyptian expedition insofar as both were the men’s greatest schemes, and both led to their deaths—Cyrus’ motives were presented in a different tone entirely. Of Cyrus’ motivation, Herodotus gave the following account: "His birth, which seemed something more than human, and his good fortune at his former wars, in which he’d always found that no matter which country he attacked, it was impossible for that country to escape." (1.204.2) There is no critical hint of capricious wickedness in this description of Cyrus, whereas in Cambyses’ case, Herodotus marks from his childhood a far less stalwart and less noble incentive for conquest.³

³ This seems the correct interpretation of Cyrus’ motivation in the context of the Cyrus-Cambyses pair. Below, however, an alternative interpretation is offered
Herodotus certifies this impression of Cambyses' youth by adding the detail that he was ten years old when he made this remark. With this one must compare the celebrated incident from Cyrus' tenth year, when his native kingliness was displayed first among his agemates and then in the presence of king Astyages. (1.114-116)

Here, again, Herodotus brings to the fore the degeneration from the father to the son.

If we recall the folkloric stories surrounding the birth and early childhood of Cyrus, Cambyses is additionally, implicitly impugned by the absence of any stories of equivalent curiosity and sympathy. Indeed, the alternative story of Cambyses' birth, in 3.2, is contentious in tone; and Herodotus' refutation of the Egyptian claim that Cambyses was part Egyptian is based on the strictness of certain Persian laws and customs governing the correct father-son succession of monarchs—the very laws and customs which, for all their strictness, Cambyses is soon to abuse widely and flagrantly.

To step back for a moment from the beginning of Book 3 that we might take a wider view, it is important to recognize that the father-son succession stories of the two pairs of Persian father-son kings are similar in

in the context of the contrast between Cyrus and Tomyris. See pp.184ff.

4 For this incident, and for a discussion of the childhood of Cyrus in general, please see below pp.139ff.
important details which highlight Herodotus' narrative purpose of presenting a degeneration from father to son in both cases. As the father Cyrus' birth was "something more than human," and his accession was the result of excellent leadership and generalship, so, too, the father Darius gained his throne through both a cleverness and good fortune which Herodotus presents in the most positive terms. Moreover, the military losses of both these men are described in a fashion which does not damn the memory of them (which is not to say that there are not "lessons" to be learned in the failures of them both). In contrast to these father-figures are the sons Cambyses and Xerxes. Cambyses' birth, as we have just seen, is described in controversial terms. The invasion of Egypt, his most glorious achievement—or, rather, failure—is dubious in its conception, and, as will be discussed in the following pages, starkly negative in its execution. The son Xerxes, like Cambyses, is introduced into the narrative in Book 9 in a description of the contentious, litigious accession which is far from positive. These contrasts between the father and son in both pairs and the similarity between the pairs are at the heart of Herodotus' artistic presentation of the men who ruled the Persians.

5 For Xerxes' accession and decision to invade, see below, chapter 4.
The characterization of Cambyses and the implicit contrast between him and his father start as early as the description of his birth and childhood, as we have just seen. It is as an adult, however, that Cambyses' nature fully emerges, set in the context of fathers and sons. To begin with, the gruesomeness of the battle at the mouth of the Nile is a function of the sacrifice of Phanes' sons (3.11). Next, Cambyses' cruel treatment of the vanquished Psammenitus is also based in part on Cambyses' separation of the old king from his son. More detailed discussions of both these passages are presented elsewhere in this dissertation⁶; for now, let us notice that they are key parts to the presentation of Cambyses. It is in the description of the madness of Cambyses, however, that Herodotus presents the most straightforward indictment of the king on grounds which most clearly involve the father-son bond and his abuse of it.

In these quick-paced, episodic nine chapters (3.30-38), Herodotus chronicles the debilitation of the Persian king after his impious slaying of the Apis bull in Memphis. It is a catalogue of outrages, and a testimony to Herodotus' craftsmanship as an author that he is as concerned with providing a vivid and believable picture of Cambyses' crimes as he is with presenting these crimes in a

---

⁶ For the slaughter of Phanes' sons, see pp.197ff.; for Psammenitus, see above, p.60.
thematically integrated way. The success of the former concern is 'attested by every reader who has left Herodotus' work with, among other impressions, a compelling picture of the insane Cambyses. As to the thematic consistency of these chapters, we shall see that the events depicting Cambyses' madness are bound together by their familial orientation, with an increasing focus on the bonds of fathers and sons, so grossly shattered by the king.

Chapters 31, 32, and 33 present three anecdotes, in which Cambyses literally and symbolically abuses the traditional practices of the family. In 31 the king has his brother Smerdis murdered through the agency of his chamberlain Prexaspes. As if to emphasize the heinousness of this crime by squarely placing it in the family context, Herodotus spells out that Cambyses' victim was ton adelphon Smerdion eonta patros kai metros tes autes (3.30.1). This straightforward affront to the familial bonds is to be contrasted with his next crimes. Chapters 32 and 33 contain two stories which involve Cambyses' marriage to two of his sisters. In the case of the younger of them, the one whom Cambyses is soon to murder, Herodotus describes her as hoi ap' amphoteron adelphee (3.31.1). The point of this description of the shared parentage of Cambyses and his victim is the same as in the previous case—to make clear the family context of the
crimes, with emphases on the parents as well as the children.

Herodotus goes on to describe by what means Cambyses secured this seemingly unholy bond of matrimony: the king extorted from the Persian royal judges their legal approval of his plan to marry his own sister. In these few lines, in which Cambyses compromises the judges, Herodotus inserts a bit of Persian lore which serves as a curious innuendo toward the growing complex of familial abuses: the royal judges are described as guardians of the ancestral laws (3.31.3), exegetes of ton patrion thesmon. The implication is that in forcing their hand, Cambyses is extending his abuses from his siblings to his forefathers. This theme is resumed shortly, in the conclusion of the story of the murder of his sister.

Before the murder itself is described, Herodotus provides two variants of the story which, to the Greeks and Egyptians respectively, account for the rage which drove the king to sororicide. Both of these vignettes show Cambyses' sister presenting to the king parables of his decimation of the royal family; where the Greeks and Egyptians agree is on Cambyses' reaction to these parables: he kicks his sister in the abdomen, and

---

7 The treatment of this problem shows that Herodotus was evidently unaware of the Avesta's sanctioning of incestuous marriage. cf. How and Wells, i.265. Professor Balcer points out that the Avesta may not have been canonized at this time, however.
Herodotus' narrative is punctuated with καὶ μίαν ἐκτροσάγαν ἀποθανεῖν (3.32.4). The point of this addendum must now be obvious: in this act, the final one catalogued in Herodotus trilogy of Cambyses' familial abuses, the king kills his own expected child. Now since the expectation of any king would be for a male heir, it is not too much to suggest that here Herodotus is implicitly focusing on Cambyses' violent breaking of the father-son bond. This ultimate outrage serves as a dramatic climax, and for the next few lines (chapter 33) the narrative eases in tone, shifting to a brief description of Cambyses' epilepsy.

In chapter 34 Herodotus resumes his description of Cambyses' crimes with a lengthy description (37 lines) of the king's treatment of Prexaspes. In this passage, Herodotus again builds toward another dramatic climax, here by focussing his narrative on an incident which directly illustrates the king smashing the father-son bonds. Prexaspes is introduced in a tricolon

Πρηξάσπεα,
τὸν ἐτύμα τε μάλιστα καὶ οἱ τὰς ἀγγελίας ἐσεφόρεε οὗτος,
τοῦτον τε ὁ παῖς οἰνοχόος ἤν τῷ Καμβύσῃ, τιμῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ
οὐ σμικρῆ,

Prexaspes, the man whom he esteemed beyond all the rest of the Persians, who carried his messages, and whose son held the office—an honor of no small account in Persian—of his cupbearer ... 3.34.1
The emphasis on Prexaspes' son is apparent, and yet, as the story unfolds in the following lines, Herodotus briefly postpones the reason for the extended mention of the son. In the interim, a conversation is reported in which Cambyses solicits his chamberlain for a compliment, but is surprised to be gently chided for his drinking. In the king's retort, Herodotus takes the opportunity to build the father-son thematic context by having Cambyses in his indignation recall some remarks the king claims were previously made to him by his courtiers. Again, it must be remembered that these comments are wholly the product of Herodotus' imagination. And yet it is not hard to understand the reason for the flashback to these conversations, as when Cambyses asked his ministers "What sort of a man did he seem to be in comparison with his father?" (3.34.4) Herodotus is simply strengthening the thematic context by having Cambyses pose this particular question, and the Persians' answer, that he is better than Cyrus by virtue of his extended conquests (3.34.4), equally simply serves to strengthen, as it were by default, the thematic force of the following remarks. We may enjoy the observation that it is left to Croesus (who was, as we have noticed, installed as a wise father figure as early as Book One) to take issue with this opinion, and rather to suggest that Cyrus is the better man, for Cambyses is yet to produce such a son as did his father!
After this flashback, Herodotus returns to the narrative, and shows Cambyses flushed with rage at Prexaspe's honest appraisal and undertaking to prove to his friend that he is indeed neither overly fond of drink nor out of his senses. To prove this, Cambyses means to demonstrate his superior marksmanship. Herodotus, returning to the son of Prexaspe who was introduced in the third element of the tricolon mentioned above, injects a degree of pathos by the demonstrative

τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ σου τοῦδε ἐστεὼτος ἐν τοῖς προθύροις.

[Look there now] at your son right there standing in the vestibule

with which Cambyses points out his intended target. The king immediately kills the boy, and leaves Prexaspe unable to answer the king's boast with anything but the sublimely ambiguous "My master, I don't believe that god himself could shoot so accurately."

On the level of the structure of the narrative, we notice that after this shocking climax to an episode in which, again, the bonds between father and son have been destroyed by Cambyses, Herodotus retreats to a less personal, more general incident in Cambyses' history of madness: the closing lines of chapter 35 tell of the king's unprovoked burial of twelve unnamed Persians up to their necks. This "step-down" in dramatic tension recalls the similar turn in the narrative after the description of
Cambyses' murder of his wife/sister and their unborn child, when 'Herodotus then lapsed into a mention of Cambyses' epilepsy. In both cases, Herodotus shifts the tone after the climactic incident, the incident in which the father-child/son bonds are broken, as a playwright would after a dramatic climax.

The relentless drive of Cambyses toward further outrages is resumed by Herodotus in a description of another incident, the attempted murder of Croesus, to which the author is led by the mention of the burial of the twelve Persians. Herodotus states that Croesus, in attendance at the spectacle of the murder of Prexaspes' son, felt constrained to offer advice to the young king against such capricious displays of his youthful spirit! Before ending his remarks, Croesus reminds Cambyses that
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It is by your father's wish that I offer you advice; he charged me strictly to give you such counsel as I might see to be good. 3.36.2

With these words Herodotus deliberately reminds his audience of the status of Croesus as father-figure, and of his special relationship with Cyrus as constructed in Book I. It is all the more significant for the indictment of Cambyses, then, that Croesus should receive such harsh treatment from the young king after having given such sage
advice. Cambyses tries to kill Croesus, but only after scornfully rejecting Croesus both as a king and as an advisor—in which two capacities the Lydian had certified his status as a father-figure, above and beyond the natural definition of his biological fatherhood. In Cambyses' words Herodotus asserts the notion of fatherhood which the Persian is rejecting: patrida and patridos are used to describe Lydia, and Cambyses refers to his father with the emphatic toi patri toi 'moi (3.36.3). At the conclusion of this incident, after the father-son clash represented by Cambyses and Croesus, Herodotus again retreats to something more generic, just as he did in the previous two passages. Here he spends a few sentences telling of the saving of the fugitive Croesus by some of the king's servants, and of their death for their action.

Up till this point we have seen Herodotus describing Cambyses' madness in three sets of outrages the king commits. This trio of crimes are all within the sphere of human conduct, in what can be seen as a sort of ascending order of gravity: first, he kills his brother, his forefathers, symbolically, in the form of the ancestral laws he subverts, and his sister and his unborn child. Next, he ruthlessly severs the father-son bond between his chief-of-staff Prexaspes and son. Finally, he symbolically abuses the bonds between himself and his father, through the proxy Croesus, in his attempted murder
of the Lydian king. Now, to heighten the dramatic tension of his portrait of Cambyses, Herodotus lifts the action from the human to the divine plane, in the final vignette of the king's madness.

In chapter 37, Cambyses is shown to insult the gods. To highlight the seriousness of these next crimes, Herodotus introduces the action with the emphatic hos de de kai as Cambyses is described entering the temple of Hephaestus and mocking the god; next he is shown to enter the temple of the Kabeiroi, off limits to all except the priests, and to mock and even burn their agalmata (3.37.3). For the modern reader, it is difficult to equate the enormity of the earlier set of crimes, in which his victims were humans, with these latter religious abuses. Yet it must be kept in mind that with these last descriptions Herodotus has reached the pinnacle of Cambyses' madness—hence the description of Cambyses' iconoclasm is saved for the climactic end of Herodotus' narrative. And yet even here, on the divine plane, Herodotus is at pains to work the description of Cambyses' madness into the thematic context of the king's abuses of the father-son bonds. This is why the final line of the present description explains the relationship between Hephaestus and the Kabeiroi: toutou de sphēs paidas legousai einai—"They say that they are his sons." Once again, upon reaching the summit of Cambyses' madness in the context of the father-
son theme, Herodotus retreats into more general comments on his assessment of Cambyses' condition. Herodotus' understanding of the king's madness is revealed to depend on the author's belief that it is a sure sign of insanity to mock one's own laws and customs (3.38.1). As Herodotus draws his audience's attention away from the specifics of Cambyses' history, and waxes philosophical in his attempt to reach a broader understanding of man's relation to law and custom, he turns to an anecdote to illustrate the varying customs of different peoples. We may take it as a sign of Herodotus' literary intent to remain consistent in his use of the father-son motif that he chooses for his illustration the particular anecdote related in chapter 38. For Herodotus, now generalizing, stays within the parameters of what has been shown as a dominant motif of the description of Cambyses' madness by telling of an inquiry once made by Darius into the differing customs of Greeks and Kallatians, an Indian tribe, with respect to the treatment of their deceased fathers. At the inquiry, Darius learned that the Greeks were as reluctant to eat the bodies of their dead fathers as the Kallatians were to cremate theirs! We will at a later point have reason to return to this passage; for now, let us note that by choosing this anecdote to illustrate the point to which his argument has led him—namely, that, as Pindar said, _nomon panton basilea... einai_, "custom is the king of
all things" (3.38.5)—by telling a story which again is rooted in the father-son relationship, Herodotus has implicitly recalled the previous extended display of Cambyses' madness while at the same time lifting the level of his narrative above the particular to the universal.
II. PRIAM AND HIS SONS (2.120.1-3)

Such is the account given by the Egyptian priests, and I am myself inclined to regard as true all that they say of Helen from the following considerations: If Helen had been at Troy, the inhabitants would, I think, have given her up to the Greeks, whether Alexander consented to it or no. For surely neither Priam, nor his family, could have been so infatuated as to endanger their own persons, their children, and their city, merely that Alexander might possess Helen. At any rate, if they determined to refuse at first, yet afterwards when so many of the Trojans fell on every encounter with the Greeks, and Priam too in each battle lost a son, or sometimes two, or three, or even more, if we may credit the epic poets, I do not believe that even if Priam himself had been married to her he would have declined to deliver her up, with the view of bringing the series of calamities to a close ...

2.120.1-3

While on his travels in Egypt\(^8\), Herodotus tell us (2.113 ff.), he took the opportunity to inquire of his guides after the local knowledge of Helen's whereabouts during...

---

\(^8\) See C. Sourdille, La Durée et L'Étendue du Voyage d'Herodote en Egypte (Paris 1910).
the Trojan War. The priests provided Herodotus with a lengthy account of her and Alexander's adventures in Egypt, and Herodotus fortifies this account with some apt quotations from Homer, in an attempt to prove that Helen had in fact visited Egypt and never reached Troy. Herodotus then learned from the priests that Menelaus himself had told the Egyptians of the Greeks' failure to find Helen in Troy after they had taken the city; the Greek king thence traveled to Egypt, where he finally found his wife.

It seems safe to say that a discussion of the events recounted by Homer would always attract the attention of a Greek crowd. In this present passage we can observe Herodotus participating in the development of Greek rationalizing criticism, a manner of analysis which Herodotus makes his own as early as the prooemium of the Histories. It is in a passage such as this one that we may look for some of the most personal of Herodotus' observations, as he speaks *proprīa persona* and lays claim to opinions other than the ones popularly held . . . and in so doing, in this passage at least, seems to impose his own values onto situations in which, for a more

---

"scientific" historian, they properly would not belong.10

At issue in 2.120 is whether Helen ever really was at Troy, and to answer this question Herodotus relies on two lines of argument, both of which refute the possibility of her presence at Troy by suggesting that the Trojans never would have put up with her, given the severity of the disaster which was the direct result of her being there. Our interest lies in part in both of Herodotus' arguments, for in each one we can observe Herodotus finding in the relationship of fathers and sons his most basic understanding of why the Trojans never would have endured Helen's presence.

To begin on the level of the structure of the narrative. "If she had been in Ilium," claims Herodotus, "they would have returned her, Alexander willing or no." Herodotus then lists, in a tricolon, the things that neither Priam nor his closest relations would have been willing to put at risk for the sake of the lovers' cohabitation: the bodies of so many Trojans, their own children, and the city. Now the first and last of these three are equally important with the middle, and no false emphasis need be given to the center element of a tricolon. At the same time, bodies of men and one's city, howsoever dear to a Greek, are not gripping on the same emotional level as

one's children. We may observe Herodotus' sensitivity to this point: in the following sentence, in which he elaborates his argument, Herodotus seems to match somasi with polloi . . . apolynto, a fairly straightforward and prosaic description, but then matches tekna by focusing on the sons of Priam, and in an extended phrase: autou de Priamou ouk esti hote ou duo e treis . . . apethneiskon. The emphasis on the number of Priam's children, and how he lost so many, is of course proverbial and symbolic of the hideous losses of war. In the colloquialness of ouk esti hote ou . . . , however, we catch a glimpse of Herodotus' own visceral repugnance at the thought of this particular cost to Priam of harboring Helen. Indeed, as a measure of his disbelief—perhaps as much at the numbers themselves as at the emotional cost behind them—Herodotus immediately adds the rejoinder ei chre ti toisi epopoioisi chromenon legein. (He seems to leave off from the earlier tricolon at this point, neglecting to match the polis with any expression of its particular losses.)

Another indication that Herodotus in this passage is especially attuned to the strain on fathers and sons presented by Helen's presence may be found in the Herodotus' introduction of Priam and then Hector into the narrative. When reporting the information of the Egyptian priests on the negotiations between the besieging Greeks and the besieged Trojans a few chapters earlier (2.118), a
logical enough place for Herodotus to introduce the Trojan chief of state, he strikingly omits any mention of Priam. It is only in 2.120, our current passage, that Priam is brought into the narrative, we can see now on the strength of his special status as father-figure. This paternal appearance is in fact the only time in the entire work in which Priam is presented as a character at all—the other three times his name appears in other parts of the Histories it is only in the genitive case, once as a patronymic, the other couple of instances as a genitive of possession, without extended significance (1.3,4; 7.43).

This same consideration also accounts for Hector's introduction in this current passage—his only appearance in the entire Histories. For Herodotus' second line of argument against Helen's ever having been in Troy is founded on his view that it was Hector, not Alexander, who was heir to the throne, and that the elder brother would not have endured Helen's presence at such a cost. Herodotus' interest in the familial aspect of this situation relies on the brothers here, but takes root, again, in the relationship of the father to the sons. This may explain the additional twin mentions of Priam in this latter half of the argument: gerontos Priamou eontos and Priamou apothanontos (2.120.4). That is to say, Herodotus casts this particular argument, really about the superiority of the one brother over the other, at least
partly in terms of their relationship with their father.

As Herodotus concludes his arguments over Helen and the Trojans, he turns to a more philosophical tone, recalling one of his moral tenets on the divine retribution which afflicts humankind when it greatly errs (2.120.5). And then, the seasoned raconteur shifts gears and lightens the mood with his extended folktale of Rhampsinitus and the thief (2.121). It seems obvious that the reason for this change of tone is that Herodotus is conscious of having reached some sort of dramatic climax in his discussion of the Trojans, and now needs to ease the tension. I believe it is a measure of the sincerity of Herodotus' arguments reviewed above, and, therefore, of the integrity of the theme we are investigating, that he relies, for his last line of defense in the argument, on the axioms of the relationship between fathers and sons.
III. DEMOCEDES OF CROTON (3.125-138)

In the narrative which leads to the first Persian expedition to Greece (3.138), Herodotus includes in the cast of characters the physician Democedes of Croton, whose curious story subtly unfolds on a plane just below the grander level of the narrative about king Darius, queen Atossa, and the other noblemen of the eastern courts. In his story we find the theme of fathers and sons working in a less protracted way than was the case in the Cambyses section of Book Three, but nevertheless functioning as a secondary motif with which Herodotus is carefully concerned. This Democedes is first introduced in chapter 125, where Herodotus casually mentions him as an attendant physician at the Samian court of Polycrates, and the best physician of his day. After the next nearly seventy lines, in which Herodotus narrates the fall of Polycrates and of his murderer, Oroetes, the action returns to the Persian royal court. Herodotus tells a lighthearted anecdote about king Darius' sprained ankle, and how it was able to be cured only by one of the recently acquired slaves of Oroetes, the same Democedes of Croton. Herodotus maintains the light tone of the passage by describing Darius' largesse toward the excellent physician, and how the slave Sciton was able to amass a sizeable fortune for himself by gathering up the excess
gold staters which Democedes was unable to hold on to as he collected his reward for having cured Darius.

Now whereas this Democedes was initially mentioned in chapter 125, Herodotus postpones until chapter 131 his short biography of the physician. The significance we find in this delay lies in the words Herodotus now uses to reintroduce, as it were formally, this character, who has already participated in a fair bit of action. Chapter 131 begins with the following description:

"Ο δὲ Δημοκήδης οὗτος ὥδε ἔκ Κρότωνος ἀπιγμένος, Πολυκράτει ὁμίλησε πατρὶ συνείχετο ἐν τῇ Κρότωνι ὄργῃ, χαλεπῶς τούτου ἐπέλευσε οὐκ ἐδύνατο φέρειν, ἀπολιπὼν ὁίχετο ἐς Αἰγίνην.

This Democedes left his country . . . . His father, who dwelt at Croton, was a man of savage temper, and treated him cruelly. When, therefore, he could no longer bear such constant ill-treatment, Democedes left his home, and sailed away to Aigina. 3.131.1

Two things must be noticed about this description, in which the father-son bond is at issue: it has been severed, and the father is described as the guilty party. Both of these points will be seen to affect the story of Democedes as it unfolds.

As a result of his successful treatment of the king, Democedes comes to enjoy high favor at the court in Susa. When he cures queen Atossa of the abscess on her breast, his popularity is increased once again. This status, and
indeed all of the good fortune Democedes comes to know, may be directly traced back to his unhappy departure from Greece. It is here that we find the thematic significance of the father-son bond broken. But if this seems perhaps over-subtle, let us notice how Herodotus insures that his audience does indeed keep the father-son connection in mind. In return for curing the queen, Democedes asks her to grant whatever favor he might request. She thus agrees to plant the suggestion in her husband’s head that he undertake an expedition to Greece, utilizing Democedes, with his native’s knowledge of the place, as a guide. Democedes’ motivation for this plot is to enable himself to return to his homeland; Atossa’s pitch to Darius is that by attacking Greece he might further ennoble himself and reduce the chance of rebellion at home. After the bedroom scene between the queen and king, Herodotus reintroduces Democedes into the narrative, and it is here that the father-son motif is effectively recalled. Darius’ words, in his effort to insure against his favorite physician running away to freedom in Greece, are thus given by Herodotus:

δώρα δέ μυν τῷ πατρί
cai tois adelphoïn ekleuev pávta tâ ekeínon épipla la-
βόντα ἁγεί, φᾶς ἄλλα οἱ πολλαπλήσια ἀντιδώσεων.

He should take, he said, all the valuables he possessed as presents to his father and his brothers.
and he should receive on his return a far more abundant store. 3.135.2

The careful listener remembers the striking description of Democedes' reason for having left his homeland in the first place--his father's unbearable treatment of him. And so this generous, though obviously self-serving offer by the king highlights for the audience the unfortunate father-son relationship between Democedes and his father. To reinforce this impression, Herodotus goes on to describe Democedes' answer to the king's offer:

Δημοκρήδης δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐωντοῦ κατὰ χώρην ἔφη καταλείψεις, ὡς ἀπείτω σφέα ἀπελθὼν ἔχου, τὴν μὲντοι ὀλκάδα, τὴν γὰρ Δαρείου ἐπαγγέλλεται ἐσ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦτα ἀδελφεσθαι, δέκεσθαι ἐφη.

Democedes, however...said he would leave his own goods behind to enjoy upon his return—the merchant-ship which the king proposed to grant him to carry gifts to his brothers, that he would accept at the king's hands. 3.135.3

This is a remarkable inconsistency, for the king's offer specifies Democedes' father and brothers, while Democedes' response omits the father and mentions only the brothers. As Herodotus is capable of showing the greatest accuracy and consistency elsewhere in the Histories, and especially as these two passages are separated by only six lines of text, we are left with the understanding that this
inconsistency is quite deliberate. Indeed, it is not to be seen as an inconsistency at all, but rather appreciated as a stroke of artistry by which Herodotus animates his character with remarkable fidelity to human behavior. Traditionally, some readers have said that Herodotus' characters are stock, two-dimensional straw men, manipulated on the author's stage; in this subtle, little reflection of human behavior, though, we see Herodotus' sensitivity in full force.

The story of Democedes continues for a brief while, and leads, after a twist or two in the plot, to the Cnidians being sent to Greece, which Herodotus describes:

\[
\text{ταῦτα μὲν μνων οὕτω ἐπρῆξη, οὕτω δὲ πρώτοι ἕκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπίκουσα Πέρσαι}
\]

Such, then, was the course which this matter took.

These were the first Persians who ever came from Asia to Greece . . . 3.138.4

This expedition then, the arrival of Persians on Greek soil for the first time, was seen by Herodotus as momentous, though the expedition itself was uneventful. And though the narrative route to this historic event is circuitous, with court intrigues, exiles, mob violence, and other tools of the storyteller's trade, we must appreciate that, at least on one sustained level, the theme of fathers and sons is utilized by Herodotus as he builds toward the campaign of Darius against Samos,
described (3.139) directly following the passage quoted above.  

11 The value of Democedes has not been appreciated; cf. Momigliano's remark "We can say that Democedes' advice does not lead to anything; yet we feel that Herodotus would have been wrong not to mention it; it remains one of those imponderable factors ..." [Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici, reprinted in Studies in Historiography (London 1966) as chapter 7, "Causes of Wars" p.114]
After the lengthy interlude on Libya (4.145-205), Herodotus returns his attention to the Persian expedition to Europe. The events of the close of this campaign, after Darius' retreat from Scythia and return to Asia, take up the opening section of Book Five, and we may look to these chapters for some fitting final impressions of the Persians' European foray, before the narrative turns, at great length, to the Ionian Revolt (5.28-6.48). As we have by now come to expect, in Herodotus' construction of the final episodes of the European expedition we find the theme of fathers and sons deliberately used to further the author's goal of a thematically coherent portrayal of the Persians and, here, the Macedonians whom they try unsuccessfully to win over.

In chapters 18-21 is told the story of the fatal banquet given for the Persians by the Macedonians. As a result of their gross imposition on the customs of their hosts, the Persians are killed through the scheme of Alexander, son of king Amyntas. This brief story is carefully constructed, first with Amyntas receiving his Persian conquerors with the kindest hospitality and enduring their obnoxiousness until it becomes insolence. Next, Herodotus introduces the king's son, and father and son engage in a brief agon. The father soon yields to the son, albeit in
fear that his son’s youthful spirits may lead him to an act of desperation against their unwanted guests. Then, Alexander hatches his plot and the Persians are killed. Finally, Herodotus tells how all traces of the Persians were erased, again through the cleverness of Alexander.

A few particulars of this story are worth pointing out, with an eye to the theme of fathers and sons. First, the vignette has several markings of a folktale, from the numerologically significant seven Persian guests to the fairytale disguise of the Macedonian youths, and finally the total disappearance of the entire Persian entourage. Additionally, Herodotus turns to a couple of motifs which would be quite familiar to his listeners: the abuse of hospitality, and the banquet scene. To account for the somewhat formulaic nature of this story, then, we must remember the dramatic intent to portray the molested Macedonians honorably defending themselves against the abusive legates of Darius. This incident, in effect, sets the final tone of the king’s venture into Europe, which is marked (especially since Herodotus reintroduced it in the beginning of Book Five) by a feeling of alienation on the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\]

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. the seven Persian conspirators of Book Four, and the total disappearance in the desert of the "sons of the chieftains" in 2.32. For the folktale in Herodotus, cf. W. Aly, \textit{Volksmarchen, Sage, und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen} (Gottingen 1969); also D. Fehling, \textit{Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzahlkunst Herodotus} (Berlin 1971); more generally, S. Thompson, \textit{The Folktale} (Berkeley 1977).
part of the Persians. This alienation was behind the
story of the cryptic four gifts of a frog, a mouse, a
bird, and arrows sent by the native king Idanthyrsus to
Darius instead of the requested earth and water (4.131-2).
Here in Book Five, chapters 3-10 and 16 provide
ethnographic information on the tribes who inhabit the
areas nearby the route of Darius' retreat and serve to
enhance the feeling of separation between the Persians and
the environment they are leaving behind. It is this same
feeling which the story set in Macedon helps to exploit:
the alienation of the Persians in Europe, punctuated by
their wholly un-Greek custom of mingling with the court-
ladies after dining. Indeed, Herodotus takes pains in
chapter 22 to certify the Hellenism of the Macedonian
family of Perdiccas, of which the hero of the story,
Alexander, is a member. This, too, in addition to
quelling the doubts of Herodotus' audience over the
Macedonian pedigree, also on the level of the narrative
reinforces the barrier between Greeks and Persians at the
close of Darius' expedition. Now we begin to appreciate
why the father-son motif is used: in the context of an
almost magical foreign Persian troupe, descending on the
court of Macedon and rendering old king Amyntas helpless
to defend his honor, Herodotus utilizes the father-son
theme to assert an idea dominant in the failure of Darius' camapign: the Persians are aliens, and so do not belong in
Europe. The way this idea is realized is by having the Macedonians, the final Greeks whom the Persians try to molest, defend themselves through a plot which brings to the fore the folkloric picture of a father and son almost sentimentally disagreeing, and then the son avenging the honor of the father and saving the country.

