Classical Quarterly 56.2 393–403 (2006) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000401

VOICELESS VICTIMS, MEMORABLE DEATHS IN HERODOTUS

Herodotus covers a vast repertoire of atrocities. When Apollo, in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (179–90), tells the Erinyes to leave his temple, he says that other places are fitting for them, places where there are beheadings, gouging out of eyes, castration of boys, mutilation, stoning, impalement. The atrocities mentioned by the god are all to be found in Herodotus, and more besides. In this article, I shall review Herodotean examples of the items in Apollo's list. Sections I.1–6 correspond to the items of the list, with the modification that impalement is replaced by a more illustrative case of crucifixion.[1] There is a basic pattern here: the victims are not represented as lamenting or complaining but remain silent, while Herodotus himself wastes no words of empathy on them. Obviously, we can look upon and construe this in different ways, and we can try to find specific reasons for each case of silence. My approach to these cases will be to bring out what Herodotus prefers to focus on. In section II, I will consider some further cases, including deaths in combat, and discuss Boedeker's and Darbo-Peschanski's explanations of Herodotus' reticence concerning the subjective aspect of death.[2]

I.1

Herodotus relates how after the defeat at Salamis Xerxes marched to the Hellespont and then proceeded to Sardis (8.113ff.). But there is also another report, he says (8.118), according to which Xerxes crossed from Eion on the Strymon to Asia in a Phoenician ship. A storm arose and the ship was in danger. The captain, asked by Xerxes if there was any means by which they could be saved, answered that there was none, save one, that they dispose of the many people on deck. Then, at the king's request, the Persians on deck jumped overboard and the ship was saved and came to Asia. As soon as Xerxes had gone ashore, he presented the captain with a golden crown for having saved the king's life, and then had his head cut off for having put so many Persians to death: *ὅτι μὲν ἔσωσε βασιλέος τὴν ψυχήν, δωρήσασθαι χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ τὸν κυβερνήτην, ὅτι δὲ Περσέων πολλοὺς ἀπώλεσε, ἀποταμεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.*

Herodotus adds (8.119) that this version of Xerxes' return to Asia is not credible: *οὗτος δὲ ἄλλος λέγεται λόγος περὶ τοῦ Ξέρξεω νόστου, οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστός, οὔτε ἄλλως οὔτε τὸ Περσέων τοῦτο πάθος.* He argues that if the captain really gave Xerxes the answer he is supposed to have given, Xerxes would no doubt have let the Persians on deck go below and instead thrown overboard an equal number of the

[1] For a survey of the forms of physical violence in the *Histories*, see R. Rollinger, 'Herodotus, human violence and the ancient Near East', in V. Karageorghis and I. Taifacos (edd.), *The World of Herodotus* (Nicosia, 2004), 121–50. Rollinger regards impaling and crucifying as one category, since the use of the Greek terms is not entirely clear.

[2] D. Boedeker, 'Pedestrian fatalities: the prosaics of death in Herodotus', in P. Derow and R. Parker (edd.), *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford, 2003), 17–36, and C. Darbo-Peschanski, 'La vie des morts: représentations et fonctions de la mort et des morts dans les Histoires d'Hérodote', *AION* 10 (1988), 41–51.

Phoenician rowers. No, Herodotus says, referring back to the first version, Xerxes returned to Asia by road. Even so, this does not make Herodotus a reluctant reporter of the version he finds incredible. On the contrary, he gives an account full of details—the storm, the frightened king's question to the captain, the answer, the king's request, the Persians prostrating themselves before the king and then jumping into the sea, the reward and punishment of the captain. One element, though, is missing: any word or reaction on the captain's part as he is faced with the requital. He is a voiceless victim. The story ends with focus on the extraordinary combination of reward and punishment.

Here a matter, often commented on, needs to be addressed. It involves three questions that are connected. What did Herodotus want to say in relating the story? What did the story say to his contemporary audience? What does it say to his modern readers? Let us begin with the third question. We find answers by looking at what scholars of today and yesterday have to say. In Flory's eyes, the story reveals Xerxes' cowardice and stupidity, as well as it illustrates Xerxes' fickleness, 'a mixture of generosity and cruelty'.[3] Immerwahr, referring to this story among others, says that Xerxes 'rewards and punishes his own subjects to excess'.[4] Immerwahr emphasizes Xerxes' contradictory nature, in which opposite qualities counterbalance each other (magnificence and weakness, courage and fear, nobility and baseness). Aly says of the crowning and decapitation of the captain that Xerxes acts 'als characterisierter Tyrann'.[5] To Benardete, Xerxes 'is shown acting out a perfect caricature of justice'.[6] The story, Benardete says, points to a truth about justice: strict application of a just rule, to repay what is owed, leads to a contradiction.

