COLONIZING THE *HISTORIES*

FOUNDATION STORIES AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE HERODOTEAN NARRATIVE

by

ALEX ROBERT MOSKOWITZ

(Under the Direction of Peter O'Connell)

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I investigate the role of foundation stories, narratives that describe the foundation of Greek colonies, in the structure of the Herodotos's *Histories.* Through a detailed study of their internal structure and their relationship to the broader themes of the history, I argue that foundation stories serve as nodes where disparate ideas can convene in order to shape readers' interpretation of other events. In particular, I maintain that the most critical function of foundation stories in the *Histories* is to portray expansionism as a dangerous venture with deleterious consequences. I also describe the capacity of foundation stories to address the concept of Hellenic identity and deconstruct notions of stable and distinct cultures in the Mediterranean world. Finally, foundation stories prove the role of human error, rather than chance, as the most important factor in precipitating divine punishments.

INDEX WORDS: Herodotos, Apoikism, Colonial narrative, Expansionism, Identity, Delphi

COLONIZING THE *HISTORIES*

FOUNDATION STORIES AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE HERODOTEAN NARRATIVE

by

ALEX MOSKOWITZ

BA, Swarthmore College, 2015

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2017

COLONIZING THE *HISTORIES*

FOUNDATION STORIES AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE HERODOTEAN NARRATIVE

by

ALEX ROBERT MOSKOWITZ

Major Professor: Peter O'Connell

Committee: Naomi Norman
Emily Baragwanath

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2017

For Mom

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the product of a great deal of effort by many people other than me. As the saying goes, it takes a village. To start, I want to thank all the teachers, professors, and mentors who have guided me along the way. Many thanks to Yoda (less frequently known as Vicki Arndt-Helgesen) at Shawnee Mission East for inspiring my love of history. Endless thanks to the professors at Swarthmore College who took that love, shaped it, and turned it into a passion, most especially William Turner, Seth Bernard, Grace Ledbetter, and Peter Judson. And special thanks are owed to Rosaria Munson for introducing me to Herodotos, showing me what good scholarship looked like, and motivating me when I needed it most.

I am further grateful to the Classics Faculty at the University of Georgia, who taught me to teach and expanded my horizons far beyond what I could have expected. Particular thanks to Peter O'Connell for his unending generosity and patience, without which this thesis would have been worse and quite spectacularly delayed. I would also like to thank Naomi Norman and Emily Baragwanath, whose thoughtful advice was of constant value as I wrote this thesis. I am additionally grateful to the Graduate School at the University of Georgia for actually paying me to learn, a generosity that I will always value.

I would also like to thank the people that make my life so wonderful. My family, my aunts and uncles, and my many cousins who have always been there. Moreover, I want to thank the friends who have been there through thick and thin, to Cole and Ford, to Fish, and to Ruth, and everyone else. To list you all would be insane, but you know who you are and you know that I love you.

To David, thank you for being a wonderful brother and for going to law school so I don't have to. I hope this can make up for all those years of torment I gave you.

To Katie, thank you for always being there. For putting up with me, encouraging me, and making me smile.

And lastly, to my parents. Throughout my whole life, I have always known that I have your approval and support no matter what. I would have never had the courage to pursue a life as an academic if I didn't know I would have your unfailing love and advice along the way. And to Dad especially, for hanging in there when I needed you most. Thank you.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Several textual issues deserve brief attention. First, all quotations of Herodotos's *Histories*, the only ancient text quoted in this thesis, are taken from Wilson's 2015 Oxford Classical Text. All translations are my own.

When writing transliterated Greek names, I strive to stay as true to the original Greek as possible. Thus, I write Kyrene, Phokaia, and Kroisos, rather than Cyrene, Phocaea, and Croesus. In the case of especially familiar names like Athens or the Etruscans I use the conventional spelling, rather than Athenai or Tyrhennoi. When discussing Greek words and concepts, I use the transliterated English words but place them in italics, such as *polis* and *apoikia*. I am certainly culpable for any and all errors and inconsistencies that may occur throughout the text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The *Histories* of Herodotos is a long and winding narrative that is partially dedicated

to recalling the events of the Persian War, but also endeavors to present a geographic and

ethnographic discourse on the Greek world. Within this intricate system, the colonial

narrative is a fascinating subject. Even outside of the *Histories,* colonial narratives possess

manifold implications as moments of intentional history and social memory.[1] Herodotos

uses these stories to great effect in his *Histories*, embedding them in his narrative to

comment on and critique themes of particular significance to his history.

In this thesis, I investigate the relationship between the colonial narratives of the

Histories and the broader narrative. Over the course of three chapters, I argue that

Herodotos composes his colonial narratives to be microcosms of the *Histories* that consider

the work's predominant themes and warn against particular behaviors. In my first and

second chapters, I analyze the Phokaian narrative (1.163-8) and the Kyrenaian narrative

(4.145-167.3). In my final chapter, I connect the events and concepts of these foundation

stories to the broader themes of the *Histories*.

The two colonial narratives have similar structures and engage in comparable

thematic discussions. First, they consider the difficulties of isolating Hellenic identity or

---

[1] Hans-Joachim Gehrke developed the concept of intentional history (*intentionale Geschichte*) in an effort to explain the use of historical narrative to shape social and political institutions. Though limited English translations of his writings are available, two (Gehrke 2001, 2010) are particularly valuable. An edited volume called *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Foxhall et al. 2010) has also influenced much of the following argument. For more on social memory, see Olick and Robbins 1998; Ma 2009; Steinbock 2013, 2–47.

drawing clear distinctions between Greeks and *barbaroi*. Second, the process of apoikism

necessarily involves migration and settlement abroad, so Herodotos employs these stories

to comment upon the social division and cultural deterioration that occurs as a product of

greed and expansionism. Lastly, the role of human error in divine punishment is a constant

factor in the events of the colonial narratives and resonates throughout the narrative.

These themes are critical to our understanding of the *Histories*, and their role in the events

of the foundation stories should instruct our interpretation of other events.

Before beginning my analysis, I will define several concepts that are critical to this

study: *apoikia,* colonial narratives, and micro- and macro-narrative.

Definitions and Concepts

Apoikia

Around the middle of the 8ᵗʰ century BCE, a combination of economic and social

incentives led Greeks from a variety of *poleis* to establish settlements outside their

traditional homelands. Many of these *apoikiai,* far from their *metropoleis*, occupied both the

physical and psychological margins of Hellenic society. The conventional English

translation of *apoikia* is "colony," but I will refrain from translating the word in this study

because of the many connotations associated with "colony" that do not reflect the meaning

of the Greek word. Accordingly, I describe the process by which the Greeks settled *apoikiai*

as apoikism.

Recent research into these *apoikiai* has focused on the process of their settlement, their relationships with indigenous populations, and their roles in Pan-Hellenic and international networks.[2] Network theory is an effective means of comprehending the nuances at play in the process of an *apoikia*'s settlement and development.[3] This theory imagines the cities and sanctuaries of the ancient world as nodes in a complex and constantly changing web of interactions. Thus, it argues, any individual *apoikia* should be seen as a singular point participating in a vast and ever-evolving system with connections (often economic but also religious and political) to other points in the system. Accordingly, it is by tracing and analyzing the interrelatedness of any given node that we may begin to better understand the development of a *polis*, a region, or the whole of the Mediterranean. For my analysis, which focuses on *stories* of foundation inserted into a broader work of history, the image of a network provides a valuable metaphor.

Colonial Narratives

Colonial narratives are pieces of folklore that describe the events leading up to and immediately following the settlement of an *apoikia.* The emergence of new polities with relatively little historical background presented settling Greek populations with the need to

---

[2] For general discussions of apoikism, see Osborne 1998; Yntema 2000; Boardman 2001; Hurst and Owen 2005. For analyses of cross-cultural interactions, see Malkin 2004; Attema 2008; Voskos and Knapp 2008; Hodos 2009; Vlassopoulos 2015. For regional and cross-cultural interactions, see Papadopoulos 2002; Malkin, et al. 2009; Malkin 2011; Mackil 2013; Gaastra 2014.
[3] Malkin 2003a, 2011; Malkin, et al. 2009; Müller 2016.

craft new origin stories for themselves.[4] These appear in the form of colonial narratives

that mythologize the foundation of a *polis* and its institutions and, in turn, enumerate the

relevant actions of its most influential citizens, deities, and political allies. This act of

retelling the settlement of a *polis* also contributes to defining the contemporary community

by whom and for whom these stories were composed. Foundation narratives existed in

multiple forms simultaneously and were dynamic; they could be adapted to changing socio-

political climates.

These narratives, originally pieces of popular, oral culture, had a corporate

authorship and constantly assimilated new elements and discarded others over time. The

stories in this form are largely lost to time, but the iconography of coinage and inscriptional

evidence does provide scholars with a degree of insight into them. A second category of

colonial narratives includes those that were received by authors and then transmitted in

texts such as the *Histories*. Because of the context of their exposition and their broader

intended audience, these stories are distinct from their local counterparts. For the most

part, I concentrate on the second form of colonial narratives.

Micro-Narratives and Macro-Narratives

A clear terminology for discussing narrative structure is of great value in any

attempt to effectively describe how authors compose their work. I choose to understand

the organization of stories and tales from a perspective that is indebted to the model that

---

[4] Malkin 2009 deconstructs foundation narratives and describes a potential process for their development. Giangiulio 2001; Darshan 2014 also discuss the subject of how foundation stories emerge.

Gregory Nagy develops in his books *Pindar's Homer* and *Homeric Responses*.[5] Nagy

describes a storyline as a macro-narrative or macrocosm that encompasses the structure of

the plot. Short stories, which he terms micro-narratives or microcosms, are segments of the

macro-narrative. Thus, a macro-narrative both is the sum total of its micro-narratives and

exists in its own right. Nagy employs this terminology in order to "appreciate the poetic

artistry" of Homer's epics; he suggests that the micro-narratives within the *Iliad* and

Odyssey are intended to mirror the themes of the macro-narratives of the two epics.[6]

As Nagy treats the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, I treat the *Histories* of Herodotos. Thus, in this

analysis, I consider the *Histories* to be the macro-narrative and the many stories within the

work, including the colonial narratives, to be micro-narratives. Much of the work of my

analysis involves engaging with these micro-narratives as independent stories and then

understanding their role in the network that is the macro-narrative.

Structure

Chapter 1: The Phokaian Narrative

In my first chapter, I conduct a close reading of the Phokaian narrative. The

Phokaians flee their city to avoid their own enslavement to the Persians and settle in Italy.

The whole narrative is only five chapters, but the episode is dense with information and its

themes resonate with other events of the macro-narrative.

---

[5] Nagy 1990, 2003.
[6] Nagy 2013, sec. 1.17.

I break my discussion of the Phokaian narrative into two parts. First, I discuss the early portion of the story, where Herodotos praises the population and elevates them as an exemplary *polis*. He notes the Phokaians' excellence at seafaring and positive relationship with non-Greeks polities, especially the Tartessians and their king Arganthonios. Herodotos also characterizes non-Hellenic peoples in positive terms throughout this section.

I then conduct a detailed analysis of a series of crises that strike Phokaian society in the second half of the narrative. Following their abandonment of Ionia, the Phokaians are repeatedly divided, first by internal disputes and second by fatalities from provoking a war with their Etruscan and Karthaginian neighbors. The virtuous character that Herodotos had earlier ascribed to the Phokaians disintegrates as they engage in piracy and misinterpret the Pythian oracle. Simultaneously, non-Greek populations continue to behave respectably and maintain the ties of *philia* that the Phokaians have come to ignore.

The Phokaians' migration and subsequent turn to piracy leads to the polity's decline. The Phokaians' failure to adequately interpret divine will is also partially responsible for the downfall of their society. Finally, the consistently positive behavior of non-Greek peoples questions any understanding of cultural identity that depends on a binary of Hellenic vs. non-Hellenic.

Chapter 2: The Kyrenaian Narrative

I analyze the Kyrenaian narrative in the much the same manner as the Phokaian narrative. I separate my discussion into two parts: first, I examine the characterizations of

the expedition to Thera and then Kyrene and, second, I discuss Herodotos's description of the increasingly divided polity and their ruling dynasty, the Battiads. The Kyrenaian narrative is a much longer colonial narrative than the Phokaian narrative and, consequently, presents a much more thorough image of the process of apoikism and the subsequent issues that can arise.

The early portion of my discussion focuses on lineage and Herodotos's interest in demonstrating the multi-cultural origins of both polities (Thera and Kyrene) and their *oikistai* (Theras and Battos). I also note the consistent capacity of the Hellenes in the first half of the colonial narrative to remedy internal social divisions and correctly interpret divine will.

Similar to the Phokaians, the Kyrenaians face many crises following the settlement of the *polis*. Starting with the misinterpretation of a Pythian oracle advising mass migration to Kyrene, they rapidly expand the territory of the *polis*, upsetting their neighbors and sparking a series of military conflicts. These external clashes complement a surge of intra-*polis* and familial strife that dramatically destabilizes Kyrene. Whereas the first part of the narrative had focused on the successful resolution of issues, the second part consistently presents problems without proper resolution. Much of the strife involved can be traced back to a series of mistakes in engaging with divine will, the polity's as well as the ruling dynasty's. The narrative also obscures Hellenic identity through depictions of the barbarous behavior of Pheretime and Arkesilaos III, Greeks and members of the Battiad dynasty.