One of the final images of the Persians in these last chapters, before the narrative turns to Ionia, adds a striking confirmation to the ideas in question. In chapter 25, after Darius, on Megabazus' advice, leads Histiaeus to Susa, Herodotus reports that he left as general of coastal Thrace Otanes, the son of Sisamnes. This information is presented in a context of familial connections, for Herodotus mentions that Artaphernes, left in charge of Sardis, is adelpheon heoutou homopatricion to Darius; he then elaborates on the father of Otanes by describing that is was Sisamnes whom Cambyses killed and flayed because of a bribe taken by Sisamnes while a royal judge. The very mention of the royal judges may very well remind the audience of Cambyses' subversion of ancestral law in 3.31 in his attempt to marry his own sister; this echo of twisted family life now rings loud as Cambyses is described as having fashioned a chair out of the hide of his flayed victim Sisamnes, and then, upon instating Sisamnes' son Otanes as a judge in his father's place, bid him remember out of what his chair was fashioned! In this
final picture of Persian court life before the Ionian Revolt becomes the center of the narrative, Herodotus deliberately recapitulates the father-son theme, with Cambyses highlighted as a particularly odious villain. This is the final part of Herodotus' effort to impress on his audience the distinction between the ruling Greeks on the one hand—who have a few chapters earlier defended themselves with distinction in a manner which certifies the bond between father and son, Amyntas and Alexander—and the royal Persians on the other, who here are represented by Cambyses as he brutally severs the bond between father and son, Sisamnes and Otanes. This clear cut distinction should not be understood to hold consistently throughout the Histories, for elsewhere we find positive and negative associations within the father-son theme on both sides; in the present passage, however, Herodotus relies on this easily understandable dichotomy to further his aim of presenting the Persians as alien and repulsive to the Greeks.
Within the extended passages in Books Five and Six in which Cleomenes plays the dominant role, even within the forty-five chapters (6.49-94) which Myres dubbed "The Tragedy of Cleomenes," there are extended sections of the narrative in which, though the action itself depends on the plotting of the famous, maligned king, nevertheless the spotlight is, for the moment at least, focused on another Spartan, namely Demaratus. These passages are important primarily for their information on the history of Sparta (and would seem to balance the section on Athenian history, 5.55-96) and its peculiar dual kingship, and on the Spartan stance, vis-a-vis Athens and Aegina, toward the clear Persian threat. By examining the manner in which these passages are constructed, we can continue to observe Herodotus organizing parts of his material around the theme of fathers and sons.

It will be helpful to approach the chapters with which we are concerned—primarily 6.50-70, as well as a few subsequent passages—by organizing them into a tripartite division, which Herodotus' narrative supports. Our passage begins after the seminal chapters 48-50, in which Herodotus tells of Darius' overtures to the Greeks, to

which the Aiginetans alone respond as the Persian hoped. The Athenians necessarily react harshly, and Cleomenes goes to Aigina to confront the responsible capitulators, and quarrels with a certain Crius, one of the guilty party. To Herodotus' Greek audience, especially in central Greece and the Peloponnese, these short chapters must have been especially gripping, as the fate of Greece is traced back to wrangling among these three central states. But in his typical fashion, Herodotus does not directly resolve the tension of the plot; in chapter 51, he introduces the first of our three sub-sections with the first mention of active hostilities between the two Spartan basileis,¹⁴ Cleomenes and Demaratus

Ἐν δὲ τῇ Σπάρτῃ τούτων τῶν χρόνων ὑπομένων Δημάρητος ὁ Ἀρίστωνος διέβαλε τῶν Κλεομένεων

Meanwhile, Demaratus, son of Ariston, was bringing up charges against Cleomenes at Sparta 6.51

The reasons for this lawsuit are twofold, the more recent having been mentioned in the previous chapter (Demaratus' partial corroboration of Crius' threatening claims against Cleomenes), the earlier mentioned by Herodotus in 5.75, where Demaratus, as one of the two Spartan generals, frustrated his colleague's plans to fight the Athenians by withdrawing his portion of the

Spartan army from Eleusis. So, whereas the reasons for the hostilities between the two kings have been provided, in 6.51 Herodotus first states outright that actual action is being taken by one against the other. It is this statement of active malice between the Spartan kings which appears three times in 6.50-70, functioning as the refrain between the three extended descriptions which will be examined for their specific father-son content. To anticipate this examination, however, let us note the two other passages which serve as bridges between what we might tentatively term the father-son narrative:

Τότε δὲ τῶν Κλεομένεα ἐστά ἐν τῇ Ἀιγίνῃ καὶ κοινὰ τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀγαθά προεργαζόμενον ὁ Δημάρχης διέβαλε,

At the time of which we are speaking, while Cleomenes in Aigina was laboring for the general good of Greece, Demaratus at Sparta continued to bring charges against him.

6.61.1 ἔδεε δὲ, ὡς οἰκε, ἀνάπυστα γενόμενα ταῦτα καταπαύσαι Δημάρχητον τῆς βασιλείας, ἤδια τὸ Κλεομένει διεβλήθη μεγάλως πρῶτον τε ὁ Δημάρχης ἀπαγαγών τήν στρατὴν ἐξ Ἐλευσίνων καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἐπὶ Ἀιγινητέων τοὺς μηδίσατας διαβάντος Κλεομένεος. ὁμοθέεις ὅσον ἀποτίνυσθαι ὁ Κλεομένης it was fated, as it seems, that these words, when bruited abroad, should strip Demaratus of his sovereignty ... Cleomenes now, being resolved to have his revenge upon him ... 6.64-65.1
These three refrains, then, all serve to introduce blocks of narrative in which Herodotus describes an incident or series of incidents which are, in the latter two cases, dramatically related—insofar as they both tell the story of Demaratus’ birth and demise; at the same time, all three dependent narratives are bound together by their underlying theme of fathers and sons. In summing up the content of these three passages, it becomes clear that fathers and sons are necessarily part of the narrative:

6.52-60 History of the Spartan dual basileis (resumed from brief notice at 5.75): story of twin sons of Argeia and Aristodemus; description of the kings’ privileges, including short ethnography of Sparta.

6.61-64 Story of Demaratus’ birth: his mother’s divinely-acquired beauty, and Ariston’s love for his friend’s wife.

6.65-70 Story of Demaratus’ deposition; his interview with his mother concerning his birth; his withdrawal to Persia.

The recounting of the background of Sparta’s dual kingship, with its curious history of the twin sons of Argeia, whom the Delphic oracle designated for kingship at first singly and then as a team; Demaratus’ birth to Ariston’s third, deceitfully-gotten wife; the explanation by his mother of Demaratus’ prematurity—all of these
stories are, on the most basic narrative level, intimately involved with fathers and sons, it is true. At the same time, there are elements of Herodotus' presentation of these stories which fit much more subtly into the fabric of our special theme. The first example concerns the history of the Spartan basileia. I suggest that whereas it is entirely predictable that Herodotus should follow his description of Cleomenes' polemics in Aigina with a mention of his rival's lawsuit, yet that he should follow this in turn with a history of Aristodemus' wife's identical twins points to an association on the part of the author between Demaratus' strange birth and the strange circumstances of the birth of Eurythenes and Procles. And yet in chapter 51 there is no need (on the level of furthering the action) for turning attention away from the conflict between the two basileis to the background on the two Spartan houses. It is in the expression of the connection Herodotus makes between his knowledge of Demaratus' birth and the birth of the sons of Argeia and Aristodemus—that is, in the narrative link from the current discussion (Demaratus and Cleomenes) to a "digression" (Spartan basileia)—that we find his "style." This style we can now see derives from a thematic relation between two seemingly disparate topics.

When Herodotus does tell of the birth of the first dual basileis, and thence launches into his catalogue of the
their prerogatives, at some point he must return to his narrative of Cleomenes and Demaratus. It is clear that he should do this after he has completed his ethnography of Sparta; what is striking is that he chooses as his last entry of Spartan curiosities an item which thematically brings him around again to the matter of fathers and sons— that is, to Demaratus' birth. This comes in 6.60, where Herodotus states

In one respect the Lacedaemonians resemble the Egyptians. Their heralds and flute-players, and likewise their cooks, take their trades by succession from their fathers. A flute-player must be the son of a flute-player, a cook of a cook, a herald of a herald; and other people cannot take advantage of the loudness of their voice to come into the profession and shut out the heralds' sons, but each follows his father's business.

This then returns Herodotus to the refrain of 6.61, recalling the audience to the narrative of Cleomenes and Demaratus.
The story of Ariston and his friend's wife is told in chapters 61-63, and Herodotus closes the tale by focussing on the father's doubts over his paternity of the premature child. This then returns Herodotus once more to the refrain of 6.64-65. This use of the refrain is not as transparent as the previous two uses; in the earlier cases, it is plainer to see Herodotus redirecting the flow of his narrative. Here, the topic is already Demaratus, and so the refrain is used to pinpoint the attention precisely on the hostilities between the kings.

And yet Herodotus must, as always, provide background information: here we read of Cleomenes hiring Leotychides to help legally depose Demaratus. The charge to be brought is of course one of illegitimacy, that Demaratus is not the rightful son of Ariston. This leads to Cleomenes' bribery of Cobon, who in turn forces the Pythia Perialla to provide Cleomenes' desired answer to the Delphic suppliants. After Herodotus tells of Demaratus' deposition, he describes the meeting between the ex-basileus and his mother, in which Demaratus asks his mother for the truth about his birth. His mother provides him with a long explanation of the queer happenings on the night her son was conceived, and of the circumstances of premature birth. Finally, Herodotus tells of Demaratus' flight from Greece and his reception at the court of
Darius in Asia, and concludes his narrative with his strong approval of the man.

A man distinguished among the Lacedaemonians for many noble deeds and wise counsels, and who alone of all the Spartan basileis brought honor to his country by winning at Olympia the prize in the four-horse chariot-race.

6.70.3

This closes the extended passage on Demaratus, at least insofar as the action leading up to the deposition of the basileis. In each of the three sections we have seen Herodotus utilizing the theme of fathers and sons as an integral part of his narrative. To support the claim that Herodotus' Spartan history indeed follows a thematically consistent program, it may be noted that in each of the three sections into which chapters 50-70 have been here divided, in addition to the inclusion of strong thematic father-son material, there are also elements in the plot of a somewhat mysterious feel, as well as descriptions of mystical, religious incidents. Thus in the story of the original twin basileis, in addition to the emphatic patronymics of 52.1-2 and the father-son theme inherent in
the story, there is also the nearly fairy-tale circumstance of identical twins being spied upon by the townspeople, and the inclusion of the advice of the Delphic oracle. In the story of Ariston and his friend's wife, there is the odd circumstance surrounding their mating, as well as the mystical experience at the temple of Helen at Therapna, where the infant, later to become the mother of Demaratus, is divinely beautified through the agency of the anonymous old woman (61.4-5). Finally, in the last section on Demaratus' revelation, there is the odd explanation of premature birth, as well as Demaratus' religious supplication of his mother, replete with an invocation of Zeus and the other gods (68.1).

Now that Herodotus' use of the father-son theme in his description of the rivalry between the two Spartan basileis has been examined, it remains to be seen how he returns to this theme to recall and highlight it in related contexts. This can be seen a number of times after the deposition and flight of Demaratus in 6.70.

First, after the laudatory remarks on Demaratus of 70.3, Herodotus takes a few lines to tell what happened to Leotychides, the reproachable pawn in Cleomenes' game to unseat Demaratus. To illustrate the deserved, unfortunate fate which met the man who was installed in Demaratus' place, Herodotus postpones the description of what befell the man himself and instead begins his description with a
citation of his thwarted paternity. Given Herodotus’ already-established position on these matters, it is not surprising that he vilifies Leotychides by stating

"Λευτυχίδης δὲ ὁ Μενάρεως Δημαρήτου καταπαυθέντος διεῦξε τὴν βασιλην, καὶ οἱ γίνεται παῖς Ζεύξιδημος, τὸν δὲ Κυνίκου μετεξέτεροι Σπαρτιτήτων ἐκάλευον. οὕτως ὁ Ζεύξιδημος οὐκ ἐβασίλευσε Σπάρτης πρὸ Λευτυχίδεω γὰρ τελευτᾷ, λυπῶν παῖδα Ἀρχίδημον. Λευτυχίδης δὲ στρεφθεὶς Ζεύξιδημον γαμεῖ δευτέρην γυναῖκα Εὐρυδάμην, ἢ γὰρ τὶς οἱ ἔστεν μὲν γίνεται οὐδέν, θυγάτηρ δὲ Λαμπίτω, ἢ γὰρ τὶς οἱ ἔστεν μὲν γίνεται, Λεοτυχίδης, τὸν γὰρ καταπαύσαντος τὴν χάριν τῆς Μενάρου, αὐτὸν ἤτρεθαν Ζεύξιδημος ὁ πίθανος παῖς Ἀρχίδημον. Λευτυχίδης δὲ στρεφθεὶς Ζεύξιδημον γαμεῖ δευτέρην γυναῖκα Εὐρυδάμην, ἢ γὰρ τὶς οἱ ἔστεν μὲν γίνεται οὐδέν, θυγάτηρ δὲ Λαμπίτω, ἢ γὰρ τὶς οἱ ἔστεν μὲν γίνεται, Λεοτυχίδης, τὸν γὰρ καταπαύσαντος τὴν χάριν τῆς Μενάρου, αὐτὸν ἤτρεθαν Ζεύξιδημος ὁ πίθανος παῖς Ἀρχίδημον."

Leotychides, the son of Menares, received the basileia. He had a son, Zeuxidamus... This Zeuxidamus did not reign at Sparta, but died before his father, leaving a son, Archidamus. Leotychides, when Zeuxidamus was taken from him, married a second wife, named Euridame... By her he had no male offspring, but only a daughter called Lampito...

6.71.1-2

15 This particular description recalls an earlier passage, and possibly throws a new light upon it. In Book Five (5.39-41), the story of Cleomenes' birth is told. Without going into detail here, suffice it to report that, similar to the contest for the Persian throne at the beginning of Book Seven (see below, chapter 4), in Sparta, too, there was a choice made between the rival sons of the late king's two wives. In short, the story behind the eventual coronation of Cleomenes, son of Anaxandridas, is filled with twists and turns dependent on the manipulation of the father-son theme. Our concern, however, is with the sad tale of Cleomenes' half-brother, Dorieus, a man who surpassed Cleomenes (5.42.1) and who would have been king of Sparta, "had he been able to endure the reign of Cleomenes" (5.48). After the death of Dorieus—driven from Sparta because he couldn't bear the thought of Cleomenes ruling in his place—Herodotus immediately
The second appearance of the father-son theme after the narrative of Demaratus' fall works on a related, subtle level. After the description of the just desserts which befell Leotychides for his role in the deposition of Demaratus, and up until chapter 84, Herodotus returns to the story of Cleomenes.

The various anecdotes illustrating his madness recall the fall of Cambyses in Book Three and surely are meant to anticipate the scene of Xerxes at the Hellespont; the parallel is strengthened at the end of Herodotus' current description, however, when in distinction to the beliefs of various people mentioned in chapter 84 (the Argives and the Spartans), Herodotus states his personal belief of the cause of Cleomenes' madness:

εμοι δὲ δοκεῖ τίσιν ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρίτης
ἐκτείνατι.

for my own part I think Cleomenes' death was a judgment on him for wronging Demaratus. 6.84.3

--------------------------

explains that Cleomenes died a short while after Dorieus.

ἀλλ' ἀνέθανε ἄπαις, θυγατέρα

but Cleomenes died without a son, leaving only a daughter, whose name was Gorgo. 5.48

On the surface, this simply explains why Dorieus should have held out just a bit longer, for he would have inherited the throne. Given our understanding of the death notice of Leotychides, however, we can see that there is an undercurrent of criticism for Cleomenes even in this short description of his death and failed paternity.
This brings back into clear focus, after the several chapters between 69 and 84, the story of Cleomenes' attack upon Demaratus' patriliny. In this final notice of the father-son theme in the story of Demaratus, Herodotus speaks *sua voce* to affirm his own view, emphasising, as it were, the heinousness of Cleomenes' particular attack upon his rival. This personal note helps us to recognize that Herodotus uses fathers and sons consistently not only as one of several themes, but as a prominent theme of special significance to him in the Spartan history he provides to balance the Athenian history of Book Five 55-96. Nor is this the final appearance of the father-son theme in the narrative leading up to the preparations for the battle of Marathon at 6.94.

Herodotus' final use of fathers and sons in this Spartan history comes in chapters 85-86, after the death of Cleomenes. In this passage, we have the culmination of the father-son theme by Herodotus in the entire extended passage of Book Six with which we have been concerned, for it seems to tie together the various pieces of the preceding passages.

As has been shown, Herodotus discredits Leotychides for his role in the deposition of Demaratus, at first by citing Leotychides' thwarted paternity in chapter 71, and then, in the following chapter, by telling how Leotychides was later found guilty of accepting bribes from the
Thessalians. Now, though, we must recall that the entire passage with which we have been concerned started originally with Herodotus' narration of the troubles among Athens, Sparta, and Aigina, when this last state agreed to send earth and water to the Persians. After the much-later banishment of Leotychides is revealed (6.72.2), then, Herodotus returns to the historical context of the disagreement among these three states, and reports that upon the removal of Demaratus from office, Cleomenes returned to Aegina with Leotychides to secure hostages from among the group of capitulating citizens (6.73.2). Ten hostages are then delivered to the Athenians. Following this description come the several chapters discussed above in which Cleomenes' madness and decline are described. Finally, Herodotus returns to the matter of the wrangling among the Greek states, and reports that upon the news of Cleomenes' death, the Aeginetans demand of the Spartans that they deliver over king Leotychides in return for the Aiginetans now being held hostage in Athens (6.85.1). This suggestion is eventually refused by the Spartans, and instead Leotychides makes a trip to Athens to attempt to convince the Athenians to hand over to the Aeginetans their hostages. This brings us to chapter 86, in which Herodotus presents Leotychides delivering his speech to the Athenians. It is in this speech and the accompanying remarks that Herodotus
certifies his denigration of Leotychides for the part he played in the deposition of Demaratus; for we recall that the basis of Leotychides' charge against Demaratus was in the latter's dubious parentage, specifically whether he was indeed the son of Ariston. Thus it is an indication of Herodotus' sensitivity to this theme of fathers and sons and the bonds between them that he has Leotychides deliver to the Athenians a speech in which he presents a parable: Leotychides tells of the Spartan of old named Glaucus, who was entrusted with a sum of money by an unnamed Milesian, and enjoined to return the money to whoever should present him with a particular set of tokens. Years later, Leotychides says, the sons of the Milesian came to Glaucus and presented the tokens, but the Spartan hesitated to return the money, and went to Delphi to consult the oracle whether he might secure his innocence through a false oath and thus retain the money for himself. The oracular response is quoted by Leotychides, and in the central position of the five lines of verse is the line:

\[ \text{δ' ἄλλος ὁ Θυγατρὶς τοῦ Θεοῦ} \]

Yet hath the Oath-God a son who is nameless . . .

6.86g.2

The oracle goes on to say that this "Son of Oath" wipes out the line of those who swear falsely. After he has quoted the oracle, Leotychides finishes his speech to the
Athenians by telling them that for merely having considered forsaking himself (for he eventually did return the money to the sons of the Milesian), the entire line of Glaucus was wiped out, and not a single descendant of his lives in Sparta this day. The expression is emphatic

Γλαύκου νῦν οὔτε τι ἀπόγονον ἐστι οὐδὲν οὔτ’ ἵστη οὐδεμία νομιζόμενη εἶναι Γλαύκου, ἔκτετριπταί τε πρὸρρυζος ἐκ Σπάρτης.

Glaucus at the present time has not a single descendant, nor is there any family known as his—root and branch has he been removed from Sparta.

6.86.d

These strong words evidently serve to strengthen the impression of exactly how severe is the damnation to which an oath-abuser is subject. It is a lengthy, moving speech as a whole, and especially so in light of the Athenians' summary rejection of it:

Λεοτυχίδης μὲν εἶπας ταῦτα, ὡς οἱ οὔδε οὔτως ἔσηκουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀπαλλάσσετο

Thus spoke Leotychides; but, as he found that the Athenians would not listen to him, he left them.

6.86.d

The actual content of Leotychides' speech is obviously enough concerned with fathers and sons: the Milesian's sons return for their father's money, the oracular
response deals with a mythical "Son of Oath," and Glaucus' entire stock is wiped out. Of interest here is Herodotus' choice of this material at this point. It should now seem evident that this particular material is used by the historian because of his concern with thematic unity: Leotychides' crime against Demaratus was committed in the realm of fathers and sons, and so, in answer to this, Herodotus maintains the theme even to the point of irony in Leotychides' speech to the Athenians. Leotychides' is guilty of the very crime for which his own character, Glaucus, paid the price. But whereas Glaucus forbore to perjure himself, returned the money, and nevertheless was punished, Leotychides did indeed go through with the crime of perjury and thus secured the deposition of Demaratus and his own installation as king of Sparta. By way of anticipating this anecdotal speech to the Athenians and its implications, Herodotus already mentioned, in chapter 71 discussed above (p.90), that Leotychides lost his first son, and then did not bear another in his second marriage. We can also find in the Athenians' wholesale rejection of Leotychides' parable another example of Herodotus piling up the evidence against Leotychides, for in answer to a speech of this considerable length (some 53 lines), Herodotus provides the briefest of responses, quoted above. I believe Herodotus fashions this laconic response as a deliberate reproof to Leotychides on the level of
narrative structure, to complement the more deeply-seated condemnation of the man which is the goal of the return to the father-son motif.

For a final, very much related word on Leotychides, we must jump ahead to Book Eight, where Leotychides resurfaces in command of the Greek fleet lying off Aegina, as word comes of Mardonius’ arrival in Thessaly. Having secured the Spartan’s condemnation two books earlier, now Herodotus is working in a different spirit, gaining momentum as the Greeks are defending themselves against the Persians. Yet, with this reappearance of a former villain, Herodotus can be seen to recall the motif of the earlier passage, either in an attempt to clear Leotychides’ name, or to remind the audience of the man’s special taint. In either case, it is to Leotychides’ patriliny that Herodotus turns his attention, with the elaborate introduction

στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ναϊάρχος ἦν Λευτυχίδης ὁ Μενάρεως τοῦ Πηγσίλεω τοῦ Ἰπποκρατίδεω τοῦ Λευτυχίδεω τοῦ Ἀναξίλεω τοῦ Ἀρχιδήμου τοῦ Ἀνα-ξανδρίδεω τοῦ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ Νικάνδρου τοῦ Χαρίλεω τοῦ Εὐνόμου τοῦ Πολυδέκτεω τοῦ Πρυτάνιος τοῦ Εὐρυφώντος τοῦ Προκλέως τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Ἀλλου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, ἐὼν τῆς ἐτέρης οἰκίας τῶν βασιλέων.
This Leotychides, who was both general and admiral, was the son of Menares, the son of Agesilaus, the son of Hippocratis, the son of Leotychides, the son of Anaxilaus, the son of Archidamus, the son of Anaxandrides, the son of Theopompus, the son of Nicander, the son of Charillus, the son of Eunomus, the son of Polydeuces, the son of Prytanis, the son of Euryphon, the son of Procles, the son of Aristodemus, the son of Aristomachus, the son of Cleodæus, the son of Hyllus, the son of Heracles. He belonged to the younger branch of the royal house. 8.131.2

This is an extraordinary list. Given the interest Herodotus showed in Book Six to the matter of fathers and sons with respect to Leotychides, it seems fair to suggest that this roll-call of his forbears deliberately hearkens to the earlier passage.

---

16 Cf. the extended patriliney of the Aigiadæ, 7.204
CHAPTER THREE
A DISCUSSION OF THE THEMATIC USAGES
OF FATHERS AND SONS THROUGHOUT THE HISTORIES

In the previous chapter we surveyed a number of passages from the entire Histories and observed that Herodotus is, throughout, attentive to the relationship between fathers and sons.¹ It follows from the breadth of our study, spanning all nine books, that his interest in fathers and sons made itself felt from his early adulthood,² and was kept alive into his maturity, when he is supposed to have composed the finely-crafted Croesus-logos and the final three books. Herodotus' lifelong interest in fathers and sons, then, may be contrasted with, for instance, his sporadic interest in the role and influence of oracular prophecy, which only makes itself felt in certain logoi, or his attention to unusual personal and behavioral habits, which, though focused on races and nations which are both familiar and outlandish, is consciously directed

¹ See Appendix C for additional passages and commentaries, Appendix A for a selective catalogue of father-son passages.

² At which time it has been conjectured he made his trip to Egypt. cf. Fornara, op.cit. chapter one "Unitarians, Separatists, and Book II" 1-23.
at what we recognize as curiosities. In the case of fathers and sons, however, Herodotus' notices are equally concerned with Greeks, Persians, Egyptians, and other barbarians, occur in contexts of peace and war, recent as well as ancient, mythical history, and in both his straightforward historical narrative as well as the ethnographic inquiries and "digressions." Indeed, Herodotus' lauded breadth of interests and sympathies is illustrated by his wide-ranging treatment of the relationship between fathers and sons across cultures, eras, and contexts. Except in certain specific cases, the reader is reminded that I am not here concerned with either his use of the standard Greek patronymic appellation which is so common in documents and literature, or the patrilinies expected in the context of dynastic succession. In matters of both style and content, it is not difficult to set these two banausic phenomena apart from the assortment of passages we have reviewed. One must begin to come to terms with this feature of Herodotus' narrative which has been shown to be so persistent, however much variegated. In the present chapter we will attempt to classify and then illustrate a particular range of father and son incidents which appear throughout the Histories, concentrating on several broad types of father-son passages which are noteworthy at the very least for their length, style, and unusual emphasis.
Throughout we shall find that the distinctions between the various classes are difficult to maintain, and that many passages resist classification partly because of, for example, their vagueness, ambiguous location within the narrative, and manifold contents, but mostly because, as he composed, Herodotus himself was mercifully unaware of any need to make his richly varied applications of this motif conform to an artificial scheme. We therefore find references to fathers and sons scattered throughout the work, in passages which illustrate the blending of Herodotus the ethnographer, the antiquarian, and the chronicler.

The first class of father-son passage is found in Herodotus' treatment of the natural world and, more broadly, ethnic diversity, that is, ethnography. At various points in Herodotus' descriptions of strange and familiar animals and peoples, we find remarks which are given an extra dimension by attracting attention, either overtly or en passant, to the father-son relationship. Sometimes these notices purport to be "neutral," i.e. they seem blandly objective, simply members of lists of curiosities. For example, in the Egypt-logos, among other animals in his catalogue of species which can be seen there, Herodotus makes mention of the phoenix and its rare visits to Egypt (2.73). It is noticeable that Herodotus casually imposes a father-son relationship on the natural-
-if, by his own admission, fantastic—behavior of this bird:

\[ \text{φοινίκαν δὲ τὸτε φασὶ ἐπεάν οἱ ἀποθάνη ὁ πατήρ.} \]

The say that he comes when it happens that his father dies.

2.73.2

How can we account for the specific, imputed relationship between the two birds? I suggest that, in cases such as this, when presenting material which stretches belief, Herodotus, like most storytellers, draws on the familiar to render the exotic comprehensible. He can most easily explain this remarkable paradigm of devotion—and thereby secure his audience's interest and credulity—in terms of the anthropomorphic motivation of filial piety. It is for this reason that he imposes on the birds the father-son relationship. To certify this imputed relationship, in the eighteen lines devoted to the phoenix, \textit{pater} is used five times to describe the parent bird.

We can observe a quite similar treatment of another natural phenomenon when we turn to the Arabian ethnography of Book 3. In his extended description of the snakes of that region, Herodotus writes
Whenever they mate, at the very moment that the male ejaculates, the female seizes the father by the neck, and, clinging to it, she does not let go until she has bitten clean through. The male dies in the manner described, but the female makes retribution to the male in the following way: while still in the womb, the young, honoring its father, gnaws through its mother, and having bitten clean through her womb, thus accomplishes its birth.

3.109.1,2

In this passage Herodotus has anthropomorphized the vipers, attributing familiar motives of retribution and honor (tisin toiende apotinei, timoreonta) to the behavior of animals, and thus rendering comprehensible their exotic behavior. More important to our discussion is Herodotus' imposition of specific roles on the animals to complement the pathetic fallacy. These include the notion of a child (here left without gender) avenging on its mater the death not simply of its male parent, but of its father, goneus.3

3 This word is used only here of animals in the Histories, elsewhere of the human father and, in the plural, human parents (v. Powell, goneus).
Since the archetype of this entire tableau can easily be recognized in Orestes' revenge over Clytemnestra for the death of Agamemnon, it follows that Herodotus implicitly expects the audience to conceive of the tekna in this description as a son. With this image of the son avenging his father, Herodotus artfully makes his narrative of this eccentricity of the natural world more compelling than the facts alone.

To take another, slightly different example introduced in the context of animals, we may turn back to the introduction of the Egyptian menagerie in Book 2, chapter 65. Upon mentioning that certain animals are considered sacred in Egypt, Herodotus states

\[\text{μελέδωνοι ἀποδείχθαται τῆς τροφῆς χωρίς ἐκάστων καὶ ἔρσενες καὶ θήλεαι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, τῶν παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδέκται τὴν τιμὴν.}\]

For the care of each of the animals caretakers are assigned, both males and females of the Egyptians, among whom the son receives the honor from his father.