Returning to the second question and the first, we find of course no precise answers. Something of what the scholars say could perhaps also be applied in tentatively answering the second question, and as for the first question, we might expect that the answer, to some degree at least, should correspond with the answers to the other two questions. That would be all. However, what if the first question is slightly changed so that we ask instead what Herodotus *wants* in relating the story? In that case, too, various answers are conceivable and they need not, of course, be mutually exclusive.[7] One answer, however, is obvious. Herodotus wants to point to the extraordinary form and circumstances of the requital. And this, as we will see, applies also to the stories to be reviewed below. Herodotus aims at the extraordinary and exceptional in respect of requital and revenge as he does in many other respects as well. The marvellous, which springs from extraordinary and unexpected things, accumulates in the *Histories*.[8]

[3] S. Flory, *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit, 1987), 59. On the pattern used in this and other stories in the *Histories*, cf. V. Gray, 'Short Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, 2002), 291–317.

[4] H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, 1966), 182–3.

[5] W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1921), 87. Cf. D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989), 180–1.

[6] S. Benardete, *Herodotean Inquiries* (The Hague, 1969), 5.

[7] Flory (n. 3), 54ff., discusses passages where Herodotus contrasts two versions, one trivial but true, the other dramatic but untrue. The true version, Flory (68) says, does not contain significant motifs and so Herodotus adds a significant but untrue version. The version ending with the captain's reward contains, according to Flory (58–9), 'a number of ideas about Xerxes, the Persians, and life in general'.

[8] As to Herodotus' predilection for the extraordinary and marvellous and the possible influences of folktales and anecdotes of the oral culture, cf. Aly (n. 5) and Flory (n. 3), 152–4. On

I.2

The Thracian king of the Bisaltae and Crestonia, Herodotus tells us in 8.116, committed a monstruous deed (ἔργον ὑπερφυές). The king, who refused to submit to Xerxes, had forbidden his six sons to serve in the Persian army attacking Greece. The sons disobeyed him and joined the expedition. Herodotus suggests they did so from a desire to see the war: ἢ ἄλλως σφι θυμὸς ἐγένετο θεήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον. When all six returned safe and sound, the father punished them for their disobedience by gouging out their eyes: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνεχώρησαν ἀσινέες πάντες ἐξ ἐόντες, ἐξώρυξε αὐτῶν ὁ πατὴρ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς διὰ τὴν αἰτίην ταύτην. The sons are voiceless victims. It is the form of punishment that interests Herodotus. We notice that he has suggested a cause of the disobedience which is in keeping with the punishment: the desire to see the war matches the gouging out of the eyes. This, Herodotus concludes, was the payment they received: καὶ οὗτοι μὲν τοῦτον τὸν μισθὸν ἔλαβον.[9]

I.3

The story of the vengeance of Hermotimus from Pedasa is told in 8.104–6. Panionius, a man from Chios, made his living by castrating boys and selling them in Sardis or Ephesus. One of the boys treated in this way was Hermotimus. He was sent together with other gifts to the Persian king and came to be most highly valued of all the eunuchs by Xerxes. Once, when Hermotimus had gone on business to Atarneus, he happened to meet Panionius, and he lured him, by making false promises, into settling in Atarneus with his wife and children. Then, having Panionius and his four sons in his power, he could have his revenge.[10]

Panionius is characterized by Herodotus as making his living from very unholy deeds: τὴν ζόην κατεστήσατο ἀπ' ἔργων ἀνοσιωτάτων. When Hermotimus has got hold of Panionius, he addresses him with similar words: Ὦ πάντων ἀνδρῶν ἤδη μάλιστα ἀπ' ἔργων ἀνοσιωτάτων τὸν βίον κτησάμενε. To Hermotimus it is clear that it is the gods who have led Panionius into his hands. You thought, he says to Panionius, that what you did would escape the notice of the gods, but they have justly delivered you, who have done unholy things, into my hands, so you cannot complain of the vengeance which I will take on you: ἐδόκεές τε θεοὺς λήσειν οἷα ἐμηχανώ τότε, οἵ σε ποιήσαντα ἀνόσια, νόμῳ δικαίῳ χρεώμενοι, ὑπήγαγον ἐς χεῖρας τὰς ἐμάς, ὥστε σε μὴ μέμψασθαι τὴν ἀπ' ἐμέο τοι ἐσομένην δίκην.[11] The revenge Hermotimus takes is as follows. Panionius is forced to cut off the

extraordinary and marvellous things, things which cause Herodotus to marvel, in the ethnographical and geographical sections, cf. H. Barth, 'Zur Bewertung und Auswahl des Stoffes durch Herodot (Die Begriffe thoma, thomazo, thomasios und thomastos)', *Klio* 50 (1968), 93–110, and W. M. Bloomer, 'The superlative *Nomoi* of Herodotus's *Histories*', *ClAnt* 12 (1993), 30–50.

[9] On this use of μισθός cf. J. Gould, 'Give and take in Herodotus', in id., *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford, 2001), 283–303, at 297.

