F

FABLE

JEREMY B. LEFKOWITZ
Swarthmore College

Fable has been identified as an important folkloric element in the *Histories* (Aly 1969), evidence of Herodotus' affinities to popular storytelling and oral traditions. Scholars have also proposed more profound connections to the ancient fable in Herodotus' overall approach to historiography, most notably in the discovery of links in the *Histories* to the archaic *ainos* (Nagy 1990) and to Aesopic fable as a significant model for Herodotus' PROSE writing (Kurke 2010).

Nonetheless, only one story in Herodotus is fully appropriated by the later Aesopic tradition: the fable of the flute-player and the dancing FISH, told by CYRUS (II) to an audience of IONIANS and AEOLIANS (1.141–42: cf. Perry 1952, 11; Babrius 9, Aphthonius 33; see also Theon *Progymnasmata* 2). A few other Herodotean stories appear to be closely related to known fables, including those of ARION (1.23–24; Perry 1952, 97) and HIPPOCLEIDES (6.126–31: cf. Nacca Jataka 32, in Chalmers and Cowell 1895). But narrative features and structural elements associated with ancient fable can be detected in any number of episodes with a moralizing thrust (e.g., 1.125; 1.158–59; 3.142; 3.46; 4.131–32; 5.92; 6.86; 9.122; see Karadagli 1981).

Cyrus' story is noteworthy for being the oldest fable extant in Greek prose. It tells of a fisherman who attempts to lure fish out of the SEA with his flute-playing and is subsequently disappointed when he must use a conventional net to haul in his catch. When the fish start to jump around on land, the fisherman mocks them for dancing too late after the right moment (*kairos*) has passed. As presented in Herodotus, the fable is directed pointedly to the Ionians and Aeolians, since both had ignored earlier overtures but were now seeking an alliance with Cyrus. Cyrus' fable appropriately reflects the attitude of a land power (PERSIA) toward maritime peoples (Greeks); it may very well be of Near Eastern origin (Hirsch 1986). In any case, it is striking that Herodotus does not ascribe it to AESOP, seeing that he elsewhere names the legendary fabulist and calls him a *logopoios* (2.134; Dijk 1997).

SEE ALSO: Proverbs; Short Stories

REFERENCES

Aly, Wolfgang. 1969 [1921]. *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*. 2nd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Chalmers, R. (trans.), and E. B. Cowell (ed.). 1895. *The Jataka: or, Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, vols. 1–3. London: Cambridge University Press. Reprinted, Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.

Dijk, Gert-Jan. 1997. *Ainoi, Logoi, Muthoi: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature*. Leiden: Brill.

Hirsch, Steven W. 1986. "Cyrus' Parable of the Fish: Sea Power in the Early Relations of Greece and Persia." *CJ* 81.3: 222–29.

Karadagli, Triantaphyllia. 1981. *Fabel und Ainos: Studien zur griechischen Fabel*. Königstein: Hain.

Kurke, Leslie. 2010. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

The Herodotus Encyclopedia: Volume II, First Edition. Edited by Christopher Baron.

Nagy, Gregory. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Perry, B. E. 1952. *Aesopica*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1980.

FAME

ERIC ROSS
University of North Dakota

Fame, a concept of paramount importance throughout Greek culture, is a driving force behind the *Histories*. In his opening sentence, Herodotus announces that he records history so that "great and marvelous deeds …may not lack *kleos*" (μή … ἀκλεᾶ γένηται). *Kleos* refers to the eternal glory attached to high achievement. Its root meaning is "to hear," which indicates the commemorative aspect of the word: those who win *kleos* have their names remembered far beyond their own lifetimes. In giving such prominence to the idea of *kleos*, Herodotus reveals the influence of Homeric POETRY and the conception of his work as a PROSE epic. Homer's Achilles risks death in exchange for "undying *kleos*" (*Il.* 9.413; cf. 18.121), while HECTOR, his Trojan adversary, seeks "great *kleos*" for his father and himself (*Il.* 6.446). The emphasis on fame in both the *Iliad* and the *Histories* underscores the power of the author as commemorator, for HOMER and Herodotus are responsible for transmitting a character's story and reputation.

Herodotus celebrates glorious and noteworthy accomplishments throughout the *Histories*, but perhaps most prominently in his battle narratives. The emphasis on martial valor comes as no surprise, given the military origins of the concept of *kleos*. After the Battle of THERMOPYLAE, Herodotus commemorates the most impressive soldiers from both sides of the conflict (7.224–27). Although he does not publish the full list, Herodotus claims to know the names of each of the 300 Spartans who fought at Thermopylae (7.224.1). Similar acknowledgment of especially heroic conduct follows his accounts of MARATHON (6.114), SALAMIS (8.93), and PLATAEA (9.64, 71, 73–75). At other times, however, Herodotus withholds *kleos* by announcing his decision to omit certain names even when he is familiar with them. He knows, for instance, but will not share the identity of a Delphian who falsely inscribed one of CROESUS' offerings as a gift from the Spartans (1.51.4). It is noteworthy that Herodotus does not seek to disgrace this individual; instead, he merely underscores that no *kleos* has been achieved, that the false engraver will fade from human MEMORY.

Given its special status in the *Histories,* Herodotus' actual use of the word *kleos* deserves closer study, especially because it is surprisingly uncommon in the work. The negative form occurs once more beyond the opening sentence, when ATHENS defeats a joint army of Lacedaemonians, BOEOTIANS, and Chalcidians, who are routed "ingloriously" (ἀκλεῶς, 5.77.1). Otherwise the word *kleos* itself appears only four times, and it is striking that each instance concerns the Spartans, usually with regard to Thermopylae. According to Herodotus, LEONIDAS considered retreat ignoble for himself, instead choosing to leave behind great *kleos* by making a fatal yet heroic stand (7.220.2). Herodotus then adds that Leonidas dismissed his Hellenic ALLIES in order to reserve *kleos* for the Spartans alone (7.220.4). The two other mentions of *kleos* occur in Herodotus' account of Plataea, explicitly presented as a sequel to Thermopylae (and both instances are placed in the mouths of characters, rather than coming from the narrator). When the Spartans initially fail to meet their own standard of COURAGE, rearranging their formation in order to avoid engaging the Persian contingent, MARDONIUS conveys his dismay via MESSENGER: the Spartans' evasive tactics are at odds with their reputation (κατὰ κλέος, 9.48.3). In other words, they are not living up to the fame won at Thermopylae. Finally, after victory at Plataea, the Spartan commander PAUSANIAS, nephew of Leonidas, is congratulated for winning unprecedented *kleos* (9.78.2).

It might seem that the Spartans' near monopoly on *kleos* in the *Histories* augments their glory, identifying them as contemporary Homeric heroes. In one famous passage, however, Herodotus undermines this perception by declaring Athens the savior of Greece (7.139). Without support from the Athenian navy, he concludes, the Spartans eventually would have fallen, no matter

how stubborn their refusal to submit. This statement glorifies Spartan heroism yet concludes that it is not enough to win the present conflict. The powerful appeal of epic motifs must give way to historical judgment. Although Herodotus claims a Homeric identity as a bestower of fame, he also announces that, as a researcher pursuing verifiable facts, he poses a challenge to traditional poetic mentalities.

SEE ALSO: Epic Poetry; Heroes and Hero Cult; Historical Method; Monuments; Prologue; Sparta

FURTHER READING

Dillery, John. 1996. "Reconfiguring the Past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and Narrative Pattern in Herodotus." *AJPh* 117: 217–54.

Gainsford, Peter. 2013. "Herodotus' Homer: Troy, Thermopylae, and the Dorians." In *Beyond the Gates of Fire*, edited by Christopher A. Matthew and Matthew Trundle, 117–37. Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books.

Lateiner, Donald. 1989. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Nagy, Gregory. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

FAMILY

MATTHEW DILLON

University of New England, Australia

The family in ancient Greece was a social, cultural, and economic institution, which was centered on the *oikos* (pl. *oikoi*), the household—which was more than just the family, but included it and its slaves (if any), livestock, possessions, and land. There was, in fact, no ancient Greek word for "family," as separate from its possessions and interests. The *oikos* could be multi-generational, with three generations living together. Preserving and increasing the WEALTH of an *oikos* was a major concern for its members. According to ARISTOTLE, the *oikos* was the "building block" of the *POLIS*, with each *polis* being constituted from the individual *oikoi*: "every *polis* is made up of households (*oikoi*)," and the household, he continues, consists of master and slave, husband and wife, father and CHILDREN (Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1–9, 1261a19–22).

Herodotus writes of several Greek families, such as the ALCMAEONIDAE, Philaidae (see AJAX), and PEISISTRATIDAE at ATHENS, the BACCHIADAE at CORINTH, the two royal families at SPARTA. He is thus aware that the family was a political unit, especially so in the ARCHAIC AGE with which he largely deals. He is interested in conflicts in families, such as that of the tyrant PERIANDER with his youngest son (in which Periander eventually had his daughter mediate: 3.50.3–53). Herodotus is aware of the pathos of family links, and he movingly describes Periander's anguish at his son LYCOPHRON being homeless, hungry, and cold, but Herodotus also puts into Periander's mouth some points about obedience to and respect for one's parents (3.52.1–6). Individual families played key roles in Spartan politics in Herodotus' account: he notes that of the royal families, that of EURYSTHENES (the Agiad branch) was senior to that of PROCLES (the Eurypontid: 6.51–52, 8.131.2).

For the father of the *oikos*, the legitimacy of his children was a prime concern. Men had one wife. Divorce was not difficult, but unless the wife was divorced for adultery, it entailed the return of the full dowry to the wife's original family. The father was the *kyrios*, or "master" and had authority over his wife, children, and slaves in the *oikos*. Sons when they turned 18, at least at ATHENS, were presented to the local DEME council which voted on whether to accept them as citizens; if so, this marked the legal independence of the sons, now having the right to vote and hold office (but not serve on juries until 30). Sons formed their own *oikos* at MARRIAGE or at the death of their father. Daughters remained in the authority of their father in the family, until they married and joined a new *oikos*. In the case of divorce, a daughter would return to the household of her father or eldest living male relative, while any children would normally remain with their father.