Chapter 3: Foundation Stories and the Macro-Narrative

In my final chapter, I isolate the three major thematic issues that have arisen in my study of the colonial narratives and discuss the role of these themes as they emerge at other points in the macro-narrative. First, I discuss the general interest of the *Histories* in perceptions of distinct cultural identity. I examine Herodotos's descriptions of the origins of Greek *nomoi* and his testimony to the barbarian heritage of Athens. I suggest that the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives clearly articulate a concept that appears throughout the macro-narrative: namely, that Hellenic culture is not unique but is instead deeply related to non-Hellenic cultures.

Next, I discuss Herodotos's treatment of expansionism and immoderate greed throughout the *Histories*. Both the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives demonstrate the deleterious effects of the abuse of one's neighbors for gain. I note similar situations in the accounts of Kroisos and the expansion of the Persian empire. I also discuss the reappearance of the Phokaian narrative in the form of Dionysios the Phokaian general, who reminds readers of the Phokaians' expansionism at the turning point of the Ionian revolt, just before the Persians commence their plan to conquer Athens and all of mainland Greece. I finish this section by discussing the similarities between the Phokaian narrative and the rise of Athens to suggest that Herodotos may present the foundation stories as a warning against Athenian expansionism and the possible impacts of the *arkhē*.

The chapters ends with a discussion of the consistency of Herodotos's treatment of divine will in the *Histories*. The human failure to properly interpret oracles is a theme that reappears throughout the narrative. From the examples in the Phokaian and Kyrenaian

narrative as well as other examples I suggest Herodotos crafts his history to describe the

role of human error in provoking divine punishment.

This thesis explores the role of colonial narratives in the structure of the *Histories* of

Herodotos. These foundation stories reflect the broader thematic structure of the history

that criticizes ideas of Hellenic exceptionalism and the persistent desire for cultural and

territorial expansion. Herodotos inserts these *logoi* into his narrative as nexuses where the

implicit themes of the *Histories* converge with particular force. The discussion of these

colonial narratives and their many facets presents an exciting inroad to understanding the

composition of the *Histories* and the significance of *apoikiai* in the Classical Greek mindset.

CHAPTER 1: THE PHOKAIAN NARRATIVE

Herodotos inserts the Phokaian colonial narrative (1.163-8), a dense and symbolically loaded story, at a crucial moment in the *Histories*: he places it at the beginning of the description of the Persian conquest of Ionia.[7] At the outset of their micro-narrative, the Phokaians behave as a shining exemplar of Greek virtue; heroic terminology abounds in Herodotos's description of the polity, its history, and the feats of its recent past. Moreover, the Phokaians engage productively with foreign populations as they travel, trade, and make alliances abroad. However, a sequence of misfortunes winnows away the Phokaian people after their flight from the invading Persian Empire. With the reduction of the population, they, likewise, shed their exceptional nature. At the same time that Herodotos casts doubt upon the virtue of the Phokaians, he surrounds them with a network of other Hellenic and barbarian peoples. The behavior of these *barbaroi* throughout the narrative contrasts with that of the Hellenes and, in many ways, presents a brighter picture of the former than the latter. Thus, Herodotos uses the colonial setting of the narrative to manipulate a wide range of cultures and construct a complex and layered perspective on the actions of the Phokaians within a Mediterranean network.

A brief summary of the Phokaian narrative may be of use before we begin our discussion. Herodotos introduces the Phokaians first among Ionian Greeks because the

---

[7] Though not focused upon this specific passage, the introduction to Book 1 in Asheri, et al. 2007, 59–71, discusses the complete narrative of Book 1 and the significance of the Phokaian *logos* to the broader discourse.

Persians attacked their *polis* first. This mention prompts a discussion of the Phokaians'

storied past as explorers and traders. Returning to the time of the *Histories*, Herodotos

recounts the decision of the Greek polity to abandon their home in Ionia rather than be

enslaved by Harpagos and his army. The Phokaians make their way west to Kurnos,

modern Corsica, where they founded an *apoikia* called Alalia twenty years earlier because

of the demands of a Pythian oracle. Here, they enrage their Karthaginian and Etruscan

neighbors and prompt a battle. Devastated in the aftermath of the clash, the Phokaians

abandon Kurnos and move to the Italian mainland where they found the *polis* of Hyele and

institute the worship of the hero Kurnos after reinterpreting the Pythia's will.

In the following pages, I analyze this micro-narrative. First, I discuss the initial half

of the story and investigate the various ways in which Herodotos both depicts the

Phokaians as an exemplary polity and positively characterizes the non-Greek peoples that

they interact with. After the desertion of Phokaia, I turn to examine the narrative's

depiction of the decline and division of the Greek population. This process of first elevating

Greek populations and then portraying their downfall while foreign populations persist in

their prosperity raises issues of Greek superiority and exceptionalism. In particular, the

proper interpretation of divine will emerges as an issue of particular weight in the travails

of the Phokaians and the successes of other peoples. Throughout my discussion, I also note

how Herodotos's attention to various non-Greek polities establishes a network of

intercultural interaction that guides the reader's interpretation of Phokaian history.

Altogether, I argue, Herodotos crafts the story of the colonial expedition of the Phokaians to

investigate the role of Hellenes in a multicultural world.

Part 1: The Beginnings of the Phokaian People and their Relationships

The Early Prosperity of the Phokaians

Herodotos goes to great lengths at the beginning of the micro-narrative to establish the Phokaians as an initially "heroic" community. As we shall see, the behavior of the Phokaians in this passage is consistent with an archetype most clearly embodied by Odysseus in the *Odyssey.* In their predisposition for exploration and investigation abroad, John Marincola asserts that "there can be no doubt that the Ionian sea-travellers are the progeny of Odysseus."[8] Their actions reflect the Homeric hero's own curiosity and wanderings, implicitly likening the polity to the most famous of Hellenic mariners.

In his introduction to the Phokaian *logos*, Herodotos begins by describing the exceptional traits of the polity in its heroic past. He asserts that: οἱ δὲ Φωκαιέες οὗτοι ναυτιλίῃσι μακρῇσι πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων ἐχρήσαντο (1.163.1).[9] He then qualifies this declaration by enumerating the many places that Phokaians discovered (τὸν τε Ἀδρίην καὶ τὴν Τυρσηνίην καὶ τὴν Ἰβηρίην καὶ τὸν Ταρτησσόν, 1.163.1)[10] and the means by which they accomplished these feats (ἐναυτίλλοντο δὲ οὐ στρογγύλῃσι νηυσὶ ἀλλὰ πεντηκοντέροισι, 1.163.2).[11] At the end of his presentation of the mythological past of the

---

[8] Marincola's discussion of the significance of Odysseus to the composition and styling of ancient history demonstrates the broad applicability of the hero to the crafting of narratives and characters alike. In particular, Marincola notes that Herodotos borrows from common characterizations of Odysseus in his depictions of Histiaios and Themistokles (Marincola 2008, 8).

[9] "These Phokaians were the first of the Hellenes to take long voyages by ship." The naval prowess of the Phokaians reemerges later in the *Histories* (6.8). For information on the Phokaians' active role in international trade and settlement, see Dominguez 2004; Morel 2006.

[10] "The Adriatic Sea and Tyrrhenia and Iberia and Tartessos."

[11] "They voyaged not with hollow ships (i.e. merchant ships) but with pentekonters."

Phokaians, Herodotos introduces the Tartessian *basileus*, Arganthonios, who, in a

relationship that reminds us of Homeric *xenia*, befriends the *polis*, attempts to convince its

citizens to take up residence in his own land, and in the event of their refusal decides to

fund the construction of a massive city wall (1.163.2-4).[12] In particular, this great gift that

Arganthonios bestows upon the Phokaians, and the offerings that the Phokaians, as traders,

presumably gave in return most clearly liken this relationship to the Homeric concept.

Herodotos's attention to the accomplishments of the Phokaians does not solely

ennoble the polity through recalling Homeric ideas but also participates in the construction

of a broader network of pan-Mediterranean communities with the Hellenic world at the

center. The narrative's enumeration of places visited prompts readers to embed the events

of this passage in a context of foreign interactions.[13] Similarly, the Etruscans, Tartessians,

and those living in other parts of Iberia emerge as subtle but significant nodes that

contribute to the shaping of meaning in the story. These peoples represent the first

constituents of an expansive framework that develops throughout the remainder of the

Phokaians' travails.

This introductory passage also crafts a heroic identity for the Phokaians themselves.

Its focus upon the early exceptionalism of this population in comparison to the rest of

Greece contributes to this aim. The Phokaians are designated πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων, "the first of

---

[12] The use of προσφίλεια in the context of intercultural relations also occurs in Thuk. 1.92, 5.40, 7.86; Xen. *Hell*. 2.3.44. The term also regularly describes the disposition of gods towards humans (Ar. *Thesm*. 515; Xen. *Eq. mag.* 1.1; Pl. *Grg.* 507e). *Xenia*, as a type of *philia* relationship, is deeply related to concepts of προσφίλεια. For more on the subject, see Mitchell 1997, 1–72; Belfiore 2000, 1–3.

[13] Hdt. 1.163.2. For more on the visualization of space and mapping through travel narratives in Herodotos's *Histories,* see Purves 2010, 118–58; Bouzarovski and Barker 2016; de Bakker 2016; Rood 2016. For a discussion of the economic network controlled by the Phokaians, see Morel 2006, 371–7.

the Greeks," for their ability to navigate. Moreover, the narrative addresses the distinct

character of Phokaian excellence. It describes not just the special connections of the

Phokaians to seafaring but also specifies that the Phokaians are a military power rather

than merchants through their choice of vessel.[14] This aside also effectively separates the

Phokaians from the Phoenicians, another population who make ναυτιλίαι μακραί (1.1.1).

Accordingly, Herodotos depicts the Phokaians with characteristics that conform to some

the heroic archetype of excellence in exploration and military strength, rather than defining

them through the less praise-worthy practice of mercantile seafaring.[15] The specific heroic

ethos that develops around the Phokaians hinges on the same concepts of wandering and

material gain that "are pervasive in the world of the *Odyssey*" and usually occur amid

patterns of gift exchange, trade, and piracy.[16]

Furthermore, the special relationship between the Phokaians and Arganthonios

introduces another, particularly Greek, aspect of Phokaian heroism that is visible

throughout the narrative: a commitment to political freedom and self-determination. The

polity's positive relationship with the mythological leader, who fits into a cluster of myths

and is counted as one of the *macrobioi*, lends them a degree of importance.[17] Furthermore,

by rejecting Arganthonios's request that they come live in his own land, τῆς ἐωυτοῦ χώρης

οἰκῆσαι (1.163.3), the Phokaians show a solemn commitment to independence. Herodotos

---

[14] For more information on ancient seafaring and the differences between various types of Greek ships, see Casson 1971, 43–96; Asheri, et al. 2007, 184.

[15] For a fuller discussion on the idea of a hero and the behaviors that are associated with heroism, see Nagy 2013. For a discussion of the heroic character of Odysseus, the figure that the Phokaians most resemble in Herodotos's narration of their history, see Stanford 1964; Marincola 2008; Montiglio 2011. With regards to negative depictions of merchants and the concept of merchants as particularly un-heroic, especially in the *Odyssey*, see Morris 1986, 3–7; Dougherty 2001, 102–121.

[16] Montiglio 2005, 108.

[17] For more on the *macrobioi*, see Asheri, et al. 2007, 185. For other ancient texts that mention Arganthonios in the context of being a *macrobios*, see Anacr. fr. 361 *PMG*; Luc. *Macr.* 20; Cic. *Sen.* 69.

does not clearly state the logic of their rejection, but the narrative does consistently emphasize the Phokaians' commitment to their ancestral territory. Accordingly, we never hear of their foundation of Massalia, Emporion, or the other *apoikiai* that they famously settled during this period. In fact, Phokaia was well known in the Hellenic world as a *metropolis*, particularly because of the polity's role in trans-Mediterranean trade, so the absence of any mention of their *apoikiai* in the narrative is yet more peculiar.[18] The best explanation for Herodotos's silence on their earlier settlement projects is that, in their absence, the narrative can emphasize the significance of the physical space of the *polis* itself to its citizens. Thus, Herodotos presents his own interest in showing the Phokaians' commitment to their independence and their homeland through material that he recollects in the narrative (their rejection of Arganthonios's offer) as well as aspects of Phokaian history that he does not include.