[10] S. Hornblower, 'Panionios of Chios and Hermotimos of Pedasa (Hdt. 8.104–6)', in P. Derow and R. Parker (edd.), *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford, 2003), 37–57, construes Panionius as a representative of Ionianism. He is a 'signifier' for the archetypal Chians who subjugated the Carians and Lelegians. Hermotimus, the Carian/Lelegian, takes revenge. Cf. on the other hand H. Erbse, *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin, 1992), 95: 'Das ist zweifellos eine wahre Geschichte. Herodot erzählt sie mit Genugtuung, weil sie ein musterhafter Beleg für seine Teleologie ist.'

[11] Cobet's μέμψεσθαι (adopted by Hude, but not Rosén) is not necessary.

testicles/genitals[12] of his sons and the sons have to do the same to their father: *ἠναγκάζετο ὁ Πανιώνιος τῶν ἑωυτοῦ παίδων, τεσσέρων ἐόντων, τὰ αἰδοῖα ἀποτάμνειν, ἀναγκαζόμενος δὲ ἐποίεε ταῦτα. αὐτοῦ τε, ὡς ταῦτα ἐργάσατο, οἱ παῖδες ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀπέταμνον.*

Panionius, together with his sons, meets with retribution, but Herodotus is not interested in representing their reactions. What interests him is the form and extent of Hermotimus' vengeance. At the very beginning of the story, Herodotus announces that Hermotimus had the fullest vengeance of all men he knew: *μεγίστη τίσις ἤδη ἀδικηθέντι ἐγένετο πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.*[13] And Herodotus concludes by saying that in this way vengeance and Hermotimus overtook Panionius: *Πανιώνιον μέν νυν οὕτω περιῆλθε ἥ τε τίσις καὶ Ἑρμότιμος.*[14] Braund notes that the story of Hermotimus illustrates Herodotus' concern for remarkable reciprocity.[15]

I.4

Cutting off ears and nose was a common punishment in the Oriental monarchies.[16] Herodotus' stories involving this kind of mutilation are set in Egypt and Persia.

Herodotus tells us about Apries (2.161–3). With the exception of his ancestor Psammetichus, Apries was the most fortunate of Egyptian kings up to then. He reigned for twenty-five years. But it was fated that ill should befall him (*ἐπεὶ δέ οἱ ἔδεε κακῶς γενέσθαι*). Apries had sent an army against Cyrene, but it suffered a crushing defeat. The surviving soldiers and the friends of those who were killed rose in rebellion, thinking that Apries had deliberately sent them to certain destruction in order to rule more securely over the rest of the Egyptians. Apries sent Amasis to try to persuade the rebels to surrender. But Amasis was offered the throne by the rebels and made preparations to lead them against Apries. Now Apries sent Patarbemis, an esteemed Egyptian, with orders to bring back Amasis alive into his presence. Patarbemis failed to do so, and on his return to Apries without Amasis, the king was so enraged with him that he ordered that his nose and ears be cut off: *περιταμεῖν προστάξαι αὐτοῦ τά τε ὦτα καὶ τὴν ῥῖνα.* Herodotus then, without wasting any words on the victim, turns to the extraordinary consequences of this outrage. He says that the Egyptians, who had been loyal to the king, seeing a most esteemed countryman so maltreated, immediately defected and went over to Amasis. Later on

[12] Hornblower (n. 10), 41–2, argues that *ἀποτάμνειν τὰ αἰδοῖα* implies an amputation of the whole genital area as opposed to *ἐκτέμνειν*, the normal word for 'castrate'.

[13] On Herodotus' search for the superlative, see Bloomer (n. 8). Pheretima's revenge, on the other hand, is not *μεγίστη* but excessive and therefore she is punished by the gods (4.202–5). Taking revenge for the killing of her son, she empaled the men responsible for the killing round the walls of Barca and she cut off their wives' breasts and stuck them on the wall. She died an evil death, seething with worms while she was still alive, Herodotus says and he adds: *ὡς ἄρα ἀνθρώποισι αἱ λίην ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι γίνονται.* Cf. N. Fisher, 'Popular morality in Herodotus', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, 2002), 199–224, at 214–15.

[14] For the idea of divine vengeance worked out through human agency, cf. T. Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000), 111–12. Cf. Aly (n. 5) at 184.

[15] D. Braund, 'Herodotos on the problematics of reciprocity', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (edd.), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1998), 159–80, at 166. On reciprocal action in the *Histories*, cf. also J. Gould, *Herodotus* (London, 1989), 43–4.

[16] See M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 1997), 430, and A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II: Commentary 99–182* (Leiden, 1988), 177. Cf. E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989), 158–9, and Rollinger (n. 1), 139–43.

(2.169) he reports that Apries, with his foreign mercenaries, was defeated by the Egyptians under Amasis. Apries was strangled to death.