Strict chastity was expected of the wife, in order to ensure that any children she had were legitimate, but not of the husband. Attempting to introduce "bastard" or illegitimate children born from a liaison with a non-Athenian woman was, however, in Athens after 451 BCE, an indictable offence to be

dealt with by the courts. That is, Athenian LAW drew a distinction between the citizen family of a man, and other offspring (*Against Neaera* [Dem. 59], esp. 16). Moreover, the property of the family could only be inherited at Athens by actual family members: illegitimate children were specifically debarred by law from inheriting (Dem. 43.51), thus strengthening the *oikos*.

At Athens, if there were no sons in a family, the property of the *oikos* was transmitted through any daughter or daughters. These daughters were termed *epiklēroi*, "heiresses," passing on the *klēros*, property, of the *oikos*. In this way they did not inherit the property in their own right, but rather transmitted it. *Epiklēroi* could be claimed in marriage by one of the nearest surviving collateral male relatives (known as the *anchisteia*); if married and desiring the inheritance, the nearest male relative could divorce his current wife. This procedure (endogamy) aimed at keeping property within the family. This was unlike at Sparta, where within the family, daughters could inherit their father's wealth: in this way, Aristotle claims, Spartan women by his time owned two-fifths of Sparta (Arist. *Pol.* 1270a23). According to the Gortyn law-code, heiresses were to be married to their father's brother; if not, it makes provisions for the next living relative to marry her, and so on (*Gortyn Lawcode* col. 7.15).

Adoption into a family, in order to maintain that *oikos* and its cults and tombs, was possible: but the adoptee, usually an adult, resigned claims to his previous *oikos*. At Athens, a man to be adopted into a citizen *oikos* had to be a legitimate member of an Athenian citizen family. Isaeus in a fourth-century Athenian law-suit states that adoption prevented the extinction of *oikoi*, and ensured that there was someone to perform family SACRIFICES and the "customary rites" for them (Isae. 7.30, and passim). The preservation of an individual family was so important that at Athens the chief archon was directed by LAW to take measures to prevent the extinction of families. Aristocratic families held certain priesthoods: hence the priestess of ATHENA Parthenos, on the ACROPOLIS, was always chosen from within the Eteoboutadae *genos*. Various religious rites focused on the family, with the husband responsible for rites of the hearth, and any household statues, such as those of the hermaphrodites and hermae. Tombs of the family ancestors were venerated.

The family was ideally economically self-sufficient (*autarkes*: Arist. *Pol.* 1261b 13–14), but in practical terms this was not possible. The *oikos*, however, could be a unit of production, with its women members in particular spinning and weaving, selling the product for profit (Xen. *Mem.* 2.7.6–12), and husband and wife were to work together to look after their possessions and increase them (Xen. *Oec.* 7.15).

A family had to support its members: the father and mother were to raise the children, and the male children were to support their parents in old age. A father was, at Athens, required to teach his son a trade (Plut. *Sol.* 22.1), otherwise the father lost his moral right to be supported by his son when elderly. Mentally or physically infirm members of the family were its responsibility. At Athens, however, there was (perhaps uniquely in Greece) a small pension for disabled citizens (Lys. 24), so that they did not have to live in poverty. In addition, boys who were left as orphans, if their fathers were killed in war, were raised at the expense of the state until they were eighteen, when they were granted a panoply of arms, under the terms of a decree passed by one Theozotides (*Agora* I 7169). While the parents could make a decision to expose a child (see esp. the Gortyn Law Code), Sparta, uniquely, took this role away from the family: a council of male elders examined the infant and decided whether it lived or died (Plut. *Lyc.* 16). Elsewhere, the Corinthians sent to kill the infant CYPSELUS, however, could not bring themselves to do so because of his beguiling smile (Hdt. 5.92.γ.3–4).

Families were part of larger groupings: at Athens there was the *genos*, the wider family. For example, when the Spartans expelled the Alcmaeonid *genos* from Athens in 508 BCE, over 700 families were thus expelled ([Arist.] *Ath. pol.* 20.3). In addition to the *genea* were the phratries (brotherhoods), a large "kinship" grouping, which survived CLEISTHENES' democratic reforms in 508 ([Arist]. *Ath. pol.* 21.6; Arist. *Pol.* 1319b19–27). They are also attested in other CITIES, such as CYRENE and ELIS. The Greek family (*oikos*) was the fundamental building block of the ancient Greek *polis*. It in many ways was a microcosm of the *polis*, with its concern for prosperity, and membership of a citizen *oikos* was essential for citizenship.

SEE ALSO: Domestic Economy; Genealogies; Religion, Greek; Ritual; Women in Ancient Greece

FURTHER READING

Cox, Cheryl Anne. 1998. *Household Interests. Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Kennell, Nigel M. 1995. *The Gymnasium of Virtue*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Lacey, Walter K. 1968. *The Family in Classical Greece*. London: Thames & Hudson.
Patterson, Cynthia B. 1998. *The Family in Greek History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Pomeroy, Sarah B. 1997. *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FARMING, *see* AGRICULTURE

FATE

ANTHONY ELLIS
University of Bern

Early in the *Histories* Herodotus introduces the story of CANDAULES' deposition and DEATH with the phrase, "for it was necessary for Candaules to end badly" (1.8.2). This is one of several expressions, used by both narrator and characters, which seem to present particular events as predestined and immutable, employing the verbs δεῖ, χρή, and μέλλω. Other apparently fatalistic terms include μοῖρα (literally "portion," "lot," but with the sense of "fate" at 1.121, 3.142.3, 4.164.4), ἐστὶ πεπρωμένον ("it is predestined," 3.64.4–5, cf. 1.91), μόρσιμον ("fated," 3.154.1), and finally the terms λάχεσις and μόρος (together in an oracle attributed to BACIS, 9.43.2). Many thus consider "fate" an important part of Herodotus' vision of historical CAUSATION or personal religiosity (e.g., Asheri in ALC, 37; Harrison 2000, 223; Fornara 1990; Immerwahr 1954; cf. Mikalson 2003, 148–50, who resists the label "fate").

Others, however, have suggested that expressions using δεῖ and χρή may be "the traditional language of a teller of tales" rather than indicating "a theory of historical necessity" (Gould 1989, 72–78). Parallels have been drawn with Homeric phrases like "I was not to…" (οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον, e.g., *Il.* 18.98) and English "it was bound to happen." Some references to μοῖρα, on this view, may be little more than archaic formulae, and phrases like "X had to come to a bad end," rather than indicating transcendental NECESSITY, mark momentous events or particularly strange actions which defy normal explanation (cf. Munson 2001, 34–35). Although such considerations are important, many narratives in the *Histories* are explicitly predicated on the notion that certain events are predestined and inevitable. Thus, for example, the narrator states that a dream "showed [Croesus] the truth about the ills that were going to happen" (1.34). CROESUS attempts to avoid this revealed "TRUTH"—the death of his son ATYS—but to no avail. Here and elsewhere the narrative insists that specific events (often predicted in ORACLES or DREAMS) are truly unavoidable, although there remains a "fundamental flexibility" in how "what must happen" comes to pass (cf. 1.91; Harrison 2000, 227).

Less clear is the relationship of this "fate" or "necessity" to other divine powers. The view expressed by a Persian before the Battle of PLATAEA—that "man is powerless to avert what must come from god" (9.16.4)—seems to suggest that "what must happen" is connected with the will of (the) god(s). By contrast the Delphic oracle given to Croesus after his capture by CYRUS (II) (1.91) presents "fate" (τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν) as immutable "even for a god," and as being the domain of a different group of divine powers: the "Fates" (Μοῖραι). APOLLO, the PYTHIA says, solicited the Fates on Croesus' behalf but was unable to persuade them to postpone further the PUNISHMENT for the crime of Croesus' ancestor GYGES. These two apparently exclusive perspectives on the relationship between "god" and "fate/necessity" have led to diverse interpretations (beginning with Henri Estienne in 1566 [Estienne 1980, 26–28]; among others, see Maddalena 1950, 65–67; De Ste. Croix 1977, 140–41; Harrison 2000, 223–26, esp. n. 9; Mikalson 2003, 149–50). However, the frequent association of "what must/will happen" with the action and will of god(s) (see e.g., ARTABANUS, 7.17–18; ZOPYRUS (1), 3.153–54; SCYLES, 4.79.1–2) undermines any attempt to establish a strict distinction between "fate" and "divinity" in the *Histories* more broadly.

These different perspectives have led some to conclude that Herodotus had a somewhat nebulous conception of fate which he failed to marshal into a coherent position (see Fornara 1990, 28–29; Harrison 2000, 228). It is, however, important to note that the view of fate as a theologically distinct entity governed by the Μοῖραι (1.91) is the exception. Moreover, it may be unwise to expect theological consistency between passages which derive from different sources (among them oracles) and are embedded in wholly distinct narrative contexts.

Ancient thinkers seem to have conceived of "necessity" or "fate" in a fundamentally different manner to post-Enlightenment readers: for the former, certain momentous events might be fixed in advance, but the precise manner and TIME in which they occur is not (the best example being the oracle's discussion of the fated loss of Croesus' empire, 1.91.1–3; see Immerwahr 1954, 32–37; Williams 1993, 136–41, esp. on "indeterminate or deferred" necessity; Harrison 2000, 226–27; compare also Aesch. *Pers*. 739–42). When characters in the *Histories* realize that what they hope for is "fated," they assume (apparently correctly) that it is incumbent upon them to work actively to bring about this desirable outcome: thus Zopyrus (1), realizing from an omen that BABYLON's fall is "fated," devises a clever stratagem to trick the defenders and reaps rich rewards (3.153–54). By contrast, when a preordained DISASTER is revealed by a dream or an oracle, the wisest characters realize what most learn only through bitter experience: that no human action can possibly avert the fated event. There is a lack of symmetry here, but these types of "fate" are associated with fundamentally different types of narrative (the former reflects the optimism of cult worship; the latter the pessimism of a tragic narrative of inevitable doom).

There are several theories of how Herodotus and his contemporaries imagined fate to function. The first somehow embeds the notion of supernatural or divine causation inside the human himself. Here "what must happen" is not an external necessity but the inevitable result of the characters of the people involved. The will of the gods and/or fate is thus little more than an expression of the personalities of the protagonists, or a projection of an individual's psychology onto the metaphysical or supernatural realm. On this view, when Herodotus says that "Candaules had to end badly" he means to say that, excessively uxorious as Candaules was, he was sure to get himself into trouble (so e.g., Focke 1932, 189–90; cf. Lloyd 1988, 2–3; Stahl 1975, 18–19). Likewise, the divine dreams which appear to XERXES and Artabanus and describe the Persian invasion of Greece as "what must happen" (7.12–18) are, on this view, nothing more than an apotheosis of the expansionist tradition of the Persian MONARCHY and Xerxes' own reckless DESIRES (e.g., Munson 2001, 33; cf. Stahl 1975, 30–31).