This information is clearly provided by Herodotus as an Egyptian curiosity. It may be noticed that whereas the description starts out with the generic \(\text{kai ersones kai thelenai}--\) most likely the result of his autopsia in Egypt

---

4 W. How & J. Wells, \textit{A Commentary on Herodotus} (Oxford 1928) ad loc. i.291.
of men and women serving as caretakers—it quickly turns specific with the mention that the office is handed down from father to son, with no further mention of how the women got the job. If we remember the historical fact that the office was actually not always hereditary,⁵ and if we reasonably suppose Herodotus to have known this, we are left to explain the reason for Herodotus' introduction of the fiction. I suggest a twofold reason for this addendum: first, as in our previous passages, Herodotus is concerned to render the exotic comprehensible to the Greek audience. In the case of an established, unisex priesthood of all manner of animals—an unusual notion for the Greeks—Herodotus relieves a measure of his audience's unfamiliarity by imposing on this office the familiar father-to-son succession of priests. (We may logically wonder whether the same conceit would allow for a mother-to-daughter succession as well; suffice it to say that, for Herodotus, the relationship between father and son was the more noteworthy.) Secondly, at the same time that Herodotus is bound in his narrative to temper the outlandishness of this priesthood in the interest of credibility, he is also committed, here and elsewhere in the Egyptian ethnography, to illustrate the extent of that culture's most curious feature, its rigid orthodoxy. In his use of the predictable, time-tested tradition of an

⁵ How & Wells, ad loc., op cit., i.199.
inviolable father-son succession of office, Herodotus finds the appropriate reflection of Egyptian religious traditionalism. For these two reasons Herodotus takes the liberty of introducing the father-son relationship in a context where strict truth does not demand it.

This issue of the passing down of an office from father to son appears with slightly different effect elsewhere in lists of foreign customs. Earlier in the Egypt-logos, Herodotus catalogues the various customs of the caste of priests (2.37), and then makes mention of the organization of the priesthood:

\[ \text{irrātai dē ouk eis } \]
\[ \text{ēkístou tōn theōn allā pollai, tōn eis ēstī arxíēreos, } \]
\[ \text{ēpeān de'tis āpodānv, tou'tou o paīs āntikatístaai. } \]

For each god there is not simply one, but rather many priests, of whom one is the chief priest. And if a chief priest should die, his son is appointed in his place

2.37.5

The evidence that the relationship between fathers and sons is here deliberately exploited by Herodotus can be recognized when we remember that in this passage, as in the previous one, Herodotus is making an inexact report of the true Egyptian custom, for whereas there are recorded cases of a son succeeding a father in this office, this was clearly not always the case.⁶ There are two

---

⁶ How & Wells, ad loc., op. cit. i. 184
particular features of this description which concern us. First, we should notice that the quoted passage is appended to a list of curiosities—e.g., the priests' hyper-hygienic body shaving and fastidious avoidance of beans— which will have struck Herodotus' Greek audience as very odd indeed. By adding in this particular context of oddities the additional information quoted above, Herodotus here equates with the others the Egyptian custom of passing the office of chief-priest from father to son. Secondly, Herodotus enhances the significance of the remark on fathers and sons by placing it in the emphatic final position of this catalogue, before he turns his audience's attention from the habits and organization of the priesthood to the Egyptian customs of offering sacrifice. In sum, then, we see that Herodotus punctuates this section of his Egyptian ethnography by providing this complex of emphases to his description of the Egyptian priesthood, specifically by exploiting and exaggerating the un-Greek manner in which the Egyptians utilise the natural succession of fathers and sons to fill out the ranks of high priests.

To take a final look at this practice of an honor or office being passed from father to son, we turn to Herodotus' discussion of Spartan kingship in Book 6. The passage which extends from chapters 52 to 61, the Spartan "ethnography," is filled with curiosities about local
history, customs, etc., and is analogous to Herodotus’ discussion of more exotic nations. At the end of this section, moreover, we find similarities with the passage on the Egyptian priesthood discussed above. At 6.60, Herodotus makes a self-conscious, forthright recollection of the previous passage (2.37), in which we can observe the narrative strength of the father-son relationship. Again we are at the very end of a catalogue of curiosities, this time immediately preceding Herodotus’ return to the history of Cleomenes and Demaratus; Herodotus ends his ethnography by stating

In the following way are the Lacedaimonians similar to the Egyptians: their heralds, flutists, and cooks inherit their fathers’ jobs — a flutist is sired by a flutist, a cook by a cook, and a herald by a herald. Other men, on account of their powerful voices, do not thus find their employment and exempt the heralds from their jobs, but all rather perform their jobs
according to what their fathers did. This is how these things are.

It is not difficult to hear the tone of sarcasm in Herodotus' voice as he reports this oddity which the Spartans share with the Egyptians. But, to back up a little, when we notice that the previous chapter, 59, deals with a noteworthy custom—debt amnesty—practiced by Spartans and Persians alike in times of the ascension of a new monarch in the wake of a deceased one, we recognize the dual context which calls to mind the Egyptian antecedent: unusual customs of transferring office, writ large, and the succession of fathers and sons. Herodotus, therefore, has established a narrative context which invites the next comparison, the opening sentence of chapter 60, in which it is the father-son relationship itself on which Herodotus focuses for his ultimate comparison of his "target group," the Spartans, with another nationality, the Egyptians. Moreover, it is worth noticing that in this queer context of stifling traditionalism, Herodotus turns at last to this relationship for his final tableau of Spartan mores; the power of the image of sons succeeding fathers is certified by its insertion into the narrative in this emphatic final position of the ethnography, and perhaps gains even additional potency by the sarcasm implicit in the picture of a society which has turned in on itself and draws
continuity from the succession of fathers and sons in spite of the impracticality, indeed ridiculousness, of certain types of nepotism.

In each of these five cases, the phoenix, the vipers, the animal caretakers, the priests, and the Spartan tradesmen, we have observed Herodotus enhancing the narrative by filling out the basic ethnographic information he has to impart with some incorporation of the father-son relationship, either implicitly or explicitly. In these cases, however, although the father-son relationship may be called to the fore for a brief moment, clearly the larger context does not thematically depend on fathers and sons, though it is enriched by the introduction of the relationship into the narrative. To consider another valuable example of this type of exploitation of the relationship between fathers and sons, as if for its inherent interest to his audience, we turn to the Scythian ethnography of Book 4.

In his brief description of the Issedonians, Herodotus states:

ἐπεάν ἀνδρὶ ἀποθάνῃ πατήρ, οἱ προσήκοντες πάντες προσάγουσι πρόβατα καὶ ἐπειτα ταῦτα δύσαντες καὶ κατατάμωντες τὰ κρέα κατατάμωσι καὶ τὸν τοῦ δεκομένου τεθνεώτα γονέα, ἀναμείζαντες δὲ πάντα τὰ κρέα δαίτα προτίθενται. τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ψιλόσαντες καὶ ἐκκαθηράντες καταχρυσοῦσι καὶ ἐπειτα ἀτε ἀγάλματι χρέωνται, θυσίας μεγάλας ἐπετελέοντες ἐπιτελέοντες. παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τούτῳ ποιεῖ, κατὰ περὶ Ἑλλήνης τὰ γενέσια.
Whenever a man loses his father, all the relatives bring sheep and then, offering sacrifice and cutting up the meat, they also cut up the meat of the dead parent. Mixing it all up together, they then set out all the meat in a feast. But, after scalping and cleaning the dead man's head, they gild it and use it as an ornament at their yearly great festivals. This is what the son does for his father, just as the Greeks celebrate the birthdays of the deceased. 4.26

Obviously, Herodotus' main interest in conveying this information to his Greek audience is to thrill them with these gruesome practices of cannibalism and totemism. The more to pique his listeners, he adds the gratuitous notice of fathers and sons in the opening and closing remarks (epean andri apothanei pater and pais de patri tutto poieei). In recognizing that the main verbs describing the various actions are all plural, referring to the relatives in general, we are led to the view that these practices are understood by the author to be more than exclusively a son's treatment of his father; indeed, Herodotus wants his audience to visualize the striking image of the whole tribe participating in the preparations. Yet Herodotus specifies father and son at the beginning and end of his description, drawing on the inherent appeal of this relationship to the sensitivities of the audience and adding thereby an extra sympathetic
dimension to his sketch of the Issedonians' practice. The familiarity of the phenomenon of a son losing a father is exploited to contrast with the exotic barbarian custom, and this contrast is further—and perhaps jocularly—highlighted in Herodotus' offhand remark that the strange practice of the Issedonians is just like the Greek festival of the Genesia, which is by comparison perversely plain! There is the similarity of occasion, of course—but here, for the sake of thrilling his audience, Herodotus is far more interested in pointing out the differences.

In Herodotus extensive treatment of the Persians, on whose customs he lavishes a great deal of attention, there are several ethnographic notices which focus on that race's regard for the father-son relationship. In 1.136, Herodotus informs his audience that, after being a good fighter, the mark of a good man is to father many sons. He then relates the Persian custom

τῷ δὲ τοὺς πλείστους ἀποδεικνύτι δῶρα ἐκπέμπει βασιλεὺς ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος. τὸ πολλὸν ὃ ἦγεται ἴσχυρὸν εἶναι.

Every year the king sends gifts to the man who can show the most sons. For they feel that there is strength in numbers. 1.136.1

We can observe how Herodotus uses fathers and sons by noticing that here he has blended this theme into his
citation of a broader point of the Persian mentality: they believe, in general (thus the indefinite *to pollon*), that more is better. But that Herodotus is here at least as interested in the specifics of Persian attitudes toward fathers and sons as he is in the general issue of Persian customs, is demonstrated in the sentence which follows the broad statement on numbers; as Herodotus continues to describe Persian customs, now turning to their educational institutions, his language emphatically specifies fathers and sons where the simple "they" would suffice.

They raise their sons from their fifth until their twentieth year on three things alone: riding, using the bow and arrow, and speaking the truth. 1.136.2

In other passages, Herodotus shows that this Persian interest in fathers and sons extends beyond a simple concern on the part of the Persians for their own sons, to more of a conceptual respect for the special bonds between fathers and sons. This is pointed out in the passage describing Cambyses' treatment of the vanquished Egyptian king Psammenitus7 where Herodotus mentions:

7 For a discussion of Psammenitus, please see above, pp. 60 and 71.
The Persians are accustomed to honoring the sons of kings. Indeed, even if certain kings should revolt from them, they hand over the reign to their sons.

3.15.2

Herodotus provides a couple of examples demonstrating this remarkable claim, and at points throughout the rest of the Histories, he describes incidents which bear it out. It will be worthwhile to examine a few of these:

-At 6.41, Miltiades the Athenian flees from the Chersonese in the face of attacking Phoenicians, and, en route to Athens, loses one ship from his fleet, the one which is under the command of his son Metiochus. The kidnapping Phoenicians hopefully convey this son of the Persians' greatest scourge to Darius, only to see the king receive Miltiades' son with favor, load him with gifts, and settle him on an estate. This unexpected hospitality and largesse contribute much to Herodotus' overall positive picture of Darius. This impression is additionally, indirectly strengthened in light of some information provided by Herodotus just a couple of chapters earlier, in the description of Miltiades' rise to power in the Chersonese (6.39). For we should not read the notice of Darius' kind treatment of Miltiades' son
without recalling Herodotus' offhand, cutting remark on the Peisistridai earlier having shown favor to Miltiades, "as if they were not obviously involved in the death of his father Kimon" (hos ou suneidotes dethen tou patros autou Kimonos ton thanaton. 6.39.1). Although it does not seem likely that Herodotus is primarily aiming at a direct contrast of Persian and Athenian character, the difference between the Persian Darius' succouring of Miltiades' son, and the Athenian Peisistridai's murder of Miltiades' father, is striking; equally important, the narration of the former incident deliberately foreshadows and strengthens the force of the latter.

-At 7.101-104, Xerxes interviews the exiled Spartan king Demaratus, who has joined the Persian expedition to Greece. After having reviewed his forces, Xerxes solicits Demaratus' opinion on their strength. Demaratus, assured that an honest answer will not forfeit for him any of the king's favor, responds that he still believes the Spartans to be irresistible, at which the volatile Xerxes is predictably peeved. In Demaratus' rebuttal Herodotus inserts a notice which will recall the ethnographic observation with which we are here concerned. Demaratus tries to reingratiate himself with Xerxes by saying

"Ω βασιλεῦ, ἀρχὴθεν ἡπιστάμην ὅτι ἄληθεία χρεώμενον οὐ φίλα τοι ἑρέω. σὺ δὲ ἐπελ ἦνάγκασας λέγεω τῶν λόγων τῶν ἄληθεστάτων, ἔλεγον τὰ κατήκοντα Σπαρτητήμει. καὶ-
O king, I knew from the start that if I should speak the truth I would say things that did not please you. But you compelled me to say the most honest words, and I said what is most appropriate for the Spartans. And yet, I happen now to be bereft of them, as you yourself know best of all — they have stripped me of my honor and paternal privilege, and have made me a city-less exile. It was your father who succoured me, and gave me life and a home.

By having Demaratus here recall his fallen station and the kind reception he won from Xerxes’ father Darius, Herodotus not only takes the opportunity to provide another example to bear out his statement on the Persian custom of honoring the sons of kings. These speeches of Xerxes and Demaratus also help to set a tone for the invasion, coming as they do directly after the forty-chapter catalogue of the Asian army. True to his earlier assessment of the Persian mentality (1.136, discussed above), Herodotus is presenting a Xerxes mesmerized by the numbers of his forces—and yet blind to the variety of contingencies by which a war’s course is equally
determined. At the same time that Herodotus is concerned to show Xerxes in his true folly and to foreshadow his tragedy, he is also interested here and elsewhere in injecting a measure of sympathy for the king. In this passage it is accomplished by having Demaratus insert in his speech the recollections of his own former losses, and of the kindness shown to him by the very father of Xerxes. Although Xerxes rejects Demaratus' reasoning, he does so gently (he laughs and dismisses him with kind words), and thus Herodotus paints a sympathetic tableau of the doomed king. The point here is that the basis of this sense of sympathy is founded in the father-son relationship functioning on the dual levels of 1) Darius' reception/adoptions of the Spartan Demaratus, bereft of his patrimony, and 2) Xerxes' being the son of this same benevolent Persian Darius. This specific picture is extended in the following chapters, when Herodotus resumes his description of the expedition, and provides another example of the kindness shown to the sons of kings. To wit:

-At 7.107, on Xerxes' march into Greece, Herodotus tells of a certain Boges, Persian governor of Eion, whose surviving sons in later days were especially honored in Persia by Xerxes. This was due to their father's devotion to the crown, as demonstrated by his choice of suicide over succumbing to the Athenians in the siege of Eion
after Xerxes' invasion. By adding this note of Xerxes' favors to the sons of Boges directly after the conversation between Xerxes and Demaratus discussed above, Herodotus is drawing on the father-son theme to confirm a sympathetic picture of the Persian king.\(^8\) In the immediate narrative context, this picture is dependent in part on the image of the benevolent Darius from the preceding chapters, and Xerxes' sharing in that benevolence. On the larger scale of Herodotus' narrative scheme, the effect of this passage is enhanced by providing confirmation of the original ethnographic observation of Persian treatment of the sons of kings.

Yet we remember that, in many places, the Persian kings are anything but kind to the sons of fathers. Cyrus, Darius, Cambyses, and Xerxes all commit outrages.\(^9\) Put in the perspective of what Herodotus tells us of Persian practice regarding fathers and sons, it becomes clear that these crimes function on a level beyond the simple, expected exposition of kingly excess. Some of these

---

\(^8\) This point may help explain Herodotus' mention that, during the battle of Salamis, Xerxes orders to be recorded the names of the daring Asian captains, as well as "who their fathers were and from which city they had come" (patrothen. . .te kai polin 8.90.4).

\(^9\) E.g. 1.211-214 Cyrus slaughters Spargapises, the son of the queen Tomyris; 4.84 Darius executes the sons of Oeobazus to punish him for requesting their exemption from service; 3.14,15 Cambyses has the son of the Egyptian king Psammenitus killed; 7.39 Xerxes kills the eldest son of Pythius, who had requested the boy's exemption from service.
incidents are featured in different discussions elsewhere in this investigation; at this point, it is instructive to point out that when Herodotus describes a king violating the bonds between father and son, the incident must be considered within the broad topic of Persian custom and character, and on the larger scale of the narrative scheme.

Herodotus does indeed describe some Persian customs regarding the potential severance of the bonds between father and son. To return to the Persian ethnography of Book One, we find a description of a curious practice:

\[\text{πρὶν δὲ ἡ πεντάετης γένηται, οὐκ ἀπικυνεῖται ἔξ ὦψιν τῷ πατρὶ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῆς γυναικὸς διάιται ἤχει. τοῦτο ἐκεῖκα τοῦτο ὄντως ποιέται, ἕνα ἥν ἀποθάνη τρεφόμενος, ἵμισθεμέναν ἄσημ τῷ πατρὶ προσβάλη. αἰνέω μὲν ὅνν τόντε}

[A son] does not come into the sight of his father until he is five years old, but spends his time among the women. They do this so that, if the son should die as an infant, he might not bring any grief to his father. I approve of this practice... 1.136.2-137.1

In addition to its value as a measure of Herodotus' own personal views of the relationship between fathers and sons (αινομένον...), this passage provides another key to understanding the use of this relationship within the
narrative. The implication of this practice is that the Persians hold so dear the bonds between father and son that they go to unusual lengths to prevent the grief which results from their severance. This observation will contribute to our appreciation of Herodotus' intent in describing the various crimes which the Persian kings commit against fathers and sons, crimes which should be measured against the standard of behavior which Herodotus describes in passages such as the present one. But the psychological aspect of the Persian custom is interesting to Herodotus per se, and is the focus of this extraordinary notice in the following chapter.

They also say that no one has ever yet killed his own father or mother, and that, when such cases do occur, if an investigation be conducted, the child would be discovered to be either suppositious or illegitimate. For they say that it is not likely that a true parent should die at the hands of his son. 1.137.2

Herodotus' inclusion of this curious observation of infallible logic matches in tone and intent the other
ethnographic remarks on fathers and sons which we have discussed. In the present and former passages, however, we have reached the farthest point along the continuum of observations which extends from the simply scientific to the pregnantly psychological. That is to say, Herodotus' attention in these two passages is directed at Persian customs which have definite implications for his characterisation of the people who fill his narrative. The Persians have such strong feelings about the father-son bond that, even if no incidence of patricide should occur among the Persians in his story (likewise incidents involving very young sons and their fathers), nevertheless, any treatment of fathers and sons among them, especially ones in which the bonds are strained or severed, must necessarily be affected by the attitudes which Herodotus has highlighted. Herodotus' primary concern is not to write a tense psychological drama after the fashion of the tragedians, it is true. Yet as we read the complex of stories which makes up the Histories, we must be attuned to the undercurrents of human motivation which Herodotus as a skilled writer is committed to exposing.

But let us return from these conceptualizations of the self-view of the Persians to the broader topic of the classes of father-son relationships as they are in fact presented throughout the Histories.
As we saw in the preceding chapter, the variety of father-son relationships is great. On the one extreme, Herodotus presents the extensive dynamics of, say, Croesus and his sons, or Amyntas and Alexander (5.18ff), whose relationship itself contributes to the course of events on a large scale; on the other, we read the sparse notice on Ameinocles, whose good fortune at finding the valuable flotsam of the Persian fleet is checked by the sense of loss inherent in his accidental slaying of his own son (7.190). There are in fact dozens of father-son pairs (as well as fathers with more than one son, and some mother-son pairs, as well) whose stories are woven into the narrative of the Histories. Their forms range from the ones in vibrant, full tones, with extended sub-plots, dialogues, and confrontations, to the more quiet, with only the narrator’s voice briefly hinting at some particular aspect of the relationship. Some bear on the course of history, others remain modestly within the personal sphere of the characters involved. As we take a closer look at several pairs of fathers and sons, we will not concern ourselves overmuch with the forms in which Herodotus presents the relationships. Rather, our purpose will be to identify and describe a variety of modalities in which fathers and sons, qua fathers and sons, function in relation to one another, to others, and to the
political environment. That is to say, we will continue both to identify the common thematic features which many of these relationships share, and to reveal the purposes within the structure of the narrative to which Herodotus puts them.

We resume on a broad level. One of the primary uses to which Herodotus puts the father-son relationship is to provide a setting for the playing out of a range of human emotions on the part of his characters. There are isolated instances, it is true, of the relationship between a father and son being marked by trust, empathy, and love (e.g. Alexander and Amyntas, Cyrus and his foster parents, Megistias and his son), but far greater are the number of father-son relationships in which the primary dynamic is drawn from the less generous side of the human spirit. Sometimes Herodotus shows his fathers and sons as if their relationship were a stage on which to act out their preexisting, usually destructive hopes and fears; often fathers and sons find within their relationship the very raw materials from which to fashion their ambitions. Let us turn to several passages which illustrate these and related situations.

We begin with the father and son relationship before it can even be described as such. There are characters who are presented in the thematic context of the severance of ties between fathers and sons even before the ties can
exist. Their actions are variously motivated, often deriving from a need for power and fear of losing it, and they express these feelings in the framework of the intended prevention of the birth of a son (their own or someone else’s).

Our first example comes from the section on Athenian history in Book One (1.59-64). Croesus’ inquiry into the condition of Athens yields a series of descriptive stories which is introduced by the occasion on which Hippocrates visits the Olympic games. Witnessing a prodigy of unheated cauldrons boiling over, it is interpreted for him by Chilon the Lacedaimonian:

\[
\text{πρώτα μὲν γυναῖκα μὴ ἀγεσθαι τεκνοποιῶν ἐστὰ οἶκία, ἐὰν δὲ} \text{ τυγχάνῃ ἔχων, δεύτερα τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκπέμπειν, καὶ ἐὰν τῷ} \text{τυγχάνῃ ἐὼν παις, τοῦτον ἀπείπασθαι.}
\]

First, let him not bring into his home a woman who could bear him a child, but next, if he already had one, let him send her away. And if he already happened to have a son, let him disown him.

1.59.2

This advice, strong as it is per se, gains additional potency coming from one of Greece’s most celebrated sages (with whom the audience might readily equate Solon, for instance), and at the same time placed at the beginning of Herodotus’ first treatment of Athens and its history; moreover, it is just a few short chapters after the
accounts of the deaths of Atys and Adrastus with strong and disturbing father-son themes found there (as discussed above in Chapter One). Yet we cannot say that the advice itself is in any way bad or evil, as much as it may offend our sensitivities. Chilon's tripartite warning is a product of Herodotus' wish to cast an uncomfortable feeling around the dynasty of the Peisistridae, and this is achieved by inserting an element of fear into the issue of the potential patriliny of Hippocrates. Thus the first and third components of Chilon's speech directly mention the father-son relationship, with the middle component indirectly doing the same.

The connection between the father-son motif of Chilon's advice and the unfortunate facts of Peisistratus' rule is brought out in the swiftness and manner of the transition from the one subject to the other:

οὐκ ὡς ταῦτα παρανεσαντος Χίλωνος πείθεσθαι θέλεω τὸν Ἰπποκράτεα γενέσθαι οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν Πεισιστράτου τούτου, ὅς στασιαζόντων

But, with Chilon advising these things, Hippocrates did not wish to be convinced; and afterwards Peisistratus was born to him, the one who, when there was factionalism . . . 1.59.3

Indeed, Herodotus' implication is that in not taking the sage's advice, Hippocrates brought troubles to the Athenians by fathering the tyrant Peisistratus. This
impression is conveyed through the description of the series of power-plays made by Peisistratus as he first wins and then secures his rule—efforts both embarrassing as well as destructive to the political unity of the Athenians (1.59.3 - 1.64 passim).

This use of this "relationship" (between the father and yet-to-be-born son) is quickly resumed within this same section, as the son, Peisistratus the tyrant, is shown trying to secure his power in Athens by marrying for political purposes, and then refusing to have "normal" sex with his wife, the daughter of his political rival Megacles (emisgeto hoi ou kata nomen, 1.61.1). Herodotus reveals that his aversion to intercourse is in large part motivated by his reluctance to father any sons by her:

Since he already had sons who were young men, and the Alcmeonidae were said to be cursed, and since he did not want any children to be born to him from his new wife ... 1.61.1

The importance Herodotus attaches to this theme in this first picture of Peisistratean Athens is certified immediately, for it is the affront which Megacles feels at his daughter being thus slighted by her new husband which
drives the father to make up with his old adversaries and thus gain the strength to drive Peisistratus back into exile. The ensuing pictures of Peisistratus conspiring with his sons to regain power and to secure it fit into the large father-son theme which is, after all, appropriate to a dynasty. We must notice that it is the repeated pictures of the characters' relationship with their sons—both unborn, "potential" sons, and full-grown ones—that introduce and sustain this digression on Athens.

In the extensive story of Cyrus and the Persians (1.95-140) there is another example of how Herodotus works into his narrative the theme of the severing of the bonds between a father and an as-yet unborn son. As in the example of Peisistratus, here, too, this theme is part of the larger father-son motif.

To examine how the theme of the unborn son is used in the story of Cyrus, let us first consider Herodotus' introduction to the rise of the Persian empire. The

10 The father-son relationship is further exploited in the actions of the exiled Peisistratus, who immediately holds a council in Eretria "with his sons" (hama toisi paisi, 1.61.2); next, when the tyrant seizes his moment and marches upon the resisting Athenians, it is specified that his masterful plan is to send his sons against the fugitives (anabibasas tous paidas epi hippous proepempe, 1.63.2); finally, to secure his power in Athens, he takes as hostages the sons of those citizens who had not fled at his approach (kai me autika phugonton paidas labon, 1.64.1).
initial paragraphs describing the line of Median kings tell of an unbroken succession of fathers and sons extending for four generations, from Deioces to Astyages.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, on the one hand, Herodotus is establishing the idea of continuity through the device of explicitly reporting on the father-son succession.

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖς Μιδοὺσι ἐγένετο σοφὸς τῷ οἴνῳμα ἦν Δημόκης, παῖς δὲ ἦν Ψραῶρτεω.} (1.96.1)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Δημόκεω δὲ παῖς γίνεται Ψραῶρτης, ὁς τελευτήσαντος Δημόκεω, βασιλεύσαντος τρία καὶ πεντήκοντα ἔτεα, παρεδέχατο τὴν ἄρχην.} (1.102.1)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ψραῶρτεω δὲ τελευτήσαντος ἐξεδέχατο Κυαξάρης ὁ Ψραῶρτεω τοῦ Δημόκεω παῖς.} (1.103.1)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἐκδέκεται δὲ Ἀστυάγης ὁ Κυαξάρεω παῖς τὴν βασιληὴν.} (1.107.1)
\end{quote}

We observe the use of the word \textit{paîs} in each of these notices, as well as the repetition of forms of \textit{teleutan} and \textit{dekesthai}. These usages serve to reinforce the idea of the establishment of a father-son continuity within the

\textsuperscript{11} Deioces, 1.96-101; Phraortes, 1.102; Cyaxares, 1.103; Astyages, 1.107 ff.
Medean kingship, and artfully reflect the language of genealogies.

On the other hand, a close reading reveals that Herodotus is at the same time inserting a tension into his narrative by setting up an opposition between this father-son continuity and a feeling of separation within and without this very relationship. To trace this subcurrent, we must examine two passages, the first of which directly precedes the introduction of the topic of Cyrus (1.95), the second of which comes from the description of Deioces’ rise to power (1.96-101).

After a few ethnological remarks, Herodotus chooses a curious event from distant Lydian history for the coda of the Lydia-logos. He tells of the circumstances behind the Lydian colonization of Tyrrhenia: there was a famine in Lydia, and the people devised certain games to while away their hunger. When the shortage continued, it was decided that half of the population should emigrate to a more fertile land. It is the manner of this migration that interests us. Herodotus specifies that it was the Lydian king, Atys (not to be confused with Atys, son of Croesus), who decided that it would be his own son, Tyrsenus, who would lead the colonists, half the population chosen by lots, away from their native land.12 The curiosity of

12 How and Wells, ad loc, op.cit., i.103: "cf. Livy v.34 for a similar migration to relieve overpopulation, and determined by lot: it is a usual motive in primitive
this expedient to relieve the famine (in combination with the odd picture of a people trying to assuage their affliction through gaming) is highlighted by its repetition at the very end of the Lydian-logos:

\[ \text{άντὶ δὲ Λυδῶν μετονομασθήναι αὐτοὺς ἔπι τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ παιδός, ὃς σφεασ ἀνήγαγε} \]

Instead of Lydians, they named themselves after the son of the king, who had led them. 1.94.7

This is a satisfying denouement to the food shortage story, to be sure, but we must notice that the severance of the bonds between the father Atys and the son Tyrsenus is not only part of the solution to the problem of famine on the narrative level, but also the motif around which this ultimate passage in the Lydia-logos is constructed. In this vignette, Herodotus thematically recalls the dominant father-son theme of the Croesus-logos, of course, but he also foreshadows the opening stories of the next logos, the rise of Persian power. This foreshadowing of separation serves as the first undercurrent of tension in the continuity we saw developed in the opening stories of the Persian history.

The second source of this tension of separation is not dependent on the father-son theme, but rather on the political posturing of the first Median king, Deioces. We
may briefly summarize Herodotus' utilization of the theme by citing his presentation of the Medes, newly revolted from Assyrian rule, as autonomous (eonton de autonomon panton ana ten epeiron, 1.96.1) and self-sufficient at first—as if the revolution were leaderless—and only then falling under the sway of Deioces. Deioces' rise to supremacy is cast in terms of a man whose goal is to gain as much power for himself, and at the same time to separate himself totally from the community. This feeling of separation is brought out in such passages as the descriptions of the bodyguard Deioces demands, his founding of the new royal city Ecbatana (with its seven-walled palace to keep him in seclusion even from the other Medes), and the tyrant's prohibition against his subjects approaching him (1.98-100). These elements of the rule of Deioces, then, contribute to the tension between the continuity of the father-son succession of early Median kings on the one hand (for which we need look no further than the smooth transition of the kingship from Deioces to his son Phraortes at 1.102.1), and the feeling of separation on the other.

This undercurrent of separation is soon brought to bear most fully when Herodotus reaches the accession of Astyages, for it is during this king's rule that the greatest separation occurs on the historical level: the sovereignty of Asia is lost to Astyages and the Medes, and
passes to Cyrus and the Persians. On the thematic level, the separation motif becomes the dominant one in the story of how Astyages loses his power to his grandson. Here we can return to the theme of the relationship between the father and the unborn son. In this story the part of Cyrus' father is shared, for whereas the biological father is the Persian Cambyses, who sires Cyrus through Mandane, daughter of Astyages, thematically the role of father is fulfilled by the Medean king Astyages himself, who is in fact the maternal grandfather of Cyrus. The theme of separation runs through both men's relationship with the son-figure Cyrus, although to a much greater degree for Astyages.