The outrage against Patarbemis was the cause of Apries' downfall. That he was a man of blind over-confidence is underlined by Herodotus when reporting his military defeat. Apries, Herodotus declares, is said to have been of the opinion that not even a god could bring him down, since his power was so firmly established.

Intaphernes also committed outrages (3.118–19). He had been one of the seven conspirators who brought about the fall of the false Smerdis and made Darius king. Intaphernes, Herodotus says, committed these outrages and met his death: *Ἰνταφρένεα κατέλαβε ὑβρίσαντα τάδε ἀποθανεῖν*. What he did was this. He went unannounced to the palace to visit Darius. But the sentry and the chamberlain did not admit him, saying that the king was in bed with a woman. Thinking they were lying, Intaphernes cut off their ears and noses with his sword. He then strung the ears and noses on his horse's bridle, tied the bridle round their necks and sent them away: *σπασάμενος τὸν ἀκινάκεα ἀποτάμνει αὐτῶν τά τε ὦτα καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ ἀνείρας περὶ τὸν χαλινὸν τοῦ ἵππου περὶ τοὺς αὐχένας σφέων ἔδησε καὶ ἀπῆκε*. After this description,[17] Herodotus changes the scene and goes on to tell what ensued. The sentry and the chamberlain, the voiceless victims, presented themselves to Darius and told him, having recovered their speech, it would seem, why they had been treated in the way they had. The king, wasting no words on the victims, suspected Intaphernes of planning an uprising and had him imprisoned, pending execution, along with his children and relatives.[18] What follows is the story of Intaphernes' wife.

In the story of Masistes (9.107–13) there is verbal abuse and mutilation. After the Persian defeat at Mycale, Xerxes' brother Masistes abused Artayntes, a Persian general, telling him that as a general he was worse than a woman and that he deserved all manner of evil because of the harm he had done to the king's house. To be called worse than a woman, Herodotus adds, is the greatest insult among the Persians. Indignant, Artayntes drew his sword to kill Masistes. But Masistes was saved by a Greek, Xenagoras, who hurled Artayntes to the ground. As a reward Xerxes gave Xenagoras the governorship of Cilicia.

On that occasion Masistes got off lightly. Nevertheless, ruin awaited him and his family. Xerxes fell in love with Masistes' wife, but his attempts to seduce her were without success. He then arranged a marriage between his son and a daughter of Masistes, believing he could seduce Masistes' wife more easily in this way. Having received his son's bride—whose name was Artaynte—into his house, he forgot the wife of Masistes and loved the daughter instead.[19] However, the affair became known in the following way. Xerxes' wife Amestris gave him a beautiful robe she had woven. He was very pleased and put it on and then went to visit Artaynte. Very pleased with her too, he told her to ask for anything she liked and vowed to give her whatever she

[17] Herodotus seems to be alluding to the phenomenon of *maschalismos* in Greece: murderers cut off the victim's ears, nose and other extremities, strung them together and placed the string round the neck and under the arm-pits of the victim, believing that in this way they could avert vengeance from those they had killed. Cf. R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1983), 107–8, and K. Sier, *Die lyrischen Partien der Choephoren des Aischylos: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Stuttgart, 1988), 164–5.

[18] On Intaphernes' mutilation of the king's servants as an act of hybris, cf. N. R. E. Fisher, *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* (Warminster, 1992), 129 and 344.

[19] Gould (n. 9) at 290 says that her name 'confusingly' is Artaynte. It is, however, a significant name, as becomes clear as the story unfolds itself.

demanded. Artaynte, who was doomed together with her entire household to end badly (*τῇ δὲ κακῶς γὰρ ἔδεε πανοικίῃ γενέσθαι*), demanded the robe and Xerxes had to give it to her.[20] The name of Artaynte recalls Artayntes, who tried to kill Masistes but failed. Where Artayntes failed, Artaynte unwittingly succeeded. With her fateful demand, she brought about the ruin of Masistes and of his whole family as well. Amestris found out about the robe and what was going on. She was not indignant at Artaynte, but thought instead that the girl's mother, Masistes' wife, was responsible, and so she plotted her destruction.[21] At the royal banquet on the king's birthday, when the king would give presents to the Persians, Amestris asked Xerxes for a present—Masistes' wife. Xerxes was horrified, but he was constrained by the law, for at the royal banquet no one may be refused his request, and he had to agree to hand over his brother's wife to her. Amestris sent for the royal bodyguard and mutilated Masistes' wife. She had her breasts cut off and thrown to the dogs and had her nose, ears, lips and tongue cut off and then sent her home: *τούς τε μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα κυσὶ προέβαλε καὶ ῥῖνα καὶ ὦτα καὶ χείλεα καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐκταμοῦσα ἐς οἶκόν μιν ἀποπέμπει διαλελυμασμένην*. Herodotus then goes on to tell that Masistes, seeing what had been done to his wife, took counsel with his sons and decided to set off for Bactria to stir up a revolt against Xerxes. Xerxes sent an armed force in pursuit, which caught Masistes and killed him and his sons.