A second view of "fatalistic" and "divine" causation—often linked to the first—is the theory of "double" or "over determination." (the latter term, coined by Freud, was applied to classical Greek religion by Dodds 1951, 7; the classic work is Lesky 1961) According to this theory, causation plays out *separately* on the "divine/fatal" and the "human" levels, leaving the "human" story as a coherent narrative which can be considered on its own terms without recourse to the metaphysical explanation (Stahl 1975, 18–19; Baragwanath 2008, 126; cf. Fisher 2002, 223, and discussion in Immerwahr 1954, 35; Versnel 2011, 174).

A third view, perhaps the most intuitive, would see external metaphysical powers—the gods, "fate," or the Moirai—deciding the future somewhat arbitrarily in advance and then manipulating the human world in various ways so that the predetermined events come about, irrespective of or even despite the desires and characters of the protagonists. Thus neither Adrastus nor Croesus seem to want anything but the best for young Atys (who himself lacks conspicuous flaws), but their actions lead to his untimely death in the manner prophesied by Croesus' dream, quite contrary to the natural order of things. The best parallel for this sort of fate, which makes a mockery of human intentions and desires, is the story of OEDIPUS written by Herodotus' contemporary SOPHOCLES.

Herodotus never explicitly discusses supernatural "necessity" or how it relates to the characters of his human protagonists. Of the various theories about how Herodotean fatalism functions mentioned above, each fits some scenes better than others. It may well be the case that more than one conception of "fate" or "divine causation" is to be found in his narratives.

A modern reader might expect a "fatalistic" world-view to diminish an individual's moral responsibility. If what is "fated/necessary" is brought about by external powers working to manipulate events through coincidences, oracles, dreams, etc., then culpability for human disasters must, in the final reckoning, lie in the supernatural rather than the human realm. Here we must interrogate the theory of "double determination" (see above), since it is often invoked in Herodotean contexts where it is out of place. On this theory, the structurally central decision of Herodotus' *Histories*—Xerxes' decision to campaign against Greece—is explained in two *parallel* scenes: in the first Xerxes decides to go to war (7.5–11), and in the second divine dreams appear which force him to go to war, in accordance with his former free decision (7.12–18). Double determination would have these as alternative explanations of the same event, playing out on different "levels": the human and the divine/fatalistic. There is, however, no suggestion in Herodotus' text that Xerxes' dreams are an "alternative" explanation for the war: the dreams occur *after* Xerxes has decided *against* the Greek campaign, and they force both him and Artabanus to stick to a course of action that they have expressly rejected for good reasons (reasons of which they remain fully aware as they make the final decision at 7.18.2–3). Most importantly, this version of events—in which the dreams are responsible for reversing Xerxes' decision to abandon the campaign—is confirmed in the dramatic world of the *Histories*: Xerxes and Artabanus refer back to it during their dialogue at the HELLESPONT (7.47.1). The fact that these divine dreams successfully bully both Xerxes and the wise Artabanus into supporting the campaign, and that the war is described as "what must happen" (7.17.2), is a fundamental, if surprising, aspect of how Herodotus presents the genesis of the PERSIAN WARS (see especially Roettig 2010). Downgrading the scene to a "parallel" cause which can thus be discounted may bring a welcome simplicity—making Xerxes wholly morally responsible for the campaign—but it does little justice to the text Herodotus chose to write. If we wish to understand Herodotus' view of historical causation and its relation to the divine, we should take such fatalism seriously when it is so boldly underlined.

The *Histories* offer several perspectives on the relationship between human responsibility and fate. When MILTIADES THE YOUNGER is advised by the priestess TIMO to enter a forbidden sacred place (and later dies of a wound suffered on leaving), the Delphic oracle excuses Timo from punishment on the grounds that "Miltiades had to come to a bad end"—Timo had merely guided Miltiades into his misfortunes (6.135; cf. the story of EUENIUS, 9.93–94). But, as Harrison has observed (2000, 223–42), a diametrically opposed view of human responsibility is also found in the *Histories*: despite the fact that Croesus' fall was "fated," he acknowledges the oracle's claim that he was αἴτιος ("responsible") for his own downfall because he did not interrogate the deceptive oracles Apollo gave him with sufficient caution. Here the predestined nature of the events concerned (cf. 1.13.2, 91.1) seems not to mitigate Croesus' role as a responsible agent (or at least as a "cause").

SEE ALSO: Blame; Characterization; Gods and the Divine; Historical Method; Knowledge; Reciprocity; Religion, Greek; Religion, Herodotus' Views on

REFERENCES

Baragwanath, Emily. 2008. *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Ste. Croix, Geoffrey. 1977. "Herodotus." *G&R* 24: 130–48.

Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Estienne, Henri. 1980 [1566]. "Apologia pro Herodoto." In *Henrici Stephani Apologia pro Herodoto, Henri Estienne Apologie für Herodot, nach der Erstausgabe (Genf 1566)*, edited by Johannes Kramer. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain.

Fisher, Nick. 2002. "Popular Morality in Herodotus." In *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees, 199–224. Leiden: Brill.

Focke, Friedrich. 1932. "Review of K.-A. Pagel. 1927. *Die Bedeutung des aitiologischen Momentes für Herodots Geschichtsschriebung*." *Gnomon* 8: 177–90.

Fornara, Charles. 1990. "Human History and the Constraint of Fate in Herodotus." In *Conflict, Antithesis, and the Ancient Historian*, edited by June W. Allison, 25–45. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Gould, John. 1989. *Herodotus*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Harrison, Thomas. 2000. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Immerwahr, Henry R. 1954. "Historical Action in Herodotus." *TAPA* 85: 16–45.
Lesky, Albin. 1961. *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
Lloyd, Alan B. 1988. *Herodotus: Book II, Commentary 99–182*. Leiden: Brill.
Maddalena, Antonio. 1950. "L'umano e il divino in Erodoto." In *Studi di Filosofia Greca*, edited by Vittorio Enzo Alfieri and Mario Untersteiner, 57–84. Bari: Laterza.
Mikalson, Jon D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. 2001. "*ANANKE* in Herodotus." *JHS* 121: 30–50.
Roettig, Katharina. 2010. *Die Träume des Xerxes. Zum Handeln der Götter bei Herodot*. Nordhausen: Traugott Bautz GmbH.
Stahl, Hans-Peter. 1975. "Learning Through Suffering? Croesus' Conversations in the History of Herodotus." *YClS* 24: 1–36.
Versnel, H. S. 2011. *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Williams, Bernard. 1993. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

"FATHER OF HISTORY"

GIUSTINA MONTI
University of Lincoln

The term "father of history" (*pater historiae* in Latin), with which Cicero depicted Herodotus in *De Legibus* (1.5), is not an absolute and objective portrayal of the historian from HALICARNASSUS. Indeed, in the very same sentence, Cicero observes that "even in Herodotus, the father of History, and in THEOPOMPUS there are countless tales" (*quamquam et apud Herodotum patrem historiae et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulae*). In Cicero's opinion, Herodotus was the father of history, but, nonetheless, a story-teller. Cicero's remark appears to be an observation aiming at self-defense, since a few lines earlier his friend Atticus had commented upon Cicero's poem on Marius, and—in a way—was charging him with neglecting the TRUTH (*Leg.* 1.4): Atticus was wondering whether many of the accounts in the poem were made-up or real (*ficta* or *vera*), and if Cicero had insisted upon truth. To this suspicion, Cicero answered that he did not desire to be considered a "liar"; however, one who asked such questions revealed inexperience in the different genres, since in that particular work they ought to demand truth from him as a poet, not as a witness in court. His brother Marcus, then, commented that Cicero—so he perceived—deemed that the laws to be observed in history differed from those in POETRY. To this assessment, Cicero replied with the well-known sentence mentioned above: "Yes indeed, since in history everything is reported aiming at truth, in poetry aiming at pleasure; nevertheless, even in Herodotus, the father of history, and in Theopompus there are countless tales." Moreover, while he assessed Herodotus' eloquence and style as sweet and fluid (*De Or.* 2.55; *Orat.* 39, 186, 219; *Hortensius* F15), Cicero also accused him of forgery, at least in the case of the ORACLE about the outcome of the war between CROESUS and CYRUS (II) (*Div.* 2.116).

Cicero was not the last to assign history's fatherhood to Herodotus: the fourteenth-century Italian humanist Francesco Petrarca (Petrarch) defined him as "the father of Greek history" ("di greca istoria padre," *Trionfo della Fama* 3.58; similarly *De Remediis utriusque fortunae* 1.23). Petrarch also noticed Cicero's contradiction in terms, and he found hard to believe the paradox that the father of history, was, at the same time, guilty of forgery (*Rerum Memorandarum libri* 4.25–26). On the other hand, almost three centuries later, Jean Luis Vives (*Libri XII De Disciplinis*, 1612, p. 87) stated that Herodotus should have been called "father of lies" rather than "father of history." In the twentieth century, at the end of a long career, Sir John Linton Myres wrote a book entitled *Herodotus, Father of History*, in which he aimed to examine Herodotus' claim to that title and "to rediscover the 'Father of History'" (Myres 1953, v–vi). The epithet persists, if perhaps mostly among non-specialists, in the twenty-first century.

SEE ALSO: "Liar School"; Momigliano, Arnaldo; Plutarch; Reliability; various entries on Reception of Herodotus

REFERENCE

Myres, John L. 1953. *Herodotus, Father of History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FURTHER READING

Dunsch, Boris. 2013. "'Et apud patrem historiae sunt innumerabiles fabulae': Herodot bei Cicero." In *Herodots Quellen—Die Quellen Herodots*, edited by Boris Dunsch and Kai Ruffing, 153–99. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Evans, J. A. S. 1968. "Father of History or Father of Lies: The Reputation of Herodotus." *CJ* 64: 11–17.

Fowler, Robert. 1996. "Herodotos and His Contemporaries." *JHS* 116: 62–87. Reprinted in ORCS Vol. 1, 46–83.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1957. "Erodoto e la storiografia moderna: alcuni problemi presentati ad un convegno di umanisti." *Aevum* 31: 74–84.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1958. "The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography." *History* 43: 1–13. Reprinted in ORCS Vol. 1, 31–45.