In the case of Astyages, the opening two chapters of his reign each describes a dream he has, and his consequent actions (1.107,108). In both instances, his response to a dream which portends that his daughter's offspring will enjoy great power (and thus deprive him of his own) is to try to sever the implicit relationship between himself and his future progeny. As Herodotus makes no mention of Astyages' children beyond his daughter Mandane, whom the king uses so callously, and as the potential offspring of this Mandane is presented as a potential inheritor of Astyages' power, the audience will have construed this expected offspring as the surrogate son of Astyages, an easy assumption in the context of a patrilineal dynasty.
And at the same time, we can recognize that since the father-figure Astyages is removed by one generation from the son-figure yet to be born to Mandane, there is already at hand a degree of separation between the two. This is enhanced after the first dream, when Astyages marries off his daughter to the Persian Cambyses, whom Astyages reckons to be of good family and gentle temperament, but of a lesser station than even a mediocre Mede (οἰκίες μὲν έοντα ἀγαθές, τρόπου δὲ ἑσυχίου, πολλοὶ ἐνέρθη ἀγον αὐτόν μεσού ανδρὸς Μεδοῦ, 1.107.2) Herodotus makes no mention of the fact that this Cambyses was in fact an Achaemenid king. His silence on this point reflects his thematic design: instead of presenting Astyages arranging a politically advantageous marriage for his daughter and cementing an alliance between Medes and Persians, Herodotus chooses to show the frightened king consigning his royal daughter to a life of obscurity, and similarly separating himself from the child she is to bear who portends trouble for the king himself.

After the second dream, and the increase of Astyages' fears, the narrative sustains the theme of separation. First, the dream is interpreted by the Magi in terms which suggest a father-son relationship between Astyages and his daughter's expected child. The holy men interpret his dream with words which recall the direct father-son succession of previous Medean kings (ὅ... γόνος
basileusein anti ekeinou, "the child will reign in his stead," 1.108.2). Next, in response to this premonition, Astyages fetches his daughter back from Persia and sets his minister--and relative (oikeion 1.108.3)--Harpagus as guard over her, waiting for the birth of Mandane's son, whom he is enjoined to kill (labé ton Mandane eteke paida, pheron de es seoutou apokteinon, 1.108.4). It must be pointed out here that in this removal of Mandane from Persia, her husband Cambyses, too, is physically separated from his expected son.

In the following scene, as Harpagus brings the boy home to his wife, the element of separation is brought to the fore, and on a larger scale:

Not even if he rants and goes crazier than he is now will I help him and commit this murder. For many reasons will I not kill him, both because the boy is my own blood, and because Astyages is old and has no son of his own . . .

Herodotus shows Astyages separated from the rest of humanity--which is by implication more reasonable and
sympathetic than the king—by the three powerful verbs of madness (paraphronesei, maneetai, mainetai) as well as by having Harpagus draw the connection between himself and the child which Astyages is so eager to sever. Moreover, the emphatic mention of Astyages’ lack of a son (apaia er senos gonou) reinforces the dramatic tension, for at the same time that Astyages has been presented in loco parentis, we are also reminded that he is not truly party to the literal father-son relationship.

This ambiguity in the relationship between Astyages and Cyrus is used throughout the story of Cyrus’ rise to power; it is interwoven with other father-son motifs to contribute to the dominance of the complex of father-son themes in this logos. Now that we have looked at Herodotus’ use of the father-unborn son motif, let us deepen our understanding of the entire logos by exploring the richness of its other father-son themes. For the sake of clarity we will remain close to the order of events as they occur in the narrative.

The rejection of Cyrus by Astyages, colored as it is by the ambiguity of their relationship, is thematically recalled in the narrative several times leading up to and including the reunion scene of 1.115ff. One way that Herodotus keeps the relationship between these two close at hand is by presenting other father-son relationships
with which the primary, severed one is implicitly contrasted.

The first example comes from Cyrus' infancy, after he has been rejected by Astyages. We have already observed the contrast between Astyages' prenatal/postpartum treatment of Cyrus, based on the king's fears of a potential loss of power, and the sympathetic refusal of Harpagus to do the king's murderous bidding. A further contrast is to be drawn from the whole-hearted, sentimental adoption of the rejected infant Cyrus by the herdsman Mitradates and his wife Spaco (1.111-113). Herodotus is concerned to present this adoption as more than simply fortuitous for the infant, adding the detail of the couple's simultaneous loss of their own son, who is stillborn. For the purpose of constructing a seamless plot, this detail is of course invaluable, in that a suppositious baby is now available for presentation to Astyages' agents. On the thematic level, however, it does much to continue the theme of the separation of Astyages from Cyrus, insofar as this humble couple is lovingly drawn by Herodotus in their grief at losing a son and then in their unexpected joy at finding one.

In the description of the reception of Cyrus by Astyages, and then in the boy's return to his biological parents in Persia (1.121,122), we see that the utility of the relationship between the foundling Cyrus and his
adoptive parents extends beyond the boy's infancy. Herodotus draws on it again to illustrate the gulf between this sympathetic relationship on the one hand, and, on the other, the abortive relationships between Cyrus and 1) the father-figure Astyages and 2) Cambyses and Mandane. In the first case, Herodotus presents an abashed Astyages trying to salvage some sort of bond with the boy whom he once tried to have killed. This uncomfortableness in the effort is reflected in at least two ways. First, Astyages is shown soliciting the temporizing Magi, with both parties trying to make the best of their former bad show in the matter of interpreting Astyages' dreams: Astyages' speech shows him now trying to win a reprieve from death for Cyrus, emphasizing that the boy has already reigned as king among his playmates; the Magi's response show them kowtowing to their lord, only too willing to adjust their interpretation to suit his preconceptions. This scene reveals the human weakness of Astyages, who implicitly regrets having done what he did with his grandson. Secondly, this weakness is highlighted in Astyages' next speech, specifically in his use of the vocative o pai (1.121.1). These are his first words to Cyrus after he recognizes him to be who he is. In the entire Histories, this is Herodotus' only usage of this vocative directed by one character to another who is not in fact a son. Indeed, the artifice of Astyages' vocative is further
exposed when we allow ourselves to hear the echo of a previous dialogue in which a character was addressed ὀ παί—the agon between Croesus and Atys, in which the reality of their father-son relationship was the thematic fulcrum of the drama. To sum up this point, then: in these two incidents, Astyages' conference with the Magi and his speech to Cyrus, Herodotus injects an element of discomfort to reflect the continued instability of the relationship between Astyages and Cyrus, which we have already seen to be drawn in father-son terms.

In the next scene, what we may tentatively term for our purposes the second banishment of Cyrus (1.122), Herodotus once again calls upon the strong, sympathetic relationship between Cyrus and his adoptive parents to reveal the weakness in the biological bond between Cyrus and his "real" parents. For Astyages' dismissal of Cyrus seems happy, it is true; but not only do the king's words, but also the reunion between Cyrus and his real parents, too, points up the respective separations. Astyages' sends Cyrus off with best wishes, but his final words set up the contrast between Cyrus' two sets of parents:

ελθὼν δὲ ἔκει πατέρα τε καὶ μητέρα εὐρήσεις οὐ κατὰ Μιτραδάτην τε τὸν βουκόλον καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

And when you get there, you'll find your father and mother, not at all Mitradates the herdsman and his wife.

1.121
These, the last words which Astyages addresses directly to Cyrus, ironically point out the ambiguity to which Astyages has subjected Cyrus, for at the same time that Cyrus, the mystery of his parentage unravelled, is bid to go to them in happiness (itti chairon, 1.121), it is this same duality of his parentage, in fact not at all resolved, which will soon incite the boy to revolt from Astyages. We can see that the doubts are left unresolved by Herodotus in the description of the reunion itself, for no sooner is Cyrus joyously received by Cambyses and Mandane than Herodotus redirects our attention away from this reunion back to the strongly-drawn bonds between Cyrus and his adoptive parents. Thus the description of the remainder of Cyrus' boyhood is not supplied here where we might expect it, but rather chapter 122 is filled with Cyrus' testimony to the positive upbringing he received at the hands of Mitradates and Spaco. In the final note of this passage Herodotus accounts for the legend that Cyrus was reared by a she-wolf, and pointedly attributes the origin of this legend to Cyrus' own parents, who opportunistically spread the rumour in an effort to convince the Persians that their son had been spared death by the gods' favor (hina theioteros dokeei toisi Perseisi perieinai sphi ho pais, 1.122.3). These parents then, in denying the true function of Spaco in Cyrus' infancy, are not attempting to draw themselves closer to their son, but
rather to sever the bonds between Cyrus and the people who lovingly reared him. In sum, by not devoting more than a passing glance at their reunion, by indicting Cambyses and Mandane for starting the rumor of Cyrus' salvation by a she-wolf, and by returning to a description of the strengths of Cyrus' relationship with Mitrdates and Spaco, Herodotus implicitly severs the bonds between Cyrus and his real parents. In this ultimate separation the stage is set for the revolt of Cyrus, who is to be persuaded on strict father-son grounds.\textsuperscript{13}

In these several ways, then, Herodotus keeps the severed father-son relationships of Cyrus in the foreground, establishing a thematic consistency with the historical events. Let us consider another father-son relationship which serves the same purpose.

The next example is drawn from Cyrus' boyhood, when he is lording it over his playmates as their chosen king, and in the process insults the pride of the son of a government official (1.114,115). Again Herodotus constructs a scenario which is necessary for the proper advancement of the plot - the young Cyrus must be hauled up in front of the authorities in order for the recognition scene to take place--yet Herodotus has depicted a scene which enhances the dominant father-son theme. Thus it is that Cyrus, alone, is cast opposite the

\textsuperscript{13} For which, see below, pp204ff.
father-son team of Artembares and his son. The offended boy has a father who can defend him, the two of them exist within a functional father-son relationship. This is to be taken in contrast to Cyrus, who must defend himself in front of his judge, the father-figure from whom he was severed, Astyages. This scene (1.114), which leads to the passages discussed above, not only advances the action, but, more importantly, depicts Cyrus positively as self-sufficient, yet painfully separated from the man with whom he ought to be most intimately bound, the father-figure Astyages.
For the past several pages we have been concerned with father-son themes as Herodotus uses them in the story of the rise of Cyrus. In all these examples, as well as those from Athens, we have seen that an understanding of the father-son theme can help to explain the actions which occur directly between the father-characters and the son-characters, whether or not these characters are in strict fact fathers and sons to each other, or even whether or not the sons are yet born. Let us turn to a couple of passages from elsewhere in the Histories to show how an understanding of this type of motif can, by illustrating the thematic background, help to reveal the causes and consequences of Herodotus' characters' actions.

At the very end of Book Six Herodotus describes how Miltiades captures Lemnos for Athens (6.137-140). This story makes a fitting close to Book Six, ending it on a note of glory for the hero Miltiades and Athens, before the final three books' description of the great war. What we find in this final story, however, is precious little that directly lauds the Athenians, but rather much that discredits the Lemnians, and thus only by default redounds to the glory of Athens. Specific to our investigation, we notice that two specific father-son motifs are used to this purpose, both of which we have seen Herodotus use previously: 1) the fathers' fears of their sons, specifically of losing power to their sons, impelling the
fathers to sever the bonds between them, and 2) the severance of the father-son bonds leading to a loss of the fathers' power. It may be added that these uses of the father-son theme at the end of Book Six are especially appropriate as a foreshadowing of the strong father-son atmosphere of the opening incidents of Book Seven.\textsuperscript{14}

After providing Hecataeus' and the Athenians' account of the Pelasgians' preliminary affronts to the Athenians and the Athenians' response of forcing them to resettle on Lemnos (6.137), Herodotus quickly launches into a description of the Lemnians' desire to be avenged over the Athenians, and their subsequent abduction and rape of the Athenian women to satisfy this vengeance. After these incidents, there is a natural sense break in the narrative (6.138.1)\textsuperscript{15}, and the story resumes with the Athenian women giving birth to the Lemnians' children. It is here that Herodotus introduces the father-son motifs, first by establishing a preliminary separation of the sons of the Lemenians from their peers\textsuperscript{16}:

\textsuperscript{14} For a discussion of which, see Chapter Four below, pp 209ff.

\textsuperscript{15} How & Wells, ad loc, op.cit., ii.123, remark that this story "may be a reminiscence of primitive customs, marriage by capture and exogamy." cf. the incidents of the prooemium, which are the same kind of thing. Perhaps this explains why there seems to be a break after 6.138.1--the primitive balance of insult-revenge has been met.

\textsuperscript{16} For the natural leadership of these Athenians asserting itself in their youth, cf. the young Cyrus taking power at age ten, 1.114.1.
The Athenian women taught their sons the Attic language and customs. The boys did not wish to mix with the sons of the Pelasgian women, and if any one of the Pelasgian boys struck one of their number, they all came to his aid and took vengeance for each other. These boys even claimed a right to lord it over the other boys, and they were more powerful by far.

6.138.2

This separation, until now only implicitly caused by the Pelasgians (insofar as they were guilty of rape, and the Athenian women's revulsion of them is thereby credible), and only functioning among the boys on the island, is next explicitly fostered by the Pelasgian fathers, and grows more ominous. For Herodotus introduces the element of fear of their own sons into the fathers' motivations. This is accomplished overtly by the content of the Pelasgians' reported speech, and overtly by its form: we notice that the fathers openly fear these sons of theirs by the Athenian women, and emotionally distance themselves.
from them, only in passing even acknowledging them to be their own sons:

And as they considered, something awful occurred to them: if these boys resolved to come to each other's aid against the sons of their lawfully-wedded wives, and moreover if they'd tried to rule over them, what then would they do when they'd grown to manhood? At this point they decided to kill their sons, the ones of the Athenian women.

6.138.3,4

Herodotus then reports that they did do this, and that they additionally killed these boys' mothers, almost as an afterthought (prosapolluoussu, 6.138.4). The murder of their own sons to which their fears had led them is so horrible an outrage that Herodotus puts it in the same league as the murder of their husbands by the Lemnian women of old (6.138.5); moreover, it inspires the revulsion of nature, as illustrated in the famine which follows the murders. This forces the Lemnians to consult the Delphic oracle, whose prophecy leads to the successful conquest of Lemnos by Miltiades (6.138.4-6.140). As we
have seen, by severing the bonds between himself and his son a father exposes himself to reversals of fortune. It follows that the murder of their own sons is the implied ultimate cause of the Lemnians’ loss of the very power which they feared their own sons would threaten. We thus see that Herodotus relies on father-son motifs to explain and even to justify the Athenian conquest of Lemnos.

For a final pair of examples of how the relationship between a father and his own son is exploited by Herodotus to provide a thematic background for an historical event, we turn back to Persian history, this time to Darius. The first example comes at the end of Book One, near the close of Cyrus’ life. On the eve of his attack of the Massagetae, Cyrus is visited by a dream in which the eldest son of his fellow-campaigner Hystaspes appears winged, shadowing both Asia and Europe with his wings. We notice the similarity of the dream motif here with Astyages’ presentiment of the loss of his power.17 Cyrus claims to know for certain that Darius is already guilty:

"Τοτασπέ, παῖς σος ἐπιβουλεύων ἐμοί τε καὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ἄρχῃ ἐάλωκε· ώς δὲ ταῦτα ἀτρεκέως οἴδα, ἐγὼ σημανέω. ἐμεῦ θεοὶ κύδουται καὶ μοι πάντα προδεικνύουσι τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα.

17 For Astyages’ dreams, see above, pp. 151ff.; for more on Cyrus’ dream, see below, p.191.
Hystaspes, your son has been caught plotting against me and my reign. That I know these things for certain I will demonstrate: the gods watch over me and reveal to me everything that will happen ... 1.209.3,4

Here we again notice the additional similarity to the response of Astyages to his premonitory dream, for in his fear over a loss of power to the son of Hystaspes, Cyrus bids Hystaspes return to Persia and sequester his son Darius until Cyrus' return after his anticipated victory over the Massagetae. Given that this fear of a loss of his power almost certainly leads a monarch to try to kill his putative challenger\(^{18}\), the effect of this command is to demonstrate that Cyrus intends to execute Darius. For the moment, we are not concerned with the fact that it is Cyrus who introduces the notion of the severance of the father-son bonds between Hystaspes and Darius. Let us rather examine Hystaspes' response to his lord's command.

In his speech, Hystaspes zealously demonstrates his allegiance to Cyrus, and shows himself perfectly willing to yield to Cyrus' wishes. Given what these wishes represent, Herodotus is implying that Hystaspes, either out of respect or fear for Cyrus, implicitly agrees to sever the bonds between himself and his son. Indeed,

\(^{18}\) Cf. Croesus' murder of Pantaleon, 1.92.3,4; Astyages' attempted murder of Cyrus, 1.108.4, and above, pp.150ff.; Cambyses' murder of Smerdis 3.30.3.
Hystaspes himself recommends death for any who threaten the king:

"Ω βασιλεῦ, μὴ εἴη ἀνήρ Πέρσης γεγονὼς ὡς τάχιστα τοι ἐπιβουλεύσει, εἰ δ' ἔστι, ἀπόλοιτο ὡς τάχιστα: ὡς ἀντὶ μὲν δούλων ἑποίησας ἐλευθέρους Πέρσας εἶναι, ἀντὶ δὲ ἄρχεσθαι ὑπ' ἄλλων ἄρχειν ἀπάντων. εἰ δὲ τίς τοι όψις ἀπαγγέλλει παίδα τὸν ἐμὸν νεώτερα βουλεύειν περὶ σέο, ἐγὼ τοι παραδίδωμι χρᾶσθαι αὐτῷ τοῦτο ὁ τι σὺ βούλεαί.

O king, may there not be born any Persian who might threaten you, but if there is, may he be killed as quickly as possible. You, who made us Persians free instead of slaves, who made us rulers of all instead of ruled by others. If some dream has told you that my son is plotting against you, I yield him to you to do with whatever you wish.

This willingness on the part of the father Hystaspes to sever the bonds from his son Darius, though it never directly comes to issue (for, as we shall see, Cyrus has doomed himself), nevertheless does have some bearing on the treatment Hystaspes receives for the duration of Darius' rule. That is to say, to the often-asked question why Darius reigned over the strongly patriarchal Persia, and thus pre-empted his father Hystaspes while the latter was still living, Herodotus in this passage seems to be insinuating an answer which tallies with his use elsewhere.
of this theme of the separation of fathers and sons. Although he never actually does it, by his willingness to forfeit the bonds between himself and his son, Hystaspes renders himself vulnerable to some sort of reversal of fortune, which in his case is represented by his being passed over in the rule of Persia. Herodotus bolsters this implication by his tacit suggestion that Hystaspes is fit to rule, as he is a member of the Achaemenidae (Hystaspeia de toi Arsameos, eonti andri Achaimenidei, 1.209.1), the royal family into which the king Cyrus was born.

We will remain with Darius and Hystaspes for our final illustration of the value of recognizing the thematic use of the relationship between a father and his own son in the context of an historical event. We turn to Book Three, in which the relationship between Darius and Hystaspes is oddly featured in Herodotus' description of the Persian conspiracy to overthrow the Magi. Although the relationship between Darius and Hystaspes is only mentioned three times, we shall find that Herodotus uses it with specific effect.

The first mention of the father-son relationship comes at the introduction of the seven conspirators, and is noteworthy in that it is the only introduction which is extended to include information about the father of the particular conspirator:
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γεγονότων δὲ τούτων ἐξ παραγίνεται ἔστα τα Σοῦσα Δαρεῖος ὁ 'Τοῦτάσπεος ἐκ Περσέων ἢκών τούτων γὰρ ἦν ὁι ὁ πατήρ ὑπαρχός.

And when there were six of them in Susa, Darius the son of Hystaspes showed up from Persia. For his father happened to be governor there. 3.70.3

The question which must be asked in this case as well as in the two following is why Herodotus includes this information on the father-son relationship. It certainly is not vital to the advancement of the plot, nor does it add anything which might enhance the audience’s understanding of the unfolding of events. What it does do, however, is contribute to the characterization of Darius, who is to be the major personality of the next three books. With this unusual mention of the relationship of Darius and Hystaspes as part of the introduction of Darius as a member of the conspirators—again, the only mention of a father among all the conspirators beyond the expected patronymics—Herodotus is recalling in substance and tone the unusual bond between these two men which was established back in Book One. What is unusual about it, it will be recalled, is that Hystaspes was quite prepared to sever the bond in the service of his king, even without any threat to himself. Additionally, in this introduction, Hystaspes is surely presented as the stronger of the two men. It seems that
Herodotus is hinting at the oddity of Darius' imminent rise to power vis-a-vis his living father by suppressing in his description the great power of Darius in favor of his father's established reputation. This is almost certainly the effect of the second mention of their relationship in this story. This comes after Herodotus has presented Darius as the most energetic of the conspirators, and the one who is most eager to be about the business of a coup d'etat. For in response to Darius' hasty call to arms, the cagey Otanes replies:

'O son of Hystaspes, you are of a brave father, and you are likely to show yourself no less a man than your father. But don't be in such a rush toward this attempt without any plan, but rather make the attempt with forethought.

Here again, Herodotus is emphasizing Hystaspes, father of Darius, at the expense of Darius himself—thus the dual use of the word pater in Otanes' speech, and his omission of the word pais where we would expect it (in the first clause). Indeed, the vocative o pai Hystaspeos itself is effectively ambiguous, for at the same time that Otanes means to compliment his hot-blooded co-conspirator, he is
also "putting him in his place" by focussing on his identity qua son of Hystaspes rather than as an independent entity in himself. This also explains why his compliments are directed at Darius' potential, not at his accomplishments to date: his potential is valued only insofar as it may match the greatness of his father. As might be expected, Darius does not agree with Otanes' cautiousness, and it is a sign of his displeasure at being thus treated that he threatens to denounce the lot of the conspirators to the Magi if they refuse to go along with his plan.

It is in Darius' answer to Otanes, in his explanation of his scheme, that we come to the third mention of the father-son relationship in this story. To understand this final mention, we must keep in mind the previous two passages, as well as recognize the tone of mystery and deceit in which the entire episode has been cloaked: from the surreptitious rule of the false Smerdis (3.61,62,67), to the distinctly un-fatherly stratagem of Otanes (in which he uses his daughter's sexual access to the royal person to ascertain his true identity, 3.68,69), to the Magi's attempted bribery of the true-hearted Prexaspes (3.74,75), to Oeobares' trick to make Darius' mare whinny first (3.85-87), the complex of stories surrounding the

\[\text{------------------------}\]

\[19\] Cf. Croesus' compliment to Cambyses, 3.34.5, which is cast in the same thematic terms. see above, p.57.
transition of power from Cambyses to Darius is marked by deception. This atmosphere of deception enhances Herodotus' characterization of Darius in that deceit is the pivot of his speech in response to Otanes' questions; for after Darius suggests that the conspirators will gain access to the palace on the strength of their rank alone, he goes on to say

\[ \text{τούτο δὲ ἔχω αὐτὸς σκῆψις εὐπρεπεστάτην τῇ πάρμεν, φᾶς ἄρτι τε ἔκειν ἐκ Περσέων καὶ βούλεσθαι τι ἔπος παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς σημῆναι τῷ βασιλεῖ. ἐνθα γὰρ τι δεῖ ψεῖδος λέγεσθαι, λέγεσθω.} \]

Moreover, I have the dandiest pretext by which we might gain entry: I'll say that I've just come from Persia and want to deliver a message from my father to the king. For when a lie must be told, let it be told.

3.72.3

In the actual event, there is no need for Darius to cite his relationship with Hystaspes to gain entry to the palace. Herodotus, in telling the story, knows that this will be the case. Yet he take pains to include the former two notices of Darius' father, as well as to put these words into Darius' mouth. We can begin to understand this inclusion by noticing that these words of Darius' speech lead him to a lengthy, philosophical justification of the practice of deceit (6.72.4,5), which is remarkable as much
for its sophistic rationalizations as it is for its direct contradiction to Herodotus' earlier remark on the honesty of the Persians (1.138.1). Yet a willingness to gain his ends at any cost is one of the hallmarks of Darius, recognized by the Persians in their characterization of him as a profiteer (legousin Persai hos Dareios men en kapelos . . . hoti ekapeleue panta ta pregmata, "the Persians say that Darius was a huckster, because he tried to make a profit on everything," 3.89.3). What we must recognize is that to begin this characterization of Darius as a trickster, Herodotus sets the preliminary action in the context of Darius' relationship with his father, and shows Darius prepared to use that relationship to his advantage not only in the context of his agon with Otanes, but also in the context of securing power. That is to say, Darius uses the same terms in which Otanes was trying, in effect, to belittle him, and transforms these terms into an agent of his own authority.

This particular father-son motif, in which a son conversationally manipulates the relationship to his own advantage, is rare in the Historiae, and the element of deceit on the part of Darius makes this passage unique. We may take it as a sign of his sensitivity to the oddity of Darius' rule during the lifetime of his father that

---

20 cf. Polycritus' jeer at Themistocles, 8.92.1, and see below, Appendix A.
Herodotus writes of the relationship between the two men in the thematic terms which we have observed.
Before we leave Persia, we shall consider another father-son motif which is used to powerful effect in this logos especially; we will then examine its use elsewhere in the Histories. This is the motif in which a person severs the bonds between others who are a father and a son. We have already taken a preliminary look at this motif in Chapter Two in our discussions of Cambyses as well as Demaratus and Cleomenes. In the former case, it will be recalled that the slaying of Prexaspes’ son before the very eyes of Prexaspes is a signal incident in Herodotus’ depiction of the monarch’s madness. In the latter case, a turning point in the relations between the two Spartan basileis is Cleomenes’ attempt to get revenge over Demaratus by bringing a charge against him of not being a legitimate son of Ariston.

We shall consider a few additional examples of this motif. As was the case with the motif of the father separating himself from his unborn son, so here, too, a character’s thirst for power and fear of losing it often motivate his action. This combination of motif and motivation figures in more scenarios than single characters’ actions within the familiar scope of a royal court or family. For example, before the battle at Lade, Herodotus reports that the Persians enjoin the refugee Ionian tyrants to win back the allegiance of their former ---------------

21 For Demaratus and Cleomenes, see above, pp.99ff.
constituents with promises of clemency, but to threaten them with severe reprisals should they refuse to capitulate (6.9.2): castration for the rebels' sons, deportation for their daughters, and the resettlement of foreigners on their lands. Herodotus does not specify which Persians make the threats, but rather vaguely mentions several sentences earlier that "the Persian generals" are in charge (hoi Perseon strategoi, 6.9.1). What is significant for us is the particular threat directed at the sons. It appears first in the tricolon, and is a reflection of the Persians' fear of the sons of the vanquished Ionians, who might rise up again in revolt against the crown. And indeed, after the battle at Lade, the Persians make good on the first two of their threats, which have to do with the children of their enemies: they castrate several boys, and send several girls to the king (6.32). Now for the purpose of our discussion we may as well state the obvious, that by castrating the sons of one's enemy, one safeguards one's power by precluding the possibility of the continuation of the feared father-son line. On the matter of the third threat, of resettlement of foreigners on the Ionians' land, Herodotus suggests the lesser concern of the Persians by including what seems an inconsistency: instead of carrying out their original threat, the Persians simply burn the Ionians' cities and temples. Thus Herodotus subtly reflects the priorities of
the Persians, who are most interested in securing their power and preventing another Ionian uprising.

In a similar vein, we turn to another, curious notice in the catalogue of satrapies in Book Three. Of the twenty satrapies, it is only "Babylon and the rest of Assyria" which, in addition to material wealth, provide eunuchs (3.92.1). The explanation for this exceptional burden may lie in the same Persian need to safeguard their power which motivated them to castrate the sons of the rebel Ionians. That is, if Herodotus' lengthy treatment of it be any indication (3.177ff.), the rebellion of Babylon no doubt loomed large in the Persian memory of recent history. The continual levying of 500 eunuchs would be a strong prophylactic against the rise of another rebellious Babylonian generation.²²

The story of Hermotimus' revenge over Panionios (8.104-106) may serve as our penultimate illustration of castration as an example of one man destroying the bonds between another and his sons.²³ A signal issue of this digression is the recently-won power of Hermotimus over his former tormentor, Panionios, and the manner in which Hermotimus exerts this power. He first forces Panionios to castrate his own sons, and then forces the sons to

²² Which does not seem to work, incidentally. Hence the second Babylonian revolt (3.150 ff).

²³ For Hermotimus, please see Appendix C.
treat the father similarly. On one level, the latter punishment exacted by Hermotimus is nothing more than an eye for an eye, for now Panionios is reduced to the same condition as that to which he formerly reduced Hermotimus. But in Panionios' forced castration of his own sons, Herodotus introduces an additional ironic element: Hermotimus certainly exerting his ultimate power over Panionios by preventing the continuance of his line by severing the ties between Panionios and his progeny. But it is specifically exaggerated since it is further represented by castration by the sons his own sons will never have.

To cite a final incident of castration which complements our theme and is clearly motivated by considerations of power, we turn to the digression on Corinth and Corcyra of Book Three, and the short notice of Periander's gift to Alyattes of 300 high-born Corcyraean boys, sent to be castrated. On the surface, Periander's choice of this gift is a reflection of the enmity between the Corinthians and the Corcyraeans, which Herodotus describes as ancient (aiei epeite ektisan ten neson eisi alleloisi diaphoroi heoutoi, 3.49.1). More specifically, by consigning the sons of the Corcyraeans to castration, Periander, like Hermotimus, exerts a dual punishment from his enemies. The first one is thematically equivalent to that which he himself suffered at the hands of the Corcyraeans when
they, out of fear of Periander, killed his son Lycophron (3.53.7); by sending away his gift to Alyattes, he, too severs the bonds between the Corcyraeans and their sons. Additionally, by sending the boys to be castrated, and thus precluding their potential fatherhood, he manifests his power, and the power of Corinth at large over the Corcyraeans into posterity.

These several examples of castration, then, illustrate one motif in which a man (Hermotimus, Periander) or men as a group (the Persians) sever the bonds between the enemy and the enemy's sons, born or unborn. As we have seen, Herodotus includes this motif often to demonstrate how a man manifests his need to secure or exert his power over another. As we return to the story of Cyrus, another type of motif will begin to emerge to fulfill a similar need.

Several pages ago the fearful dream of Cyrus was mentioned, as a result of which the king ordered Hystaspes to start the motions which would in all probability lead to the death of his son Darius. This passage was discussed with an eye to observing how Cyrus attempts to sever the bonds between a man and his son in an effort to secure his own power, which he perceived to be threatened because of his dream. Now we must recognize how this theme is enhanced and expanded on a larger scale.