The implied reasoning for the Phokaians' rejection of Arganthonios arises in the subsequent passage when Harpagos asks for the Phokaians' submission. Despite offering lenient terms to the Hellenes, a sort of symbolic capitulation, he does not succeed in securing their surrender. Herodotos writes that their rejection of Harpagos was founded upon their "being greatly aggrieved by slavery" (περιημεκτέοντες τῇ δουλοσύνῃ, 1.164.2). Just as they had declined to take up residence in Arganthonios's country, they refuse to become Persian subjects. The Phokaian people's absolute resolve to retain their own independence motivates them in both situations.

---

[18] For more on Phokaian apoikism, especially the *polis*'s foundation of Massalia, see Morel 2006; Gailledrat 2015. Indeed, the absence of Massalia and the other *apoikiai* in the Phokaian *logos* has presented scholars of Herodotos and Phokaia alike with a conundrum (Morel 2006, 364–9).

The demands of the Persian Harpagos denote the beginning of the more recent portion of the history. Likewise, the arrival of the Persian army introduces another foreign polity into the web of cultural interactions that surrounds the polity throughout the narrative. Responding to the general's offer of terms for their surrender, the Phokaians take action on their desire for self-determination and abandon their homes, an act reminiscent of the Athenians' own abandonment of their *polis*. Herodotos describes this process in great detail:

> οἱ Φωκαιέες ἐν τούτῳ κατασπάσαντες τὰς πεντηκοντέρους, ἐσθέμενοι τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἔπιπλα πάντα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἱρῶν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα, χωρὶς ὅ τι χαλκὸς ἢ λίθος ἢ γραφὴ ἦν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα ἐσθέντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσβάντες ἔπλεον ἐπὶ Χίου. (1.164.3)

> In this time, the Phokaians were dragging down the pentekonters putting both the children and women and all sorts of movable property into them, and also the statues from the temples and other votive offerings, except for anything bronze, or stone, or painted. Once they had put all these other things onboard, they went onboard themselves and sailed to Khios.

We are to envision this exodus from Phokaia as the solemn departure of an irrepressible people from their homeland. Herodotos describes the two events similarly, drawing attention to the removal of women and children from the *polis* in the Phokaian narrative (ἐσθέμενοι τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας) just as he does when describing the Athenians abandoning Athens (παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας ὑπεξαγάγωνται ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, 8.40.1). But while he depicts the Phokaians as devoting significant energy to ensuring the fate of sacred materials, he makes no mention of the Athenians endeavoring to save any of their temple dedications. In the latter case, he does note that some people refuse to abandon the *polis* for the sake of these items, which suggests a shared concern for temple property between

the two polities (8.40; 51).[19] Though the two events are not necessarily parallel in intent

(the Athenians intended to return to Athens) or extent (the Athenians only sailed to

Salamis), their similarities are noteworthy because of the subtle linkages they establish

between the Phokaians and Athenians.[20]

These details, namely the enumeration of the objects that the Phokaians brought

with them and what they had to leave behind, illustrate the emotional strife involved in the

abandonment of the Phokaian homeland. Likewise, the earlier description of the Phokaians'

refusal to abandon their *polis* makes their eventual decision that much more striking. The

vivid description of the Phokaians' departure emphasizes the moment as a touchstone

event in the micro-narrative that echoes throughout the macro-narrative. Moreover, the

moment deserves added emphasis in the micro-narrative because it marks the beginning of

the diminution of the Phokaians; after this moment, Herodotos describes the slow but

certain demise of the heroic nature of the Phokaians as they transition to become

something distinctly less virtuous.

---

[19] The Phokaian narrative emphasizes the removal of property to a greater degree than Herodotos's depiction of the abandonment of Athens does. In his only description of the removing of people from Athens, Herodotos simply writes (8.41.1-3):

> μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄπιξιν κήρυγμα ἐποιήσαντο, Ἀθηναίων τῇ τις δύναται σώζειν τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι ἐς Τροίζηνα ἀπέστειλαν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Αἴγιναν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα… ὡς δέ σφι πάντα ὑπεξέκειτο, ἔπλωον ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον.

> After the arrival, they made an announcement to save their children and servants in whatever way each of the Athenians was able. The majority departed to Troizen, others to Aigina and to Salamis… And when all things were safely stowed away for them, they sailed to the military camp.

[20] This is a topic that I address at length in my third chapter. The full discussion of the similarities between the Phokaian narrative and the history of Athens in the *Histories* is on pages 94-100.

Effective Intercultural Relationships in the Early Phokaian Narrative

Before progressing to the decline of the Phokaians' polity in the narrative, we now turn to discuss the narrative's early portrayal of "barbarian" populations. In keeping with Herodotos's treatment of the Phokaians, the narrative positively characterizes the behavior of non-Hellenic peoples. To demonstrate the nuances of how the narrative treats these populations, it is necessary to look case-by-case at their depiction in the first half of the narrative.

At the beginning of the micro-narrative, Herodotos describes the Phokaians' participation in a network of Mediterranean trade through the listing of various polities. Among the peoples and places mentioned, the Tartessians and their foremost citizen, the king Arganthonios, receive the greatest attention. In the opening account of the early accomplishments of the Phokaians, Arganthonios emerges as a fascinating character. His generosity, first encouraging the Phokaians to take up residence in his own territory and second building a wall for the *polis* (1.163.3-4), is his most evident characteristic.[21] Herodotos emphasizes the giving spirit of this quasi-mythological king when he describes the donated wall: ἐδίδου δὲ **ἀφειδέως**· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡ περίοδος τοῦ τείχεος οὐκ ὀλίγοι στάδιοί εἰσι, τοῦτο δὲ πᾶν λίθων μεγάλων καὶ εὖ συναρμοσμένων. (1.163.4).[22] The adverb ἀφειδέως is a particularly suggestive description of the behavior of Arganthonios and of

---

[21] Arganthonios's behavior is in line with the common stereotype of the "wealthy barbarian." For more on specific characterizations of barbarians by Classical Greek authors, see Hall 1989. For a broader discussion of the evolution of these stereotypes and the cultural context that produced them, see Vlassopoulos 2013, 161–225.

[22] "And he gave extravagantly, for truly the extent of the wall is not a few stades and it is composed entirely of great and well-fitted stones." For information on the archaeological evidence for the city walls of Phokaia, see Özyiğit 1994.

Herodotos's depiction of him. It reflects the two dominant characteristics of the tyrant in the story: his mythological wealth and his famous generosity.

Surprisingly, Harpagos, the Persian general, also merits inclusion in the list of positive depictions of barbarian individuals and populations.[23] Initially, he offers lenient terms for the surrender of the Phokaians, simply the destruction of one of the battlements on their wall and the dedication of a single shrine (1.164.1). This largely symbolic submission would have spared the *polis* any significant harm.[24] The stranger moment comes in the immediate aftermath of this offer, when the Phokaians ask for a stay of the siege, telling Harpagos that they must think over the terms (ἔφασαν θέλειν βουλεύσασθαι ἡμέρην μίαν καὶ ἔπειτα ὑποκρινέεσθαι, 1.164.2) when in reality they plan to flee. Harpagos declares that he knows what the Phokaians intend, but that he will give them time to discuss, nevertheless (ὁ δ' Ἅρπαγος ἔφη εἰδέναι μὲν εὖ τὰ ἐκεῖνοι μέλλοιεν ποιέειν, ὅμως δέ σφι παριέναι βουλεύσασθαι. 1.164.2).[25] He then withdraws his army (1.164.3), which provides the opportunity for the Phokaians to flee.[26] The generosity of the Persian general makes little sense in the context of the *Histories*, especially because Kyros had earlier refused any leniency to the Ionian Greeks, which makes the event all the more

---

[23] Harpagos, a crucial character in the Kyros *logos*, is present for the entirety of the Persian king's rise to power and expansion. Interestingly for our purposes, it is thought that the Harpagids, supposed descendants of Harpagos, were sources for Herodotos during the writing of the *Histories* (Asheri, et al. 2007, 68, 197). If true, this would partially account for the narrative's positive characterization of the Persian general.

[24] Asheri, et al. 2007, 185. The offer of Harpagos here also addresses the motif of the uselessness of walls in defending a polity that pervades the *Histories* (Bowie 2006, 130–5).

[25] "And Harpagos said that he knew well the things that they intended to do, but nevertheless allowed them to consult."

[26] How and Wells 1912, 128 notes that Harpagos's behavior in this instance is inconsistent with earlier Persian tactics, which were considerably less generous towards the Ionians.

noteworthy.[27] Thus, in his willingness to allow the besieged population to escape from his

army, the narrative identifies Harpagos, unexpectedly, as another benevolent barbarian.

The generous actions of Arganthonios and Harpagos are followed by the more self-

serving behavior of the Khians who refuse to sell territory to the Phokaians. Herodotos

describes their motives as based in a desire to protect their own prosperity:

> οἱ δὲ Φωκαιέες, ἐπείτε σφι Χῖοι τὰς νήσους τὰς Οἰνούσσας καλεομένας οὐκ
> ἐβούλοντο ὠνευμένοισι πωλέειν δειμαίνοντες μὴ αἱ μὲν ἐμπόριον γένωνται, ἡ δὲ
> αὐτῶν νῆσος ἀποκληισθῇ τούτου εἵνεκα, πρὸς ταῦτα οἱ Φωκαιέες ἐστέλλοντο ἐς
> Κύρνον. (1.165.1)

> When the Khians did not wish to sell the islands called Oinoussai to them out of fear
> that they would become a center of trade and that their own island would be shut
> out because of this, the Phokaians set out to Kurnos.

The selfish refusal of the Khians to support their Hellenic neighbors, refusing to aid their

kinsmen for fear of a possibility, presents readers with a distinct foil to the more charitable

actions of the barbarians.[28] Though one may question whether the Khians' decision was not

justified, considering the Phokaians' treatment of their neighbors later at Kurnos, the

comparison is still striking.[29] Through this formulation, the beginning of the Phokaian

narrative demonstrates the difficulties inherent to ethnically-connoted behavior. In fact,

---

[27] For more on the behavior of Harpagos here as peculiar in one way or another, see How and Wells 1912, 128; Asheri, et al. 2007, 185.

[28] The Khians' preoccupation with maintaining their own profits at the expense of *philia* establishes the citizens of the polity as the type of corrupt merchants that the narrative contrasts with the Phokaians from the beginning. As mentioned on pages 13-4, the Phokaians correspond to a military archetype rather than that of a trading state, a generally less-virtuous identification in the Greeks' perspective.

[29] How and Wells 1912, 128 suggest that the Khians may have also rejected the Phokaians because the two polities participated in different trade networks: the Phokaians looked towards the West, while the Khians engaged with Miletos and eastern trade partners. Furthermore, the Khians' rejection of the Phokaians appears further justified by the Phokaians' reputation for piracy (Just. *Epit.* 43.3.5). Though Herodotos himself demonstrates an awareness of their behavior in his retelling of the piracy of Dionysius of Phokaia (6.17) later in the *Histories*, he neglects to mention it in this passage which both elevates the Phokaians and portrays the Khians negatively. Herodotos elsewhere notes the enmity between the Thessalians and Phokians (8.27-30) and asserts the principle of hatred shared between closest neighbors.

Herodotos describes the Phokaians as closer to the barbarian polities, with whom they share friendships (προσφιλέες), than their own Hellenic kinfolk.

Next, the narrative notes the death of Arganthonios just before the Phokaians slaughter the Persian guard at Phokaia and suffer their first major division (1.165.2-3). The function of this aside is twofold. First, it accomplishes the simple task of explaining why the Phokaians do not decide to take up residence in Tartessian land after the refusal of the Khians.[30] Second, the death of Arganthonios appears at a semantically dense moment in the narrative and appears to signal a break in Phokaian history where their larger-than-life prominence begins to decline. After his death, the Phokaians fail repeatedly at establishing positive relations with other polities. This instance demonstrates the manifest significance of intercultural interactions throughout the narrative and the *Histories* as a whole.

Several trends emerge most clearly from this discussion. First, Herodotos establishes the beginnings of a network of non-Hellenic polities connected to the Phokaians through a series of positive and amicable relationships, while simultaneously distancing the *polis* from its Greek neighbors. Second, the narrative works to enshrine the Phokaians in their early history as a unified and exemplary polity whose accomplishments verge on the heroic. Lastly, through his characterization of the Phokaians and their rejection of Persian rule, Herodotos portrays them as a paradigm of Hellenic excellence. Herodotos maintains these themes throughout the rest of the narrative even as he turns to criticize the behavior of the Phokaians.

---

[30] Dominguez 2004, 433.

Part 2: Phokaian Failures and Non-Greek Propriety

The second half of the Phokaian narrative hinges on a series of missteps and disasters on the part of the Phokaian people beginning with their flight from their homeland. The misinterpretation of oracles and a turn to divisive behavior result in the progressive diminution of the Phokaians throughout the course of the narrative. Simultaneously, Herodotos depicts non-Hellenic populations continuing to interact with one another in good faith and correctly observing divine will. The juxtaposition of Greeks behaving badly and non-Hellenes conforming to positive and characteristically "Greek" conduct confuses the distinction between Hellenic and barbarian identities. Herodotos continues to expand a web of intercultural interactions throughout the course of the story, inserting the travails of the Phokaians into a broader context entangled with foreign actors. Due to the compact nature of the narrative, the break between its two sections is not a simple division. Some heroic events that occur late in the first section possess indications of moral decline. Other actions that occur in the second portion of the narrative betray some signs of Phokaian virtue. It is a matter of rapid, but not instantaneous, change. I will demonstrate the transitions of the second half of the Phokaian narrative in the same manner that I conducted my earlier analysis. First, I discuss the behavior of the Phokaians and, second, I analyze the characterization of non-Greek polities.