FEAR, *see* EMOTIONS

FEASTING

ANGUS BOWIE

Queen's College, Oxford

Herodotus works with both Near Eastern and Greek ideologies of feasting. In Near Eastern art and literature, the royal banquet was the site of major cosmic and historical events and signified the majesty of the king. Something of this is found also in HOMER, and Herodotus still associates it with major events. Eastern banquets tend to have a sinister connection with death and endings, whereas the Greek symposium is the site of more auspicious events.

The banquet can symbolize the centrality of the king. At his birthday feast (*tukta*, 9.110.2), XERXES must grant any request, so is forced to cede MASISTES' wife to his own wife's VENGEANCE; he offers Masistes another wife, but he refuses, revolts, and is subsequently killed (9.108–13). The king is at the center but is constrained to maintain loyalty by gifts, which are not negotiable; brutal treatment may be necessary.

The rise and fall of eastern empires and kings are centered round banquets, for instance the ACHAEMENID Empire. When king ASTYAGES discovered that the Median general HARPAGUS had failed to carry out orders to kill Astayages' grandson Cyrus, who according to PROPHECY would depose Astyages, Astyages invited Harpagus to a banquet and served him his own son. Harpagus plotted his revenge with Cyrus, who offered his Persian army a choice between two tasks: they cleared a large area of thorny ground with sickles, and then "he made them recline in a meadow and feasted them" (1.126.3). They preferred the latter, and then defeated Astyages, who called Harpagus "the most unjust of men, who enslaved the MEDES because of that banquet" (1.129.3). Cyrus entertaining his people to "myriad good things" reflects the tributary relationships in the empire: the king provides good things and the people are loyal.

Cyrus' reign ends also with a banquet. Fighting the MASSAGETAE, he refused their queen TOMYRIS' warning not to capture yet another country. The Massagetae knew nothing of luxury, so a trick banquet was prepared, with generous FOOD and WINE, attended by the worst Persian soldiers (1.207.6–7); these the Massagetae massacred and "reclining, began to feast" (1.211.2). Once drunk, they were killed or taken alive by the Persians, including SPARGAPISES, Tomyris' son, who killed himself. Tomyris scorned this victory won "through the fruit of the vine" (1.212.2) and defeated the Persians; finding Cyrus' body, she filled a wineskin with blood and thrust his head into it.

Feasting also marks the rise of Greek families. AMYNTAS I, king of Macedon, invited Persian ambassadors (5.18–21). "When they were drinking," the Persians demanded that the Macedonian wives attend and then molested them. Amyntas' son, ALEXANDER, the founder of the Macedonian kingdom, had the women go to wash and substituted beardless young men who despatched the Persians. The presence of wives and oafish drunkenness are implicitly contrasted with Greek moderation and all-male drinking. Similarly, the ALCMAEONIDAE rose to prominence at ATHENS after MEGACLES (II) was victor in the tests set by CLEISTHENES, tyrant of SICYON, "and most especially in the banquet" (6.128.1), and married Cleisthenes' daughter AGARISTE (I) (6.126–31).

This contrast between the nations reappears when banquets frame the Persian army's final defeat at PLATAEA. In the first (9.16), Persian subjection to rulers contrasts with Greek FREEDOM of speech. After the battle, the Spartan commander PAUSANIAS, seeing the grandeur of the royal tent, orders a Persian and a Spartan meal prepared and set side-by-side, "to demonstrate the folly of the leader of the Medes, who, despite his own high lifestyle, came to take away our wretched existence" (9.82.3).

SEE ALSO: Anthropophagy; Barbarians; Drinking and Drunkenness; Persia; Women in the *Histories*

FURTHER READING

Bowie, A. M. 2003. "'Fate May Harm Me, I Have Dined Today': Near-Eastern Royal Banquets and Greek Symposia in Herodotus." *Pallas* 61: 91–99.

Dentzer, Jean-Marie. 1982. *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et monde Grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.

Fehr, Burkhard. 1971. *Orientalische und griechische Gelage*. Bonn: Bouvier.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Heleen. 1995. "Persian Food: Stereotypes and Political Identity." In *Food in Antiquity*, edited by John Wilkins, E. David Harvey, and Mike Dobson, 286–302. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

FESTIVALS (ἑορταί, αἱ, or πανηγύρεις, αἱ)

ANGELIKI PETROPOULOU

Hellenic Open University at Patras

Greek festivals very often gave their names to the months in which they were celebrated, but varied from city to city except in the case of some festivals common to Dorian or Ionian cities or unique to individual *poleis*. A regular feature was the *pompē* (πομπή), i.e., a procession towards the sanctuary, while the central event was the SACRIFICE and the banquet of the people. In contrast to everyday life, the sacred period of the festival (*hieromēnia*) was a community holiday, while the actual celebration of the festival tended to strengthen civic bonds between citizens. In Herodotus' *Histories* the celebration or foundation of Greek or foreign festivals is usually described in stories concerning victory or defeat. Sometimes festivals become the scene for the assassination of men, the RAPE of women, or capture of a city or ship of those celebrating. Herodotus' view that the Egyptians first held festivals, while the Greeks had adopted the custom only recently, is incorrect.

DICAEUS, an Athenian fugitive accompanied by the ex-Spartan king DEMARATUS, happened to be on the THRIASIAN PLAIN while XERXES' army was ravaging Attica in 480 BCE (8.65). Dicaeus saw a dust-cloud, "as of about 30,000 men," coming from ELEUSIS and heard the sound of the "mystic cry" (*iakkhos*). Since ATHENS was empty after its evacuation, Dicaeus interpreted the cry as divine, and a sign of aid to the Athenians and their ALLIES. He explained to Demaratus that each year during the Eleusinian MYSTERIES huge crowds of worshippers, who wished to be initiated, went from Athens to Eleusis, chanting the *iakkhos* cry. What Dicaeus heard was "a divine equivalent going in the opposite direction" (Parker 2005, 327). When the dust-cloud then rose up into the air and drifted toward SALAMIS, Dicaeus and Demaratus realized that Xerxes' fleet would be destroyed there.

Two stories referring to the foundation of festivals resemble *aitia,* etiological explanations of origins. The *Magophonia* (the killing of the MAGI) commemorated the day on which DARIUS I and the Persians massacred the "false" SMERDIS, who had usurped the Persian throne, together with his brother and all other Magi who could be found. During the festival, no Magus was allowed to appear outdoors (3.78–79). The story concerning the rescue of 300 boys from leading Corcyraean families sent by PERIANDER to ALYATTES at SARDIS for castration is linked to the foundation of an ARTEMIS festival (3.48.2–4). The Corinthians charged with the mission put in at SAMOS, but the Samians, when they learned why the boys were being taken to Sardis, instructed them to become SUPPLIANTS in the sanctuary of Artemis. The Corinthians tried to cut off supplies of FOOD to the boys, but the Samians instituted a festival: every night, they organized choruses of maidens and young men, and then passed a LAW that cakes of sesame and honey should be brought by them to the sanctuary (to be snatched and

eaten by the boys), until the Corinthians left the island. The festival was still celebrated with the same rites in Herodotus' day. The RITUAL theft of food (also attested for Artemis Orthia at SPARTA) is an initiation rite marking the transition from boyhood to manhood.

Scythian kingship had been originally handed over to COLAXAÏS, who had picked up the GOLD fallen from the sky after being tested through a FIRE ordeal (4.5–6). The kings kept the "sacred gold" with utmost care and placated it each year with great sacrifices. The man guarding the gold during the festival was given as much land as he could ride on horseback in a day; but if he fell asleep while performing this duty, legend said, he would not outlive the year (4.7.1–2). The "watch" was an ordeal, testing the magic powers of the priest-king to protect the community.

At Athens, HIPPARCHUS was assassinated by HARMODIUS AND ARISTOGEITON as he was overseeing the procession of the PANATHENAEA (5.55–56). The Scythian king SAULIUS shot dead his brother ANACHARSIS while the latter was celebrating the Mother of the Gods (CYBELE) in the same fashion as he had seen it performed at the Greek city of CYZICUS (4.76). The PELASGIANS of LEMNOS sailed to Attica, kidnapped the Athenian women holding the festival of Artemis at BRAURON, and returned to Lemnos where they kept them as CONCUBINES (6.138.1). Colophonian exiles, who had been hosted in SMYRNA, conquered the town while the citizens were celebrating DIONYSUS in the countryside (1.150.1). During a festival held at SUNIUM every four years, the Aeginetans ambushed and captured the official Athenian state ship, which was conveying the most important Athenians, whom they then imprisoned (6.87).

Herodotus' argument that the Egyptians were the first people to hold festivals (*panēgyreis*, "all-gatherings"), processions, and "offering-bringings" (*prosagōgai*), while the Greeks adopted the custom only recently (2.58), is a *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy. Festivals, processions, and "the bringing of offerings" appear in Minoan-Mycenaean iconography (Burkert 1985). Herodotus' view that the Dionysiac ritual and other Greek practices had their roots in the festival of the Egyptian "Dionysus" (2.48–49) and in other Egyptian festivals (2.59–63) rests on superficial similarities.

SEE ALSO: Apaturia; Carneia; Egypt; Feasting; Gods and the Divine; Hyacinthia; *nomos*; Piety; Religion, Greek; Temples and Sanctuaries

REFERENCES

Burkert, Walter. 1985. *Greek Religion*, translated by John J. Raffan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parker, Robert. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

FURTHER READING

Clinton, Kevin. 2007. "The Mysteries of Demeter and Kore." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 342–56. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cole, Susan Guettel. 1998. "Domesticating Artemis." In *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, edited by Sue Blundell and Margaret Williamson, 27–43. London: Routledge.

Larson, Jennifer. 2016. *Understanding Greek Religion*. London: Routledge.

Lefkowitz, Mary. 1996. *Not out of Africa. How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History*. New York: Basic Books.