24 See above, p.165ff.
in the narrative context of the final story of Book One, Cyrus' final expedition and death.

The campaign against the Massagetae is an event of paramount significance in Herodotus' narrative of Persian history. The enormousness of the task is reflected in the scope of the short digression which follows the statement of Cyrus' intent to conquer this nation in chapter 201. In addition to crediting the Massagetae with being "a great and fierce people," (to de ethnos touto kai mega legetai einai kai alkimon, 1.201), and reporting on several of their customs, Herodotus goes on to draw a picture of a vast territory, including the Caspian Sea and the wide plains to its east, against which Cyrus is determined to wage war (1.204.1). In the story of this fateful campaign (1.204-214), and especially at its crux, the death of Spargapises, Herodotus has carefully constructed a narrative which is a culmination of several themes which we have observed to be used throughout the first book of the Histories.

At the outset of the narrative Herodotus provides an impression of the respective strengths of the opponents Cyrus and Tomyris, leader of the Massagetae. As she is to cause the death of the great Persian, Herodotus takes pains to draw her character with care:

\[ \text{ἡμ} \]
\[ \text{δὲ τοῦ ἄνδρὸς ἀποθανόντος γυνὴ τῶν Μασσαγετέων βασιλείας·} \]
\[ \text{Tόμυρις οἱ ἦν οὔνομα.} \]
Since her husband had died, a woman was the queen of the Massagetae. Her name was Tomyris. 1.205.1

We see that in her first appearance, by mentioning her late husband first, and by predicating her rule on his death as if she were his proxy, Herodotus immediately draws her in terms which at the same time subordinate her as a woman to man, and impart to her a measure of masculinity, as well. This can be explained in two ways: 1) Whereas this story, in which Cyrus is punished for going "too far," is thematically enhanced by several exotic touches, including his adversary being a woman, nevertheless it is more seemly that if such a leader as Cyrus be laid low by a woman, she must be at least partly masculine.25 Her remarkable ferocity at the close of the story also is a function, in part, of Herodotus' desire to cast her as both outrageously exotic and familiarly, "masculinely" brutal.26 2) As we shall see, Cyrus' primary folly in his dealings with Tomyris will be his treatment of her son, and Tomyris' dominant motivation for killing Cyrus will be her rage at this treatment. Whereas the absolutely valid relationship between mothers and sons is

---

25 Thus Croesus' taunt that it would be unbearable for Cyrus to yield before a woman (1.207.5).

26 To her may be compared Pheretima, whose brutality at the end of Book Four is similarly highlighted to contrast with the character of her son Battis.
certainly included in the *Histories*, the major motifs which are used in this passage are most similar to those used in passages in which the relationship between fathers and sons is the centerpiece. That is to say, although Tomyris' actions are perfectly understandable as those of a mother, nevertheless the type of actions she performs, and the reasons for those actions, are those which Herodotus elsewhere presents as characteristic of fathers. (This also relates to reason 1 cited above.) This brings up a point which may be applied to the entirety of our investigation. The motives and acts attributed by Herodotus to fathers and sons are not psychologically more "masculine" than those of his female characters; for as we observe in this passage and elsewhere, Herodotus' women are capable of acts which can easily, popularly be described as masculine in their strength, resolve, etc., but which are in fact the acts of strong humans, regardless of gender. It is simply that the majority of actors in the history of the male-dominated Near East and eastern Mediterranean are men, are fathers and sons, and by association their deeds come to be identifiable as masculine. And so in this story, while we will see Tomyris functioning, in our terms, as a father figure, there is no need to deprive her of her woman-ness.

---

27 E.g. Cambyses and Cassandane, 3.3; Demaratus and his mother, 6.68-69; the robbers of Rhampsinitus' treasury and their mother, 2.121.
Herodotus quickly contributes another element to Tomyris' character after the introductory sentence quoted above. Following the mention of Cyrus' fallacious strategic suit of her, Herodotus describes Tomyris' snappy rejection:

"η δὲ Τόμυρις, συνειδότα ὡκ
αὐτὴν μὲν μυσώμενον ἄλλα τὴν Μασσαγετέων βασιλείαν,
ἀπείπατο τὴν πρόσοδον."

Tomyris, knowing that it was not she whom he was wooing but rather the kingship of the Massagetae, dismissed the embassy. 1.205.1

The terms of this description attest to Tomyris' cleverness, a quality which is augmented by something even more substantial as she sends her counterproposal to Cyrus. For in Tomyris' speech, in which she suggests that either one or the other army retire from the Araxes in preparation for an engagement, Herodotus significantly adds to her depiction with the following:

"Ω βασιλεὺς Μῆδων, παῦσαι σπεύδων τὰ
σπεύδεις· οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἶδεῖς εἰ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἵνα ταῦτα
τελέομενα· παυσάμενος δὲ βασίλευς τῶν σεωτοῦ καὶ ἡμέας
ἀνέχειν ὅρεων ἄρχοντας τῶν περ ἄρχομεν· οὐκ ὡς ἐθελήσεις
ὑποθήκησαι τὴν τε χράσθαι, ἄλλα πάντως μᾶλλον ἡ δὲ
ἡσυχίας εἶναι."

O king of the Medes, stop rushing what you are rushing. For you cannot know whether these things, once they have come to their conclusion, will have
been done seasonably. Rather, ceasing your efforts, go rule what is yours, and bear to see us ruling whatever it is we rule. But you will not heed this advice, and would rather anything than peace.

1.206.1,2

By her use of the key word teleomena, by her cognizance of the unpredictability of things, and mostly by her general attitude, Tomyris is depicted by Herodotus as having a share in Solonic wisdom, the getting of which has been featured so prominently in the entire first book of this work.

This important first impression of Tomyris is to be contrasted with what is revealed about Cyrus in Herodotus' description of the spirit in which he undertakes his ambitious campaign. Instead of presenting a sane and balanced rationale for his expedition, Cyrus is said to be motivated by reasons which are clearly in opposition to the positive ones displayed by Tomyris:

πολλά τε γάρ μιν καὶ μεγάλα τὰ ἐπαείροντα καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα ἢν, πρῶτον μὲν ἡ γένεσις, τὸ δοκεῖν πλέον τι ἐστὶς ἄνθρωπον, δεύτερα δὲ ἡ ἐντυχία ἢ κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους γενομένη ὡκὴ γὰρ ἵστειε στρατεύε-σθαι Κῦρος, ἀμφίχανον ἢν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔθνος διαφυγεῖν.

Many things raised his hopes and urged him on: first there was his birth, which seemed to be more than
human. Next there was his great fortune against his enemies, for withersoever Cyrus drove his army, it was impossible for his enemies to escape. 1.204.2

Both of Cyrus' motivations, then, are clearly incongruous with the model of human wisdom presented by Herodotus sua voce in the prooemium (1.5.3,4), by the quintessential sage Solon (1.32), and, in the following sentences (discussed above) by Tomyris. When we consider the close juxtaposition of Cyrus' and Tomyris' attitudes, it becomes apparent that Herodotus is purposefully setting up this contrast as part of the thematic substructure of this episode. This suggestion is strengthened in the scene following Tomyris' message to Cyrus, when the Persian calls together his lieutenants to take counsel on whether to do battle on the near or far side of the Araxes. Most of his staff recommends awaiting the Massagetan army, but Croesus conspicuously dissents from the majority opinion in a speech that is laden with philosophical terms. Much of what Croesus says thematically answers Herodotus' description of Cyrus' motivation, such as in this, one of Croesus' first arguments:

εἰ μὲν ἀθώνατος δοκεῖς εἶναι καὶ στρατηγὸς τοιαῦτης ἀρχεῖς, οὐδὲν ἂν εἰς πρᾶγμα γνώμας ἔμε σοι ἀποφασίσασθαι· εἰ δ' ἔγνωκας ὅτι ἄνθρωπος καὶ σὺ εἰς καὶ ἔτερων τοιῶν ἀρχεῖς, ἐκείνο πρῶτον μάθε ὡς κύκλος τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐστὶ πραιμάτων, περιφερόμενος δὲ οὐκ ἐὰν αἰεὶ τοὺς αὐτούς εὐτυχεῖν.
If you think that you are immortal and that you command an army of the same nature, then my opinions will be worth nothing to you. But if you realize that even you are a man, that you command men, then first learn this, that there is a circle of human affairs, and as it spins around it does not permit the same people always to come out on top. 1.207.2

These thoughts of Croesus directly contradict what Herodotus has just told us about Cyrus' self-view, and since Croesus' words (as did Tomyris') echo Herodotus' own philosophy, it is clear that Cyrus' views themselves are in direct opposition to the dominant philosophy of the book—a situation which is, it seems, fitting for this climactic, didactic episode.

Working alongside the philosophical themes in the opening chapters of this story is the notion of limitations. Briefly stated, Tomyris and Cyrus display disparate views of the nature of setting limits to human ambition. Cyrus is obviously prepared to go to any lengths (and this is reflected in the setting of this episode, the farthest reaches of Asia), while Tomyris is wisely aware of the boundaries of her domain and of human endeavor. The abusing of limits, as represented by Cyrus'
crossing of the Araxes river, is symbolic of the Persian's willful ignorance of the ways of fortune.

We now come to the range of father-son themes. In general, it is implicitly introduced with the character Croesus himself, in this, his first reappearance in the narrative since his conference with Cyrus over the Lydian revolt (1.155). It will be recalled that the major themes of that previous passage (as, of course, of the extended Croesus-logos) were fathers and sons and gender ambiguity.²⁸ It seems likely that the audience will easily have associated Croesus with those same themes in this current passage. Thus it is appropriate that it is Croesus who cites the following reason to Cyrus for carrying he battle across the Araxes to Massagetan territory:

It would be shameful and unbearable for Cyrus, son of Cambyses, to yield and retreat before a woman.

We have already discussed this passage in a different context,²⁹ but it bears mentioning again here that in the content and construction of this sentence, Croesus is

²⁸ For gender ambiguity in the Croesus-logos, see above, pp.25 and 52ff.

²⁹ See above, p.56
exploiting the father-son theme (by reminding Cyrus of his patriliny, which he must live up to) as well as the threat to Cyrus’ masculinity (by the situation itself, as reflected in the juxtaposition of Cyrus’ name and the word gunaikí). It follows that it is the potency of this dual consideration which motivates Cyrus to action.

The final part of Croesus’ speech introduces the last important motif of this episode, and again it is appropriate that it come from Croesus. As the Lydian demonstrated to Cyrus earlier (1.155), soft living crushes the manly spirit of a people, and Croesus’ stratagem for subduing the Massagetan troops relies on tempting the primitive Massagetae with the sine qua non of soft living, a full-blown banquet, at which he predicts they will uncharacteristically sate themselves and thus render themselves vulnerable to attack (1.207.6,7). Beyond the motif of the banquet,30 the heart of Croesus’ plan is that the Massagetae, exposed to dangerous new things, will not know their own limits, and in overstepping them will expose themselves to death. This is a wisdom which of course has application to Croesus’ former situation, but more importantly must here be equally applied to Cyrus as he fatally decides to cross the Araxes.31 Yet at this

30 For the banquet motif, see below, pp.197ff.

31 This lesson is the one to which Herodotus turns at the very end of the Histories (9.122). After the defeat of the Persians by the Greeks, and in the mood of sadness and
point, Cyrus is evidently growing in wisdom, as he accepts the advice of the "wise advisor" Croesus. This partial wisdom of Cyrus is again displayed in the following scene, as we shall see presently.

Before the crossing and the implementation of the plan, Herodotus adds certain details which contribute to the thematic richness of this story. Directly before the crossing, these details are subtly inserted:

Κύρος δὲ

Κροῖσον ἐς τὰς χεῖρας ἐσθεῖς τῷ ἐωτοῦ παιδὶ Καμβύσῃ, ἕῳ περ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐδίδου, καὶ πολλὰ ἐντειλάμενος οἱ τιμᾶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἢν ἡ διάβασις ἢ ἐπὶ Μασσαγέταις μὴ ὤρθωθί, ταῦτα ἐντειλάμενος καὶ ἀποστείλας τούτους ἐς Πέρσας αὐτὸς διέβαινε τὸν ποταμὸν

Cyrus put into the hands of Croesus his own son Cambyses, whom he’d made heir of the kingship, and strictly ordered him to honor and do well by him, should the crossing against the Massagetae not go well. Ordering these things and sending them off to Persia, he crossed the river... 1.208.1

Confusion of the final several chapters of Book Nine, Cyrus is presented in a flashback in possession of the wisdom to know his own limits. It is a beautiful touch that Herodotus shows Cyrus counseling the Persians against soft living, the temptation to which was at the heart of Cyrus’ greatest plan, to overcome the Massagetae. At the end of the work, Cyrus is shown finally to know his limits, as he did not yet know when he was filled with the flush of his first, partial victory over the Massagetae.
First, Cyrus is here revealed to be perfectly willing to be exposed to the possibility of separating himself from his son (an attitude which in the entirety of Book One we have recognised to be an harbinger of loss). The action described in the first sentence thematically reinforces this idea, as he is shown putting his son into the hands of Croesus; the idea of separation is mirrored in the distance between the words Kyros and toi heotutou paidi Kambysei, separated by the bulk of the clause's verbiage. And yet at the same time, to display Cyrus' partial wisdom, Herodotus cites the king's acknowledgment that his attack may not turn out as he hopes and his insistence, should he be killed, that his son be well cared for. Beyond these elements of the narrative itself, we must recognize the significance of Herodotus' choice of the father-son relationship as the kernel of Cyrus' ultimate declaration before his crossing; we must also acknowledge the implication of having this relationship introduced by Croesus, for whom the father-son theme is by now a calling card, and of using this relationship again in the story of Cyrus, for whom, as we have seen, the father-son relationship has been purposefully used previously. This choice of theme and characters must be seen as indicative of the author's intention to connect this story to the entirety of Book One, an impression which is strengthened
in the light of the pivot of the action, the upcoming death of Spargapises, son of Tomyris.

That the theme of the separation of father and son is indeed meant to be of central significance is reflected in the action which occurs directly after the crossing of the Araxes. Here it is that Cyrus is visited by his dream, in response to which he initiates the separation of Hystaspes and his son Darius. We have already considered this passage\(^{32}\) in our discussion of how Herodotus uses the separation of a father from his own son. Now, however, to view it in another light, we observe that Herodotus is trying to show a Cyrus who is caught between incipient wisdom (as demonstrated by his accepting Croesus' advice, and his recognition that he may meet with defeat), and the folly of a willingness to sever father-son bonds, first between himself and Cambyses, now between Darius and his son Hystaspes. Seen from this perspective, the entr'acte of chapters 209 and 210 does much to certify the importance of the father-son theme. We can now view all of the chapters leading up to 211, in which Croesus' plan is put into action, as thematic foreshadowing of the major events of the story: 204/205/206 present the protagonists Tomyris and Cyrus with an eye toward their differing philosophical views; 207 presents Croesus tempering the view of Cyrus, introducing the father-son theme and the

---

\(^{32}\) For Cyrus' dream, see above, p.165ff.
banquet motif, which in turn reemphasises the notion of limits introduced in 204-6; 208 shows Cyrus severing the bonds between himself and his son, and 209/210 severing the bonds between Hystaspes and his son.

We finally come to the confrontation between the Persians and the Massagetans, which functions as a dramatic climax, and the drama of which is ensured by the prefatory remark that Cyrus has indeed crossed the Araxes and advanced (1.211.1). As planned, the Massagetans, after slaughtering the weak part of the Persian army left behind as a decoy, fall to the feast, overeat and drink (for they do not know their limits), and are then attacked from ambush and killed in large numbers by the Persians. Among the many captives is Spargapises, son of the queen Tomyris (1.211.3).

In this passage we see that Herodotus begins to narrow the narrative perspective to the two leaders, Cyrus and Tomyris, with the son Spargapises functioning as a catalyst for the action. This is the explanation of the description of the banquet and counter-attack, in which the tension builds to the mention of Spargapises after he is described as the son of Tomyris:

οἱ δὲ Περσαι ἐπελθόντες πολλοὺς μὲν σφευρὸν ἐφύσεσαν, πολλῷ δὲ ἔτι πλεῦνας ἐξωγρησαν, καὶ ἄλλους καὶ τὸν τῆς βασιλείας Τομύρως παιδα, στρατηγέουτα Μασσαγετέως, τῷ οἴνουμα ἤν Σπαργαπίσης. ἢ δὲ πυθομένη τὰ τε περὶ τὴν στρατϊήν γεγονότα καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν παιδῶν
The attacking Persians killed many of them, and they took alive even more by far, among them the son of the queen Tomyris, whose name was Spargapises. And when she learned what had happened to the army and to her son . . . 1.211.3-212.1

This is the first mention of Spargapises, and he quickly becomes the focus of Tomyris’ attention, as she sends a message to Cyrus, at the core of which is her relationship with her son, whom she demands back. But we must notice that at the beginning of her message Herodotus demonstrates her wisdom, as she eloquently and pointedly pronounces that the success of the Persians has been wholly dependent on the effect of the wine. In expressing her rage at Cyrus, she recalls the banquet by abusing Cyrus for his reliance on the "grape juice" to trick her son, rather than on a fair fight (1.212.2). This motif of banqueting, specifically drinking, is brought into high relief with her ultimate threat against Cyrus:

```
ἀποδοὺς μοι τὸν παῖδα
ἀπιθι ἐκ τῆς τῆς χώρης ἀξίμιοι, Μασσαγετέων τριτημορίδι τοῦ στρατοῦ κατυβρίσας· ηὔ ταῦτα οὐ ποιήσεις,
ἤλιον ἐπόμνυμι τοι τῶν Μασσαγετέων δεσπότην, ἢ μέν σε ἔγω καὶ ἀπληστὸν ἑώντα αἵματος κορέσω.
```
Give my son back to me and get out of this country, unharmed, even though you have insulted a third of the Massagetae army. But if you do not, I swear by the Sun, lord of the Massagetae, that I shall sate you, though you are insatiable, with blood. 1.212.3

This is a potent mixture of the relationship with her son, the motif of banqueting, and the idea of a limit (satiety) about to be violently passed. But following the precedent of his former ignorance (his severing of the bonds between himself and Cambyses and Hystaspes and Darius; his overstepping his limits and crossing the Araxes) we know that Cyrus is here fated to display the same ignorance. It is no surprise, therefore, that Cyrus not only fails to return her son to Tomyris, but rather allows Spargapises to take his own life, thus severing himself from his mother. This suicide is of course the final symbol of Cyrus' ignorance of the inviolability of the bond between parent and son; by allowing it to occur, in the context of asserting his power over another (that is, the context of a military conquest), Cyrus has doomed himself. This is reflected in the structure of the opening sentence of chapter 214, in which the final battle takes place:

καὶ δὴ οὗτος μὲν τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ τελευτᾷ, Τόμυρις δὲ, ὡς οἱ Κύρος οὐκ ἐςήκουσε, συλλέγασα πᾶσαν τὴν ἐωτής δύναμιν συνέβαλε Κύρῳ.
In such a fashion did he die, but Tomyris, since Cyrus did not obey her, collected her whole force and attacked Cyrus.  

The men and de clauses of this sentence certify the cause/effect relationship of the death of Spargapises and the attack of Tomyris, as their main verbs teleutai and sunebale suggest.

In the manner of Cyrus’ death Herodotus dramatically conflates the dominant motifs of the episode. First, the notion of limits is again introduced, this time in the superlative which is used to describe the battle between the Massagetae and the Persians, which Herodotus says was the most fierce ever fought between foreigners (krino ischurotaten genesthai, 1.214.1). Again, the limit of Cyrus’ satiety, and the motif of banqueting, are used in the victory speech of Tomyris:

Σὺ μὲν ἐμὲ ζωσάν τε καὶ νικῶσάν
σε μάχῃ ἀπόλεσας παιδα τὸν ἐμὸν ἐλὼν δόλῳ: σὲ δ’ ἐγώ,
κατὰ περ ἡπείλησα, αἳματος κορέσω.

You have destroyed me, even though I am alive and victorious in battle, for you have taken my son, by a trick. But, just as I threatened, I have sated you with blood.
The very rare verb koreo is used twice in this episode, and with it Herodotus strikingly drives home via the motif of banqueting the idea of a limit surpassed. But by far the dominant idea of this entire episode has become the price Cyrus pays for the severing of the bonds between Tomyris and Spargapises. In breaking their relationship, Cyrus has done no more than he has shown himself prepared to do elsewhere; in thus constructing the story of the death of the first great Persian king, Herodotus has both borrowed from the precedent of earlier Asian history (Croesus) and established a precedent for the heirs of Cyrus' throne, a precedent which we have already seen to be followed throughout the Histories.

---

33 It is only used one other time in the Histories, passively, and with much less effect, at 3.80.3.
The vivid picture of the bereft parent Tomyris immersing the severed head of her enemy Cyrus in his own blood, in retribution for the fatal feast of which he forced her lost son to partake, is one which derives its potency in part from the long, dark association in the Greek mind of banqueting and death.\(^\text{34}\) Herodotus combines this motif of a death feast with the theme of fathers and sons in several passages in the *Histories*.

The Persian conquest of Egypt, and the depiction of the madness of Cambyses (to which are devoted the first thirty-eight chapters of Book Three), as we have seen, are in several places highlighted by incidents in which the father-son theme is paramount.\(^\text{35}\) Indeed, we may here point out that with the first reason Herodotus provides for Cambyses' invasion of Egypt (beyond his inheritance of the designs of Cyrus, 1.153.4), the father-son theme is already introduced: Cambyses was tricked by one of his ministers, an anonymous Egyptian physician, who wished his former lord Amasis to be attacked because he had sent him to Persia, having torn him away from his wife and children.

---

\(^\text{34}\) This connection is at least as ancient as the earliest *mythoi*. The story of Tantalus serving the flesh of his son Pelops to the gods is a well-known example. cf. Aly, op. cit., p.50ff. "Atreusmahl."

\(^\text{35}\) This passage has already been introduced in the context of the Madness of Cambyses; please see above, pp.66ff.
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The actual Persian plan of attack is formulated by another of Cambyses’ ministers, Phanes by name, who, like his anonymous predecessor, had left Egypt for Persia with a grudge (3.4.1). It is this Phanes who not only reveals to Cambyses all of the secrets of his former king Amasis, but also devises the method by which the invading force crosses the waterless desert (3.4.3). In the description of what Phanes provokes by these actions, Herodotus combines the motif of a death feast with the theme of securing power for oneself by breaking the bonds between another and his son.

In anger against Phanes for leading a foreign army against Egypt, the Greek and Carian mercenaries in the service of the Egyptian king Psammenitus (son of the now-deceased Amasis) take their revenge upon Phanes in one of the most gruesome descriptions in the entire work.

---

36 It is interesting to note that in attributing Phanes’ defection from Egypt to familial reasons, specifically ones which have to do with his separation from his [wife and] children, Herodotus makes his story thematically conform with the pattern which we have observed in the personal stories of the other two important foreign ministers to the Persian crown of the latter books: Democedes’ absence from Greece is attributed to a falling out with his father (see above, p.88ff.); Demaratus fled Sparta because his legitimacy as a son of Ariston was publicly questioned (see above, p.99ff.). Immerwahr (F&T, p.94) notices the parallel among these three of the foreign advisor starting a quarrel between countries, but does not mention the similarity of their personal histories.
Phanes had sons who had been left in Egypt, whom they [the Carian and Greek mercenaries] led into the camp, and in front of the very eyes of their father they set up a bowl midway between the two camps; and then leading them to it, they slew the sons one by one over the bowl. When they'd gone through all the sons, they poured wine and water into the bowl, and then, all the men having drunk the blood, they went into battle.

3.11.2,3

The relentless parataxis of this description, the ironic blandness of the introductory dative of possession\(^{37}\) in contrast with the ominously pendant participle kataleleimmenoi, the emphatic mention that the entire spectacle was conducted \(\varepsilon\alpha \varphi\iota \varsigma \tau o u \pi a d \varsigma, \kappa \sigma \tau o \tau e \varsigma, \) and \(\kappa e \tau e r,\) the repetition of the words \(p a i d e s, \sigma t r a t o p e d o n, \) and \(\kappa r e t e r,\)

\(^{37}\) Cf. the similar effect of the dative of possession at 1.30.4 (Tellus), see pp.19 and 215; and cf. 1.34.2 (Croesus).
all demonstrate Herodotus' revulsion at this almost unbelievable deed. In the description of the battle which follows this death-feast, which may for its ferocity recall the unprecedented battle between the Persians and Massagetae (1.214.1), we are reminded that both of these battles are surrounded by similar circumstances of feasting. In the current passage, the fighting is unusually fierce:

τοῦ αἵματος πάντες οἱ ἐπίκουροι οὕτω δὴ συνέβαλον. μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερῆς καὶ πεσόντων [ἐξ] ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατοπέδων πληθεὶ πολλῶν ἐτράποντο οἱ Αιγύπτιοι.

A mighty battle was fought, and a great number of men from both sides fell, before the Egyptians retreated.

3.11.3

We are left to wonder why Herodotus cast his description of this entire incident in such vivid, horrific terms, with its emphasis on the severed bonds between Phanes and his sons. The answer may lie in our understanding of the morality of the father-son relationship as we have seen it applied elsewhere. By examining Herodotus' indictment of Phanes' various caprices, we learn how the author shapes this character, utilizes the father-son theme, and builds to the climax of the blood feast and slaughter.

Herodotus introduces the Halicarnassian mercenary Phanes with a description of his capricious defection from Amasis and flight to Cambyses:
houtos ho Phanes memphomenos kou ti Amasi ekidreskei ploioi ex Aiguptou, boulomenos Kambusei elthein es logous.

This Phanes, finding fault for some reason or other with Amasis, fled Egypt by ship, wishing to get an audience with Cambyses.

3.4.2

This indictment is continued in the reason cited for the reaction of the Greek and Carian mercenaries whom Phanes left behind in Egypt. Whereas the reaction itself is outrageous, the reason for it is perfectly understandable;

Then the Persians ... took up their position near Egypt in order to make their attack, at which point the Egyptian mercenaries, Greek and Carian men, finding fault with Phanes because he had led a foreign army against Egypt, devised this plan against him.

3.11.1

To embolden his point, Herodotus purposefully repeats from the previous passage the word memphomenoi, calling attention to the legitimacy of the mercenaries' anger, and thus certifying the accountability of Phanes. It is in the following sentence, cited above, that Herodotus...
introduces the anonymous sons of Phanes, and in so doing reveals Phanes as maximally culpable for having abandoned them. In sum, Phanes, in originally deserting Amasis, to whom he was bound as a soldier, in leading a foreign army against Egypt, and, most importantly, in abandoning his own sons in Egypt, fatefully demonstrated his ignorance and willingness to leave the bonds between himself and his sons vulnerable to severance. Thus he is punished, and loses his sons.

On the other side, the Greeks and Carians are guilty of breaking the bonds between Phanes and his sons, and so they, too, are liable. It is here that we can appreciate the function of the horror of Herodotus' description of the mercenaries' revenge. First, we observe that the particular form of revenge taken by the mercenaries thematically answers the affront they endured from Phanes, who led the foreign army against them. That is, Herodotus earlier demonstrated that the primary obstacle to a Persian invasion of Egypt was the waterless desert, with its implicit threat of dehydration to whoever should attempt a crossing. Phanes played a primary role in overcoming this hurdle:

δὲ στρατεύεσθαι Καμβύση ἐπ’ Αἰγυπτών καὶ ἀπορέοντι τὴν ἑλασίν, ὅκως τὴν ἀνυδρον διεκπεραῖ, ἐπελθὼν φράζει μὲν καὶ τάλλα τὰ Ἀμάσιος πρήματα, ἐξηγεῖται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἑλασίν, ὡδὲ παραμένειν.
When he arrived, finding Cambyses planning to attack Egypt but at a loss over how to manage the crossing of the waterless desert, Phanes not only told him the secrets of Amasis, but also explained how to make the crossing, recommending that ... 3.4.3

The solution to the desert crossing necessarily involved the securing of fluids to drink, and it is a stroke of Herodotus' genius that he exploits the mercenaries' revenge within the same thematic context. By emphasizing the outrageousness of their slaughter of Phanes' sons, by artfully drawing out the letting of their blood, the mixing of it with wine and water, and the drinking of it, Herodotus certifies the premeditated culpability of the mercenaries.

This enhanced guilt on the mercenaries' part, coupled with the guilt of Phanes, explains the unusual ferocity of the subsequent battle. That the mercenaries in the service of Egypt lose the battle and allow the entrance of the invading Persians into Egypt is simply a matter of history, but their loss in such a set of circumstances as Herodotus describes answers to the morality of the father-son relationship, as well as paves the way for the ensuing familial distortions of the madness of Cambyses.36

---

38 Immerwahr (F&T, 167-169) discusses the dynastic aspect of Cambyses' behavior, and suggests that the many stories in Book Three dealing with the destruction of children are used to underline the motif of "the importance of the destruction of offspring for the whole
The motif of feasting is coupled with the severing of fathers and sons twice in Book One, in incidents which are concerned with Cyaxares and his son, Astyages. In the former instance (1.73) the suppliant Scythians at the Medean court, severely chastised by Cyaxares for failing to bring home game one day, take revenge on their host by serving him at table one of the paides whom he had put in their charge. As I suggested in the earlier discussion of this passage,39 this anonymous boy may be construed as a son of Cyaxares. This impression is strengthened by the violence of Cyaxares' reaction to the refusal of Alyattes to extradite the refugee Scythians (1.74.1)--he goes to war against the Lydians.