Thus Herodotus gives a complete description of the mutilation with all its details. Then, without wasting words on the victim, he turns to the consequences, the attempt at revolt and the death of Masistes and his sons.[22]

I.5

An Athenian, Lycidas, was stoned by his fellow-countrymen in Salamis. Herodotus says (9.4–5) that when Mardonius had found Attica deserted, he sent Murychides, a man of the Hellespont, as messenger to Salamis to repeat the proposals conveyed to the Athenians by Alexander the Macedonian. The message was delivered to the Athenian council in Salamis, and Lycidas, who was one of the councillors, expressed the opinion that it was best to admit the proposals and lay them before the people—either because he had received money from Mardonius, Herodotus says, or because he was himself of this opinion. The Athenians in the council and those outside were so indignant that they surrounded Lycidas and stoned him to death. Without dwelling on this, adding only that the messenger was left unhurt, Herodotus goes on to the extraordinary sequel. The Athenian women, he says, having learnt what had happened, went to Lycidas' house and stoned his wife and his children: *κατὰ μὲν ἔλευσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα, κατὰ δὲ τὰ τέκνα*. The women following up the stoning of Lycidas by stoning his whole family is the climactic point with which the story ends.

[20] On the king's robe as a symbol of the kingship, see H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 'Exit Atossa: images of women in Greek historiography on Persia', in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (edd.), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London, 1983), 20–33, at 27–30. For the narrative pattern, see also V. Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's* Hellenica (London, 1989), 15–16. On the logic of the gift, cf. Gould (n. 9), 289–91.

[21] On the theme of the vengeful queen, see Flory (n. 3), 42–6. Cf. V. Gray, 'Herodotus and the rhetoric of otherness', *AJPh* 116 (1995), 185–211.

[22] The story, as a pendant to the story of Gyges and Candaules, can be construed as alluding to the murder of Xerxes later on, accordin → E. Wolff, 'Das Weib des Masistes', *Hermes* 92 (1964), 51–8.

I.6

Stoning and crucifixion are combined in the story of the Persian governor Artayctes (9.116–20). Artayctes is described by Herodotus as ἀτάσθαλος. He had gained control of the precinct of Protesilaus in Elaeus by tricking Xerxes, and then removed all its treasures to Sestus and turned it over to farming. Whenever he visited Elaeus, he would have intercourse with women in the precinct. After the defeat of the Persians, he was taken prisoner by the Greeks. When one of the guards was roasting salt fish and the fish began to jump as if newly caught, Artayctes took it as a portent that applied to him. He said that Protesilaus revealed that, although dead, he still had power from the gods to avenge himself on the man who had wronged him. Artayctes said he was willing to pay 100 talents in compensation for what he had taken from the precinct, and 200 talents to the Athenians, if they spared his life and the life of his son. But Xanthippus, the Athenian commander, did not accept Artayctes' offer. He felt the same way as the people of Elaeus who wanted revenge for Protesilaus. So they brought Artayctes to the place where the abutment of Xerxes' bridge had been—some say to the hill above the town of Madytus—and there they nailed him to a plank and hung him up: σανίδι προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν.[23] His son was stoned to death before his eyes.

Thus, what makes Artayctes speak is the portent of the jumping fish. He interprets the portent and tries, in vain, to bargain for his life and the life of his son. After that he is silent. When he is crucified, Herodotus is careful to point out the place of the crucifixion—overlooking the straits where Xerxes' army crossed into Europe—and the fact that Artayctes' son was stoned to death before his eyes. This done, Herodotus adds, the Athenians sailed for Greece, taking with them the cables of the bridges, with a view to dedicating them in the temples. And nothing more, he says, happened that year. Dewald would have liked at least a sentence from Herodotus characterizing the Athenian behaviour at Sestus. He does not, she says, put a value, positive or negative, on the Athenian actions.[24] However, what matters to Herodotus is to give prominence to the special form and place of the punishment: Artayctes and his son dying near or at the very spot where Xerxes led his army into Europe. This is, so to speak, his point. Boedeker notes that linking the execution of Artayctes with the bridgehead at Sestus allows Herodotus 'to conclude his reconstruction of the Persian invasions with an episode that evokes an important recurring theme: the consequences of limits violated and natural boundaries transgressed'.[25] The story of Artayctes and Protesilaus recalls the Trojan War, Herodotus' mythological prologue, and the beginning of the enmity between Europe and Asia.[26] The story is already mentioned summarily in 7.33, as Xerxes' first bridge is built across the Hellespont to the headland between Sestus and Madytus. Here, Herodotus says, the Athenians under Xanthippus nailed the Persian

[23] σανίδι is Reiske's conjecture for σανίδα, σανίδας. Cf. 7.33 πρὸς σανίδα διεπασσάλευσαν, referring to the same incident (see below).