Mikalson, Jon D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Scullion, Scott. 2007. "Festivals." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 190–203. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

FETTERS

ALEXANDER SKUFCA

Florida State University

Fetters are a concrete and tangible representation of imperialism and enslavement for Herodotus. They first appear being carried by the Spartans, spurred on by a cryptic oracular message, in their attempt to conquer their northern neighbor TEGEA (1.66). In an ironic twist, it would be the Spartans who found themselves in the chains, not the Tegeans. Their imperialistic policy was checked by the divine, and the fetters provided a physical testimony of the outcome (Osborne 2002). The historian records that he himself saw the chains hanging in the temple of ATHENA

Alea at Tegea (1.66.4). The Spartans' mistaken confidence, made tangible by the fetters, serves as a precursor and parallel to that of CROESUS, who himself ends up shackled on his own funeral pyre (1.86.2; see Stadter 2006). In a similar fashion, Croesus' fetters become votives, which he has sent to DELPHI as the "FIRST FRUITS" of his failed CONQUEST (1.90.4). These chains, too, symbolize a misunderstood oracle (1.91.1). Fetters also appear as DEDICATIONS on the ACROPOLIS of ATHENS after the city's victory over the Thebans and Euboean Chalcidians (5.77.3). Herodotus reports that they could be seen as testimony of the conflict even after the acropolis' destruction at Persian hands (5.77.3). Moreover, chains may represent the enslavement of an individual, as in the case of the doctor DEMOCEDES of CROTON. Regardless of the story's credibility, Herodotus' narration of the medical adventurer's career begins with his entry into the Persian court in rags and bound in chains (3.129.3). After healing DARIUS I, Democedes is rewarded by the monarch with two pairs of golden fetters (3.130.4), formalizing, in a way, Democedes' servitude (see Davies 2010). The ETHIOPIANS, earlier, mistook golden jewelry offered by the representatives of King CAMBYSES (II) for shackles and a sign of impending invasion (3.21–22). Here Herodotus uses the Ethiopians' reaction to highlight the country's abundance of GOLD, but also to reveal again the real intentions of the Persians (see Hofmann and Vorbichler 1979). Perhaps the most infamous fetters in Herodotus' work are those cast into the HELLESPONT by XERXES after the destruction of his bridge in a storm (7.35.1). Viewing himself as the water's master, the Persian king symbolically punished it with shackles and a WHIPPING (7.35.2). As with the earlier episodes, the fetters foreshadow an ultimate reversal of fortune, as Xerxes' attempt to conquer and enslave EUROPE would fail before the Greek alliance.

SEE ALSO: Oracles; Punishment; Slavery; Symbols and Signs

REFERENCES

Davies, Malcolm. 2010. "From Rags to Riches: Democedes of Croton and the Credibility of Herodotus." *BICS* 53: 19–44.

Hofmann, Inge, and Anton Vorbichler. 1979. *Der Äthiopenlogos bei Herodot*. Vienna: Afro-Pub.

Osborne, Robin. 2002. "Archaic Greek History." In *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees, 497–521. Leiden: Brill.

Stadter, Philip. 2006. "Herodotus and the Cities of Mainland Greece." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, 242–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FIRE

JAN HAYWOOD

The Open University, UK

Fire features repeatedly in Herodotus' *Histories*, (i) as a weapon used against both significant individuals and wider bodies of citizens, (ii) in several ethnographic *logoi*, and (iii) as an important aspect of narratives that concern some portentous or extraordinary event.

A variety of groups and individuals fall victim to fire attacks. For example, the Lydian king CROESUS is placed on a funeral pyre, having fallen in battle to the Persian CYRUS (II); strikingly, Croesus is delivered from the flames after his PRAYER to the god APOLLO is followed by the sudden appearance of a rainstorm (1.87.2; for this account and its connections with Bacchylides' third ode (468 BCE), see West 2004, 85–88). In Book 6, after the Greek ALLIES prevail at the Battle of MARATHON, the Athenians pursue the fleeing Persians and lay hold of their ships "demanding fire" (πῦρ τε αἴτεον, 6.113.2; for the logistical improbabilities here, see Hornblower and Pelling 2017, 255). Fire also figures in selected ORACLES, most notably, in the first of two foreboding oracles given to the Athenians before the Battle of SALAMIS (7.140.3; see also 4.163.3).

Herodotus' ethnographic *logoi* on the Persians, MASSAGETAE, Egyptians, and SCYTHIANS also contain references to fire. In Herodotus' DIGRESSION on the customs of the Persians (1.131–40; cf. Munson 2001, 149–56), he observes that the Persians do not kindle a fire when sacrificing for the gods (1.132.1; cf. 4.60.2, where Herodotus posits that the Scythians light no fire

when performing a SACRIFICE). He also relates that one of the few deities to whom the Persians have always sacrificed is Fire (1.131.2; cf. 3.16.2). Later in Book 1, Herodotus writes that the nomadic Massagetae fall into a state of inebriation from the fumes of a particular fruit that gets thrown into a fire (1.202.2). And in his lengthy digression on Scythian customs, Herodotus notes that for eight months of the year mud can only be produced by lighting a fire (4.28.1), and that the Scythians use fire as part of an elaborate cleansing RITUAL that follows the burial of their dead (4.73–75).

In addition, fire appears at several junctures in Herodotus' monumental Egyptian *LOGOS*. According to Herodotus, Egyptians kindle a fire when sacrificing bulls, and they sacrifice PIGS to the goddess SELENE with fire (2.39.1, 47.3). He also relates that Egyptians crush the poppy-like core of the lotus plant and bake loaves from it using fire (2.92.2). Perhaps most curiously, Herodotus writes that when a home is on fire, Egyptians focus exclusively on protecting the cats, since these have a tendency to "leap into the fire"(2.66.3; see Lloyd in ALC, 239).

Finally, fire occurs in certain Herodotean accounts that incorporate an ominous event, or an element of wonder. For instance, when HIPPOCRATES (1) (father of the Athenian tyrant PEISISTRATUS) was at OLYMPIA for the games, he offered a vessel with sacrificial MEATS that boiled over, despite the absence of any fire (1.159.1–2). Another striking case can be found at the very end of the *Histories*: the Persian governor ARTŸACTES was frying "dried fish" (τάριχοι) when they suddenly began to leap and twist on the fire (9.120.1). Artÿactes interpreted this incredible occurrence as a message conveyed by PROTESILAUS of ELAEUS, since he had earlier plundered treasure from the hero's temple (cf. Hollmann 2011, 237–39).

SEE ALSO: Egypt; End of the *Histories*; Ethnography; Gods and the Divine; *nomos*; Symbols and Signs; *thōmata*

REFERENCES

Hollmann, Alexander. 2011. *The Master of Signs. Signs and the Interpretation of Signs in Herodotus'* *Histories*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Hornblower, Simon, and Christopher Pelling, eds. 2017. *Herodotus: Histories Book VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

West, Stephanie. 2004. "Herodotus and Lyric Poetry." *Letras Clássicas* 8: 79–91.

FURTHER READING

Burkert, Walter. 1990. "Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen." In *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs*, edited by Giuseppe Nenci, 1–39. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

FIRST FRUITS

WILLIAM BUBELIS

Washington University in St. Louis

Herodotus frequently describes certain religious DEDICATIONS and SACRIFICES that represent preliminary or preferential offerings to the gods from objects, animals, or other forms of wealth otherwise retained by those making the offering. Often labeled specifically as *akrothinia*, *aparkhai*, or *dekatai,* offerings of this category are sometimes likened to the broad if potentially misleading heading of "first-fruits" (Jim 2014, 1–27), but in the *Histories* at least these terms have little or no functional connection to AGRICULTURE *per se* (cf. 4.188). Offerings of *aparkhai* alone could be made, for instance, out of the windfall from any endeavor or circumstance (e.g., 1.92.2: inheritance), to commemorate a great achievement (e.g., 4.88), or even as offerings for the dead (though here Herodotus applies it only to the decidedly non-Greek funerary customs of EGYPT (3.24.4) and the SCYTHIANS (4.71.4)). Similarly, although etymologically *dekatai* (sing. *dekatē*) ought to signify a tenth of something (thus, a "tithe"), many offerings labeled as such might vary in actual proportion to the wealth or objects from which they were taken. But Herodotus does seem to draw upon *dekatē*'s strictly numerical sense when describing the monetary value of the sacrificial IRON roasting spits offered at DELPHI by the courtesan RHODOPIS

(2.135; cf. 7.132; 9.81). Likewise, Herodotus does perhaps observe the etymological sense of *akrothinia* as the "top of the heap" when employing this term for the dedications offered by victorious Greek ARMIES from the collective war booty assembled from the defeated, exclusively with regard to spoils taken from ACHAEMENID forces (8.121–22; 9.81) or, in two examples, those that cast a grotesque light upon the Achaemenids (and CROESUS) for what seems tantamount to an offensive misunderstanding of how and what to sacrifice properly (1.86.2, 90.4; cf. 7.54, 113–14). But at 7.132, *dekatē* signifies the tithe that the Greeks took also from the property of those Greeks who allied themselves with the Achaemenids, suggesting perhaps that each of these words occupied a distinct semantic range. As with all "first-fruits," Herodotus employs at 8.121 *akrothinia* both for "raw" offerings of armament as they were captured (i.e., three Phoenician ships for three different sanctuaries) as well as offerings of wealth "converted" from their original form into a new one (i.e., auctioned (?) booty whose monetary proceeds paid for a massive BRONZE statue at Delphi; cf. 9.81). Herodotus does not usually indicate that those dedications to which he applies these terms were meant to fulfill outstanding obligations that the Greeks already, in effect, contracted with gods, even where that might be reasonable to assume. But, in one instance APOLLO demands certain *akrothinia* from the Aeginetans, namely, their first prize in valor awarded for service at SALAMIS (8.122).

SEE ALSO: Burial Customs; Etymology; Gods and the Divine; Money; Plunder; Religion, Greek; Temples and Sanctuaries; Wealth and Poverty

REFERENCE

Jim, Theodora Suk Fong. 2014. *Sharing with the Gods. Aparchai and Dekatai in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

FURTHER READING

Mikalson, Jon D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

West, William C. 1969. "The Trophies of the Persian Wars." *CPh* 64: 7–19.

FISH

JESSICA BARON AND CHRISTOPHER BARON
University of Notre Dame

Herodotus shows ethnographic interest in the customary ways different peoples prepare fish as FOOD. The last thing he tells us about the Babylonians (1.200) is that there are three clans (*patriai*) who eat nothing but fish, which they dry in the sun and turn into fishmeal. Two chapters later, we find ourselves among the swamp-dwellers at the mouth of the River ARAXES, who eat raw fish and wear seal-skins (1.202.3; cf. the raw-fish-eating Indians living in the marshland of the INDUS RIVER, 3.98). The MASSAGETAE sow no crops, subsisting on animals and the abundant fish provided by the Araxes (1.216.3).