In a passage of greater length and fame, another victim of the banquet of Thyestes also precipitates a war in reaction to the meal he is served. This is, of course, Harpagus, on whom Astyages takes revenge for his failure several years previous to execute his order to kill the newborn Cyrus. The revenge is to serve Harpagus at table his own son. In this passage, however, as in the story of

____________________

course of Persian empire." This does not exactly fit with what Herodotus tells us about the favor the Persians traditionally show to the sons of defeated enemy kings. (also see Action, 25, n.19 - contrast of great and petty generations; Causation 258, n.30. For the idea of an "inherited" war, see Causation 260, n.37)

39 See above, pp.38ff.
the slaughter of the sons of Phanes, Herodotus lingers over the horrible death feast.

\[ \text{"Astyagns } \delta \varepsilon, \, \omega \varsigma \, \iota \, \alpha \pi \kappa \kappa \epsilon \tau o \, \theta o \nu \, \alpha \nu \tau o n \, k a i \, k a t a \, m e l e a \, d i e l w n \, t \alpha \, m e n \, \omega p t h s e, \, t \alpha \, d e \, \eta \psi \psi s e \, t o w \, k r e w n, \, e u t u k a \, d e \, p o i n - s a m e n o s \, e i x e \, [e t o i m n a], \, e p e i t e \, d e \, t h s \, \omega r h s \, n y n o m e n h s \, t o u \, d e i p n o u \, p a r h s a n \, o i \, t e \, a l l o i \, d a i t u m o n e s \, k a i \, o \, "A r p a g o s, \, t o i s i \, m e n \, a l l o i s i \, k a i \, a u t o \, "A s t y a g e i \, p a r e t i d e a t o \, t r a p e z a i \, e p i p l e a i \, m i l e w n \, k r e w n, \, 'A r p a g w \, d e \, t o u \, p a i d o s \, t o u \, e w u t o u, \, p l i n \, k e f a l h s \, t e \, k a i \, \acute{a} k r o w n \, c h e i r o w n \, t e \, k a i \, p o d o w n, \, t a l l a \, 'a n t a \, t a u t a \, d e \, c h w r i s \, e k e i t o \, e p i \, k a n e f \, k a t a k e k a l y m m e n a. \]

When the son of Harpagus arrived, Astyages slaughtered him and, cutting him up into pieces, he roasted some pieces, and boiled others, and getting everything prepared, he kept it ready... For all the other guests and for Astyages were set out tables full of mutton, but for Harpagus, the table was filled with the flesh of his own son, all of it except for the head and the fingertips and feet, which were laid aside in a covered basket.

1.119.3,4

Harpagus' immediate response to the revelation that he has eaten his own son is subdued, but in his subsequent conspiracy with Cyrus, Herodotus makes it clear that he well remembers the treatment he received at the hands of Astyages. This is brought out in at least three places.
First, when Cyrus grows to manhood, Herodotus describes Harpagus' feelings:

Κύρον δὲ όρέων
ἐπιτρεφόμενον ἐποιεῖτο σύμμαχον, τὰς πάθας τὰς Κύρον τῆς ἐωτοῦ ὀμοιούμενος.

... seeing Cyrus grown to manhood, he tried to make him an ally, likening what Cyrus had suffered to what he, himself, had also suffered. 1.123.1

On the most apparent level, Cyrus' and Harpagus' sufferings are similar to the extent that they have both been treated inappropriately to their rank. But beyond this, Harpagus sees that both men are victims of the severing of the father-son bonds at the hands of Astyages, he himself having lost a son, Cyrus having been intended to be lost to his own father, and in fact having been separated from his father as an infant. This painful realization is behind Harpagus' salutation to Cyrus in the secret note sent to Persia. To address Cyrus with the unusual vocative patronymic ὁ παῖς Καμβυσεο (1.124.1)⁴⁰,

⁴⁰ Vocative patronyms are used nine times in the entire work, in almost every case calling attention to the father-son relationship of the addressee: 1.124 ὁ παῖς Καμβυσεο—Harpagus incites Cyrus to revolt by reminding him of his patriliny; 3.14 ὁ παῖς Κουροῦ—Psammetichus answers his tormentor Cambyses' question (why he did not break down until he was confronted by his old boon-companion) by ironically recalling the father-son relationship which Cambyses has just severed; 3.34 ὁ παῖς Κουροῦ—Croesus cleverly criticizes Cambyses for not yet having fathered a son; 3.71 ὁ παῖς Ηυστασπεοῦς—Otanes compliments Darius on the bravery he has inherited from his father; 6.129 ὁ παῖς Τεισάνδρου—Cleisthenes rejects Hippocleides as a son in law, with whose family he was very interested in being connected; 7.14 ὁ παῖς Δαρείου—
calls attention to the relationship between Cyrus and his father, a relationship which was preserved through the efforts of Harpagus, and which, in the case of Harpagus and his own son, was severed by Astyages. Harpagus expects the vocative patronymic to recall these facts to Cyrus, and yet in the note he once more explicitly recalls what they have both suffered:

κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν τούτου προθυμήν τέθηκας, τὸ δὲ κατὰ θεοὺς τε καὶ ἐμὲ περίεσ. τὰ σὲ καὶ πάλαι δοκέω πάντα ἐκμεμαθηκέναι σέο τε αὐτοῦ πέρι ὡς ἐπρήξθη καὶ ὁλα ἐγὼ ὑπὸ Αστυάγεος πέπονθα, ὤτι σὲ οὐκ ἀπέκτεινα, ἀλλὰ ἐδωκα τῷ βουκόλῳ.

According to his wishes, you would have died; according to the gods' and to mine, you are alive. I think that for some time now you have known what was done to you, and what I suffered at the hands of Astyages because I did not kill you, but gave you to the herdsman. 1.124.2

The spectre of the banquet is raised a final time in the interview between Harpagus and the defeated Astyages. Herodotus describes the focus of Harpagus' words:

the dream vision chastises Xerxes for his reluctance to announce the plan to invade; 7.103 οἱ pai Gobrueo—Artabanus challenges Mardonius to stake their sons on the outcome of Xerxes' expedition; 9.58 οἱ pai Aeleueo—Mardonius rebukes the Aleuadae for their praise of the Lacedaimonians 9.78 οἱ pai Kleombrotou—Lampon tries by flattery to convince Pausanias to behead Mardonius. (These last two vocatives cannot be fit into the pattern.)
Harpagus, drawing near to the captive Astyages, rejoiced and jeered, and, among other insulting things he said to him, he asked him, with regard to the meal of his son's flesh on which he had been feasted, how slavery suited him instead of kingship? 1.129.1

The emotional focus of Harpagus' words is clearly the loss he still feels over the death of his son, and in the connection between this emotion and the final rhetorical question he puts to Astyages at the end of this speech, Herodotus drives home the dominant lesson of a major aspect of the father-son theme. That is, in the cause and effect relationship, severing the ties between Harpagus and his son in a wreckless display of power has cost Astyages dearly.
CHAPTER FOUR
AN ANALYSIS OF THE BEGINNING OF BOOK SEVEN
AND THE EPILOGUE OF BOOK NINE

From the earliest stages of Xerxes' kingship up until the crossing into Europe, Herodotus repeatedly introduces into his narrative the father-son relationship. This ranges from Xerxes' and other characters' open discussions of the effect of the memory of his father Darius on current policy (7.8-18), to tableaux of Herodotus' creation either overtly or subtly evocative of events from Darius' career (7.27-40, e.g.). The manifold impressions of these reminiscences, within the context of Xerxes' rise to power and major military undertaking, combine to suggest his susceptibility to human manipulation and, ultimately, his inherent tragedy. This in turn anticipates the eventual loss and confusion of the Persian national effort itself.

At the end of the ninth book, in the final images of the defeated and retreating Persians, these same father-son themes are once again brought into the narrative, tying together the end of the expedition with its beginning at the opening of the seventh book, and, of course, with the
entirety of the Histories. In this final chapter, we will review several passages from the beginning of Book Seven and from the closing chapters of Book Nine, and demonstrate how Herodotus anticipates the outcome of the Persian attack against Greece by manipulating the father-son relationship in the descriptions of the major events of the beginning of Xerxes' reign.

The passages which we will examine are taken from four distinct sections of the narrative,1 each of which treats a significant time period from the career of Xerxes. These are 7.1-4, 7.5-19, 7.20-55, and 9.106-122.

1. ASCENSION (7.1-4)

The opening sentences of Book Seven are a curious blend of strength and resolve on the one hand, and strife and disappointment on the other. We witness the willful king Darius now hotter than ever for a renewed fight against the Athenians and utterly engrossed in levying fresh troops from throughout his empire. At the same time, however, we must consider, first of all, the context in which Herodotus has set this. This is established from the very beginning:

Επεί δὲ ἡ ἀγγελιὰ ἀπίκετο περὶ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρείου τὸν Ἰστάσπεος

---

1 Cf. Myers, op. cit., chapter 5 "The Structure of the Histories," and Immerwahr, Form and Thought, chapter 3, "The Units of the Work."
When the news of the defeat, the one that happened at Marathon, reached king Darius, son of Hystaspes ...

7.1.1

These opening phrases of the book ring with the news of the Persian defeat, which, though fresh in the memory of the audience which has just heard its narration for most of Book Six, nevertheless occurred in Darius' absence, and so is here "reported." Herodotus' recollection of this news deliberately evokes the feelings of shock and disappointment on the part of Darius and the other Persians who stayed at home. These feelings increase with the news of the revolt of Egypt a few lines later (7.1.3), although this secession is said to have occurred three years after the loss at Marathon. By telescoping these signal events of several years into one brief paragraph Herodotus conveys a sense of momentum and greatly enhances the contrast between the maelstrom of activity undertaken by Darius, and the reverses of fortune which threaten to thwart his plans.

The effort to shock is also directed at the audience, for we must recall that between the descriptions of the battle at Marathon and the ensuing military operations (which end at 6.124), and the arrival of the news of the battle (7.1), Herodotus characteristically inserts an engaging interlude which has removed his audience's
attention from the current events in Greece. Therefore, this digression on Miltiades' unsuccessful siege of Paros and earlier capture of Lemnos has, by its very inclusion, added force to the recapitulation of the Persian loss at Marathon by providing a respite from the scenes of warfare which is then shattered when the "news" is again reported. Moreover, if we take a moment to investigate some of its contents, we will find that Herodotus has included in the description of Miltiades' exploits elements which will have effected very specific responses in his audience when the Persian narrative is resumed at 7.1. I refer specifically to some key elements in the dual stories of the original displacement of the Attic-dwelling Pelasgians, and their commission of the "Lemnian deeds" after their resettlement on Lemnos.

In the first case, the offended Athenians chase the Pelasgians out of Attica because of their repeated harrassment of the Athenians' daughters and sons (phoitan gar de tas spheteras thugateras te kai tous paidas epi hudor epi ten Enneakrounon 6.137.3). This initial picture of the obnoxious Pelasgians interfering in the family life

There may have been a very real separateness between the final three books of the work and the preceding ones, an argument made by Macan. (Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books, (London 1908) introduction pp.15-19.).

See above, pp.161ff, for the previous discussion of this passage.
of the Athenians is significantly darkened in the next set of scenes. The Pelasgians, now resettled as Lemnians, once again disrupt family life by abducting from the Brauronia a number of Athenian wives, whom they bring back to Lemnos, and by whom they soon father children.

Up to this point, Herodotus has spoken of both Athenian sons and daughters as victims of the sexual harassment (6.137.3) and of the children, without reference to gender (teknon, 6.138.2), whom the Lemnians fathered. Now, however, Herodotus focuses on the sons of the Athenian mothers and Lemnian fathers, and describes the boys' refusal to mix with their full-blooded Lemnian age-mates (6.138.2). It is out of a fear of the violent potential of this young corps that the Lemnian fathers are driven to the murder of their sons.4 It is this deed which ultimately leads to the Lemnians' loss of their island to Miltiades. This pattern is familiar to us by now, in which the father, by severing the bonds with his son, fosters his own loss. But here I wish to point out a different aspect of this story. We notice that the horrible murders among the Lemnians are set in the context of a dispute between the two groups of their sons. In sum, with regard to both the murderers and the quarrelsome

4 N.b. the emphasis is on the murder of the sons, the murder of the wives functioning as a sort of addendum (6.138.4).
boys, the picture of these new "Lemnian deeds" is filled with the discord of fathers and sons.

This discord is recalled in the opening of Book Seven and strongly contributes to the feeling of strife which is set against and quickly overcomes the momentum and resolve of Darius. Even as the king is on the verge of leading his armies in a noble quest for vengeance against Athens and Egypt, Herodotus interrupts with the stasí that erupts between Darius' two sons in contention for their father's throne. This emphasis is achieved in the construction of the narrative:

\[ \text{εἰθαῦτα δὴ καὶ μᾶλλον ὅρμητο καὶ ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέρους στρατεύεσθαι. στελλομένου δὲ Δαρείου ἐπὶ Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ στάσις ἐγένετο μεγάλη περὶ τῆς ἕγερμονίας,} \]

And now he was really rushing to go to war against both. But as Darius was about to lead his armies against Athens and Egypt, a fierce struggle arose between his sons concerning the reign ... 7.2.1

The force of mallon hormeto and the ambition of ep' amphoteres strateuesthai are quenched by the following sentence, in which the semantic and grammatical focus shifts to the dispute; Darius' imminent plans are frustratingly reduced to the weaker genitive absolute. The sons of Darius soon secure the dominant position, for
in the following sentence Darius is relegated to the
dative of possession:  

in the next sentence it is disclosed that the two
disputants, Xerxes and Artabazanes, are Darius' sons by
different mothers (eontes de metros ou tes autes 
estasiazon 7.2.3), and the construction of the clause
juxtaposes their differing matrilinies with the repetition
of the idea of conflict in the verb estasiazon. By now it
is evident that Herodotus is not only harping on the
discord inherent in this sort of fraternal competition,
but also exploiting the similarity of this present
situation to the previous tragic description of the
Lemnian sons of different mothers. This haunting echo
does much to darken the mood of the eventual emergence of
Xerxes as heir.

The appearance of Demaratus at this point, and his
function as Xerxes' advisor, is contrived to shadow
further the ascendance of Xerxes. This is achieved
through the remembrance of Demaratus' personal history

5 For similar dative usages, see above, pp.19 and 214.
It must be recalled that Demaratus himself was embroiled in ugly fraternal wrangling for supremacy in Sparta, and, indeed, that the history of the Spartan dual kingship not only revolved around the "dispute" between the twin infant sons of Aristodemus and Argeia, but also evolved into an historical enmity between the two royal houses which the brothers founded (6.53). And so Demaratus brings to Xerxes' ascension additional negative associations of family strife, which complement the already dubious atmosphere of the beginning of Book Seven.

Let us step back for a moment from Herodotus' shadowing of these opening incidents, and restate how the father-son theme is made central to the action in "neutral" ways. First, Herodotus refers to Darius by his patronymic in the opening sentence of the book. Next, we recognize that not only are Artabazanes and Xerxes understandably introduced (in their capacities as potential heirs), but also the entire lot of Darius' sons is mentioned, along with the patronymic name of their mothers (esan gar Dareioi ... heteroi tesseres, 7.2.2). Now Xerxes himself

---

6 For Demaratus, see above, pp.92ff.

7 Cf.Macan, op.cit. v.1, part1, p.1, n.2 "The use of the patronymic may simply be for the sake of emphasis, or solemnity; cf.1.45 for a conspicuous example; but still it serves, with the other items, to mark the new beginning, which may have been the old beginning, in the work of Hdt." [see further his intro, section 7].
comes with an already-established, as it were, father-son emphasis, for he has only been mentioned three times previous to this passage in the work, in each case in a context in which his paternity, or at least his lineage, is brought out.\(^8\) In this passage, both he and his rival Artabazanes press their claims on the basis of their lineage.

Finally, Xerxes' victorious strategy is in part dependent on the superior father-son relationship of Darius and himself over Darius and Artabazanes. This line of reasoning Xerxes learns from Demaratus, who explains it with specious arguments and an otherwise unknown Spartan law (7.3.2,3). That Herodotus himself downplays the importance of this claim, yet at the same time has introduced Demaratus into the narrative for the sole purpose of presenting it, further suggests that his intention is to establish the father-son motif as central to the ascension of Xerxes.

II. DECISION (7.5-19)

After the death of Darius, Xerxes is not enthusiastic about invading Greece (7.5.1). In the chapters devoted to the waverings and ultimate decision of Xerxes to go ahead with his father's agenda, the father-son theme is at the heart of the manipulation of Xerxes by his own

\(^8\) 1.183, 4.43, 6.98.
imagination, by his advisors, and by the supernatural (or, his subconscious). We will not follow each step of the arduous course of Xerxes' deliberations, but rather will review selected passages in which Herodotus uses the father-son relationship to account in part for Xerxes' assent to the expedition.  

Mardonius' approach to Xerxes immediately brings to the fore the king's need to outdo his predecessor, his father Darius. It is in answer to this motivation that the most important arguments in the several speeches at this point in the text are based. First, Mardonius presents the plan to attack Greece as a justifiable, indeed obligatory measure to punish the Athenians for the "insult" they gave by defending themselves against Darius' invasion. This is the theme of Mardonius' first, short speech (7.5.2), and in Xerxes' lengthy address to the council (7.8a-d) it is elaborated so that Xerxes may be understood to be primarily motivated by this

---

9 The idea to follow up on his father's efforts is put into Xerxes' mind by Mardonius, messengers from the Thessalian Aleuadae, and Onomacritus the oracle-monger working with the Pisistratidae. Each of these three parties has its own reasons for advocating a Persian invasion of Greece, and each presents a case which is calculated to appeal to Xerxes (7.5, 6). The two Greek parties make generic offers of assistance and promises of the ease with which Greece may be captured; Mardonius, Xerxes' cousin, and therefore the war-advocate with the greatest influence at court (7.5.1), is most carefully drawn by Herodotus.

10 To which must be compared the similar motivation of Cambyses. See above, p. 66ff.
consideration. For examples of this, we may cite the opening remarks the king makes by way of introducing his plan:

"Andres Persai, ou' autos kathegyma nomon tovdde ev hymn theies paradexamenos te autho khrismomai. Ows gar egw pnuhano mai tov presbetairopoi, oudvama kow htrermiasame, epieite parelabbomev tin hgemonin tovdde para Midoiv, Kuron kateleontos 'Astuagea: alla theos te ouw agei kai autoue hymn polla epesounti symergetai epi to amewon. Ta mev vun Kuros te kai Kambusis patiri te (d) emos Dareios katergasaunto kai prosektisanto ethnea, epistamenvosi ev ouk an tis legoi. Egw de epieite parelabbou tov thronon touvou, ephroutizoun okos mi leipsomai tov proteron genomenvon ev tvmi tmodi mhd elasow prosektisomai dunamw Pershos:

Men of Persia, I shall not begin establishing this law among you, but rather shall use it as it has already been handed down. For as I have learned from the elders, we [Persians] have never stayed still, ever since we wrested the leadership from the Medes, when Cyrus overcame Astyages.... What Cyrus, Cambyses, and my own father Darius did, and how they conquered nations, no one need tell you, as you well know. Ever since I inherited this throne, I have considered how I might not fall short of my predecessors in honor, nor win less power for the Persians.  7.8a.1,2
In these lines is displayed Xerxes' deep-seated desire to outdo his several predecessors, and in his further comments he narrows his thoughts to reveal his specific need to follow up on his father's exploits. It is here that the issue of revenge, first suggested by Mardonius, is restated by Xerxes, but in terms which bring out the father-son theme beyond the level of mere suggestion (of Mardonius' speech):

"ὑρᾶτε μὲν νῦν καὶ Δα- βιου λόγον ἑκαττόροις τοῖς ἔτη τοῦ ἴλλου τούτου. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν τετελεύτηκε καὶ οὐκ ἐξεγένετο οἱ τιμωρήσασθαι. ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπὲρ τε ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Περσέων οὐ πρῶτον παύσομαι πρὶν ἢ ἔλω τε καὶ πυρῶσω τὰς Ἀθηνάς, οἱ γε ἐμὲ καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμὸν ὑπῆρξαν ἀδικαὶ ποιεῖτε.

You saw Darius preparing to attack...I shall...lead an army...against Greece, so that I may get vengeance from the Athenians for what they did to the Persians and to my father.... On his behalf, and on behalf of the other Persians, I shall not stop until I take... Athens, which unjustly insulted me and my father.

7.Rb.2

In the second speech at the council, Mardonius picks up on Xerxes' concern, and so in his opening sentence flatters
this aspect of Xerxes' ego by flattering the king in this context of generational continuity:11

O despota, ou mou non eis ton genomenon Perscon aristos, alla kai ton esomonon...

O king, you are the greatest not only of those Persians who have lived before, but even of those who are yet to be...

To bolster the momentum in favor of war, Mardonius quickly sets the tone of his speech to match the certainty of assured victory. His confidence is cast in terms which answer to Xerxes' father-son concerns:

We have already overcome their sons, those who live in our country, the so-called Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians. I have had experience with these men when I marched against them, having been ordered by your father, and none of them stood up against me in battle

---

11 An artistic manipulation of what seems to be a formula. cf. Croesus' regard for the future and the past in his flattery of Cambyses at 3.34.5, and see above, p.57.
as I drove on towards Macedon and fell just a bit short of Athens itself...

Not only does Mardonius bring Xerxes' father back into the discussion in a way which suggests a familiar, well-defined relationship between them (which would secure Xerxes' trust), he also juxtaposes the commanding, nearly successful Darius with the disparaging reference to the Greeks of Asia Minor in such a way that the father-figure gains in stature and thereby inspires Xerxes' confidence of victory all the more. Moreover, Mardonius hints that since the mainland Greeks' "sons" have been no match for the Persians, so, too, the "fathers" will be similarly easy to conquer. By analogy, then, the son of the heroic Darius will show himself to be like the father Darius, to whose valor Mardonius himself is able to testify.

In the third speech of the council, Xerxes' uncle Artabanus, to win over Xerxes, sensibly argues against the war-effort in terms which also rely on the father-son relationship. Artabanus, like Mardonius before him, argues from precedent:

\[\text{ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ πατρὶ τῷ σῷ, ἀδελφὲφ \hspace{1cm} δὲ ἐμῷ, Δαρείῳ ἠγόρευνον μὴ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Σκύθας, 15}\]

---

12 Herodotus introduces this speaker by explaining his confidence in terms of his relationship with Xerxes:

'Ἀρτάβανος ἄ Τατάσπες, πάτρως ἐὼν Ξερξῆ, τῷ δὴ καὶ πάσης ἐὼν ἐγὼ τάδε.

Artabanus, the son of Hystaspes, being the uncle of Xerxes, and relying on this, said ... 7.10a
I advised your own father, my brother Darius, not to attack the Scythians... 7.10a.2

Here Artabanus is trying to win Xerxes' confidence by equating his relationship with Darius (brothers) with Xerxes' own (father-son). Later in his speech, Artabanus recalls Darius to illustrate the folly of trusting one's allies:

δεινόν. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδεμιᾷ σοφίᾳ οἰκημῖ αὐτῶς ταῦτα συμβαλλομαί, ἄλλ' οἴνον κοτε ἰμέας ὀλίγον ἑδέσει καταλαβεῖν πάθος, ὅτε πατήρ (δ) σος ξεύξας Βόσπορον τῶν Ὀρηίκων.

I have not come up with this idea from my thoughts alone, but I remember by how little we avoided disaster when your father, bridging the Bosporus...

7.10g.1

Again the reference is not to Darius alone, but to "your father." This constant harping on the father-son relationship is, of course, carefully directed at Xerxes' vulnerability. Artabanus, adopting the same tactic as Mardonius, tries to tighten the bond between Xerxes and Darius to the degree that Xerxes may feel that like his father who tried to attack Europe and just narrowly escaped disaster, he, too, will be doomed in the effort.

The similarity of Artabanus' and Mardonius' approaches is revealed in the wager Artabanus proposes to his rival.
But if it is absolutely necessary to attack these men, come now, let the king remain among the Persians. Let's stake our children on it: you lead the attack, and choose whichever men you desire and as strong an army as you wish. If things turn out for the king as you say, let my sons be killed, and me along with them. If it all turns out as I say, then your sons suffer the same thing, and you with them—if you manage to return.

7.10th.1,2

On the purely emotional level, this is, of course, a horrific scenario, and it does much to illustrate the desperation of Artabanus' convictions. At the same time, however, it plainly reveals the substructure of both Artabanus' and Mardonius' speeches. That is to say, by making their sons liable to suffer whatever the fathers may, the destiny of the sons is inextricably bound up with
that of the fathers. (It also symbolically reflects the war itself, inssofar as fathers lose their sons.) This is what both men have wanted Xerxes to believe from the start, with Mardonius casting Darius as a hero who was nearly victorious but whose goals are easily attainable by his superior son, and Artabanus presenting a Darius whose fortunes will inevitably come back to visit his son. The importance of this passage for recognizing the consummate craftsmanship of Herodotus' narrative is signal, for here we see him deliberately using the father-son theme to make an artistic point which works alongside and strengthens a point of psychological motivation.

In Xerxes' answer to this outrageous proposition, the final speech of the council, Herodotus certifies that Xerxes truly does believe his own destiny to be intimately linked with that of his father and other ancestors. This is the reason for Xerxes' vociferously proud recitation of his patriliney:

μὴ γὰρ εἶμι ἐκ Δαρεῖου τοῦ 'Τστάσπεος τοῦ Ἁρσάμεος τοῦ Ἀριαράμμεος τοῦ Τείσπεος τοῦ Κύρου τοῦ Καμβύσεως τοῦ Τείσπεος τοῦ Ἀχαιμένεος γεγονός, μὴ τιμωρησάμενος Ἀθηναίος,

For may I not have been born of Darius, son of Hystaspes, son of Arsamnes, son of Ariaramnes, son of Teispes, son of Cyrus, son of Cambyses, son of
Teispes, son of Achaemenes, unless I get vengeance from the Athenians... 7.11.2

Xerxes' conviction of the intertwining of his destiny with that of his forefathers is at the heart of his final remark to the council, too, when he vaunts of his virtually assured victory over the Peloponnesians—men who were, in effect, conquered by his forefathers:

τούτο μάθω, ἔλάσσας ἐπὶ ἄνδρας τούτους, τοὺς γε καὶ Πέλοψ ὁ Φρύξ, ἐὼν πατέρων τῶν ἐμῶν δοῦλος, κατεστρέψατο οὕτω ὦς καὶ ές τὸν αὐτοὶ τε ἀνθρωποὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν ἐπώνυμοι τοῦ καταστρεψαμένου καλέονται.

...as I march against these men whom Pelops the Phrygian, a slave of my forefathers, subdued to the extent that even today these men and their land are called by the name of their conqueror. 7.11.4

At this point, then, Xerxes is set on attacking Greece, but there follows in the next several chapters (7.12-19) a series of waverings in which the king is swayed by his conscience, by a recurring dream-vision of a powerful man commanding him with threats\(^1\) to go forward with the plans, and by further discussions with his uncle Artabanus. The father-son theme is brought into this

\(^1\) For a view of the nature of these threats, as well as of the other incidents of physical abuse in first parts of Book Seven, see P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "Pain, Mutilation, and Death in Herodotus VII," Parola del Passato 31 (1976) 356.
series of events at key points: 1) In its second visit, the dream-vision, having grown impatient with Xerxes' reluctance to commit himself to the expedition, addresses him with the patronymic ο παῖς Φαρείος (7.14). This has a dual effect, both to remind Xerxes of his obligation to fulfill his paternal destiny, and in part by denying him his own name to treat him as a child in an effort to frighten him. I am inclined to believe that this latter is the more important motivation behind this patronymic, especially in light of the menacing tone of the dream-vision. 2) When Artabanus is urged by Xerxes to place himself in a position in which the dream-vision may visit him, too, Artabanus gently explains to Xerxes the true nature of dreams (7.16). In this tender passage, Artabanus addresses his king with the vocative ο παῖς (where at the start of this conversation he used the expected ο βασιλεύ). This vocative again puts Xerxes in the weak position of a son, here a son who must be instructed by his elder, a putative father. 3) After the dream-vision makes a believer out of Artabanus, he speaks to Xerxes in terms which reveal the old man's discomfiture at the confounding of everything he has come to believe (7.18.2,3). Experience has taught him that it is unwise to wish for more than one has. The precedents he cites are drawn from the lives of Xerxes' forefathers--the same

---

14 For vocative patronymics, see above, p.206,n.41.
ones Xerxes has boasted of—events which, in Herodotus' descriptions in the preceding books of the *Histories*, do indeed bear out Artabanus' philosophy. Whereas the unsuccessful campaigns of Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius demonstrate the vanity of improper ambition, yet "the gods," through their dream-vision mouthpiece, seem to negate this wisdom with their injunction to attack Greece. It is as if the comfort of knowing one's place within a context of paternal precedents is rendered useless in the face of the mystery of the gods' will—a worrisome thought.15

III. EXPEDITION (7.20-55)

In the description of the preparation and journey to Europe, Herodotus repeatedly draws the connection between Xerxes' enterprise and that of Darius. This is not always obvious, however, and at several points the connection between the destiny of the father and the son is subtle and underlying. On the more obvious level are the opening notices of the novelty of Xerxes' expedition. At the beginning of the description of the size of the force, Herodotus tellingly compares this expedition with Darius' Scythian campaign:

15 For a discussion of the dream vision as a reminder to Xerxes of his obligation to follow the Persian nomos of imperialism, see J. Evans, "The Dream of Xerxes and the "Nomoi" of the Persians," *CJ* 57, no.3 (1961) 109.
This was the greatest of all expeditions of which we know, such that even that of Darius against the Scythians appears as nothing in comparison...

7.20.2

Similarly, opening the description of the canal-building at Athos is another reminiscence of Xerxes' father's expedition:

καὶ τοῦτο μὲν, ὡς προσπηλεύσαντων τῶν πρώτων περιπλεύσαντων περὶ τοῦ Ἀθων, προετοιμαζετο ἐκ τριῶν ἑτέων κοινῷ μάλιστα ἐσ τοῦ Ἀθων.

And moreover, since the previous fleet had suffered a disaster around Athos, for three years preparations were very much indeed made at Athos. 7.22.1

When we recall that Artabanus' unsuccessful plea to the eager Xerxes also contained his recollection of the painful lessons of Darius' expedition, it becomes clear that Herodotus is deliberately shadowing even these earliest stages of Xerxes' plans in tones that recall his father's tragedy. Additionally, to emphasize Xerxes' intention to make a place in history for himself—an intention which has already been shown by precedent to be doomed—Herodotus reports sua voce the real reason for

---

16 See above, p. 221.
Xerxes' canal-building: the king wants to display his power and have a memorial (apodeiknusthai kai mnemosuna lipesthai, 7.24).