The Diminution of the Phokaians

Descriptions of separation and reduction demonstrate the faltering virtue of the

Phokaians. The first instance of this occurs before the death of Arganthonios, in the

immediate aftermath of the Phokaians' first flight from the *polis*, when Herodotos describes

Phokaia as a Persian possession "deprived of its men" (**τὴν δὲ Φώκαιαν ἐρημωθεῖσαν**

ἀνδρῶν ἔσχον οἱ Πέρσαι, 1.164.3).[31] Herodotos's description of Phokaia as stripped bare of

men, ἐρημωθεῖσαν ἀνδρῶν, presents a particularly evocative image to his readers that

emphasizes the depletion of the *polis*. Moreover, he immediately follows the description of

Phokaia, now an empty possession of the Persians, with a description of the behavior of the

Phokaians, now separate from their homeland. This division is clearer in the original text:

he ends 1.164.3 with Phokaia abandoned (τὴν δὲ Φώκαιαν ἐρημωθεῖσαν) and then begins

his next sentence (1.165.1) with the words "οἱ δὲ Φωκαιέες," a juxtaposition that

demonstrates the separation between *polis* and citizen body.

Furthermore, the narrative's emphasis on the division between the citizens and

their *polis* and its specific description of the *polis* as emptied resemble its depictions of the

Persians' invasions of Attica. As was the case with Phokaia, when the Persians first seize

Athens, Herodotos describes the *polis* as emptied (καὶ αἱρέουσι ἔρημον τὸ ἄστυ, 8.51.2).

The *Histories* persist in this language, when they narrate Mardonios's return to Athens: ὃς

οὐδὲ τότε ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν εὗρε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἀλλ᾽ ἔν τε Σαλαμῖνι τοὺς

πλείστους ἐπυνθάνετο εἶναι ἔν τε τῇσι νηυσί, **αἱρέει τε ἔρημον τὸ ἄστυ** (9.3.2).[32] Thus,

---

[31] "And the Persians held Phokaia deprived of its men."

[32] "Then, having arrived in Attica, he found no Athenians, but learned that the majority of them were in Salamis and in their ships. And so he seized the empty city."

Herodotos continues his efforts to align the Phokaian abandonment of the *polis* with the Athenians' own desertion of Athens through the persistent description of the cities as "emptied." His composition in both episodes is an artful and effective illustration of the division in the narrative: the people from their homeland.

Thus, the Phokaians' abandonment of their *polis* is a layered moment in the narrative. It ought to have stood as a righteous sacrifice, another example of the Phokaians' dignity, but instead it precipitates the downfall of the polity. In fact, this early description of division is the first of a series of divisions that accompany the breakdown of the virtuous character of the Phokaians.

The initial heroism of the Phokaians does not vanish immediately, but reemerges as they return home a final time to slaughter (κατεφόνευσαν, 1.165.2) the Persian guard left at Phokaia. Nevertheless the valiant reaction of the Hellenes here is distinct from their earlier behavior as this stands as the first mention of violence within the passage.[33]

Herodotos provides little time to reflect positively on these feats. Instead, he declares the death of Arganthonios and then immediately records the Phokaians' curses (ἰσχυρὰς κατάρας, 1.165.2) on their kinsmen who refused to leave and their subsequent oath to never return to their homeland: "and additionally, they sank a red hot ingot of iron and swore that they would not come back to Phokaia before this ingot reappeared" (πρὸς δὲ ταύτῃσι καὶ μύδρον σιδήρεον κατεπόντωσαν καὶ ὤμοσαν μὴ πρὶν ἐς Φώκαιαν ἥξειν πρὶν ἢ τὸν μύδρον τοῦτον ἀναφανῆναι, 1.165.3).[34] On the heels of this

---

[33] The Phokaians' assault on the Persian guard also echoes various episodes of subterfuge in Greek mythology and history, most especially the night-raid of Odysseus and Diomedes in *Iliad* book 10. The sneaky aspect of the Phokaians' attack casts further doubts on its positive connotations.

[34] The text of the pledge itself is quite interesting for what it informs us about the process and ritual involved in swearing oaths in Greek society. For analogous occurrences in other ancient texts, see

moment, Herodotos describes the further winnowing of the Phokaian people as a great

portion of the population abandon their pledge on account of homesickness:

> στελλομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν Κύρνον, **ὑπερημίσεας τῶν ἀστῶν** ἔλαβε πόθος τε καὶ οἶκτος τῆς πόλιος καὶ τῶν ἠθέων τῆς χώρης, **ψευδόρκιοι** δὲ γενόμενοι ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω ἐς τὴν Φώκαιαν. οἳ δὲ αὐτῶν τὸ ὅρκιον ἐφύλασσον, ἀερθέντες ἐκ τῶν Οἰνουσσέων ἔπλεον. (1.165.3)

> When they set out to Kurnos, longing and compassion for the city and the customs of the country seized **more than half of the citizens**. Having become **oath breakers**, they sailed back into Phokaia. The others maintained the oath, and, getting under way, set sail from Oinoussai.

The heroics of the Phokaian polity as a unified body are clearly short-lived. Herodotos

describes the specifics of the oath and in no short order attests to the violation of the

solemn pledge *en masse*. In the span of several sentences, their population moves from

unified and noble to shattered, homeless, and deprived of their greatest ally. Indeed, he

emphasizes that fully "more than half of the citizens" abandoned their oath and their fellow

countrymen.

   The usage of the term ψευδόρκιοι represents a particularly clear indication of the

moral decline of the people in addition to their reduction in population.[35] As the narrative

later clarifies, through such episodes as the story told by Leotykhides, the Spartan King, to

the Athenians (6.86), "the Greek gods do not tolerate dishonesty and… they punish those

who go against a sworn oath."[36] In a story that has focused on the exceptionalism of the

---

Diod. Sic. 9.10.3, Hor. *Epod*. 16.17-22. For a discussion of the ritual involved in swearing oaths, see Sommerstein and Bayliss 2012, 151–83.

[35] Euripides illustrates the seriousness of the label in the *Medea*, when Medea asks Jason, "What god or divine power gives ear to you, an **oath breaker** and betrayer of hosts?" (τίς δὲ κλύει σοῦ θεὸς ἢ δαίμων, /τοῦ **ψευδόρκου** καὶ ξειναπάτου; 1391-2). The Phokaian narrative is the only episode in the *Histories* where Herodotos uses the word in any form, though he does mentions false prophets (ψευδομάντιαι, 4.69.2) and false virgins (ψευδοπαρθένοι, 4.180.2).

[36] Kindt 2016, 16–8. For more on the general significance of oaths and their violation in Greek society, see Sommerstein and Fletcher 2007.

Phokaians, their characterization as oath-breakers is a significant moment. Moreover, the extent of culpability for the breach is unclear; the narrative is ambiguous as to whether the ψευδόρκιοι are alone at risk following their perjury or whether the Phokaians as a whole merit punishment.[37] Furthermore, Herodotos never actually attests to any tribulations that the perjuring Phokaians suffer.[38] Regardless, the violation of the oath and the fracturing of the Phokaian populace initiate a series of conflicts and failures throughout the remainder of the narrative. Furthermore, the timing of this schism in the polity is significant as the formerly united and powerful Phokaians suffer a terrible loss just prior to the outset of their colonial expedition. Their long-lived virtue fails at the moment when a great portion of the population breaks their oaths and cleaves the community into two unequal parts. It suffices to say that this is an inauspicious start to the colonial expedition.

In addition to describing the divisions of the Phokaian population in numerical terms, Herodotos underscores through word order the fissure that cleaves the Phokaian population. His syntax at the end of 1.165.3 divides the populace into two sections, the ψευδόρκιοι and "the others who maintained their oath" (οἳ δὲ αὐτῶν τὸ ὅρκιον ἐφύλασσον), signaling the singular importance of this moment and their separation to the reader. The contrast between the two sections of Phokaian society, split by geography and moral uprightness, encourages the perception of a widening gulf in the population.

---

[37] The swearing and subsequent violation of oaths in Greek society often has fallout that extends far beyond the culpable individual. The family line regularly falls victim to divine punishment for an ancestor's violation of an oath in the form of internecine strife or simply annihilation (Hdt. 6.86; Lyc. *Leocr.* 79) but others also receive retribution for an association or familiarity with oath-breakers (Eur. *El.* 1355). For more on divine punishment directed towards perjurers and those associated with them, see Gagné 2013; Torrance 2014.

[38] At Torrance 2014, 300–3, she provides several alternative interpretations of the divine response to the violation of the Phokaian vow.

Accordingly, this alternation between subjects attests to Herodotos's interest in

constructing the narrative to portray the breakdown of Phokaian society.

Beyond the oath, Herodotos asserts the role of divine will in the passage through his

citation of a Pythian oracle.[39] Though he does not provide a text or summary of the oracle,

it is clear that the necessary action revolves around Kurnos (the ancient name the modern

island of Corsica, as well as the name of one of the sons of Herakles). He writes that the

remainder of the Phokaian population travel to Kurnos and found an *apoikia* there in

sustained compliance with their interpretation of this oracle, which they had received and

acted upon twenty years earlier (ἐν γὰρ τῇ Κύρνῳ εἴκοσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τούτων ἐκ

θεοπροπίου ἀνεστήσαντο πόλιν, 1.165.1).[40] While recalling the oracle and their voyage to

Kurnos, Herodotos avoids any consideration of Massalia and the other Phokaian *apoikiai* as

potential destinations for the now-homeless citizens. In contrast to this account, Strabo,

citing Antiokhos of Syracuse, declares that the Phokaians also took refuge at Massalia, their

daughter-city (6.1.1).[41] Accordingly, the narrative's disinterest in other Phokaian *apoikiai*

appears to be part of an effort to focus upon Kurnos. Herodotos's declaration that all the

Phokaian refugees settled there also serves to underscore this specific oracle and its role in

defining Phokaian behavior.

As the Phokaian population is divided, the narrative continues to expand the

network of intercultural interactions. Herodotos's citation of the Pythia subtly engages the

---

[39] The Pythia is famous for its specific role as an instigator of colonial expeditions. Indeed, it is likely that the Delphic oracle's special significance to the Greeks comes from its role in sanctioning *apoikiai*. For more on this, see Malkin 1987, 17–29.
[40] "For they set up a *polis* in Kurnos from a divine oracle twenty years earlier than this."
[41] For a concise survey of ancient authors that mention the Phokaian abandonment of their homeland and subsequent travels to the Western Mediterranean, see Papalas 2013, 6–8.

narrative with Delphi, a focal point of cultural relations in the Greek world.[42] From its

connection to the Delphic oracle, the Phokaian voyage harmonizes with the conduct

expected of proper settlement expeditions and interacts with a node of especial importance

in a pan-Mediterranean context.[43] Indeed, as Alex Purves writes, Delphi acts as "a median

or nodal point through which the paths between so many other places intersect" in the

Histories.[44] Moreover, the Phokaians' departure from Ionia introduces new geography and

new peoples, Kurnos and the Karthaginians, and it shifts the setting of the narrative to the

West. In this switch, the Hellenes move from one border zone, touching upon the Persian

empire, to another, abutting the Etruscan and Karthaginian settlements in Italy. Regardless

of geographical context, the Phokaians consistently inhabit the margins of the Hellenic

world and the peoples they most frequently interact with continue to be non-Hellenes.

Almost paradoxically, the Phokaians' connection to Delphi links the heartland of Greek

culture with this periphery, bridging cultural and geographic distance. Thus, this network

of the Phokaians demonstrates the multiple layers inherent to their identity as Greeks.[45]

After the Phokaians arrive at Kurnos, they go about reestablishing their society at

the *apoikia*, but cannot recreate the prosperity of their original home and resort to

---

[42] Herodotos first refers to the oracle as a θεοπρόπιον at 1.165.1 and only at the end of the passage (1.167.4) does he name the oracle a Pythian proclamation. While θεοπρόπιον technically could refer to any oracle from anywhere, we may suggest that he expects his readers to infer that it was a Delphic oracle, considering the Pythia's specific role as an instigator and legitimizer of *apoikiai*. For more on the usage of θεοπρόπιον in Herodotos, see Asheri, et al. 2007, 81.

[43] For more on the specific significance of Delphi in the *Histories* and beyond as a site enmeshed in travel narratives, exploration, and pan-Hellenic and pan-Mediterranean networks, see Purves 2010, 150–8.

[44] Purves 2010, 152.