[24] C. Dewald, 'Wanton kings, pickled heroes, and gnomic founding fathers: strategies of meaning at the end of Herodotus's *Histories*', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler (edd.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton, 1997), 62–82, at 71. For various conjectures on Herodotus' attitude (approval or censure?) cf. Lateiner (n. 5), 132–3.

[25] D. Boedeker, 'Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus' *Histories*', *ClAnt* 7 (1988), 30–48, at 42.

[26] On ring-compositional technique at the end of the *Histories*, see J. Herington, 'The closure of Herodotus' *Histories*', *ICS* 16 (1991), 149–60. Cf. Boedeker (n. 25), 42–5.

governor Artayctes to a plank not long afterwards. In this way, the execution of Artayctes frames the account of Xerxes' invasion.

II

The norm in the examples reviewed above is that the victims—no matter who they are, whether anonymous figures or not—suffer and perish without a word, with no reaction whatsoever. Herodotus' focus is on extraordinary forms, circumstances, and consequences of punishment and revenge. The victims' reactions are not allowed to divert or detract from this.

The result of this focusing is that there is no difference in Herodotus' treatment of human and animal victims. The story about the cavalry general Pharnuches (7.88) is illustrative. When Xerxes' army started its march on Greece, Pharnuches was left behind because of an accident. His horse was scared when a dog ran under its feet, it reared and threw its rider. Pharnuches threw up blood and fell ill and the illness turned into consumption. Herodotus goes on to tell about the punishment of the horse. He says that the servants did at once what Pharnuches ordered them to do to the horse. They brought the horse exactly to the spot where he had thrown his master and cut off its legs at the knees: *ἐς τὸν χῶρον ἐν τῷ περ κατέβαλε τὸν δεσπότην ἀπαγαγόντες, ἐν τοῖσι γούνασι ἀπέταμον τὰ σκέλεα.*[27] So the story ends, with Herodotus saying that Pharnuches was relieved of his command.

When comparing this story with those reviewed above, we notice a striking similarity: the interest in the punishment without concern for the victim. If the story had been recast and the victim were a human being instead of an animal, there is no reason to believe that Herodotus would have shown any more concern for the human victim than he now does for the animal.

Silence is typical of the victims throughout the *Histories*. But what about departures from this norm? Under what circumstances does a victim speak? Or, to put it in another way, when are the victim's words and reactions of interest to Herodotus? The case of Croesus (1.86–7) may provide an answer. Croesus makes himself heard when death closes in on him. Standing on the pyre, Croesus remembers Solon's words that not one of the living could be called happy. He sighs and three times utters Solon's name. Then, at the request of Cyrus, he tells the story of Solon's visit to Sardis. Cyrus, touched by the words of Croesus, changes his mind and orders that the fire should be put out and Croesus brought down from the pyre. But the attempts to extinguish the fire fail. Croesus, with tears, calls upon Apollo to come and save him, if any of his gifts has pleased him, and suddenly clouds gather in the clear sky, a storm breaks, the rain puts out the fire and Croesus is saved. So for Croesus, talking—to himself, his captors and the god—does pay off. By making him talk, Herodotus can add the finishing touch to the Solon-Croesus story and give an account of the miracle of the intervention by Apollo.

Croesus is a victim that speaks and so departs from the norm. We need to see this in perspective. The norm can actually be considered a side-effect of Herodotus' interest in the extraordinary and marvellous. There is no place in his stories for victims reacting, so to speak, in ordinary ways, with emotions and laments that make no impact. To be related, the victim's reaction must be of an extraordinary kind.

[27] Cf. the words of Candaules' wife (1.11): *ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν χωρίου ἡ ὁρμὴ ἔσται ὅθεν περ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ ἐπεδέξατο γυμνήν.*

I turn, for a comparison, to the deaths in combat. Boedeker notes that, compared to the *Iliad*, the *Histories* tends to treat deaths in combat more summarily. Boedeker asks: 'Why does Herodotus consistently avoid detailed, emotional, or subjective treatment of combatants' deaths, especially when this approach is so well modeled in the *Iliad*?'[28] She refers to Darbo-Peschanski's observation that in general Herodotus tends to avoid reporting the moment or process of death and especially avoids a subjective account from the victim's perspective. In explanation, Darbo-Peschanski argues that Herodotus emphasizes the active role of death (it marks boundaries, effects changes and contributes to the order of the world, to *dike*).[29] In Boedeker's view, however, Herodotus' use of death as an action does not explain why he avoids the subjective aspect of death in his narrative.[30] She argues that the differences between Homeric and Herodotean accounts of death in battle is in accord with distinctions drawn by Bakhtin and his followers between 'poetic' and 'prosaic' narratives. The 'poetic' narrative is highly unified, implicitly authoritative, forming a closed system, 'monologic' in the sense that it does not allow for other competing levels of discourse, while the 'prosaic' narrative is open-ended, including a play of discourses, deploying competing perspectives, assuming a world that is de-centred, heteroglossic. Boedeker admits that Homeric epic is not a purely 'poetic' narrative in Bakhtin's sense, it is a polyphonic poem with varying personal perspectives. But she insists that 'when it comes to death, the perspectives largely converge in the shared ideology of a heroic code predicated on mortality'. It can be argued, she says, that 'the *Iliad* is highly monologic in its assumption of the heroic value system'. In the *Histories*, by contrast, 'deaths in combat have extraordinarily varied meanings to the narrator and to other evaluators whose voices can be heard along with his'. Herodotus can evoke a traditional heroic character, as with Leonidas, and praise brave warriors, but these passages are 'part of a dialogic, almost kaleidoscopic, range of responses to deaths in battle'.[31]