On the march, too, Xerxes' actions are described in such a way that comparison between him and Darius is invited. For instance, a complex of incidents en route to Sardis recalls Darius on several levels. At Celaenae, a certain Pythius desires an audience with the king and is introduced as "the man who gave your father Darius the golden plane tree and vine" (houtos esti hos toi ton patera Dareion edoresato tei platanistoi tei chrusei kai tei ampeloi, 7.27.2). Thus the encounter between Xerxes and Pythius falls under Darius' shadow even before the two men meet. Then, after he has left Celaenae and Pythius, the next event to befall Xerxes is the discovery of a plane tree so beautiful that he gilds it (7.31). Herodotus does not say that Xerxes does this with the intention of aping his father; rather, the implication is that Xerxes, just as he consciously wishes to rise to the level of his father's greatness, is also unwittingly following the same course as Darius even to the smallest detail.

This same unintentional but tragic mimicking of Darius is in part behind Xerxes' final action before leaving Sardis; for it is here that Pythius is reintroduced, coming to Sardis--ironically--to beg military exemption
for his oldest son. Xerxes' outraged response is to commit a crime that is utterly heinous and does much to characterize the king's potential for dangerous caprice. Far from granting Pythius' wish, Xerxes has the favored son put to death. The body is sliced in half, and the army marches out between the halves, as it were framed by the ominous crime which Xerxes has perpetrated. Even more interestingly, Xerxes' action is absolutely with precedent. It will be recalled that Darius, in response to the request of a certain Oeobazus that the king exempt one of his three sons from the Scythian campaign, instead had all three sons put to death (4.84). Herodotus sets this horrible event as Darius was marching forth from Susa,\(^{17}\) as Xerxes' murder of Pythius' son takes place just as the king is about to march out from Sardis. This entire series of events from the beginning of Xerxes' march so closely resembles events from Darius' march that we must acknowledge Herodotus to be deliberately, symbolically dooming Xerxes to repeat the failures of his father.

\(^{17}\) It is also interesting to note that just before this incident, Herodotus mentions in passing that Artabanus had tried to dissuade Darius from the expedition (4.83). I cannot conceive of any other reason for this inclusion other than Herodotus' desire, as he was assembling his materials, the more subtly to foreshadow the complex of characters and circumstances surrounding the similar expedition, several years later, of Darius' son.
This is certainly the impression made by Herodotus' description of Xerxes' final Asian stop before crossing the Hellespont. After the touching scene in which Xerxes and Artabanus weep together over the brevity of human life, Artabanus turns their conversation to the issue of the allied Ionians. Artabanus here shows his characteristic caution by reasonably suggesting that the king not rely on the Ionians:

I recommend that you in no way lead these men against their fathers... For, if they follow us, they must either become the most unjust of men by enslaving their motherland, or the most righteous by helping to free it. If they become the most unjust, they offer us no great benefit; if they become the most righteous, they will be able to do great damage to your expedition. 7.51.2,3
This speech is important on at least two levels. With respect to the echoes of Darius' campaign, we remember how precarious was Darius' flight from Scythia and how close the Ionians who guarded the bridge over the Thracian Bosporous came to breaking up the bridge, abandoning their post, and leaving Darius stranded in hostile territory (4.136-142). On the literal level of strategy, then, Xerxes' refusal to take Artabanus' sound advice once again balefully recalls a dangerous precedent from Darius' life. On the thematic level, Herodotus has Artabanus cast his advice in father-son terms, and indeed end his plea with a philosophical observation borrowed directly from Herodotus' private stock, to illustrate the flaw in Xerxes graver than his strategic unawareness--namely, his ignorance of the father-son relationship. Xerxes in fact shows his ignorance to be of the aggressive variety in his response to Artabanus. By claiming that the Ionians at the bridge in his father's day were true-hearted heroes, he displays his ignorance--at least either rhetorically or by deliberate blindness--of what really happened. By denying the validity of Artabanus' reasoning, he reveals an unawareness of the strength of the bonds between the figurative "fathers and sons," i.e. the mainland and Ionic Greeks. Moreover, by basing his assurance of the Ionians'...

---

18 There is also the common Greek notion of a "mother" city found in metropolis.
fidelity on their having left behind in Asia their wives, children, and property, Xerxes shows a selective ignorance of the importance of various familial bonds and renders negligible the father-son bond which has been shown throughout the Histories to be of singular importance.

IV. RECESSION (9.107-122)

Near the very end of the Histories, when the Persians have suffered their final defeat at Mycale, Herodotus might have rested his pen, satisfied at having completed the tasks he set for himself in his prooemium: he has now recorded and preserved from obscurity the great and notable events of Greeks and foreigners, as well as other things, too, including the cause of their conflict. By the close of 9.106, the Persians have been routed, and the Greeks have regrouped and sailed off to their various destinations. The story of the "Persian Wars" is over. Yet Herodotus continues his narrative in an "epilogue" which extends for another one hundred and ninety lines and contains four separate additional stories. The last of these, a vignette concerning Cyrus and his ministers, serves structurally to tie together the end and the beginning of the whole work, as the great dynast of generations and hundreds of pages ago is nostalgically bathed in the limelight for the very last time, in a show of wisdom and mildness. Between this ultimate anecdote
and the removal of the Greeks from Mycale are the remaining three stories whose intended effects are somewhat harder to understand. For the purposes of our discussion, it will be helpful briefly to recall the events themselves from the epilogue.

Following the trail of the defeated Persians back to Sardis, Herodotus first reports on the quarrel between Masistes, son of Darius, and Artayntes, a losing general of the previous battle. Reproached by Masistes with all sorts of insults, Artayntes finally loses his patience and tries to kill Masistes, but is prevented by a bystander, the Halicarnassan Xenagoras, who thus saves Masistes' life. As Herodotus mentions, by this act Xenagoras wins favor not only with Masistes, but with his grateful brother Xerxes, too, and is rewarded with the whole of Cilicia to rule. "Nothing else happened along the route," writes Herodotus, "they all got back to Sardis." (9.107)

It is back in Sardis that the second story of this coda is set, with Xerxes and Masistes again figuring in leading roles. Xerxes falls in love with his brother's wife, only to transfer his attentions to his brother's daughter, Artaynte. Then his secret, requited passion is discovered by his own wife Amestris, who directs her jealousy not at her rival Artaynte, but rather at Artaynte's mother, the wife of Masistes, and plots her destruction. Xerxes is unwilling to yield to his wife's malice, but because of
the constraints of the tradition of the holiday they are celebrating, he must grant her a desired boon, to wit, to receive Masistes' wife into her own power. Vainly trying to spare Masistes the grief of losing his wife, Xerxes urges his brother to divorce her and remarry Xerxes' own daughter, but Masistes refuses, at which point the frustrated king violently rebukes his brother. Meanwhile Amestris has had Masistes' wife mutilated, and when Masistes discovers this, he flees from Sardis with his sons, with the intention of fomenting a mutiny among his loyal subjects in Bactria. On his flight he is set upon by Xerxes' troops, who slay both him and his sons. "That is what happened regarding Xerxes' love and Masistes' death," concludes Herodotus after this extended intrigue. (9.108-113)

At this point, for his third story Herodotus reintroduces in the narrative the Greeks who had sailed for the Hellespont. Surprised to find the bridges Xerxes had built already destroyed, Leotychides and his Peloponnesians return home, leaving the Athenians to their desire to besiege Sestos, whither have flocked great numbers of foreign enemies. Included in the crowd of refugees are two important Persians, Oeobazus, who had been in charge of the bridge's cables, and the local satrap Artayctes, who is noted for his gross impiety toward the gods. As the months pass and the siege is
pressed, the Persians despair and finally make their escape, but both fugitives are caught along with their troops. Oeobazus is at last sacrificed by the Apsinthian Thracians into whose hands he has fallen, while Artayctes is executed by the Athenians and Eleans. "And nothing more after these events happened that year," concludes Herodotus. (9.114-121)

We finally reach the last story in the entire work, the vignette about Cyrus. To introduce this passage Herodotus states that it was the grandfather of this very Artayctes who had suggested to Cyrus generations earlier that the king consider moving the Persian homeland to a territory more bountiful than Persia. Of course, Cyrus declined with graciousness, warning this grandfather and his fellow advisors that the Persians would lose their warlike spirit should they exchange their hard land for a land of ease. The Persians then took their leave of Cyrus, convinced of his superior wisdom, and agreeing to continue to dwell in their rough land exercising power over others rather than being slaves. So with the close of this tale, at the end of the epilogue, ends the entire Histories.

The traditional discussion over whether Herodotus ever finished his work centers on the apparent inappropriateness and artlessness of these final stories. Yet it has been shown that these stories indeed exhibit features which argue for their deliberate, subtle use by
Herodotus as a fitting end to his work: they combine to demonstrate the breakdown on several levels of Persian morale, with violent arguments between Persians of the highest rank, unseemly intrigues at the royal court, religious impiety among high-ranking officials; at the same time, all of this shame is brought into greater relief by the august presence of the virtually deified Cyrus, who returns as if to haunt the undertaking of the wars in its entirety. This reading does render understandable the addition of these final chapters, but we may through closer examination reveal several aspects of these stories which further demonstrate the care and consistency which Herodotus exercised in their construction. By adding to our perspective our new understanding of the importance of the familial, especially father-son relationship, we may reveal features of this epilogue which have thus far eluded the attention of Herodotean scholars.

It is obvious that in the incident between Masistes and Artayntes, except perhaps for his countryman Xenagoras, Herodotus is not concerned with bestowing any credit for their conduct on anyone involved. By reviewing the development of the plot here, it will be shown that

---

19 Cf. Myres, op.cit., 299; Immerwahr, op.cit., 144. These features (intrigues, impiety, etc.) are certainly not without precedent in the work, however.
Herodotus is attempting to link the two brothers in the unpleasant spirit of this incident.

Unprovoked, Masistes lays into the general Arayntes with a barrage of insults, accusing him of harming the king’s house, and even calling him "worse than a woman" for his poor generalship (9.107.1). What is peculiar about this harangue is that Herodotus has not provided us with any real evidence to justify it, least of all an indication of any lack of skill on the part of Artayntes. The general has been mentioned earlier as a naval leader (8.130, 9.102), but Herodotus has also made it clear that in the battle at Mycale the Persians defended themselves heroically, losing primarily because of the Athenians’ extraordinary enthusiasm and the Ionians’ defection. Therefore Masistes’ harangue, though perfectly understandable as an outburst borne of frustration, is obviously overly harsh, especially as his last slur is singled out by Herodotus as the worst affront a Persian can offer (para de toisi Perseisi gunaikos kakio akousai dennos megistos esti, 9.107.1, cf.8.88, 9.20). Thus we can possibly understand why the general draws his sword and in his rage tries to kill Masistes. Their ugly scene is interrupted by the bystander Xenagoras, who very forcibly prevents the murder by lifting up Artayntes by his middle and dashing him down to the ground. By this violent act he wins the favor of Masistes—and of Xerxes,
for Herodotus now reminds us that he has saved in Masistes the brother of the king. Now although we cannot doubt the sincerity of the king's joy at his brother's life spared, nevertheless the unpleasant circumstances surrounding the incident detract from the positive properties possibly inherent in Xenagoras' accomplishment. By postponing the revelation of the relationship between the saved man and Xerxes to the end of the sentence, following the mention of their names, Herodotus closely links these two brothers in the dubious spirit of the whole affair:

ο δὲ Ξειναγόρης ταῦτα ἐργάσατο χάριτα αὐτῷ τῷ Μασίστῃ ὑπεδείμησε καὶ Ξέρξην, ἐκφύγων τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἑκείνων καὶ τῷ τοῦτο τῷ ἔργῳ Ξειναγόρης Κιλικίας πάσης ἦρε δόντος διὰ τοῦτο τῷ ἔργῳ Ξειναγόρης Κιλικίας πάσης ἦρε δόντος βασιλέως.

Xenagoras did this and so won for himself the gratitude of Masistes and of Xerxes, for he had saved his brother. And because of this deed, Xenagoras ruled all of Cilicia, the king having given it as a gift.

9.107.3

We see that in the sentence following the revelation of the brothers' relationship, Xerxes rewards Xenagoras with a gesture whose extravagance contributes to the portrait of the jaded, prodigal great king. Thus ends the first story, in which Herodotus closely links the two brothers, subtly casting a negative light on them individually and then again binding them by his narrative structure. It is
also interesting to note that the familial context is heightened by the introduction of Masistes into the narrative as "Masistes, son of Darius" (9.107.1), as if to direct our attention to the familial context which will soon figure thematically in this passage, and that Herodotus postpones mentioning of his relationship to Xerxes until Masistes has impugned his own character.

The next story of these final four continues to focus on the relationship between Xerxes and Masistes. The bond between the brothers, which Herodotus has forged in the previous story from an alloy of dubious integrity, here begins to crumble as early as the first sentence of this story, in which Xerxes is said now to have fallen in love with his brother's wife. Herodotus here introduces a new element: Xerxes scruples to use force to procure her favors out of regard for his brother, but instead lights upon the scheme in which his own son, Darius, is to be his pawn. He arranges a marriage between Darius and Masistes' daughter Artaynta, thereby hoping to draw Masistes' wife closer to him. Now whereas arranged marriages are common enough in the Histories among royal families, they elsewhere serve the purpose of securing alliances and other political advantage.20 In our present passage,

20 Cf. Cambyses' attempted marriage to a daughter of the Egyptian king Phanes (3.1); the story of Cleisthenes of Sicyon's attempt to join his daughter Agarista to the Athenian Hippocleides (6.126-131).
however, the nefarious ends to which Xerxes is shown at his manipulations indicts him in his position as father. Indeed, Herodotus’ use of the middle ἐγαγέτο (9.108.2), elsewhere used of the groom himself,\(^{21}\) highlights the self-serving father here procuring to sate his own lust a bride for his son, and also foreshadows the following perversities. For now, after the marriage, Xerxes capriciously transfers his affections from his brother’s wife to his son’s wife, Artaynta, thereby not only directly abusing the bond of trust between father and son, but also in his further actions continuing to degrade the fraternity between himself and Masistes. When his affair with Artaynta is discovered by his own wife Amestris, and she in her jealousy plots the destruction not of her rival Artaynta, but of her mother, Masistes’ wife,\(^{22}\) Xerxes is impotent to protect the woman whom he would by virtue of her relation to him and her innocence (ὁ δὲ δεῖνον τε καὶ ἀναστρίσιον ἐποιεῖτο τούτῳ μὲν ἀδελφείᾳ γυναικά παραδοούναι, τούτῳ δὲ ἀναίτιεν εούσαν τοῦ πρεγμάτου τούτου, 9.110.3). Instead, Xerxes cowardly tries to spare his brother the grief of seeing his wife subjected to Amestris’ cruelty by trying to convince him of specious grounds to divorce his

\(^{21}\) 9.3.1, 1.34.3 (How & Wells, op.cit., ii.334).

wife. Xerxes' iniquity is best expressed in his opening plea to his brother:

Masista, su eis Darciou te pais kai emos adelphcos, pros d'eti toutoisi kai eis aner agathos.

Masistes, you are a son of Darius, and my own brother, and, in addition to these, a good man.

9.111.2

Xerxes is here playing off the same familial bonds which he is secretly defiling, and by way of contrast to the king's spirit, Herodotus has Masistes politely refuse this request, claiming a satisfaction with his present wife that chiefly resides in his righteous appreciation of the same bonds:

My lord, what is this that you've said and ordered me to do, that my wife, from whom I have youthful sons and daughters--to one of whom you've married your own son--and who is in perfect accord with me, you order me to divorce, and instead to marry your daughter?
When Xerxes grows wroth at Masistes and menacing in tone, Masistes retreats with defiant words, and the atmosphere of fraternal strife becomes dominant. This is increased when Masistes learns of the mutilation of his wife by Xerxes' wife, and in response to this outrage calls his own sons to counsel. Between this father and his sons there has already been established something of a bond, insofar as Masistes' response to Xerxes' order mentioned his conscious pleasure with these sons. This bond is now strengthened, in contrast to the decaying bonds between the two sons of Darius, when Masistes and his sons flee Sardis to start a justifiable mutiny. His interception and murder by Xerxes' troops casts the brightest light on the effect of the breakdown of the relationship among the brothers, and of the abuse of the father-son bonds.

The third story (9.114-121) shifts our attention from the Persian court to the Hellespont, but here, too, the elements of paternity and filiality inform Herodotus' intent, albeit much more subtly. It is true that the rehearsal of Artayntes' religious crimes adds to the picture of failing Persian morale, and that Oeobazus' capture and death neatly tie up the extended theme of the bridges across the Hellespont, but I believe that more seminal to the episode is the behavior of the Greeks, specifically the Athenians. It must constantly be borne in mind as we read Herodotus that, whatever the order and
dates of the composition of the various logoi, Herodotus did live to see the Athenians change their role from the "saviors of Greece" to the arch-imperialists whose power and acquisitiveness, regardless of Pericles' golden rule at home, proved such a bane to all Greece. This realization must bear upon our reading of the present passage at least as strongly as anywhere in the entire text, coming as it does at the very end of the work. Here, now, Herodotus must have had at least one eye toward the future, and thus he makes the point (9.106.4) that the Samians, Chians, and Lesbians after the battle at Mycale join the league whose composition and maintenance was to become a major issue in the events of the next several decades; and thus he mentions this entire episode of events at Sestos, to direct his listeners' gaze toward the rapidly-following consequences, with which all Greeks had become all-too acquainted, of the Athenians' insistence on the siege.\(^{23}\) These points, as well as the intricacy of construction of this epilogue, secure its status as a well-wrought, wholly appropriate ending to the work.

The Greeks who left Mycale split up at Abydos, with Leotychides and the Peloponnesians returning to their homes, and the Athenians under Xanthippus about to exercise their developing territorial prerogative over the

\(^{23}\) To put this problem into perspective, see the understandable discussion in Fornara, op.cit., chapter III "Herodotus and Athens."
Chersonese, which after all had been before the war under the jurisdiction of the Athenian Miltiades.\textsuperscript{24} Caught inside Sestos by the siege are Oeobazus (whose mention has been discussed above), and Artayctes, whom Herodotus describes as a fearsome and impious man (\textit{deinos de kai atasthalos}, 9.116.1). What lies behind this charge of impiety, Herodotus tells us, is his having robbed the treasure from the Elean temple of Protesilaus, worshipped locally as a god (and thereby cheating his king of what was rightly his), and further engaging in sexual intercourse whenever he visited the temple.

Presently, however, Artayctes flees Sestos, falls into his enemies' hands, and is brought back to Sestos along with his son. At this point a prodigy occurs, and Artayctes understands that the jumping salted fish (which a soldier is broiling nearby) signifies a message from the god Protesilaus—the very god whom he had earlier in his career insulted. Artayctes immediately offers to make ample recompense to the god, and also to provide a tremendous ransom to the Athenians for his own life and the life of his son. But the Eleans are intent upon his execution, and the Athenian general Xanthippus agrees with them. At this point it is instructive to point out certain features of Herodotus' construction of this story: he writes that Artayctes was brought back to Sestos with

\textsuperscript{24} 6.39.
his son, and this is the first time his son is ever mentioned. Then the prodigy occurs, and is read by Artayctes in a way that attests to his wisdom,\textsuperscript{25} and to his earnest willingness to atone for his former impiety through compensation that is obviously satisfactory. In this religiously-charged context Herodotus has begun to win our sympathy for Artayctes. Next, when Artayctes offers the ransom money with fatherly concern, he expressly includes his son in his offer. "But promising such things he didn't persuade general Xanthippus," (tauta hupischomenos ton stratagon Xanthippon ouk epeithe, 9.120.4), is Herodotus' curt description, as the Athenian goes along with the Eleans in their desire for Artayctes' death.\textsuperscript{26} So they lead him out to the promontory where Xerxes bound his bridge, or, according to other reports, to the hill above Madytus--either location a fitting, lonely place for the execution which Herodotus is describing in increasingly foreboding tones. There Artayctes is executed, by exactly whom it is not made clear, but the strong impression Herodotus gives is that under Xanthippus the Athenians are at least as responsible as the Eleans. Strikingly, Artayctes is crucified, the

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. the spiritual transformation of Croesus as he faced death, 1.87.ff, and see above, pp.46ff.

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Fornara, op.cit., 56, "If Herodotus had intended the compliments some have assumed, his task was accomplished very badly."
only incident of its sort perpetrated by Greeks in the entire *Histories* (and for its unusual, distinctly un-Greek barbarity, it was mentioned in an earlier passage, 7.33). In front of his father's own eyes they stone to death Artayctes' son. The Athenians collect their belongings, and sail away.

This unflinching cruelty to father and son expressed through such harsh treatment strengthens the portentous tone Herodotus invests in this final scene of Athenian activity, the penultimate scene in the work. By briefly looking back to recent passages of the final book, Herodotus' intentions come into greater relief. The hero Pausanias, whose reputation Herodotus leaves unsullied, was urged, it will be remembered, by the Plataean Lamon after the Spartan victory to behead and then to crucify the corpse of Mardonius, in order to avenge the spirits of the fallen at Thermopylae. Pausanias, however, refused to debase himself by participating in an act "which befits barbarians, not Greeks." (9.78-79). Later, when the Thebans surrender their city to Pausanias, Herodotus' Spartan hero refuses to kill the sons whom Attaginus, the medizer, has abandoned in the wake of his escape from the city. Pausanias makes clear his conviction that the sons have no share in the guilt of their fathers (*phasis tou medismou paidas ouden einai metaitious*, 9.88). How different a picture does Herodotus paint at the end of the
book, in the story we are considering! It contributes to the shame of the Athenians under Xanthippus that they deliver such cruel punishment to the father Artayctes, and then penalize with death the son whom Herodotus mentions only anonymously, and in no other connection except this, and wholly undeserving of the treatment which Pausanias in his magnanimity refused to deal to the victims available to him, the innocent sons of the guilty Aleuadae.

We gain a better perspective on Herodotus' well-known partiality to the Athenians for their leadership in the struggle for Greek freedom by acknowledging that he here intimates his ambivalence toward the role they assumed in events shortly following the final defeats of the Persians. It is a mark of the subtle, moving, and very conscious artistry that Herodotus employs in these final passages, with their different yet unified intents, the theme and variations of the relations between brothers, fathers, and sons.

27 And how different a picture does Thucydides' paint of Pausanias! cf. Thuc. 1.95, 131-134.

28 For conflicting interpretations of the Greek victory, see C. Starr, "Why did the Greeks defeat the Persians?" Parola del Passato, 17 (1962) 321-332.
CONCLUSION

In the preceding four chapters I have tried to demonstrate something of both the breadth and depth of Herodotus' use of fathers and sons. In the arrangement of the selected evidence and of my arguments, I have followed what I perceive to be the organic development of Herodotus' narrative: starting with the specifics of the Croesus-logos, then moving to a panoramic view of fathers and sons from the entirety of the world depicted in the work, next to a deeper investigation of how the themes function consistently and comprehensively throughout, and finally returning to the specifics of the tremendous conflict which is the culmination of the opus. It remains for me to suggest how an understanding of the theme of fathers and sons aids us in better appreciating both the artistry and historicity of the Histories.

To have considered the nine books as a complete, logical, and successful compositional unity commits me to evaluate the use of the father-son theme as a unit, and one of the work's integral components--again in terms of its own completeness, logic, and success. By this point, I am hopeful, the reader of this paper has been convinced
of the completeness of Herodotus' use of the theme. From first to last, from Croesus to Xerxes, fathers and sons have been pervasive, if nothing else.

There is also a logic to Herodotus' usage which transcends our notion of historicity, and more properly belongs to the realm of art. To make this point, it is necessary at first to suggest that the thematic unity of fathers and sons is dependent in part on the progression of the very theme itself.

As we have seen, at the start of the work the composition of the Croesus-logos—both on the level of its narrative and of its underlying philosophy—is fashioned with the father-son relationship in pivotal positions. Far from using them simply for realizing the stated claim of demonstrating an historical proof, Herodotus values the Lydian stories for the issues which revolve around the paideia of Croesus. And at the foundation of Croesus' education is the father-son relationship. On the narrative level this is evident throughout; one need only recall the many incidents and speeches scattered throughout the logos in which fathers and sons are central. On the philosophical, moral level, fathers and sons are used as symbols, for example in Solon's illustrations of the correct way to live one's life, in the Adrastus-logos, and in the several events of Croesus' life which postdate his near immolation. Now just as the
events of the Croesus-logos set the narrative tone, and its philosophical lessons are recalled throughout the entire work, so, too, the various themes of the Croesus-logos are repeatedly reworked. The father-son theme, introduced comprehensively in the Croesus-logos, is naturally returned to in all nine books; similarly, just as one must bear in mind the historical lessons of the Lydians as one reads of the Egyptians, Scythians, Greeks, and Persians, so too, one must remember the father-son lessons of Croesus as one comes to the many father-son incidents in the lives of the great individuals throughout the Histories. Or, from a different angle, the foundation for a complete understanding of fathers and sons is laid in Book One, and so when fathers and sons take their parts in stories set in Greece and Persia—and even among the animal kingdom—the sensitive reader is obliged to put these events into a perspective which is initially molded by the treatment of Croesus.

This approach has its most important application in the understanding of the large-scale development of the work. It is a natural step from the referential process of appreciating the universality of the Croesus-logos to the inferential process of understanding the humanity of the Xerxes-logos; by recognizing the centrality of the father-son theme throughout, the inevitable evolution of the work, i.e., the transition from the small Lydian beginning
to the large intercontinental end, becomes evident. The initial failure of Croesus to understand life, symbolized in his failure to understand the bonds between himself and his sons, is painfully replaced by a profound understanding of life, epitomized in his dictum on peace and war. On the larger scale of the final three books, the initial failure of Xerxes to understand life, symbolized by his failure to understand his relationship with his father--indeed with the line of his forefathers--is painfully left unreplaced by any sort of wisdom, epitomized in the familial abuses which he commits in the epilogue. This is not to say that Xerxes is an unsympathetic character, for obviously Herodotus' compassion and understanding of the human animal, and the subtlety of his art, obviate the one-dimensional portrayal which would have forfeited the credibility and sympathy which are Xerxes' hallmark. Rather, the greatest tragedy of Xerxes on the historical level--his colossal failure to achieve his goal of military conquest--is mirrored on the human plane in the realm of fathers and sons. This is not surprising, especially in light of the inexorable march of failure, from the beginning of the work, on the part of the mighty rulers who play mighty roles in the history. This trend is complemented by an unmistakeable, increasing significance in the father-son relationship which casts its shadow on these failures. And so the great king's
unavoidable losses are prefigured by the precedent of his forefathers, both in the military failures of Cyrus, Cambyses, and, most importantly, Darius, and in their personal failures, which were, as we have seen, repeatedly set in the arena of the father-son relationship. And not only are the particular features and events within these failures set within this theme, but the pattern itself of accession, failure, and succession is intimately bound up with fathers and sons. To reduce the devious course of history to the simplest terms, we might say that Cyrus came to power in the breach left by Astyages when his kingdom was subverted by the father Harpagus after Astyages killed his son. Cyrus lost his power because Tomyris' wrath was so great after he severed the bonds between Tomyris and her son Spargapises. Cambyses inherited the throne as the eldest son of Cyrus, it is true, but his motivation for conquest was the need to live up to his father's reputation, just as his career of defeat and madness was founded on his abuses of the father-son bond. The same is true for Xerxes and Darius. In between Croesus-Atys, Cyrus-Cambyses, and Darius-Xerxes, moreover, are the many lesser father-son relationships, each contributing to the course of the history, each filling out the thematic background to the history. There is a deliberate progression within the theme, but it is not just a simple filling out of a
literary device, or a development from a vague to an articulated father-son idea; the father-son theme is complex and complete from the first book. It is rather a comprehensive progression of understanding, which starts in the Croesus-logos with the clear lesson that Croesus' ignorance cost him everything he held dear; it culminates in the Xerxes-logos, by which point the understanding has been reached that the father-son bond is an integral and inherent part of life, almost a symbol of the inevitable companion of the cycle of personal, political, and military success and failure.

The final problem, of course, is to understand the interplay of the thematic demands of the author's composition on the one hand, and the description of the course of events, on the other. That is, one must try to comprehend in what manner Herodotus allows the father-son theme to inform the "history" which he is narrating, and, ultimately, to what extent Herodotus' art and the broad canvass of life he is depicting mirror each other. This is the intriguing mystery of Herodotus' creation, more significant, and more elusive, than the question of Herodotus' historical accuracy.

In the patriarchal world of Herodotus' day, and in the context of dynastic monarchies, fathers and sons, qua fathers and sons, were necessarily important characters in the human drama of recent and ancient events. And so
there is every reason to expect that Herodotus would gravitate to stories of fathers and sons in his selection of materials for inclusion, and even that the characters of fathers and sons in the Histories would have a certain primacy. This is of course no different from what we observe in the canon of Greek literature, with its stories of the great patrilineal "houses," starting as early as Homer's Odysseus and Telemachus. But what of those father-son stories in Herodotus which seem to enjoy a false prominence? There is more than one story in which the relationship between the father and the son seems either to be a focal point for its own sake, or at least to be only tangentially related to the causal relationship between events. In the story of Democedes of Croton, for example, we observed that Herodotus exercises a measure of subtlety in insuring that his audience be attuned to the grave consequences of Democedes' estrangement from his father. Yet at the same time that Herodotus makes it clear that Darius' invasion of Greece was the result of far more plausible political causes than the manipulations of the court physician, the only explanation for the inclusion of Democedes into the narrative is that Herodotus wants his audience to acknowledge that a severed father-son bond as far away as Italy had its humble part in the evolution of the great conflict.
On the larger scale, Herodotus presents the grandly tragic Cambyses in a context of failures that must be read in relation to the great successes of his father Cyrus. The same is true for Xerxes, whose personal tribulations revolve around his perception of his relationship with Darius, his need to surpass the accomplishments of his father and forebears. It need hardly be remarked that Herodotus cannot have known whether the great king's soul was burdened with doubts of his inadequacy vis-a-vis his father's legacy. And yet in his artistic search for a believable, compelling stage on which to set the personal tragedy of Xerxes to match the very real, geopolitical stage of his political and military tragedy, Herodotus turned to the father-son relationship. I do not think it is possible to state whether this thematic choice prefigured a subsequent decision to incorporate fathers and sons into the whole work, or was the natural choice following an importance already placed on fathers and sons in the rest of the book. In either case, however, since the theme of the entire work is the Persian Wars and the narrative moves toward those events undertaken and lost by a father and son pair, at each successive encounter of a father-son incident the audience gradually comes to anticipate the ultimate pair, Darius and Xerxes.