Fish appear numerous times in Book 2 on EGYPT. Herodotus notes that PRIESTS there are not allowed to taste fish (2.37.4), though other Egyptians eat fish that has either been dried in the sun or cured with salt (2.77.4). The keepers of sacred animals shave their CHILDREN's heads (or just a part of them) and use the HAIR to purchase fish, which they feed to their animals (2.65.4). On the other hand, some species of fish were themselves sacred, for example the *lepidotos* (2.72, *barbus bynni*). Herodotus also notes that Egyptians who live upstream in the DELTA marshes live only on the fish they catch and dry in the sun (2.92.5), which leads into a DIGRESSION about fish spawning in the NILE (2.93–94). After CAMBYSES (II) conquers Egypt, he employs members of an entire tribe called "Fish-Eaters" (ICHTHYOPHAGI), whom Herodotus places at ELEPHANTINE, as spies on a mission to the ETHIOPIANS (3.19–23).

Herodotus notes other bodies of water which produce copious amounts of fish. Lake MOERIS in Egypt brings one TALENT of SILVER to the royal treasury each day from its fish (2.149.5; cf. 3.91). The BORYSTHENES River in SCYTHIA contains a large invertebrate fish called *antakaioi*—likely a type of sturgeon—which are salted (4.53.3; Corcella in ALC, 621–22, for the importance of this market). Lake PRASIAS, in the former land of the PAEONIANS, produces so many fish—specifically the *paprax* and *tilon*—that those wishing to catch them simply dipped a bucket in the water; these

lake-house dwellers even fed fish to their HORSES and beasts of burden (5.16.4). XERXES' march through THRACE takes him by a brackish lake near PISTYRUS that was full of fish, until it was drunk dry by the Persian army's beasts of burden (7.109.2).

As with other aspects of the natural world, most of these instances occur in non-Greek or fringe areas. Greek interactions with fish in the *Histories* take the form of portents, prophecies, and other symbolic manifestations. The seer AMPHILYTUS recites an ORACLE to PEISISTRATUS before the Battle of PALLENE in Attica (546 BCE) about a net being cast around tunny fish—a notoriously easy fish to catch. Peisistratus accepts the good omen and leads his army to victory, establishing himself permanently as tyrant (1.62–63; Lavelle 1991). After the Persian CONQUEST of LYDIA, CYRUS (II) offers a parable of fishes in his angry reply to the IONIANS and AEOLIANS who come seeking his favor at SARDIS. The Ionians, having refused to rebel against CROESUS when Cyrus asked them to, are told a story of a flute player who tries to summon fish. When the fish reject his MUSIC, he catches them and taunts them as they flop around in his net, saying, "It's no use dancing now"—an ominous warning for the Ionians (1.141; Hirsch 1986). In the famous story of POLYCRATES' ring, which he throws into the SEA in an attempt to break up his run of good fortune, his prized possession returns to him via a fish so large and beautiful that the fisherman deems it worthy of the tyrant (3.40–43). SOCLES of CORINTH employs fish as a METAPHOR in his speech on the dangers of tyranny: he warns the Spartans that the world is turned upside down and fish will dwell on land if SPARTA decides to restore TYRANTS (5.92.α.1).

Fish appear a final time near the END OF THE *HISTORIES*. The disgraced Persian governor of SESTOS, ARTAΫCTES, a prisoner of the Athenians, witnesses a portent: one of the guards is frying fish when they appear to come back to life. Artaÿctes decides the divine message is meant for him and offers to pay for the treasures he stole from the shrine of PROTESILAUS, and double that amount for his and his son's lives. But the Athenian general XANTHIPPUS refuses and has both men executed (9.120).

SEE ALSO: Babylon; Ethnography; Prophecy; Speeches; Symbols and Signs

REFERENCES

Hirsch, Steven W. 1986. "Cyrus' Parable of the Fish: Sea Power in the Early Relations of Greece and Persia." *CJ* 81.3: 222–29.

Lavelle, Brian M. 1991. "The Compleat Angler: Observations on the Rise of Peisistratos in Herodotos (1.59–64)." *CQ* 41.2: 317–24.

FISH-EATERS, *see* ICHTHYOPHAGI

FOCALIZATION, *see* NARRATOLOGY

FOLLY, *see* MADNESS

FOOD

R. DREW GRIFFITH

Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario

Food figures in three main ways in Herodotus' *Histories*: in ethnographic studies, to convey moral truths, and as symbol.

Examples from ethnographic studies include the refusal of Ionian women to eat with their husbands, who had killed the men they found living in Ionia to take the women as their own wives (1.146). Egyptians differ from Greeks in part because, while Greeks knead bread with their hands, Egyptians use their feet (2.36). Because SCYTHIANS live where TREES are scarce, they cook MEAT over fires made from the animals' own bones. They also often use the animals' stomachs as pots for stewing (4.60–61). (For other instances of food in ethnographic portraits, see 1.66, 71, 132–33, 193, 200, 202, 203; 2.14, 18, 37, 39, 41, 47, 69, 77, 92, 125, 140, 168; 3.6–7, 18, 19, 23, 100; 4.17, 19, 22, 23, 53, 65–66, 70, 73, 109, 121, 169, 172, 182, 183, 186, 194, 199; 5.8, 16, 6.57, 60; 7.31).

A subset of such references deals with acquiring food. An example is the fable CYRUS (II) told, which may reflect Persian suspicions about coast- and island-dwellers, about a man who tried to lure FISH out of the water by piping to them. When that failed, he caught them with a net. The fish leapt and danced on the shore, and the piper rebuked them for dancing once it was too late, when they had refused to do so when asked

(1.141, cf. Aesop *Fable* 24 Chambry, Ael. *NA* 1.39; see Hirsch 1986, esp. 224; Ceccarelli 1993). ARABIANS obtain cinnamon-sticks by waiting for the large BIRDS that bring them from the land where they grow. These birds build nests of the sticks on sheer cliffs no one can climb. The Arabians place large joints of meat at the base of the cliffs. These the birds carry up to their nests, which cannot support their weight and fall to the ground, where the Arabians gather them up (3.111). In a further example, Scythians live on horse-milk. Before milking the mares, they inflate their wombs by blowing through pipes they have thrust up their vulvas to force the udder downward (4.2). Once again there are many other examples (e.g., 3.110; 4.22; 7.23, 108, 115, 118–20, 127, 147, 187, 196).

The Delphic maxim, "nothing in excess" underpins much of Herodotus' work. Food affords great temptation to excess, and many of his stories use food to underscore the need for moderation (*sōphrosunē*). Only once do people die directly from overeating—the Persians in hasty retreat from Greece when they reached their stores at ABYDOS on the HELLESPONT, and in fairness they had been starving before they came upon the food (8.117). Nonetheless, Herodotus locates many examples of VENGEANCE in a banquet-context. For example, Queen NITOCRIS of EGYPT avenges herself on her brother's murderers by inviting them to a banquet in her basement, and then drowning them in a flood (2.100, cf. 1.211; 2.107; 4.73; 5.18–20; 6.35; 7.135). Alcohol often plays a role. So when RHAMPSINITUS' men killed a man and stood guard over his corpse, the dead man's brother made an elaborate display of his donkeys' spilling wineskins. When the guards went to investigate, the man offered them several skins and encouraged them to get drunk. After they had passed out, he recovered the corpse, and for a lark shaved off half of each guard's beard (2.121.4). CLEOMENES of SPARTA went mad and died after adopting the Scythian custom of drinking WINE unmixed with water (6.84). Herodotus may not let even a happy feast pass without reflecting on the brevity of human good fortune (9.16). Other examples of Herodotus' interest in drunkenness are not wanting (cf. 1.106, 133, 172, 207–8, 211–12; 2.60, 77; 3.4, 20, 22, 34; 4.177; 8.28; see Immerwahr 1966, 161–67).

The negative counterpart to excessive eating is fasting, whether voluntary (as with Egyptian purges, 2.77; see Morgan 1991) or enforced by famine caused by natural disaster or SIEGE. It too makes for interesting stories. Atys of LYDIA distracted his subjects during a famine by letting them eat only every other day, while devising GAMES for them to play on the off days (1.94). Again, when the Corinthians were taking a group of boys to ALYATTES to be made into EUNUCHS, they stopped to draw water on SAMOS. The boys fled to the sanctuary of ARTEMIS, and sat upon her ALTAR, where they would be considered inviolate. The Corinthians, unable to drag the boys off by force, decided to starve them out by a siege. The Samians, however, knowing what awaited the boys in Lydia, pitied them and pretended to recall a FESTIVAL in which they were to dance round the altar holding food and drink. Those things the endangered youths gladly seized, and so avoided starvation, until the Corinthians gave up their siege and went home (3.48). Yet another story describes the men of ARTAŸCTES, one of XERXES' satraps being besieged by the Athenians. They grew so hungry they boiled and ate the leather strapping of their beds (9.118). Again, there are many such stories (e.g., 2.13, 40; 3.25, 4.36, 152; 5.34, 65; 6.139; 7.49, 171; 8.68, 115; 9.49–50).

Cannibalism (ANTHROPOPHAGY) straddles the boundary between ETHNOGRAPHY and moralizing. Stories of cannibalism serve to define a nation's customs, as with the PADAEANS, who eat their own dead, and in order not to lose meals to DISEASE, kill their friends at the first sign of sickness, with the unsurprising result that no Padaean ever admits to being ill (3.99). On the other hand, cannibalism often makes for great revenge, as when the Median king ASTYAGES feeds HARPAGUS the flesh of his own son in a stew (1.119). (For other examples, cf. 1.73, 162, 216; 3.11, 25, 38; 4.18, 26, 64, 106.)