Boedeker remarks that the matter is complex and surely has no single explanation. In my view, we must not overlook Herodotus' interest in the extraordinary and marvellous. Boedeker and Darbo-Peschanski touch on this. Thus, contrasting Herodotus' reticence concerning deaths in battle with his more extended treatment of other kinds of deaths, Boedeker mentions the deaths of Pheretima, Cambyses, Cleomenes, and Adrastus, and says that compared to such extraordinary deaths the fall of a warrior might well seem ordinary.[32] And Darbo-Peschanski says with reference to 'les éloges individuels' in 9.71–5: 'On remarquera cependant qu'Hérodote détourne notablement la tradition épique en n'évoquant les combats particuliers

[28] Boedeker (n. 2) at 21.

[29] Boedeker (n. 2) at 22. Cf. Darbo-Peschanski (n. 2), 41–2: 'Or, dans les passages, pourtant très nombreux, où *les Histoires* font référence à la mort, on a du mal à trouver des récits du moment précis où les personnages l'éprouvent, des évocations de la mort comme passion. Presque jamais le point de vue du récit n'est celui de la victime ou, plus largement, de l'objet du procès de mort. Le mourir n'a pas de place dans le text.' Cf. also Darbo-Peschanski (n. 2) at 50: 'Ainsi, en passant sous silence l'épisode du mourir pour s'en tenir à l'expression de la mort comme action et en donnant à celle-ci la triple fonction de contribuer à l'ordre du monde, à sa destruction et à son rétablissement, Hérodote met en place les éléments d'une réponse originale à la difficulté qu'il semble éprouver à formuler ce franchissement de la limite qu'est la mort dans son accomplissement.'

[30] See Boedeker (n. 2), 22ff.

[31] As for Homeric features, see also the Masistius episode in 9.22–5 (fight over the corpse and wonder at Masistius' beauty). Cf. Aly (n. 5), 274–5.

[32] Boedeker (n. 2), 22–4. Cf. Darbo-Peschanski (n. 2), 47–8.

qu'après avoir raconté les affrontements de masse et en sélectionnant des actions autant—et, le plus souvent, plus—à cause de leur caractère étonnant que pour conférer le Kléos à ceux qui les ont accomplies.'[33] Now, from the passages cited by Boedeker and Darbo-Peschanski it is clear that Herodotus can be brief or give more detailed accounts with regard to both deaths in combat and other kinds of death. It is also clear that he can give a subjective account from the perspective of the victim/combatant if it suits him. His mode of procedure varies. However, for Boedeker and Darbo-Peschanski the point of departure is the contrast between Herodotus and Homer (for Darbo-Peschanski also the tragedians), not the variation in Herodotus. In their explanations, they give no weight to this variation. In my view, however, the variation must be taken into account.

The tendencies noted in Herodotus by Darbo-Peschanski and Boedeker respectively are that he avoids reporting the moment or process of death and avoids giving a subjective account from the victim's perspective and that he avoids detailed, emotional, or subjective treatment of combatants' deaths. Let us take the variation into account and look at a passage which is not quite in line with these tendencies, the case of Callicrates (9.72). Herodotus says that Callicrates was the most handsome man in the whole Greek army at Plataea. He died outside the battle, hit in the side by an arrow, while Pausanias was offering sacrifice. Dying he said to Arimnestus, the Plataean, that what grieved him was not to die for Hellas, but that he had done no deed worthy of himself, although eager to do so. We see that Callicrates' death is an extraordinary case. The most handsome man of all the Greeks, he has come to accomplish a deed worthy of himself. Injured before the battle and dying, he gives vent to his at once frustrated and noble feelings. Now, this is something for Herodotus to dwell upon, and what he gives us is precisely a subjective account from the victim's/combatant's perspective.