[45] Interestingly, the reality appears to have been quite different. Dominguez 2004 argues that Phokaian identity, both at home and in their *apoikiai*, was rather well developed and persisted after the abandonment of the Ionian *polis*. Crucial characteristics of the civic identity apparent in the archaeological record include the worship of Artemis Ephesia, a vibrant system of kinship politics, and close relationships with nearby non-Greek peoples.

expansionism and the violent abuse of neighbors. Herodotos first notes that they lived

peaceably for five years, establishing their temples and coexisting with the earlier settlers

(οἴκεον κοινῇ μετὰ τῶν πρότερον ἀπικομένων ἐπ' ἔτεα πέντε, καὶ ἱρὰ ἐνιδρύσαντο

1.166.1).[46] But after this brief period, the Phokaians begin to engage in piracy and

unprovoked aggression, which contribute to the perception of their decline.[47] In

comparison with the peaceful and friendly relations with other polities that characterized

the history of their ancestors, this generation conducts themself quite differently: they

bully and raid their neighbours (καὶ ἦγον γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἔφερον τοὺς περιοίκους ἅπαντας,

1.166.1). The Phokaians here resemble a more negative type of naval population, perhaps

recalling the Phoenicians from the proem, snatching people where they lay anchored

(1.1.4). So egregiously do the Hellenes mistreat their neighbours that they trigger a major

conflict with the Etruscans and Karthaginians, the major local powers. Formerly a small

polity revolting against the machinations of a greater power, the Phokaians are now an

intruding people that harm nearby communities. They are solely responsible for the battle

that ensues, referred to by Herodotos and others as the Battle of Alalia.[48] And, despite the

eventual Hellenic victory, the narrative does not dedicate any thought to celebration

because the Phokaians lose so many ships that Herodotos names it a "Kadmeian victory"

---

[46] "The lived in common with those having arrived earlier for five years and they established their temples."

[47] For more on Hellenic piracy as a historical phenomenon, see Luraghi 2006, 30–6.

[48] The Battle of Alalia was in fact a fairly momentous event by the reckoning of many modern historians. For more on the battle, its conduct, and its historical significance, see Papalas 2013; Wear 2016.

(Καδμείη τις νίκη, 1.166.2).[49] All virtuous behavior that characterized the early history of the Phokaians evaporates in the complex of misfortune that now surrounds the polity.

Herodotos continues to employ language of reduction and separation in this portion of the narrative. He carefully describes the number of ships present in the naval encounter on each side: the Etruscans and Karthaginians sailed with 60 ships each (1.166.1), while the Phokaians met them with just 60 of their own (1.166.2).[50] Following the battle, Herodotos details the destruction of the Phokaian navy: αἰ μὲν γὰρ τεσσεράκοντά σφι νέες διεφθάρησαν, αἰ δὲ εἴκοσι αἰ περιεοῦσαι ἦσαν ἄχρηστοι· ἀπεστράφατο γὰρ τοὺς ἐμβόλους. (1.166.2).[51] The Phokaian fleet, the same that accomplished the great journeys at the beginning of narrative and was most emblematic of the excellence of the *polis*, is shattered. In addition to considering the fallout of the battle in terms of naval damages, Herodotos describes its role in the reduction of the population. He recalls the earlier fragmentation of the citizenry during their flight from Phokaia (1.165.3) in his account of the Phokaian war dead: καὶ οὖτοι μὲν τῶν Φωκαιέων τοιούτῳ μόρῳ διεχρήσαντο, οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐς τὸ Ῥήγιον καταφυγόντες ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμώμενοι ἔκτισαν πόλιν γῆς τῆς Οἰνωτρίης ταύτην ἥτις νῦν Ὑελῆ καλέεται (1.167.3).[52] Another division has split the Phokaian people, this between the dead and living following the Battle of Alalia. The community is now a small fraction of its

---

[49] Whether or not the Battle of Alalia was actually a Phokaian victory or whether a Greek victory was reported for propaganda purposes is a topic of ongoing debate among scholars (Morel 2006, 369).

[50] The round numbers, generally thought to be unreliable, should not be taken literally but have their own significance within the bounds of the narrative (Asheri et al. 2007, 186). Herodotos clearly wants readers to perceive the overwhelming odds that the Phokaians faced and their general numerical inferiority against their opponents. For other situations where the *Histories* presents such disparities between Greek forces and those of their opponents, see 6.8-9; 7.186.2.

[51] "On the one hand, forty of their ships were destroyed, and, on the other hand, the twenty that remained were useless for their rams were turned aside."

[52] "Some of the Phokaians suffered such a death, and others of them having fled to Rhegion set out from there and acquired a *polis* from the land of Oinotria, which is now called Hyele."

original size; divided from its homeland and navy and with its citizenry reduced, the colonial polity bears little resemblance to its glorified origins.

Accordingly, when the Phokaians are forced to flee from their home a second time, they do so as failed combatants in a war they began rather than as fearless Hellenes committed to liberty in the face of tyranny. Herodotos describes the abandonment of Kurnos in a manner that matches this sentiment: καταπλώσαντες δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἀλαλίην ἀνέλαβον **τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κτῆσιν** ὅσην οἷαί τε ἐγίνοντο αἰ νέες σφι ἄγειν (1.166.3).[53] In contrast to the flight from Phokaia, Herodotos provides an exceedingly brief account of the abandonment of Kurnos. He links the two scenes through the maintenance of syntax in his description of the flight from the respective *poleis* (earlier, he listed the τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἔπιπλα πάντα as being put aboard the ships, 1.164.3), but here he makes no mention of the sacrifices of the Phokaians. He does not enumerate the objects left behind, reasons to mourn for the defeated Hellenes, and makes no effort to prompt sympathy from readers. In this lack of detail, the *Histories* clearly separates this event from the earlier abandonment of Phokaia. For their violent behavior, the Phokaians are simply not of sufficient character to merit the consideration that they deserved just two chapters earlier.

The Phokaian micro-narrative does not finish with the itinerant people of Phokaia left marginalized and reduced without an explanation, but instead connects their failings to the misinterpretation of divine will. Having fled from their *polis* a second time, the

---

[53] "Having sailed to Alalia, they took up their children and women and as many other belongings as the ships were able to bear"

Phokaians acquire land to found the *polis* of Hyele, later called Elea (1.167.3).[54] Here,

Herodotos provides one last revelation before the close of the narrative; a Poseidonian man

suggests to the Phokaians that they had misinterpreted the Delphic oracle that led to the

foundation of Kurnos. Rather than founding a *polis* at Kurnos the island, the Pythia had

actually intended for them to establish the worship of Kurnos the hero (τὸν Κύρνον σφι ἡ

Πυθίη ἔχρησε κτίσαι ἥρων ἐόντα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὴν νῆσον. 1.167.4).[55] This disclosure encourages

a reimagining of the series of failed diplomatic interactions as dependent on the proper

interpretation of oracles rather than completely based on the moral deficiencies of the

Phokaians. With this concentration on the misinterpretation of oracles, Herodotos ends his

discussion of the Phokaians.

This final movement also presents the last expansion of the Phokaian network. The

mention of Rhegion and Poseidonia compares other Hellenic *apoikiai* to the Ionian Greeks.

In contrast to the volatile Phokaians, these two *poleis* manage to successfully live outside

the Greek world and not destabilize their neighbors. Nevertheless, despite the connection

that Herodotos establishes, particularly between Rhegion and the once-again homeless

Phokaians, the Italian Greeks are not responsible for the final settlement of the Phokaians

at Hyele. Instead, the passage introduces another polity, the Oinotrians, who sell land to the

Hellenes. Accordingly, even at their most desperate, the Phokaians interact primarily with

---

[54] Hyele, also called Elea and later Velia, was the last major Phokaian *apoikia*, founded around 540 B.C.E. The site of the *apoikia* was previously free of Greek occupation but reveals signs of native inhabitation long before the Phokaian settlement. There is no sign of active inhabitation of the area by Oinotrians or any other population in the period just before the foundation of the *polis* (Morel 2006, 370).

[55] "The Pythia commanded them to establish the worship of Kurnos the hero, not to establish a settlement on Kurnos the island." Almost nothing is known of Kurnos, the son of Herakles, outside of this mention. It is possible that Kurnos is a child of Herakles and one of the daughters of Thespios, who was sent to colonize Sardinia with Iolaos (Diod. Sic. 4.29-30).

barbaroi rather than engaging with other Greeks.[56] The web of polities surrounding

Phokaia in this passage continues to suggest that the Phokaians do not conform with any

clear concept of Hellenic identity.

Thus, we are to understand the progressive diminution of Phokaians, wherein both

their internal unity and their capacity to engage peaceably with other polities break down,

as the product of a failure to adequately respond to divine will, their misinterpretation of

the Delphic oracle. Throughout the process of their expedition from Ionia, the polity faced a

series of crises that critically undermined their civic and cultural identities. The network

surrounding the Phokaians throughout the passage informs the reader's opinion of their

behavior and reflects Herodotos's interest in scrutinizing the construct that is Hellenic

identity.

Continued Prosperity Among Non-Hellenes

A series of suggestive interactions with non-Greek polities occurs after the

Phokaians settle at Kurnos. Whereas Phokaian behavior was regularly violent and

ineffective, non-Greeks in the later half of the narrative conduct themselves in generally

positive and effective manners.

The Etruscan and Karthaginian opposition to Phokaian piracy merits a significant

place in our discussion of this narrative. The two polities form an alliance with one another

(κοινῷ λόγῳ χρησάμενοι, 1.166.1) with the specific aim of stopping the scourge of

---

[56] For more on issues of cultural relativism or the relationship between Greeks and barbarians in the *Histories*, see Pelling 1997; Kim 2009, 172–85; Vlassopoulos 2013, 145–60.

Phokaian piracy.[57] At the most basic of levels, this action demonstrates the capacity of both peoples to accommodate neighbors and their willingness to prevent destructive behavior. Their readiness to work together in a situation of need perhaps echoes the Phokaian friendship with the Tartessians and Arganthonios in what is, at this point, the long distant past. It is no coincidence that Herodotos demonstrates ties of *philia* concurrently with the Hellenic polity's faltering interest and capacity to maintain these sorts of friendly relationships.

The behavior of the people of Agulla, an Etruscan city better known as Caere, following the naval encounter further suggests the degradation and faults of the Phokaians in comparison with the barbarian polities with whom they interact. Following the great naval encounter, Herodotos describes the Agullaians stoning captured Phokaians. Because of their brutal behavior, all land, livestock, and people in the vicinity of the place where the murders occurred become deformed, crippled, and paralyzed (διάστροφα καὶ ἔμπηρα καὶ ἀπόπληκτα, 1.167.1). In an effort to the lift the curse, the Agullaians send to Delphi and ask for guidance, a barbarian polity petitioning one of the centers of Greek culture.[58] Herodotos describe the course of their ensuing actions, writing, ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφεας ἐκέλευσε ποιέειν τὰ καὶ νῦν οἱ Ἀγυλλαῖοι ἔτι ἐπιτελέουσι· καὶ γὰρ ἐναγίζουσί σφι μεγάλως καὶ ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν

---

[57] The Etruscans, residing on the northwestern coast of Italy, and the Karthaginians, with settlements in Sardinia, western Sicily and southern Iberia, were together the regional powers and controlled trade. Accordingly, for the Phokaians, maintaining a positive relationship with the two communities was almost a matter of necessity for the sake of enabling productive trade routes (Morel 2006, 372).

[58] Visser 1982, 404 suggests that the Agullaians, having breached Greek custom, must fulfill the request of a Greek deity, thus accounting for their seeking advice from the Pythia. The reality may be simpler, however. Strabo 5.2.3 suggests that the Agullaians built a treasury at Delphi, which presupposes a more consistent relationship with the oracle than Visser's interpretation accounts for. This is in keeping with current scholarly understanding of the relationship between Greeks and Etruscans in the late Archaic and early Classical periods (Gailledrat 2015).

καὶ ἱππικὸν ἐπιστᾶσι. (1.167.2).[59] The Agullaians request advice at Delphi, receive their instructions, and immediately choose the correct interpretation of the oracle, which is to adopt two specific Greek customs (gymnastics and equestrian contests) in honor of the murdered Phokaians. This occurs just before Herodotos recounts that Phokaians learn the proper interpretation of their own oracle only when they found Hyele, twenty years after they first received it. Thus, the narrative juxtaposes the Agullaians' ability to correctly interpret the Delphic oracle with the Phokaians' inability, as a Hellenic people, to adequately understand the advice of the Pythia. A striking contrast, indeed. Moreover, the brutality of the Agullaians to the Phokaians is made softer by their conforming to Greek customs of hero worship by continuing to venerate the dead Greeks.

Lastly, Herodotos mentions the Oinotrians at the close of the colonial narrative. Unlike the Khians, who refused to sell land to the Phokaians at the beginning of the narrative, the Oinotrians appear to have distributed (presumably by sale) territory to the landless population (1.167.3).[60] Thus, the final consideration of barbarian behavior in the Phokaian narrative is a description of their generosity in the aftermath of Greek expansionism and greed, namely the Phokaian's piracy and abuse of their neighbors.