Thirdly, food features in symbolic contexts. For example, after CAMBYSES (II) had had his brother SMERDIS murdered, he and his sister/wife (unnamed by Herodotus =? Roxane) were eating a lettuce, when she plucked all its leaves

off and told Cambyses he had done the same to his FAMILY. So incensed was he, that he leapt upon the woman and killed her (3.32.2–4; Griffith 2009). The Corinthian tyrant CYPSELUS was named after the grain-chest (*kypselē*) in which his mother hid him as an infant when the ruling BACCHIADAE, warned by an ORACLE about his future power, were trying to kill him (5.92.4). Cypselus' son, PERIANDER, sent MESSENGERS to the oracle of the dead in THESPROTIA with a certain inquiry, and his late wife's ghost appeared to answer their question. As proof that she spoke the truth, she told the messengers to tell Periander he had baked his loaves in a cold oven. He realized the oracle was true, for he alone of living mortals knew he had had sex with his wife after she was dead (5.92.6). A food-story at once symbolic and affirming moderation concerns PAUSANIAS of Sparta. Once he had captured the tent of Xerxes, Pausanias bid MARDONIUS' slaves make the kind of banquet they served the Persians, and his own soldiers to make a simple Spartan meal. When the two were set side by side, Pausanias remarked on the Persians' folly, when they had such WEALTH already, in trying to conquer a land whose people lived on so little (9.82, cf. Polyaenus, *Strat*. 4.3.32; see Gunter 1988, 22–24; Granger 2002, esp. 120). (For other symbolic uses of food, see 1.62, 71, 123–24, 126, 141; 2.133; 3.46; 4.143, 163–64; 7.21, 41; 8.137; 9.120).

Related to symbolism is food's role in tests. Wishing to learn the veracity of the Delphic oracle, CROESUS sent messengers to DELPHI and ordered them on an appointed day to ask the oracle what Croesus was doing at that moment. He boiled lamb and turtle-meat together in a kettle, and when the oracle correctly said what he was doing, he realized it was trustworthy (1.48). The Egyptian king PSAMMETICHUS I performed an experiment to determine the world's original language. He had two CHILDREN isolated from all human interaction and reared by goats, whose milk they sucked, until they were old enough to talk. At that point he had people eavesdrop on them until they heard them utter the vocable *bekos*, which turned out to be Phrygian for "bread" (2.2). In another example, pharaoh AMASIS worried that his ally, POLYCRATES of SAMOS, enjoyed seemingly endless success. Knowing the gods' jealousy, Amasis reasoned that Polycrates' continued good luck must precede some great catastrophe. Amasis therefore advised him to take whatever he loved most and throw it away. Polycrates tossed into the SEA a precious ring. Not long afterward, a fisherman caught a huge fish, which he brought and offered to the TYRANT; Polycrates' ring was found in its stomach. Once Amasis got wind of this, he broke off all relations with Polycrates, sparing himself the grief of Polycrates' inevitable bad end (3.40–42; Davidson 1997, 288–89; cf. 4.7; 6.129; 7.29).

The themes of ethnography, morality, and symbolism do not exhaust Herodotus' use of food, which also includes, for example, deliberate poisoning (3.15), vegetarianism (4.184), and food for animals (8.41; 9.70).

SEE ALSO: Agriculture; Barbarians; Cattle; Drinking and Drunkenness; Feasting; Pigs

REFERENCES

Ceccarelli, Paola. 1993. "La fable des poissons de Cyrus (Hérodote, I, 141)." *Mètis* 8: 29–57.

Davidson, James. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London: HarperCollins.

Granger, Russel. 2002. "The Great King Invites You to Dine: Food and Ideology in the Achaemenid Empire." *AH:RfT* 32.2: 118–43.

Griffith, R. Drew. 2009. "Honeymoon Salad: Cambyses' Uxoricide According to the Egyptians (Hdt. 3.32.3–4)." *Historia* 58: 131–40.

Gunter, A. C. 1988. "The Art of Eating and Drinking in Ancient Iran." *Asian Art [continued as Asian Art and Culture]* 1: 7–52.

Hirsch, Steven W. 1986. "Cyrus' Parable of the Fish: Sea Power in the Early Relations of Greece and Persia." *CJ* 81.3: 222–29.

Immerwahr, Henry R. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press.

Morgan, Gareth. 1991. "'Nourishing Foods': Herodotus 2.77." *Mnemosyne* 44.3–4: 415–17.

FORCE, *see* NECESSITY; VIOLENCE

FOREIGNERS, *see* BARBARIANS; GUEST-FRIENDSHIP

FORTIFICATIONS

MATTHEW A. SEARS
University of New Brunswick

Fortifications are an important feature of ancient WARFARE. They also figure prominently in the topography and identity of many CITIES and states, and are often used as a literary device. Fortifications in Herodotus' *Histories* can be roughly divided into three types: city WALLS and citadels, boundary walls, and fortified military camps. All three play key roles in the events Herodotus recounts, and all three figure into Herodotus' literary themes.

Until recently, most scholars assumed that Greek cities were rarely walled in the ARCHAIC AGE. Recent studies, however, shed light on the many permanent fortifications of cities prior to and during the period of the PERSIAN WARS (Frederiksen 2011), even if the techniques of SIEGE WARFARE were still rudimentary. In the archaic period, fortification walls tended to be constructed with lower courses of stone, consisting of stone faces with a rubble core, while the upper portions of the wall were made of mud-brick. Walls could be supplemented with towers. Herodotus' *Histories* include many cases of siege warfare which suggest permanent fortifications, and he describes several city fortifications in detail. The Lydians attacked MILETUS for several consecutive years during the sixth century BCE, focusing on territorial raids presumably because the Milesians were protected by a city wall (1.17–22). Herodotus says that all the Ionian cities were fortified with walls in the face of the threat posed by CYRUS (II)'s expansion of the Persian Empire, though it is unclear whether new walls were built or old ones were refurbished (1.141). The walls of Miletus did not save the city from destruction: it was besieged and sacked by the Persians following the IONIAN REVOLT (6.18–22). NAXOS (5.34), ERETRIA (6.100–1), and SAMOS (3.39, 54–55) also experienced sieges, and Herodotus describes the latter's fortifications, which included a moat and towers. The ACROPOLIS of ATHENS was protected by a wall, which was strengthened with wood and other ad hoc materials by the few Athenians who remained to defend the city against the Persians in 480. These defenses were soon breached (8.51–54). The most impressive fortification walls are those of Median ECBATANA (1.98) and BABYLON (1.178–81) which, though fabulous as befits Herodotus' description of the East, did not prevent either city from falling to the Persians.

Aside from city defenses, occasionally entire regions could be walled off. Though this strategy became much more prevalent after the Persian Wars—examples include the Dema gap wall in Attica and most famously Hadrian's Wall in Britain—Herodotus records two early cases. MILTIADES THE YOUNGER built a wall across the neck of the Hellespontine CHERSONESE in order to keep out groups of enemy Thracians (6.36–37). At THERMOPYLAE, the Spartans reinforced a Phocian barrier wall, which had fallen into disrepair. The Phocians, who had first built the wall, also diverted the courses of the local hot springs so that they bisected the narrows at several points, which, along with the wall, created a complex system of defensive works (7.176). The Spartans and other Peloponnesians scrambled to construct a wall across the ISTHMUS of CORINTH, especially after the Persians broke through Thermopylae and entered central Greece. Though Herodotus says that every available person and piece of building material was brought to bear on building this wall (8.74; 9.7–9), some eight kilometers in length, it is unclear whether it was ever completed (Flower and Marincola 2002, 110–14). The Peloponnesians did not actually make a stand at the Isthmus, since the decisive battles took place at SALAMIS and PLATAEA, outside the Isthmus. It is doubtful that the Isthmus barrier would have been effective if the Persians had maintained control of the SEA. Herodotus seems critical of the Peloponnesians' isolationist defensive strategy and sympathetic to the Athenians' outrage at their ALLIES abandoning them to a Persian sack.

There are a few occasions in Herodotus in which temporary fortifications were constructed to protect an army's position in the field (Pritchett 1974, 133–46). This type of fortification was different in each case, since ad hoc materials and building techniques were used. The Persians used two different field fortifications at Plataea in 479: one consisting of a wooden palisade to surround their camp, which was supposedly 10 stades, or some 2,000 meters, per side (9.15); and one hastily assembled out of wicker shields during the

battle in order to stop the advance of the Spartan HOPLITES (9.61–62). Neither fortification proved successful. The Spartan hoplites made short work of the wicker shields, and though the retreating Persians were kept safe for a time by their palisade, owing to the Spartans' poor siege warfare skills, once the Athenians arrived the wall was breached and the Persians were slaughtered in great numbers (9.70). At MYCALE, the Persians constructed a palisade by beaching their ships and surrounding them with sharpened stakes made out of TREES harvested nearby. But the battle ended in a Persian defeat when the Greeks managed to breach this fortification and kill many Persians inside (9.96–97, 102).

Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of Herodotus' description of various fortifications is their high rate of failure (Bowie 2006). Virtually every fortification, from city walls to field works, fell to the enemy. In fact, once fortifications were breached, the slaughter was often much more intense since there was nowhere the defeated defenders could run. Had the Peloponnesians, led by the Spartans, not fought at Plataea, once the Persians broke or bypassed the Isthmus fortifications, the entire Peloponnese might well have suffered the fate of the Persian armies at Plataea and Mycale.

SEE ALSO: *polis*

REFERENCES

Bowie, Angus M. 2006. "Herodotus on Survival: City or Countryside?" In *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, 119–37. Leiden: Brill.

Flower, Michael A., and John Marincola, eds. 2002. *Herodotus: Histories Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frederiksen, Rune. 2011. *Greek City Walls of the Archaic Period, 900–480 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pritchett, W. Kendrick. 1974. *The Greek State at War, Part II*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

FURTHER READING

Lawrence, A. W. 1979. *Greek Aims in Fortification*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Winter, Frederick E. 1971. *Greek Fortifications*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

FORTUNE, *see TYCHĒ*

FOUNDERS, *see* COLONIZATION

FREEDOM

MELINA TAMIOLAKI
University of Crete

Freedom was a cardinal concept of ancient Greek civilization. On the one hand, for the individual it designated the state of being a non-slave, the privilege *par excellence* of the Greek citizen (Finley 1976); on the other hand it had a strong political dimension, referring to the absence of external domination and the capacity of states to exercise power. The PERSIAN WARS were the decisive event for the conceptualization of political freedom. Authors of the fifth century BCE (such as AESCHYLUS, PINDAR, and Herodotus) attest to this development (Raaflaub 2004). Herodotus' work provides the richest evidence. He employs a wide range of terms referring to freedom (Breuil 1992). The great majority of these occurrences concern political freedom, while references to individual freedom are scarce (2.135.2; 4.95.2; 5.92.η.3; 6.58.3, 59). The adjective ἐλεύθερος (free) and the noun ἐλευθερίη (freedom) are the most frequently used terms. Others include the adverb ἐλευθέρως (freely), designating freedom of speech (5.93.2; 7.46.1; 8.73.3), the adjective ἐλευθέριος (employed at 1.116.1, in the expression ὑπόκρισις ἐλευθεριωτέρη, denoting "a free style of responding," and at 3.142.2 and 4, concerning ZEUS' denomination as Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος), the verbs ἐλευθερόω (to liberate) and συνελευθερόω (to contribute, help to liberation), and the noun ἐλευθέρωσις (liberation), which is a *hapax* in Herodotus (9.45.3). Herodotus also occasionally uses the term αὐτονομία (autonomy) and the adjective αὐτόνομος (autonomous), which denote political independence and are presented in his work as less ideologically charged than freedom (1.96.1; 8.140.α.2). Finally, the Herodotean expressions γεύομαι ἐλευθερίης (to taste freedom,

6.5.2), πειρῶμαι ἐλευθερίης (to try freedom, 7.135.3), and γλίχομαι ἐλευθερίης (to stick to freedom, 8.143.1) deserve special notice.