As for detailed treatment or not of combatants' deaths, let us also look first at the death of Cynegirus (6.114) and then at the story of the killing of Artybius (5.111–12). Herodotus mentions Cynegirus together with other Athenians who fell in the battle of Marathon. As to the others—the polemarch Callimachus, the general Stesilaus, and other well-known Athenians—he mentions simply that they fell in the battle, adding about Callimachus *ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός*; about Cynegirus, however, he tells us more, saying that he fell in the battle as he was getting hold of the stern of a Persian ship and had his hand cut off with an axe:

καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος [Καλλίμαχος] διαφθείρεται, ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός, ἀπὸ δ' ἔθανε τῶν στρατηγῶν Στησίλεως ὁ Θρασύλεω. τοῦτο δὲ Κυνέγειρος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἐνθαῦτα ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νεός, τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεὶς πελέκει πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί.

Boedeker, who notes that Herodotus seldom mentions the specific circumstances of a death in battle, unless they are remarkable in some way, says of Cynegirus that, although the circumstances are briefly mentioned, his death is described with far less detail than that of Ilioneus and many others in the *Iliad*.[34] To me, however, the important point is that Herodotus is so interested in the remarkable detail that he inserts it into what is actually a short list of fallen Athenians.

From Cynegirus we proceed to the rather elaborate story of the killing of the Persian commander Artybius at the battle in Cyprus (5.110–12). When the troops

[33] Darbo-Peschanski (n. 2) at 48, n. 25.
[34] Boedeker (n. 2) at 19.

were drawn up in battle-order, Onesilus, the king of Salamis, chose to take his stand opposite Artybius. The horse on which Artybius rode was trained to rear up against enemy soldiers and kill them with its hoofs and teeth. Oniselus conferred with his Carian armour-bearer, who thought it best that the king take on Artybius, while he himself would go for the horse. When Artybius came charging and Onesilus aimed at him and struck, the horse reared and brought down its feet upon Onesilus' shield. At that moment, the Carian swung his sword and cut off the feet of the horse. The horse fell and Artybius with him. The narrator, Boedeker says, is not interested in the experience of death from Artybius' point of view.[35] Well, he is not, because the story is first and foremost about the Carian giving advice to his master, advice which turns out to be good. The Carian promises that Artybius' horse will never again rear up against anybody (*ἐγὼ γάρ τοι ὑποδέκομαι μή μιν ἀνδρὸς ἔτι γε μηδενὸς στήσεσθαι ἐναντίον*), and the story ends with the focus on how the Carian makes good his promise.

As for Herodotus' interest in the extraordinary, it is very telling what kinds of death he treats extensively. They include deaths involving barbarian *nomoi*, ruse and machination, hybris, female perpetrators, as well as spectacular suicides.[36] The suicide of Adrastus (1.45) is the culmination of the tragic story of Croesus' son Atys.[37] Adrastus slays himself on the tomb of Atys, whom he has accidentally killed. We hear of the suicide in the final sentence of the story, where Herodotus, employing a periodic structure, recapitulates the ancestry and life-history of Adrastus and conveys his thoughts and feelings (*συγγινωσκόμενος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τῶν αὐτὸς ἤδεε βαρυσυμφορώτατος*), before revealing that he slayed himself on the tomb of Atys. Gould notes that the effect of the recapitulation is reminiscent of the 'obituaries' of warriors in the *Iliad*.[38] At an earlier point, Adrastus had begged Croesus to kill him over the dead body of Atys: *ἐπικατασφάξαι μιν κελεύων τῷ νεκρῷ*. Now a similar expression, *ἐπικατασφάζει τῷ τύμβῳ ἑωυτόν*, is being used in the description of his suicide on the tomb of his victim.

To conclude, it is not appropriate to say that Herodotus *avoids* reporting the moment or process of death and giving a subjective account from the victim's perspective and *avoids* detailed, emotional, or subjective treatment of combatants' deaths. Instead, we have to differentiate. Herodotus is interested in deaths and the circumstances of death, if they are extraordinary in some way. It makes no difference whether it is a death in combat or other kinds of death. The extraordinary element may involve the victim's sentiments, and in that case Herodotus gives a subjective account from the victim's perspective. Thus, what determines his choice—to focus on a case of death or not, and to give an account from the victim's perspective or not—is largely his interest in the extraordinary and marvellous.

Uppsala University OVE STRID
ove.strid@lingfil.uu.se

[35] Boedeker (n. 2) at 20.

[36] Cf. Darbo-Peschanski (n. 2), 47–8, and Boedeker (n. 2), 22–4.

[37] E. Kornarou, 'The tragic Herodotus?', in V. Karageorghis and I. Taifacos (edd.), *The World of Herodotus* (Nicosia, 2004), 307–19, at 314, sums up the many tragic motifs in the story: the concepts of *ate* and *nemesis*, the god-sent dream which predicts a disaster, supplication and *catharsis*, *peripeteia*, tragic irony, the inadvertent crime, suicide.

[38] Gould (n. 15) at 54. On the pathos of the 'obituaries' in the *Iliad*, cf. J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980), 103–43.