Accordingly, Herodotos positively characterizes the behavior of non-Greek communities in the latter half of the Phokaian narrative. Their proper conduct in inter-communal relationships and efforts to maintain equilibrium in the region portray them as

---

[59] "The Pythia commanded them to do things that even now the Agullaians still do. For they offer sacrifices to the dead for them [the Phokaians that they killed] and establish gymnastic and equestrian contests."

[60] ἐκτήσαντο πόλιν γῆς τῆς Οἰνωτρίης ταύτην ἥτις νῦν Ὑέλη καλέεται. "They procured this city from Oinotrian land which is now called Hyele." In this situation, I agree with the interpretation of Asheri, et al. 2007, 187–8, that ἐκτήσαντο in this context most likely denotes a purchase rather than a seizure through force. Herodotos uses κτάομαι to explicitly describe a purchase at 8.105.

prosperous communities. The quick and accurate interpretations of the Delphic oracles and

the equally rapid fulfillment of divine will demonstrate the capacity of non-Greeks to

conform to the proclamations of the gods. In the narrative as Herodotos constructs it, the

barbaroi in terms of both religious and political culture conform to categories of

exceptional behavior. Their capacity to act properly is particularly significant because they

accomplish these matters in direct opposition to the failures of the Phokaian people.

Concluding Remarks

Though outside the bounds of the Phokaian narrative, the section immediately

following the passage's end describes a situation that is instructive for how we might

interpret the colonial narrative. Here, Herodotos describes the Teians as the only other

Hellenic population to flee their city to avoid enduring slavery under Persian rule (οὗτοὶ

μέν νυν Ἰώνων μοῦνοι τὴν δουλοσύνην οὐκ ἀνεχόμενοι ἐξέλιπον τὰς πατρίδας, 1.169.1).[61]

The narration of the Teian escape from Ionia is condensed and straightforward. The

population abandons their *polis*, sails to Thrace, and founds the *polis* of Abdera where they

honor the hero Timesios of Klazomenai, who had attempted to found a settlement there

before them:

> ἐπείτε γὰρ σφεων εἷλε χώματι τὸ τεῖχος Ἅρπαγος, ἐσβάντες πάντες ἐς τὰ πλοῖα
> οἴχοντο πλέοντες ἐπὶ τῆς Θρηίκης, καὶ ἐνθαῦτα ἔκτισαν πόλιν Ἄβδηρα, τὴν
> πρότερος τούτων Κλαζομένιος Τιμήσιος κτίσας οὐκ ἀπόνητο, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ Θρηίκων
> ἐξελασθεὶς τιμὰς νῦν ὑπὸ Τηίων τῶν ἐν Ἀβδήροισι ὡς ἥρως ἔχει. (1.168)

> For when Harpagos seized their wall with an earthen mound, they all boarded the
> ships and sailed to Thrace. There they found the *polis* Abdera, which Timesios of

---

[61] "Now these alone of the Ionians left their fatherlands because they could not endure slavery."

Klazomene had founded earlier, but did not profit from, since he was driven out by the Thracians. He is now honored by the Teians in Abdera as a hero.

The behavior of the Teians, simple and pointed, provides a perfect foil for the excessive and ill-conceived actions of the Phokaians. On every point of Phokaian failure, the Teians succeed: they retain their unity (πάντες) and virtue in the process of founding a new settlement while the Phokaians shed their inborn excellence when they depart from their homeland. Furthermore, the Teians establish a hero cult, while the Phokaians suffer setback after setback for their failure to do so. This contrast is made yet more explicit by the close proximity of the two narratives.

With the Teian narrative highlighting the failings of the Phokaians further, we better understand the meaning of the various themes that arise throughout the narrative. The unbridled aggression and misinterpretation of oracular will on the part of the Phokaians are responsible for their progressive division and the decline of their prominence and exceptional virtue. They stumble not only as a polity seeking a new home but also as a Hellenic community. Embedded in a foreign context, they act arguably more barbaric than any population nearby. Accordingly, Herodotos consistently portrays the non-Hellenic polities that engage with the Phokaians as equal parts positive, generous, and pious. Indeed, the settling Hellenes progressively develop into the least positive characters in their own narrative. Through this systemic devastation of the Phokaian people, the narrative examines common Greek characteristics – shared gods, customs, and kinships – and strips them from Hellenic peoples while attributing them to other non-Greek

communities. Indeed, Herodotos leverages the plight of the Phokaians to assert the

artificiality of supposedly stable concepts of Hellenic identity.[62]

---

[62] Several scholars have noted the mutability of supposedly stable concepts. Most especially Thomas 2000, 102–34. Dewald 1998, 596–7 address this facet of the *Histories* as it appears in the proem.

CHAPTER 2: THE KYRENE NARRATIVE

The Kyrenaian narrative occupies a significantly greater portion of the history than the Phokaian narrative and, similarly, provides readers with notably more depth of discussion.[63] Moreover, unlike the Phokaian narrative, we have several comparanda to the Herodotean Kyrenaian foundation story, which appears to have been particularly well-developed and well-developed.[64] Though I do not discuss the relationship between Herodotos' Kyrenaian story and those of Pindar, Kallimakhos, and others, several other scholars have considered this issue at length and their inquiries affect much of my thinking and argument.[65]

Despite the difference in scale between the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives, the two foundation stories are structured similarly and emphasize similar thematic issues; the importance of geographical and genealogical connections, the dwindling size of the *apoikiai*, the waning of moral behavior, and the attention dedicated to proper interactions with ritual and oracles are all issues of concern in Herodotos' telling of the narrative. The presence of these themes in the Kyrenaian *logos* exemplifies one intention of the narrative:

---

[63] The Phokaian narrative extends from 1.163-71, while the Kyrenaian narrative occupies more than triple the space in the *Histories,* covering chapters 4.148-67. Furthermore, the Kyrenaian narrative encompasses the foundations of Thera, Kyrene, and even Barke, while the Phokaian narrative is restricted to the Phokaians' travel from their *polis* to Alalia and then Hyele.
[64] Pindar's *Pythian* 4 and 5, Kallimakhos' *Hymn to Apollo,* and the so-called "Foundation Decree of Cyrene," Meiggs and Lewis 1988, n. 5, provide the best testimony outside of Herodotos to the development of this Kyrenaian foundation narrative. Several alternative foundation stories for Kyrene exist and are reported in Pindar's *Pythian* 9 and in Apollonios of Rhodes's *Argonautica*.
[65] Giangiulio 2001; Calame 2003, 2014; Malkin 2003b.

questioning the constructed divisions between Greek and non-Greek cultures. Furthermore, I argue that the Kyrenaian narrative follows a structure that is relatively similar to the Phokaian narrative; it begins with an early and peaceful quasi-mythological period that ends with a crisis event and is followed by the progressive diminution of the population. In the case of Kyrene, the fractious Battiad dynasty is a focal point for many of the thematically significant issues in the narrative. To demonstrate the nuance of this foundation story and describe how Herodotos underscores its particular significance, my analyses generally follow events as they occur in the course of the narrative.

Herodotos locates this narrative just after describing the Persian general Megabazos recount his displeasure when he sees Byzantium and Kalkhedon, two Greek *poleis* on either side of the Bosporus Strait (4.144). Specifically, Megabazos is incredulous that anyone would found a *polis* at the site of Kalkhedon first, when Byzantium occupied a clearly better vantage point. It is no coincidence that Herodotos begins by commenting on the importance of placement for the foundation of any settlement. Immediately after this, he interrupts his narrative of a great Persian assault on Libya with the long and complex narrative of the foundation of Kyrene. Indeed, the importance of location to the success of an *apoikia* becomes a crucial issue in the course of Kyrene's story.

The Kyrenaian narrative ranges widely and covers a broad time period, so a brief summary of the major events that occur within the episode may be useful. Herodotos begins the narrative by recounting the foundation of the *apoikia* of Thera by a Spartan noble, Theras, and a group of Minyans that had been forced out of Sparta. Next Herodotos launches into a discussion of the foundation of Kyrene by the Therans in which he provides both a Theran version and a Kyrenaian version of the story of the *apoikia*'s foundation.

After the eventual foundation of the settlement, a process that involves multiple consultations with the Pythia and the Greeks' inhabitation of three different sites at various times, Herodotos mention a brief, peaceful period at Kyrene. He then narrates several episodes of infighting and dispute that occurred at all levels of Kyrenaian society. The *logos* ends with the Persian seizure of the *polis*, urged on by the mother of the murdered tyrant of Kyrene.

The events of the Kyrenaian episode occur in two distinct portion; the first half of the narrative (4.145-158.3) describes the heroic origins of Kyrene during a generally positive era of exploration and foundation, while the second half of the passage (4.159-167.3) describes the decline of Kyrene after its foundation. In the first section of this chapter, I consider how Herodotos situates polities and individuals of particular significance (namely the founder Battos and the first Kyrenaians) within a broader network of peoples and places. Through various tactics, the narrative explores positive intercultural interactions and defines colonial projects as cooperative operations that possess the capacity to combine communities. In its latter portion, however, the narrative turns to distinctly bleaker considerations. Still operating within an extensive web of polities and genealogies, the second section explores the breakdown of peaceable relations at all levels of society and portrays a spectrum of behavior by Greek-identified peoples that extends from stereotypically Hellenic to distinctly non-Hellenic.

Part 1: Early Exploration and Settlement in the Kyrene Narrative

The Foundation of Thera and Kyrene

The Kyrenaian narrative begins in earnest with the Minyans, the descendants of the crew of the Argo, who take up residence near Sparta. Herodotos describes them initially as "the children of the children of the sailors from the Argo" (τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀργοῦς ἐπιβατέων παίδων παῖδες, 4.145.2). Their presence, as a population with a deep mythological history and a reputation for naval exploration, situates the initial foundation events of the narrative in quasi-mythological time, distant from the contemporary period of the audience of the *Histories*.[66] Furthermore, the Minyans are the first of many peoples that the narrative connects to Kyrene.[67] These two factors, the establishment of temporal distance and the emphasis on genetic relatedness, are the first components as the narrative constructs a contextual framework for the foundation story.

Following this introduction, Herodotos describes the failed attempt to integrate the Minyans into Lakedaimonian society, the first instance of political instability within the narrative. So severe are the differences between the two polities, that the Lakedaimonians sentence the Minyans to death. The two parties only narrowly avoid this bloodshed thanks the trickery of the Minyans' Spartan wives who break them out of jail by night. This intervention enables the involved parties to happen upon a diplomatic solution, unlike later clashes in the narrative, when the Spartan Theras volunteers to accommodate the Minyans

---

[66] Baragwanath 2017, 6–7.
[67] For a discussion of the "convergent genealogical lines" in the Kyrene narrative, with specific attention to the foundation of Thera, see Calame 2003, 87–8.

in his own colonial ambitions: ὁ Θήρας, ὅκως μήτε φόνος γένηται, αὐτός τε ὑπεδέκετό

σφεας ἐξάξειν ἐκ τῆς χώρης (4.148.2).[68] Here, Herodotos depicts the exile of dissident

members of society, regardless of their social status or ethnic affiliation, and their

foundation of *apoikiai* as the proper response to issues of civic *stasis*. Accordingly, the

intruding Minyans leave Sparta and then settle various polities throughout the

Peloponnese and elsewhere. In the scattering of the Minyans, a portion of the population

joins Theras in the expedition to found the *polis* that would be called Thera.

The Lakedaimonian and Theran version of this story, which Herodotos reports

(4.150.1), does not emphasize the presence of the Minyans in this endeavor. Instead, it

draws attention to Theras, the *oikistēs*, and the plurality of populations involved in the new

settlement project.[69] Indeed, Herodotos depicts the new *apoikia* at Thera as a collaboration

between its earlier Phoenician inhabitants with the new Spartan and Minyan settlers.

He describes the twofold Phoenician presence in the expedition. Herodotos explains

that Kadmos had taken an interest in the island and left the Punic settlement of Kallistē

there, prior to the foundation of Thera (4.147.4).[70] Furthermore, he provides the genealogy

of Theras, linking him to Kadmos and the Phoenicians via his ancestor Polyneikes (4.147.1),

and declares the expedition, in part, a return to his kinsmen (ἀλλ' ἀποπλεύσεσθαι ἐς τοὺς

συγγενέας, 4.147.3). This dynamic partially explains why Theras intended to settle his

apoikia not through the expulsion of the local population (οὐδαμῶς ἐξελῶν αὐτούς), but

---

[68] "Theras, in order that there would not be murder, promised to lead them (the Minyans) out of the country himself." See Forsdyke 2005, especially 30-78, for the frequent Greek recourse to exile or expulsion, often resulting in the foundation of an *apoikia*, to remedy political conflicts.
[69] Asheri, et al. 2007, 674.
[70] The timing here reflects general historical fact, as the period of Phoenician expansion preceded the era of Greek apoikism by around two centuries. For information on the process of Phoenician settlement and migration throughout the Mediterranean, see Niemeyer 2006. For Phoenicians in Herodotos, see Mavrogiannis 2004.

rather through cohabitation with the earlier Punic inhabitants that are his kinsmen

(συνοικήσων τούτοισι)(4.148.1).