Herodotus refers to the Greeks' freedom for the first time in the Croesus *LOGOS* of Book 1. He notes that before the subjugation of Ionia to CROESUS, all Greeks were free (1.6.3). The IONIANS' relationship to freedom is later contested by the SCYTHIANS who characterize them as "the most subservient slaves and staunchest in their loyalty to their masters" (4.142). Herodotus also employs the vocabulary of freedom in his narrative of the IONIAN REVOLT (Books 5 and 6). This revolt represents the first attempt of Greek states to liberate themselves from Greek TYRANTS and Persian dominion, but it eventually fails due to the unsuccessful manipulations of its two instigators, ARISTAGORAS (1) and HISTIAEUS SON OF LYSAGORAS. Other peoples in the *Histories* who fight for their freedom are the following: the MEDES, who get liberated from the ASSYRIANS (1.95.2); the Egyptians, who are liberated from their king and proceed to a new government system composed of twelve kings (2.147.2); the NOMAD Scythians (4.128.2) and the PERINTHIANS, who defend their freedom against the Persians (5.2.1). The SATRAE are described as "the only free Thracians" (7.111.1). The Persians also liberate themselves from the Medes. The freedom of the Persians is interwoven with the exercise of their power: CYRUS (II) liberates them from the Median yoke and initiates a tradition of Persian dominion (1.126.6, 127.1, 210.2; 3.82.5; 7.3.1). Herodotus also informs us that the Persian nobleman OTANES (1) enjoys a peculiar kind of freedom within the Persian system: "his house continues as the only free one in PERSIA and is under the rule of another only insofar as it itself chooses, provided that it does not violate the laws of Persia" (3.83.3).

Freedom occupies a most prominent position in the war narrative of the last three books of the *Histories*. Although not all Greeks participated in the battle for freedom (e.g., the Thessalians and the Thebans MEDIZED, while the Argives remained neutral) the RHETORIC of freedom had a Panhellenic appeal and dimension (von Fritz 1965). The Persian Wars are often depicted as a fight for Greek freedom against Persian dominion (8.77.2; 9.45.3, 60.1, 98.3). Freedom is advertised as a distinctive element of Greek culture: during their encounter with XERXES, the two young Spartans, SPERTHIAS AND BULIS, refuse to follow the Persian custom of *PROSKYNESIS*, which dictated a servile attitude (bowing before the king); they proclaim instead their respect for Greek freedom and they accept to bow only before gods. They also emphasize the main difference between the Greek and Persian way of life: Persians have not experienced freedom, because all of them but the king are unfree, whereas Greeks have a high awareness of its value (7.135–37). ATHENS and SPARTA, the protagonist states of the battle for freedom, both cherished freedom, but Herodotus also presents differentiations in their conceptions of it (Tamiolaki 2010): for the Spartans, freedom was closely linked with (and limited by) obedience to the martial LAW which obliged Spartans to fight till DEATH (7.103–4), while the Athenians' love of freedom was part of their respect for the achievements of their ancestors (8.143–44). Freedom for the Athenians was also associated with their democratic constitution. Herodotus devotes two lengthy narratives to Athens' tyrannical past (1.59–64, tyranny of PEISISTRATUS; 5.55–96, fall of tyranny and establishment of DEMOCRACY). He attributes great importance to the role of the ALCMAEONIDAE in the liberation from tyranny (6.123.2), and he states that Athens became more powerful from the moment it was liberated from tyrants and acquired a democratic constitution (5.78). Finally, Herodotus expresses the controversial view that Athens' contribution to the liberation of the Greeks was the most crucial (7.139).

SEE ALSO: Conquest; Despotism; Necessity; Panhellenism; *polis*; Rebellion; Slavery

REFERENCES

Breuil, Jean-Luc. 1992. "Le lexème *eleuther-* chez Hérodote." In *Visages de liberté: recherches lexicales et littéraires*, edited by Roger Sauter, 45–70. Saint-Étienne: Centre interdisciplinaire d'études et de recherches sur l'expression contemporaine.

Finley, Moses. I. 1976. "The Freedom of the Citizen in the Greek World." *Talanta* 7: 1–23.

Raaflaub, Kurt. 2004. *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Tamiolaki, Mélina. 2010. *Liberté et esclavage chez les historiens grecs classiques*. Paris: Presses Universitaires Paris–Sorbonne.
von Fritz, Kurt. 1965. "Die griechische *eleutheria* bei Herodot." *WS* 78: 5–31.

FURTHER READING

De Romilly, Jacqueline. 1989. *La Grèce antique à la découverte de la liberté*. Paris: éditions de Fallois.
Hunt, Peter. 1998. *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Patterson, Orlando. 1991. *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
Payen, Pascal. 1997. *Les îles nomades. Conquérir et résister dans l'*Enquête *d'Hérodote*. Paris: EHESS.
Sluiter, Ineke, and Ralph M. Rosen, eds. 2004. *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

FRIENDSHIP

ELIZABETH VANDIVER
Whitman College

Friendship translates two words in the *Histories*, *philiē* and *xeiniē* (Ionic forms for *philia* and *xenia*). Both concepts cover a range of meanings, from personal affection to political alliances. Powell (1960) defines *philiē* as "friendship, esp. national" and the cognate noun *philos* as "a friend, personal or national" (def. 3); he defines *xeiniē* as "amity (Usu. national, but personal 4, 154.4; 7, 228.4)" and *xeinos* as "1) stranger; pl. foreigners; 2) host; 3) friend, ally," oddly omitting the meaning "guest." *Xeiniē* in the sense of "GUEST-FRIENDSHIP" is treated in a separate entry of this encyclopedia, but it is worth noting that even in the interactions between CROESUS and ADRASTUS SON OF GORDIAS, where the Homeric sense of guest-friendship is strongly foregrounded (Vandiver 2012), the categories of *xeiniē* and *philiē* overlap. When the homicide Adrastus arrives at Croesus' court and begs for purification, Croesus reassures him by saying "you come from men who are *philoi* and you have come among *philoi*" (1.35.4). The reference here clearly reflects Powell's definition "national friendship," but the development of the story implies a more personal affective element as well, since Croesus entrusts Adrastus with his son's safety and is concerned that Adrastus himself do well (1.41.2–3).

The relationship between the Samian ruler POLYCRATES and the Egyptian king AMASIS well illustrates the complexities involved in trying to disentangle the personal from the political in Herodotean friendship. These two monarchs form an alliance that many scholars read as purely political, yet when Amasis writes Polycrates to warn him to take steps to reduce his worrisome good fortune, he calls him a man "*philon kai xeinon*" (3.40.2). Asheri notes that this formulation stresses the personal rather than the political relationship (in ALC, 441; cf. König 1989). Amasis' concern that Polycrates will inevitably meet with catastrophe seems grounded not only in his fear of political repercussions if an ally falls but also in private emotion, as indicated in his severance of the relationship after Polycrates miraculously recovers his ring. Amasis sends a MESSENGER breaking off the friendship between the two so that he will not feel distress in his soul for his *xeinos* when Polycrates inevitably meets with misfortune (3.43.2). The breaking off of relations points to a formal alliance, but the reason given highlights personal feeling.

The slippage of the term *xeiniē* between personal and formal friendship also occurs in friendships between private citizens. When Herodotus says that SIMONIDES wrote his four-line epitaph for MEGISTIAS, the seer who died at THERMOPYLAE, because of *xeiniē* (7.228.4), this seems most likely to mean personal, affectionate friendship, explaining why Simonides singled out this one man for an individual four-line epitaph. Here, there seems to be no distinction between *philiē* and *xeiniē*. In each instance, the exact meaning of *philiē* and *xeiniē* must be deduced from the overall context.

SEE ALSO: Allies; Emotions

REFERENCES

König, Ingemar. 1989. "Die Xenia zwischen Polykrates und Amasis." *PP* 44: 321–40.
Powell, J. Enoch. 1960 [1938]. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Vandiver, Elizabeth. 2012. "'Strangers Are from Zeus': Homeric *Xenia* at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus." In *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, edited by Emily Baragwanath and Mathieu de Bakker, 143–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

FURTHER READING

Herman, Gabriel. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FURIES (Gk. Ἐρινύες, αἱ)

KATHARINA WESSELMANN

Christian-Albrechts-University, Kiel

The Furies (*erinyes* in Greek) are avenging spirits inflicted by the curse of a wronged party, especially a parent, such as Clytaemestra, whose *erinyes* chase after her son and murderer ORESTES (most famously attested in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*). The Furies can bring insanity (for the case of Orestes, see e.g., Aesch. *Eum*. 341ff.; Eur. *Or*. 36–37, 400, 531–32) or childlessness (Hom. *Il*. 9.453). The latter is the case in Herodotus: the clan of the AEGEIDAE must mitigate the avenging spirits of their ancestors LAÏUS and OEDIPUS in order to beget offspring who can survive (4.149.2). Oedipus' CURSE on his descendants is also called a Fury (*erinys*: e.g., Aesch. *Sept*. 70 and 785; Soph. *OC* 1299); according to the concept of the *erinyes*, Oedipus' MURDER of his father Laïus might also have called forth such avenging spirits. The avenging spirits of Laïus and Oedipus are also attested in Pausanias (9.5.15), as the reason for AUTESION, father of THERAS of the clan of the Aegeidae, to leave THEBES for the PELOPONNESE.

SEE ALSO: Myth; Religion, Greek; Vengeance

FURTHER READING

Corcella in ALC, 676.

Johnston, Sarah Iles. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, 250–67. Berkeley: University of California Press.