Everyone who reads Herodotus can well understand what happened on various levels, such as international
politics, interpersonal relations, and divine and oracular influence. This is one of the strengths of Herodotus' achievement, that the lessons of history are presented on several parallel planes, political, divine, and personal, which are unobscure and complementary. In his choice of fathers and sons as a primary facet in the personal plane, Herodotus insured that his work would be a "possession for all time," for unlike the temporal and topical considerations of territorial imperialism and international diplomacy, and unlike the society-specific theological axioms of divine retribution and god's jealousy of man, there have always been and will always be fathers and sons. The historical events narrated by Herodotus take on a deeper significance for us when we acknowledge that events on the largest and smallest scale share a place in Herodotus' universe, and that one of the successful literary features which binds them all in the Histories is their participation in the continuity which is represented by the characters of fathers and sons.
APPENDIX A

CATALOGUE OF SELECTED PASSAGES IN THE HISTORIES
IN WHICH FATHERS AND SONS ARE SIGNIFICANT

This is a list of selected passages in the work in which fathers and sons are either active participants in some action, or are of some other special significance. The purpose of this catalogue is to illustrate the great number of father-son incidents from throughout the work, and to guide the reader to passages of particular interest. The variety of roles played by fathers and sons is tremendous, and resists classification. (N.B. This list is not all-inclusive, simple patronymics and casual references to sons and fathers [as in father-son succession of monarchs] are not listed.)

BOOK ONE
7 extended patriliny of Heracleidae
17 Alyattes inherits war against Miletus from Sadyattes
30 Tellus the Athenian
31 Cleobis and Biton (n.b. mother)
32 Solon's opinion on human happiness
34 Croesus has two sons
35 arrival of Adrastus, son of Gordias
36-40 agon of Croesus and Atys
3-44 death of Atys, reaction of Croesus
45 suicide of Adrastus
55 Delphic oracle of mule (mixed parentage)
59 Chilon's warning to Hippocrates not to father a son
61 Peisistratus refuses to have intercourse with daughter of Megacles
73-74 Cyaxares fed flesh of "son"; war between Lydia and Media
84 the lion born to Meles
85 Croesus' other son
86 capture of Sardis
87-89 dialogue of Croesus and Cyrus
92 Croesus' lineage
94 Manes and Tyrrhenus
107-108 Astyages' dreams and intended infanticide
109 Harpagus and his wife
111-113 Spaco and Mitradates
114-115 Cyrus at ten years old
116 recognition of Cyrus
117-119 feast of Harpagus' son
121-122 Cyrus' return to his parents
123-124 Harpagus' overture to Cyrus
136 Persians honor having many sons
138 Persian view of parenticide
155 Cyrus regrets sparing Lydia
183 Darius and Xerxes in the temple of Bel
207 Croesus' advice to Cyrus
208 Cambyses entrusted to Croesus
209 Cyrus dreams of Darius
210 Hystaspes' response
214 Tomyris reacts to death of Spargapises

BOOK TWO
1 Cambyses succeeds Cyrus
32 expedition of sons of chieftains
37 patrilineal priesthood
65 patrilineal stewardship of animals
73 the phoenix
79 the Linus-song
107 two sons of Sesostris die in flames
110 statues of Sesostris and sons
120 Priam and his sons
121 the architect and his two sons (Rhampsinitus and the thieves)
133 Mycerinus' lament
136 burial decrees of Anysis
143 genealogies of Hecataeus and the priests
BOOK THREE

2 Egyptian version of Cambyses' parentage
11 sacrifice of sons of Phanes
14 Cambyses tries spirit of Psammenitus
15 execution of son of Psammenitus
16 Psammenitus commands son to bury him
19 Phoenicians refuse to sail against Carthage
34 Croesus' flattery of Cambyses
35 murder of Prexaspes' son
36 Croesus' admonishments
37 defilement of statues of Hephaestus and sons
38 custom is king
49-53 Periander and his sons
55 Archias the hero
61-63 revolt of the Magi
64 Cambyses' remorse at having killed his brother
65 Cambyses' farewell speech
66 death of Cambyses
68-69 Otanes and his daughter
70-79 conspiracy of the seven
89 Persians call Cyrus a father
118-119 death of Intaphernes; Darius' clemency
126-127 nefarious deeds of Oroetes; his assassination
131 Democedes of Croton
135 Darius' promises to Democedes
160 Zopyrus' descendants

BOOK FOUR

5-10 stories of Scythian origins
26 Issedonians eat their fathers' corpses
69 execution of false prophets and their sons
76 death and patriliny of Anacharsis
84 execution of sons of Oeobazus
110-116 Amazons an Sauromatae
127 Idanthyrsus and the fathers' tombs
145-146 Minyae at Sparta
147-148 origin of Theran expedition to found Cyrene
149 story of Oeolycus' name
150-167, 200-205 passim stories of the
    Battus and Pheretima

BOOK FIVE

19-21 Alexander and Amyntas
25 Otanes and the Sisamnes-chair
30 Aristagoras and the beginning of the
    Ionian revolt
39-41 Anaxandridas and his two wives
42 departure of Dorieus
65 kidnaping of Peisistratidae
66-69 naming of the tribes
92 Sosicles of Corinth
94 Hegesistratus, bastard son of Peisistratus

BOOK SIX

9 (& 32) Persian threats against Milesians
14 Samians inscribe names of valorous
27 catastrophes on Chios
34, 35 patriliny of the two Miltiades
37 Croesus' threats against Lampsacencians
38 death of Miltiades
41 capture of Metiochus, son of Miltiades
49-94 passim Cleomenes and the Spartan basileis
103 Cimon and the Peisistratidae
137-139 Lemnian deeds

BOOK SEVEN
2, 3, 4 struggles among Darius' heirs
8-19 deliberations of Xerxes
27-39 passim Xerxes and Pythius
51-52 Artabanus' advice against deploying Ionians
104 Demaratus' speech to Xerxes
105-106 Mascames, governor of Doriscus
107 Boges, governor of Eion
114 Persian sacrifice of youths
133-137 the wrath of Talthybius
190 Ameinocles
204-205 patriliny of Leonidas, his ascendance

221 Megistias saves his son

233 death of Leontiades and his son

BOOK EIGHT

22 Themistocles' graffiti

73 Sicinnus, tutor of Themistocles' sons

77 Bacis' prophecy

90 Xerxes records names of the valorous

92 Polycritus' jeers at Themistocles

103 Artemisia entrusted with Xerxes' sons

105-106 Hermotimus' revenge

116 Thracian chief slays medizing son

131 patriliny of Leotychides

136 Alexander's relationship with the Persians

NOOK NINE

10 patriliny of Pausanias

84 the corpse of Mardonius

88 Pausanias spares the sons of Attacinus

107 Xerxes and Masistes

108-113 court intrigues

120 crucifixion of Artayctes, stoning of son

121 Cyrus and grandfather of Artayctes
APPENDIX B

THE TEXT OF 1.73-74

73 Ἐστρατεύετο δὲ ὁ Κροίσος ἐπὶ τὴν Καππαδοκίην τώνδε εἶνεκα, καὶ γῆς ἵμερψ προσκήσασθαι πρὸς τὴν ἑωτοῦ μοῦραν βουλόμενος, καὶ μάλιστα τῷ χρηστηρίῳ πίσυνος ἔων 2 καὶ τείσασθαι θέλων ὑπὲρ Ἀστυάγεος Κύρου. Ἀστυάγεα γὰρ τὸν Κυαξάρεω, ἐόντα Κροίσον μὲν γαμβρόν, Μήδων δὲ βασιλέα, Κύρος ὁ Καμβύσεως καταστρεφόμενος εἰχε, γενό-3 μενον γαμβρὸν Κροίσῳ ὤδε. Σκυθέων τῶν νομάδων ἱλη ἄνδρῶν στασιάσασα ὑπεξῆλθε εἰς γῆν τὴν Μηδικήν· ἐτυράννευε δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον Μήδων Κυαξάρης ὁ Φραώρτεω τοῦ Δημόκεω, ὡς τοὺς Σκύθας τούτοις τὸ μὲν πρῶτον περείπε τ εὖ ὃς ἐόντας ἰκέτας· ὥστε δὲ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιεόμενος αὐτοὺς, παῖδας σφι παρέδωκε τὴν γλώσσαν τε ἐκμαθεῖν καὶ τὴν 4 τέχνην τῶν τόξων. χρόνον δὲ γενομένου καὶ αἰεί φοιτεόν-}


tων τῶν Σκυθέων ἐπ᾽ ἄγρην καὶ αἰεί τι φερόντων, καὶ κοτε σωφήνεικε ἐλείν σφεας μηδέν· νοστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς κεινης: χερσὶ ὁ Κυαξάρης (ἡν γὰρ, ὡς διεδέξε, ὀργην [οὐκ] ἀκρος) τρηχέως κάρτα περιέσπε ἀπεικέιν. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς Κυαξάρεω 5 παθόντες, ὥστε ἀνάξα σφέαν αὐτῶν πεπονθότες, ἐβούλευσαν τῶν παρὰ σφίσι διασκομένων παῖδων ἕνα κατακόψαι, σκευάσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν ὀσπερ ἐώθεσαν καὶ τὰ θηρία σκευά-ζεω, Κυαξάρη δοῦναφερόντες ὄς ἄγρην δήθεν, δώοτες δὲ τὴν ταχίστην κομίζεσθαι παρὰ Ἀλυάττα ὁ τῶν Σαμβάττων ἐς Σάρδης. ταῦτα καὶ ἐγένετο· καὶ γὰρ Κυαξαρῆς καὶ οἱ παρε- 6 ὁντες δαιμονίων τῶν κρεῶν τούτων ἑπάσαντο, καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι ταῦτα ποιήσαντες Ἀλυάττεω ἰκέται ἐγένοιτο. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, 74 οὖ γὰρ δὴ ὁ Ἀλυάττης ἐξεδίδον τοὺς Σκύθας ἐξαιτεοιτι
Κυαξάρη, πόλεμος τοῦκ Λυδοίς καὶ τοῦτον Μῆδοις ἐγεγόνει ἐπ’ ἐτεῖα πέντε, ἐν τοῖς πολλάκις μὲν ὦι Μῆδοι τοὺς Λυδοὺς ἐνίκησαν, πολλάκις δὲ οἱ Λυδοὶ τοὺς Μῆδους· ἐν δὲ καὶ νυκτομαχίᾳ τωά ἐποίησαντο· διαφέρουσι δὲ σφι ἐπὶ ἑσης 2 τὸν πόλεμον τῷ ἔκτῳ ἔτει συμβολῆς γενομένης συνήψεικε ὡστε τῆς μάχης συνεστεώσης τὴν ἡμέρην ἐξαπίης νύκτα γενέσθαι. τὴν δὲ μεταλλαγὴν ταύτην τῆς ἡμέρης Θαλῆς ὁ Μιλήσιος τοῦτο Ἰωσὶ προηγόρευσε ἔστεθαι, οὕτων προθέμενος ἐνιαυτοῦ τοῦτον ἐν τῷ δὴ καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ μεταβολή. οἱ δὲ Λυδοὶ τε καὶ οἱ Μῆδοι ἐπείτε εἴδον νύκτα ἄντι ἡμέρης 3 γενομένης, τῆς μάχης τε ἐπαύσατο καὶ μᾶλλον τι ἐσπευσαν καὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰρήνην ἕως τοῦτο ἔστεθαν. οἱ δὲ συμβιβάσαντες αὐτοὺς ἤσαν οὕτε, Συνεννεσίς τε ὁ Κύλις καὶ Λαβύννητος ὁ Βαβυλώνιος. οὕτοι σφὶ καὶ τὸ ὅρκιον οἱ σπεύσαντες 4 γενέσθαι ἤσαν, καὶ γὰρ ἐπαλλαγὴν ἐποίησαν. Ἄλλατεα γὰρ ἐγνωσαν δοῦναι τὴν θυγατέρα Αρόνην Ἀστυάγει τῷ Κυαξάρεω παιδί· ἀνευ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖς ἰσχυρῆς συμβάσιας

6 ἰσχυρὰν οὐκ ἔθελον συμμένειν. ὅρκια δὲ ποιῆται ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνεα τὰ πέρ τε Ἑλληνες, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοι, ἐπεάν τοὺς βραχίονας ἐπιτάμωνται ἐς τὴν ὁμοχροῖν, τὸ αἷμα ἀναλείχοις ἀλλήλων.
73. There were two motives which led Croesus to attack Cappadocia: firstly, he coveted the land, which he wished to add to his own dominions; but the chief reason was, that he wanted to revenge on Cyrus the wrongs of Astyages, and was made confident by the oracle of being able so to do: for the Astyages, son of Cyaxares and king of the Medes, who had been dethroned by Cyrus, son of Cambyses, was Croesus' brother by marriage. This marriage had taken place under circumstances which I will now relate. A band of Scythian nomads, who had left their own land on occasion of some disturbance, had taken refuge in Media. Cyaxares, son of Phraortes, and grandson of Deioces, was at that time king of the country. Recognising them as suppliants, he began by treating them with kindness, and coming presently to esteem them highly, he intrusted to their care a number of boys, whom they were to teach their language and to instruct in the use of the bow. Time passed, and the Scythians employed themselves, day after day, in hunting, and always brought home some game; but at last it chanced that one day they took nothing. On their return to Cyaxares with empty hands, that monarch, who was hot-tempered, as he showed upon the occasion, received them very rudely and insultingly. In consequence of this treatment, which they did not conceive themselves to have deserved, the Scythians determined to take one of the boys whom they had in charge, cut him in pieces, and then
dressing the flesh as they were wont to dress that of the wild animals, serve it up to Cyaxares as game: after which they resolved to convey themselves with all speed to Sardis, to the court of Alyattes, the son of Sadyattes. The plan was carried out: Cyaxares and his guests ate of the flesh prepared by the Scythians, and they themselves, having accomplished their purpose, fled to Alyattes in the guise of suppliants.

74. Afterwards, on the refusal of Alyattes to give up his suppliants when Cyaxares sent to demand them of him, war broke out between the Lydians and the Medes, and continued for five years, with various success. In the course of it the Medes gained many victories over the Lydians, and the Lydians also gained many victories over the Medes. As, however, the balance had not inclined in favour of either nation, another combat took place in the sixth year, in the course of which, just as the battle was growing warm, day was on a sudden changed into night. This event had been foretold by Thales, the Milesian, who forewarned the Ionians of it, fixing for it the very year in which it actually took place. The Medes and Lydians, when they observed the change, ceased fighting, and were alike anxious to have terms of peace agreed on. Syennessis of Cilicia, and Labynetus of Babylon, were the persons who mediated between the parties, who hastened the taking of the oaths, and brought about the exchange of espousals.
It was they who advised that Alyattes should give his daughter Aryenis in marriage to Astyages the son of Cyaxares, knowing, as they did, that without some sure bond of strong necessity, there is wont to be but little security in men's covenants. Oaths are taken by these people in the same way as by the Greeks, except that they make a slight flesh wound in their arms, from which each sucks a portion of the other's blood.
APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL PASSAGES FROM THE HISTORIES
WITH COMMENTARIES ON HOW FATHERS AND SONS
ARE USED IN EACH

1. THE TOMBS OF THE FATHERS OF THE SCYTHIANS (1.127)

_column_1_

πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Σκυθέων βασιλεὺς Ἰδάνθυρσος ἔλεγε τάδε. Οὕτω τὸ ἐμὸν ἔχει, ὁ Πέρσας· ἐγὼ οὐδένα κω ἄνθρωπων ὀνόματα ἐφυγόν οὔτε πρότερον οὔτε νῦν σὲ φεύγω· οὔδὲ τι νεώτερῶν εἰμὶ πουῆσας νῦν ἢ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐόθεα ποιεῖν. ὥς τι δὲ οὐκ ἀντίκα μᾶχομαι τοι, ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο σημανέω· ἢμῖν οὔτε ἤστεα οὔτε γῆ πεφυτευμένη ἐστὶ, τῶν πέρι δείκτας μὴ ἀλήθεια ταχύτερον ἀν ἢμῖν συμμίσγομεν ἐς μάχην· εἰ δὲ δέοι πάντως ἐς τούτο κατὰ τάχος ἀπικυνέεσθαι, τυγχάνουσι ἢμῖν εἴσοδες τάφοι πατρών· φέρετε, τούτους ἀνευρόντες συγχέειν πεισάσθε αὐτούς, καὶ γνώσεσθε τότε εἴτε ἢμῖν μαχισόμεθα περὶ τῶν τάφων εἴτε καὶ οὐ μαχισόμεθα. πρότερον δὲ, ἢμὲν μὴ ἠμέας λόγος αἴρῃ, οὐ συμμειζομέν τοι.

To this message Idanthrysus, the Scythian king, replied, "This is not my way, Persian... There is nothing new or strange in what I do; I only follow my common mode of life in peace... If, however, you must needs come to blows with us speedily, look you now, there are our fathers' tombs—seek them out, and
attempt to meddle with them—then you shall see whether or no we will fight with you. Till you do this, be sure we shall not join battle, unless it pleases us.

4.127.1-3

Since chapter 97 of Book Four, when Darius crosses the river Ister in Scythia, indeed since the opening chapters of Book Four, where Herodotus begins the Scythian ethnography, the action has been building towards the confrontation between the invading Persians and the defending Scyths. In chapter 126, Herodotus tells us that the Persians have grown so tired of the Scyths' waiting games and delaying tactics that Darius sends a message to the Scythian king urging him either to do battle or to surrender. Idanthyrsus refuses to fight and adds the message printed above, which includes Herodotus' only mention of any special filial piety among the Scythians.

To explain this appearance of the father-son motif, it is necessary to recall that Darius does not meddle with the tombs' of the Scythians' fathers, and the two armies never clash. Instead, he chooses to quit the country and after much hardship manages to return to Asia. Herodotus makes Idanthyrsus' response to Darius' challenge a turning point in the course of the Scythian expedition, and we must try to understand why this speech, raising the
particular issue of the molestation of ancestral tombs, is used so signally by the author.

Herodotus is deliberately using the father-son motif in an effort to enhance his characterization of king Darius. From the beginning of his portrait, Darius, for the most part, has been presented favorably by the historian, who depicts him as a positive foil to twin losers, his predecessor Cambyses (the son of the successful Cyrus, the good father), and his successor Xerxes. To enhance this contrast, Herodotus turns to the father-son theme. Yet this is not to say that Darius, as a Persian imperialist, is immune to committing crimes which severely indict him on charges much as we saw levied at Cambyses. Thus, in chapter 84 of Book Four, Darius brutally and deceitfully kills the three sons of Oeobazus, a Persian who had requested a military exemption for his sons. These murders stand out as one of Darius' most outrageous acts, and, as will be discussed in a later chapter, fit into a pattern of murders Herodotus uses throughout the Histories which seems to constitute a sub-motif within the father-son theme. In the case of Darius, though, whereas he is in certain respects likened to Cambyses, generally he is shown by Herodotus to be a wiser, better ruler and man. In his portrayal of the king, then, Herodotus draws the distinction between the two Persians by showing Darius scrupling to disturb the tombs of the Scyths' fathers--
that is, by observing some measure of respect for the sanctity of native custom—where Cambyses, it will be remembered, was shown to have flagrantly disregarded and even abused the observance of the Egyptians. In both instances, the arena of religion is specified to be one in which is grounded the bond between fathers and sons; in both instances, the manner in which the two kings respond to these father-son bonds functions as a key in the characterisation of the kings and as a pivot for the ensuing action: the abusive Cambyses is condemned as a madman and loses his conquests and eventually his life; Darius, implicitly respectful, owns that he has been exhausted on his campaign, and returns, alive, to Asia.

II. AMEINOCLES (7.190)

In this passage Herodotus introduces the theme of fathers and sons almost casually, with only a touch of pathos to offset the predominant feeling of the passage. After the description of the storm off Cape Sepias and the explanation of why the Greeks had called upon the wind-god Boreas to aid them (7.188-189), Herodotus launches into a tallying of the Persian losses, and then introduces the Magnesian farmer Ameinocles by means of one of the author's favorite tropes: Ameinocles gains unexpected fortune by collecting the riches which come to him through
no effort of his own (cf. Alcmeon 6.125; Sciton 3.130). We have the picture here of a happy farmer reaping from the tide the valuable flotsam of the wrecked Persian fleet. Yet all is not well with Ameinocles:

οὐκ εὐτυχεῖν εὑρήμασι μέγα πλοῦσιος ἐγένετο. ἥν γὰρ τις καὶ τούτου ἄχαρις συμφορὴ λυπεῦσα παιδοφόνος.

Ameinocles grew to be a man of great wealth in this way, but in other respects things did not go well with him; he too, like other men, had his own grief, he had slain his son. 7.190

Herodotus, in summing up Ameinocles' situation, emphasizes his misfortune in the opening clause, and adds the mention of his found wealth. Then the stress on misfortune is resumed in the second sentence above, in which both the language and sentiment are sadly reminiscent of another passage in the Histories in which the relationship between father and son was broken:

"Αδριστε, ἐγὼ σε συμφόρη πεπληγμένον ἀχάριτη

1.41.1

This line from the Croesus-logos, in which the Lydian welcomes the exile fratricide Adrastus, Herodotus may not be deliberately recalling, but it is easy to see that the echo serves to affirm the sincerity which Herodotus reserves for his notice of Ameinocles' situation. Indeed, the unfortunate lot which later in life made a son-slayer
of Ameinocles is clearly equated with, if not implied to be weightier still, than the great good fortune which Herodotus describes in vii.190 by the catalogue of valuables washed up on his stretch of shoreline. The entire short passage, moreover, is cast in philosophical terms of happiness and fate, and in its brief mention we see how gravely Herodotus reckoned the breaking of the bond between father and son.

III. THEMISTOCLES AND POLYCRITUS, SON OF CRIUS (8.92)

This brief incident illustrates the consistency of Herodotus' use of the father-son theme over great quantities of text, even in contexts where he could hardly have expected his audience to recall entirely the reference. In the battle outside the bay at Salamis, Herodotus describes the Aiginetan rear-attack, and in chapter 92 presents a dramatic confrontation between the admiral of the fleet Themistocles, and an Aiginetan ship captain, Polycritus, the son of Crius. This Polycritus had just changed a Sidonian vessel when

\[\text{όδ}'\,\text{δὲ}\,\text{ἐσείδε}\,\text{τὴν}\,\text{νέα}\,\text{τὴν}\,\text{Ἀττικὴν}\\\text{ὁ}\,\text{Πολύκριτος},\,\text{ἐγνώ}\,\text{τὸ}\,\text{σημίων}\,\text{ϊδὼν}\,\text{τῆς}\,\text{στρατηγίδος},\,\text{kαὶ}\\\text{βώσας}\,\text{τὸν}\,\text{Θεμιστοκλέα}\,\text{ἐπεκερτόμησε}\,\text{ἐς}\,\text{τῶν}\,\text{Αιγινητέων}\\\text{τῶν}\,\text{μηδισμῶν}\,\text{ὁνειδίζων.}\]
Polycritus no sooner saw the Athenian trireme, than knowing at once whose vessel it was, as he observed that it bore the ensign of the admiral, he shouted to Themistocles jeeringly, and asked him, in a tone of reproach, if the Aiginetans did not show themselves rare friend to the Medes. 8.92.2

Whereas all of Herodotus' Greek listeners knew well of the imputed medizing of the Aiginetans, the especial irony of this remark is only truly appreciated by those who have also recalled the incident from as far back as Book Six, chapter 50 (mentioned above, p.83), in which Cleomenes and Crius the Aeginetan have their threatening argument over the islanders' refusal to deliver over into the Spartan's hands the Aeginetans who had sent earth and water to the Great King. Herodotus, in specifying Polycritus' parentage, no doubt intends to recall this incident—and seems even to enjoy avenging the father by means of the son, as the son's heroics are amplified in the next sentence.

"ταῦτα μὲν υψυ καὶ ἐμβαλὼν ὁ Πολύκριτος ἀπέρριψε ἐς Θεμιστοκλέα:"

At the same time, while he thus reproached Themistocles, Polycritus bore down on the [Sidonian] ship. 8.92.2

Without stating outright the reference backwards in the Histories, Herodotus nevertheless lets his audience know,
here as elsewhere, that the theme of fathers and sons is always part of the larger scope of the narrative.

IV. XERXES, ARTEMISIA, AND HERMOTIMUS (8.104-106)

A passage from Book Eight illustrates how Herodotus' deep-seated interest in fathers and sons sometimes leads him to reintroduce the theme as it were for its own sake in contexts where the action is not necessarily furthered by its inclusion. Of course, the seemingly extraneous digression is a hallmark of Herodotean style; in the passage in question, we can see one route Herodotus takes in approaching his characteristic digressions.

After the Persian defeat at Salamis, Mardonius gives his advice to Xerxes for further action in Greece, with or without the king's presence. This advice pleases the king, and, seeking a second opinion, Xerxes solicits the glorious Halicarnassan leader Artemisia. Herodotus understandably takes special pride in this character, and this may explain his insertion of this conversation (chapter 102), in which Artemisia's advice and reasoning are straightforward, strategically sound, and flattering to the king. Herodotus writes that Xerxes found the advice to his liking, and then adds that the king
επανέσαις δὲ τὴν Ἀρτεμισίαν ταύτην μὲν ἀποστέλλει ἄγουσαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς παιδᾶς ἐς Ἐφέσου νόθου γὰρ τινὲς παιδές οἱ συνείποντο.

[Xerxes] gave praise to Artemisia, and entrusted her sons to her care, ordering her convey them to Ephesus; for he had been accompanied on the expedition by some of his bastard sons.

R.103

We see that Herodotus certifies his positive portrayal of Artemisia by showing the Great King praising her, and then extends this positive portrayal by having the king entrust her with his sons.

Once Herodotus has introduced sons into the narrative, his penchant for the topic leads him to a digression which functionally does nothing to advance the action after the loss at Salamis. The chapters on the revenge of Hermotimus1 are pure digression in this sense, and we can see how Herodotus uses the mention of sons as a point of departure for this aside:

συνέπεμπε δὲ τοῖς παισὶ φύλακαν Ἔρμοτίμου

He likewise sent away at this time one of the

1 Cf. Immerwahr, F&T, 284, 285, "In connection with the return of the illegitimate sons, Herodotus tells the terrible story of the eunuch Hermotimus....I believe the most important connection of this story with the main narrative lies in the synchronism with the campaign of Xerxes. Hermotimus is one barbarian who succeeded in taking vengeance on a Greek, as Xerxes decidedly did not. In addition, the motif of the destruction of children is emphasized, at the moment when Xerxes is fearing for his offspring..." (and see note 135 on same page).
principal of his eunuchs, a man named Hermotimus, who
was bidden to take charge of these sons. B.104

Once Hermotimus has been introduced in the context of
sons, it follows that his story be told in a related
context. This is indeed the case, and his bizarre tale
pivots on the manner in which he ultimately avenges
himself over Panionios, the man who castrated him early in
his life. The revenge itself has everything to do with
fathers and sons, for Hermotimus, once he has Panionios in
his power, forces this man to castrate his own four sons,
and then the sons to do likewise to their father! This
tableau, moreover, postponed to the end of Hermotimus' 
story necessarily for dramatic reasons, is transparent in
its focus on father and sons, for Panionios' fatherhood is
not mentioned beforehand, and Herodotus' language infuses
a stress on the father-son theme with its repetition of
päis-forms and its strong, negative verbs of forcing and,
of course, cutting:

\[ \text{After these reproaches, Hermotimus commanded the four} \]
\[ \text{sons of Panionius to be brought, and forced the father} \]
to castrate them with his own hand. Unable to resist, he did as Hermotimus required; and then his sons were made to treat him in the self-same way. So in this way there came to Panionius requital at the hands of Hermotimus.

Another factor which contributes to the understanding that fathers and sons are the raison d'être of this digression is the speedy return to the main narrative once this denouement is reached. As if reminded by the pais-words, Herodotus, after a brief closing statement on the tisis of Panionios, returns to his narrative of Xerxes, re Ξέρξης δὲ ὃς τοὺς παιδᾶς ἐπέτρεψε 'Αρτεμισία ἀπάγειν

Ξέρξης δὲ ὃς τοὺς παιδᾶς ἐπέτρεψε 'Αρτεμισία ἀπάγειν ἐς Ἐφεσον

Xerxes, after charging Artemisia to convey his sons safe to Ephesus...

This reintroduction leads to Xerxes' retreat from Attica and the Persian fleet's removal to the Hellespont; the brief interlude of Hermotimus stands as a digression unrelated to the flow of the narrative, but thematically related, as has been shown, to the portrayal of Xerxes' relationship with his favored advisor Artemisia.
The briefest notice of Pausanias' clemency, after the siege of Thebes forces its inhabitants to sue for peace from the angry Greeks, is a pointed reminder of what Herodotus reckons as the true mark of the general's greatness. Evidently, Herodotus chose to ignore the Spartan's subsequent medizing, leaving it to be revealed and questioned by Thucydides (1.128). For Herodotus, Pausanias was a hero. In his effort to portray him thus, when the Thebans agree to hand over to the Greeks the ringleaders Timagenidas and Attaginus, and the latter flees, his sons are delivered to Pausanias in their father's place. Herodotus then writes

\[ \pi\alpha\idots \; \delta \; \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron \; \alpha\pi\alpha\chi\theta\epsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \; \Pi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\alpha\varsigma \varsigma \; \alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \; \tau\epsilon\varsigma \; \alpha\iota\tau\iota \varsigma \; \varsigma, \; \phi\omicron \; \tau\omicron \; \mu\iota\delta\iota\sigma\omicron\nu\omega \; \pi\alpha\idots \; \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\epsilon\nu \; \epsilon\iota\nu \; \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\iota\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma. \]

but Pausanias refused to hold them guilty, since his sons (he said) could have had no part in having Medized.

Herodotus makes it clear in the next sentence that Pausanias, quite rightly, did not show the same mercy to the other Thebans handed over to him; the special treatment afforded to the innocent sons of Attaginus, and

---

2 For a survey and appraisal of the literature on Pausanias, see J. F. Lazenby, "Pausanias, Son of Kleombrotos," Hermes 103 (1978) 235.
especially the *explanation* of this treatment, show Herodotus at work relying on a *special theme* to convey a particular impression of Pausanias.
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