 This characterization of the process of the settlement contrasts well with the

Phokaian narrative where the transient polity failed to integrate themselves into their new

locality. Accordingly, the foundation of Thera represents one facet of a "successful" *apoikia*,

in that the Spartans managed to incorporate local populations to found a *polis*. Moreover,

the mixed genealogy of Theras and his decisions as *oikistēs* present an early instance of

cultural hybridity.

 Furthermore, the productive relationship between various *ethnea* in the settlement

results in an ethnicity that has implications for the rest of the narrative. These Therans are

not solely of Spartan and Minyan descent, but also of Phoenician ancestry through both

Theras and the island's earlier inhabitants . Indeed, connotations from their mythological

and cultural heritage define them not only as travelers but also as settlers abroad.[71] They

are a truly naval population and, as such, are fitting protagonists for the early "age of

exploration" that occurs at the beginning of the Kyrenaian narrative. Here, the adaptable

quality of Theran ethnicity plays a dual role in first explaining their appropriateness as a

metropolis, a *polis* that establishes settlements elsewhere, and second emphasizing the

multicultural and trans-geographical nature of apoikism.[72]

 With the foundation of Thera secured, Herodotos begins his account of the

foundation of Kyrene. From this point, I trace three particular themes in the foundation of

Kyrene that the narrative endows with particular significance. First, I return to genealogy

---

[71] Both the Phoenicians and the Minyans regularly appear in the context of traveling and settling abroad (Phoenicians - Homer. *Od*. 15.415-485; Hdt. 1.1; Argonauts and Minyans - Hdt. 1.2; Apollod. 1.9).
[72] Baragwanath 2017.

to discuss how the lineage of the Battiad dynasty is a focal point in the debate over the identity and agency of the Kyrenaians in the process of foundation.[73] Second, I trace the role of intercultural interactions and exploration in establishing the process of settlement abroad within in a multicultural context. Lastly, I analyze the significance of oracles and ritual in the early foundation to understand how Herodotos uses evidence of divine will to legitimize his history and prove the importance of the gods to domestic and international prosperity.

The competing histories of the expedition to Kyrene, one from the Therans and the other from the Kyrenaians, provide the primary material for my discussion of genealogy. In particular, Battos I and his eponymous dynasty are central factors in the history of Kyrene as recorded by Herodotos. The two colonial traditions mentioned by Herodotos attest the specifics of his lineage and his role in the process of foundation.[74] Moreover, this attention establishes the Battiads as the primary node for understanding the interconnected web of Kyrenaian identity.[75] The many cultures and locations that factor into the lineage of Battos create a genealogical and symbolic link between these polities and the population of Kyrene as focalized through their most important citizen.[76]

---

[73] Calame 2014, 322–8 in particular argues that Herodotos's entire report of the foundation story aims at heroizing Battos, the *oikistēs*.

[74] So numerous are the considerations of the genealogy of Battos and Theras that Giangiulio believes in the existence of written versions of their lineage in the ancient past (Giangiulio 2001, 124–5).

[75] For more on the centrality of the *oikistēs* to both literary and cultural memories of the foundation of a *polis*, see Graham 1999, 19–39; Malkin 2002, 208–16, 2009, 2015; Dominguez 2011; Morakis 2011; Müller 2016. Müller's argument, particularly at pages 4-6, is especially instructive here for its consideration of "chain linking" in the foundation of *apoikia*, a process that demonstrates how the ethnic and civic alignments of the *oikistēs* (or *oikistai*) are particularly significant and have implications for the identity of the whole settlement.

[76] Smith 2008, 31 discusses the specific role of these symbolic linkages in the crafting of ethnicity. Hall 2015, 21 complements Smith's work and attests to the importance of these connections to the genesis of broader Hellenic identity.

As mentioned previously, Herodotos provides two different stories of the origins of Battos, one told by the Therans and the other by the Kyrenaians, which emphasize different components of the dynast's heritage. Both versions promote specific facets of the foundation of Kyrene, but focus on the same themes: while the Therans promote the role of the mother city as the civic body responsible for the foundation of the *apoikia*, the Kyrenaians assert their independence and define their distinct identity through emphasizing the role and genealogy of Battos in the initial settlement. The contrasting tales highlight Irad Malkin's argument that foundation stories are "oriented to identifiable mother cities and human founders, serving as the focus of collective identity."[77] Accordingly, the resolution of this conflict between stories matters little; instead, as we shall see, it is the presence and exploration of these two thematic concepts, genealogical connections and civic responsibility, that are most significant to understanding the importance of those two traditions to the history. Herodotus's inclusion of the two versions reflects his intent within the narrative to raise questions of identity and relatedness and to use both concepts to connect the foundation of Kyrene to as many polities as possible.

First, I discuss the Theran version. This passage emphasizes the role of the polity in the colonial project while relegating Battos to the role of a non-descript citizen arbitrarily chosen to be *oikistēs*. It introduces Battos as a Theran who comes to Delphi with Grinnos, the king of Thera (4.150.1). This portrayal defines Battos as first and foremost Theran because of his position as one of a crowd of citizens accompanying their king, though it does acknowledge his Minyan ancestry (it provides his patrilineal line: "the son of

---

[77] Malkin 2011, 57.

Polymnestus son of Euphemus of the Minyan clan," 4.150.1).[78] Moreover, the future *oikistēs*

is a passive actor in the narrative, as the Theran version underscores the role of Grinnos,

recalling: χρεωμένῳ δὲ τῷ Γρίννῳ τῷ βασιλέϊ τῶν Θηραίων περὶ ἄλλων χρᾷ ἡ Πυθίη κτίζειν

ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν (4.150.3).[79] Grinnos proceeds to beg the Pythia to place the burden on

another individual, pointing to Battos (ἐδείκνυε ἐς τὸν Βάττον). At the end of this first

interaction with the Pythia, Grinnos appears responsible for the foundation of Kyrene

because of his centrality in the selection of Battos as *oikistēs.*

Outside of Battos, the Theran story also describes the beginnings of the connection

between Kyrene, Thera, Samos, and Krete. Rather than asserting a genealogical connection,

the narrative situates the origins of their relationship, an alliance well-established in the

literary and historical record, in the part played by the Kretans and Samians in locating and

founding the early settlements in Libya.[80] Herodotos goes to great lengths to connect their

past actions with later political consequences, as epitomized by his assertion, "The

Kyrenaians and Therans first acquired a great friendship with the Samians from this deed"

(Κυρηναίοισι δὲ καὶ Θηραίοισι ἐς Σαμίους ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου πρῶτα φιλίαι μεγάλαι

συνεκρήθησαν, 4.152.5). Rather than declaring familial ties with the Samians and Kretans,

this narrative focuses on ancient ties of φιλία.

---

[78] The allusion to the Minyans throughout this narrative is a crucial factor in comprehending the identity that the Kyrene narrative crafts. For the capacity of seemingly innocuous references to affect reader perception, see Dewald 2012, 70. For a discussion of the manifold references to the Minyans in this narrative and the importance of their connection to the Kyrenaians, see Baragwanath 2017, 3–8.

[79] "The Pythia instructed Grinnos the king of the Therans, who was asking concerning other matters, to found a *polis* in Libya."

[80] By Herodotos's reckoning, the Therans sent to Krete for aid in locating Libya (4.151.2) and are particularly indebted to a Kretan murex fisherman named Korobios. The Samians appear in the narrative as merchant sailors that aid Korobios, whom the Therans abandon to return to their island to deliberate. Herodotos proceeds to describe their travels from the island of Platea to Tartessos and the magnificent profits they derive from the experience.

Moreover, the narrative removes all agency from Battos in the process of foundation and instead portrays the early settlement in Libya as a Theran initiative directed by the Pythia. After seven years of blight on the island, the Therans collectively send a delegation to the Pythia who recapitulates the demand for the *polis* to settle an *apoikia* in Libya (4.151.1). After a period of exploration, the Theran people collectively resolve to select a portion of the population as settlers and then choose Battos as leader and king of the settlement: Θηραίοισι δὲ ἔαδε ἀδελφεόν τε ἀπ᾽ ἀδελφεῶν πέμπειν πάλῳ λαχόντα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν χώρων ἀπάντων ἑπτὰ ἐόντων ἄνδρας <…>, εἶναι δὲ σφεων καὶ ἡγεμόνα καὶ βασιλέα Βάττον (4.153.1).[81] In this instance, the Theran tradition limits the role of Battos in the process of foundation. The *oikistēs* is chosen by his fellow citizens to lead an expedition, rather than pursuing the venture out of his own interest. And the genealogy of Battos, though mentioned in passing, never occupies a position of significance in the narrative. The citizens of the *polis* elevate the role of the civic body of Thera in the establishment of Kyrene over the agency of Battos or the specific settlers; indeed the settlers are themselves chosen by lot and not by design. The effect of this is to define the *polis* as a Theran product, both in terms of genealogy and responsibility. Nevertheless, the Therans do declare Battos to be their "leader and king," an aside that they include perhaps as an acknowledgement of the dynasty of *basileis* that follows him.

In contrast to the dogged elevation of the *metropolis* that characterizes Herodotos's report of the Theran story, the Kyrenaian version of the foundation that Herodotos recounts expands the genealogical web of the *polis* and asserts the autonomy of the

---

[81] "It was the opinion of the Therans to pick brother from brother by lot, to send men from all seven of its regions <…>, and that Battos be their leader and king."

apoikia.[82] Once again, the figure of Battos provides a clear indication of the intentions behind the crafting of the colonial narrative. The Kyrenaians agree that Battos is the child of Polymnestos (4.155.1), thus, acknowledging his Theran and Minyan ancestry, but they also append a backstory about his mother. In their account, she was the daughter of a Kretan king named Etearkhos.[83] Accordingly, the Kyrenaian tradition traces the settlement of *apoikiai* at Libya back to Theran, Minyan, and Kretan ancestors. Though the narrative does not go so far as to emphasize the royal lineage of Battos or his relationship to the Argonauts as does Pindar, for example, the Kyrenaian tradition reported in the *Histories* elevates the founder's ancestry more than the Theran version.[84] Furthermore, the Kyrenaian version looks beyond Kyrene's relationship to its mother city to underscore genealogical connections to other polities throughout the Hellenic sphere. These efforts may have emerged from an interest in facilitating advantageous inter-*polis* relations through claims of kinship.[85]

Commensurate with its emphasis on the lineage of Battos, the Kyrenaian version also asserts his particular agency in the expedition. This Theran-born child of Kretan royalty has a legend surrounding him that corresponds to many other *oikistai*: he possesses a physical malady, in this case a stutter, and seeks help at Delphi; the Pythia responds with a demand that he found an *apoikia* at Libya.[86] In contrast to the Theran story, the oracle

---

[82] Malkin 2003b, 159.

[83] Etearkhos and his daughter Phronime, the mother of Battos, are attested names of significance at both Kyrene and throughout Krete, though not much is known of them (Asheri, et al. 2007, 681).

[84] Giangiulio 2001, 128–9 argues that these changes in the characterization of Battos from Pindar to Herodotos occur on account of the cessation of Battiad rule at Kyrene.

[85] For the role of kinship, whether genuine or assumed, in enabling civic and political interactions in the Greek world, see Jones 1999, 17–35.

[86] Giangiulio 2001, 120–1. For more on the generic structure of myths surrounding *oikistai*, which include physical maladies, divine selection, some form of civic struggle or *miasma*, and other

explicitly directs Battos to found this settlement, and, as in the other version, the Pythia delivers that message on two different occasions (4.155.3; 4.156.2). Moreover, Herodotos devotes more of his account to the Kyrenaian version than to its Theran counterpart, a device that privileges the Kyrenaian tradition and may indicate a preferred interpretation.[87]

Herodotos is clearly interested in Battos. After recounting the specific aspects of his ancestry, he inserts a brief aside to provide a linguistic origin for the name "Battos" that he claims as his own. Herodotos does not agree that the *oikistēs* was named βάττος, "stammerer" in Greek, because of the speech impediment he famously possessed. Instead, he argues that the *oikistēs* took the name βάττος later in life "because the Libyans call a king a 'Battos'" (Λίβυες γὰρ βασιλέα βάττον καλέουσι, 4.155.2). From the perspective that Herodotos proposes, the naming of Battos does not evoke his disability but instead recognizes his innate right to rule at Kyrene. Accordingly, Herodotos's revision heroizes Battos and establishes him within the narrative of the *Histories* as the ordained founder of Kyrene.[88]

---

features, see Malkin 1987, 204–260. For examples of *oikistēs* myths in other ancient authors, see Plut. *Mor.* 772e-773b; Strabo 6.2.2.

[87] Herodotos relies on oracles and omens as plot devices to assert his reliability and to denote significance. Kindt 2006 explores this phenomenon with regard to the Kroisos *logos*, another narrative that particularly emphasizes oracles. The question of whether Herodotos is reporting a pro- or anti-Battiad account in these passage has been long debated and is an interesting discussion, though beyond the scope of my study. For arguments on the political bent of the Kyrenaian narrative, see Giangiulio 2001; Malkin 2003b, 156–64.

[88] On the role of the name debate of Battos as an instance of further heroizing and legitimizing the *oikistēs* of Kyrene, see Calame 2014, 326. Indeed, Calame suggests the entirety of the Kyrenaian foundation story in the *Histories* serves to elevate Battos. This is in line with the analysis of Dewald 1999, who describes partisan ideology instilled in Herodotus's narrative. For examples of other instances in the *Histories* where Herodotos describes the connection between a name and an aspect of that person's character, see 1.122, 6.98.3.

This instance of conflicting memories in the foundation of Kyrene ought not

surprise us. Evidence for the intentional manipulation of cultural memory, particularly

with regard to genealogy, in literature as well as public art and architecture to the

advantage of a community abounds in the ancient Greek world.[89] For the sake of our

discussion, however, the central theme of agency, whether civic or individual, and

genealogy in the foundation of Kyrene most demands our attention. The debate over the

role of various Greek polities in the foundation of Kyrene establishes a web of connections

with the *apoikia* situated firmly as the central node.

Intercultural Interactions in the Early History of Kyrene

Next, let us move on from a consideration of genealogy and competing traditions

surrounding the foundation of Kyrene to chart the early narrative's portrayal of

intercultural interactions. As is the case in the Phokaian narrative, Herodotos dedicates

considerable time here to discussing the relationship between Hellenes and non-Hellenes.

In particular, two exchanges occur in the narrative that reflect the prevalence of

harmonious relations between cultures rather than disputes: the Samian episode at

Tartessos and the Hellenic interactions with the indigenous Libyans. The connections

established here take the network that Herodotos crafts in the micro-narrative and expand

its scope beyond that of Greece and Greek peoples to embed the story in a framework of

cross-cultural interactions. Thus, we may perceive a critical facet of the narrative through

---

[89] Ma 2009; Baragwanath 2012, 54. For instance, Lomas 2015, 73–4 presents the example of the continued usage of the Greek language in public inscriptions at Naples until late in the second century A.D. This phenomenon, exceptional even among other originally Greek settlements in Italy, suggests the town's continued interest in asserting its Hellenic heritage.

the intercultural relationships that arise during the process of apoikism: it consistently

presents unified cultural action instead of emphasizing the heterogeneity of foreign

peoples. This creates a framework to understand the role of Hellenes and the impact of

their actions in a multicultural space.

The Samians' voyage to Tartessos and the remarkable profit they achieved there add

other nodes to the web of cultural interactions surrounding the foundation of Kyrene in the

micro-narrative. Moreover, the "opening" of Tartessos in the Kyrenaian narrative

synchronizes the early events of this passage with the early incidents of the Phokaian

narrative. As Herodotos writes, the Phokaians had been the first Hellenes to discover the

Iberian culture (1.163.1), but it was the Samians who first profited from trade with the

Tartessian people:

> καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἀνίει τὸ πνεῦμα, Ἡρακλέας στήλας διεκπερήσαντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς
> Ταρτησσόν, θείῃ πομπῇ χρεώμενοι. τὸ δὲ ἐμπόριον τοῦτο ἦν ἀκήρατον τοῦτον τὸν
> χρόνον, ὥστε ἀπονοστήσαντες οὗτοι ὀπίσω μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς
> ἀτρεκείην ἴδμεν ἐκ φορτίων ἐκέρδησαν. (4.152.2-3)

> For the wind did not even abate, and they, having passed through the Pillars of
> Herakles, arrived at Tartessos under divine guidance. And this market was
> untouched at that time so that these Samians, having returned back home, derived
> from their cargo the greatest profits of all Greeks about whom we know accurately.

This first interaction portrays a productive, and divinely guided, economic relationship that

occurred in connection with the settlement of Kyrene.[90] Here, the origins of the *apoikia* are

associated with peaceful intercultural interactions between the Samians and Tartessians, a

relationship that extends the network of relations built throughout the narrative.

Moreover, Herodotos describes this happy time as occurring in near simultaneity with the

Phokaian narrative because of the recent discovery of Tartessos. Thus, he equates these

---

[90] Archaeological and literary evidence suggests that Samos and Kyrene did in fact maintain close
ties (Asheri et al. 2007, 680; Austin 2008).

early prosperous periods and builds towards the diminution of Kyrene in replication of the struggles of Phokaia.[91] In fact, Herodotos mentions Tartessos only twice in the *Histories*, during the two narratives under consideration in this study, further strengthening their relatedness. Accordingly, this episode creates ties between Samos, Tartessos, and Kyrene, but also connects the Kyrenaian narrative with the earlier Phokaian narrative.

A positive but peculiar political relationship between the Hellenes and the indigenous Libyans near Kyrene at the time of the foundation of the *polis* complements the earlier interaction between Samians and Tartessians. Having already moved their settlement once, from the island of Platea to Aziris on the mainland, Herodotos writes that a contingent of indigenous Libyans spontaneously encouraged the Therans to move and promised to lead them to a better place, ἐς ἀμείνονα χῶρον (4.158.1). Many perceive this aspect of the passage as aimed at "amicably involving the Libyans in the history of [Kyrene]," an endeavor that some also perceive in the Theran tradition's inclusion of the Kretans and the Samians.[92]

Herodotos does not provide a wholly positive characterization of the Libyans, but instead depicts them as ambiguous political actors that nevertheless greatly affect the Greek experience on the continent. The soon-to-be Kyrenaians acquiesce to the advice of the Libyans and trust them, while the indigenous population responds by tricking them: they prevent them from seeing the most desirable site at Irasa by travelling at night and lead them instead to another location (ἦγον δὲ σφεας ἐνθεῦτεν οἱ Λίβυες ἀναστήσαντες πρὸς ἑσπέρην, καὶ τὸν κάλλιστον τῶν χώρων ἵνα διεξιόντες οἱ Ἕλληνες μὴ ἴδοιεν,

---

[91] Baragwanath 2017, 5 notes that the Samians' navel wanderings also liken this period to the mythical travels of the Phoenicians in the proem.
[92] Jahne 1988, 152–3; Asheri, et al. 2007, 686.

συμμετρησάμενοι τὴν ὥρην τῆς ἡμέρης νυκτὸς παρῆγον. ἔστι δὲ τῷ χώρῳ τούτῳ οὔνομα Ἴρασα, 4.158.2).[93] No clear purpose is given in the narrative for this treachery; but Chamoux suggests that the behavior occurs from a desire on the part of the Libyans to rid the Greeks from a portion of their land, an action that foreshadows the eventual tension between the Kyrenaians and the indigenous population.[94] Furthermore, this ploy has an earlier precedent in the narrative, that of the Minyans' nighttime escape from execution at Sparta (4.146), that provides an indication of shared behavior between Greeks and non-Greeks. Despite the trickery of the Libyans, the foundation narrative allots them full responsibility for the siting of Kyrene.[95] Whereas Herodotos goes to great lengths to deliberate over the situation surrounding the initial expedition to Libya, "the two versions converge as soon as Battos touches Libyan soil" and there is no disagreement or doubt that it is the indigenous population that guides them to the location of their *polis*.[96]

Just as the interactions between indigenous populations and the migrating Hellenes demand attention, so too does the specific manner in which Herodotos characterizes the indigenous populations. During the Samian expedition to Tartessos and the exchanges between the Libyans and the Therans, Herodotos never describes an individual or sub-

---

[93] "Then, the Libyans led them, heading towards the west, and, in order that the Greeks passing through would not see the most beautiful part of the country, they led them along by night, measuring the time of the day. This country is named Irasa." Language emphasizing the beauty and desirability of the landscape abounds in the Kyrenaian *logos*, a narrative tool that has been noted for emphasizing the "colonial" landscape's role as a "target of conquest" (Baragwanath 2008, 166). Furthermore, this seems to be a standard category in the depiction of Kyrene in a great variety of sources, perhaps because of the *polis*'s association with silphium, a plant with medicinal and, perhaps, contraceptive uses (Skinner 2012, 136–8).

[94] Chamoux 1953, 120. Alternatively, Macan 1895, 112 suggests the inclusion may have been a self-conscious response to critics, to explain why the Kyrenaians had not chosen the best location for settlement. We see just such a criticism through the mouthpiece of Megabazos at 4.144.

[95] Austin 2008, 206 briefly meditates on the tensions and complexities involved in interpreting the behavior of the Libyans. For another instance of non-Greek trickery at night, see 8.6-7 and Bowie 2007, 96–100.

[96] Calame 2014, 325.

group of the foreign polity. This is particularly interesting in the latter case, because so much of the content of the end of Book 4 focuses on the Libyan tribes (4.168-97). Here, the narrative focuses on cultural unity, presenting readers with visions of unified communities interacting in chorus with one another.[97] This portrayal establishes a precedent that the second phase of the Kyrenaian narrative will complicate. Moreover, Herodotos ultimately describes the non-Greek populations as effectively benevolent and fully civilized, as neither the Libyans nor the Tartessians fit into the negative stereotypes of *barbaroi*.

The Role of Oracles and Divine Will in Guiding Foundation

Let us turn to consider some of the many moments of oracular, divine, and ritual character that occur throughout the first half of the Kyrenaian narrative.[98] So central is divine will to the action of this passage that Herodotos recounts nine oracles (which represent almost a seventh of the fifty-seven oracles that occur throughout the entirety of the *Histories*) in the course of the whole narrative, the first six of which appear in the early history of Kyrene. Here is a list of the oracles in the Kyrenaian narrative:

> 1) An oracle demanding that the Aegidae of Sparta found a temple to the Erinyes of Laios and Oedipos (4.149.2),
> 2-3) Two oracles in the Theran story of the founding of Kyrene, separated by seven years, demanding that Thera found a *polis* in Libya (4.150.3, 151.1),
> 4-5) An oracle quoted in full in the Kyrenaian story of the founding of Kyrene demanding that Battos found a city in Libya, followed by a second, presumably identical, oracle whose text is not provided (4.155.3, 156.1),

---

[97] Indeed, the entire "Greek story" in Libya refers to the indigenous population of the country only as "Libyans," despite delving into an excursus on the various tribes and customs of Libya several chapters later. The insistence on referring to the Libyans as a single cultural unit, thus, ought to be understood as an intentional choice by Herodotos (Austin 2008, 205–10).

[98] For the role of Delphi in the *Histories*, see Kindt 2006, 2016, 16–54. Only the Kroisos *logos* incorporates more oracles than the foundation story of Kyrene.

6) A final oracle quoted in full that instructs Battos and the Therans living on Platea to move their settlement to the mainland of Libya (4.157.2).
7) A seemingly spontaneous oracle delivered by the Pythia and quoted in full that warns against settling at Kyrene after the land is divided up (4.159.2-3).
8) An oracle procured by the Kyrenaian citizens to stabilize the *polis* by instituting the reforms of a Mantinean mediator (4.161.1-2).
9) The last oracle has two parts and is fully provided. It first declares the right of the Battiad dynasty to rule Kyrene for eight generations. Second, it advises Arkesileos III on how to act in a series of situations when he returns to Kyrene (4.163.2-3).

Most important to our interests in this narrative is the general reluctance of the Therans to settle at Libya. In both versions of the foundation of Kyrene, Delphi demands the foundation of a *polis* in Libya and is roundly ignored. The rejection of both oracles (2 and 4) spurs on misfortune, specified as a drought in the Theran version (τὰ δένδρεα… ἐξαυάνθη, 4.151.1) and left vague in the Kyrenaian version (συνεφέρετο παλιγκότως, 4.156.1). In both versions, the Pythia then restates Apollo's demand (oracles 3 and 5), the Therans submit, and found a settlement on Platea off the coast of Libya. Oracle 6 provides the final push for the Therans on Platea, still suffering after two years on the island (οὐδὲν γάρ σφι χρηστὸν συνεφέρετο, 4.157.1), to move to the mainland. These oracles give the passage an air of divine authority and also imbue the narrative with the recognition that the commands of the Pythia cannot be refused.[99] The Therans suffer for their initial neglect of the oracle and profit from their eventual compliance. This pattern primes the reader for the three oracles in the latter half of the Kyrenaian narrative that end less favorably for the

---

[99] For further consideration of the centrality of the Delphic oracle in the foundation of Kyrene, see Harrison 2000, 153 n 112; Kindt 2016, 37–44. Kindt's concluding remarks further address the nuance of Delphi's role in the two stories of the foundation of Kyrene:

> Between them, the Theran and the [Kyrenaian] traditions of the events leading up to the foundation of [Kyrene] thus not only complement each other in terms of the story they tell about the foundation of a new settlement, but they also map out the ways in which fate and human agency complement each other in human history and the oracle's role in making this fate manifest. (p.44)

Kyrenaians who, despite a close relationship with the Pythia, appear to have a persistent

difficulty in sufficiently obeying Delphic commands.

Furthermore, Herodotos repeatedly cites divine will throughout the course of the

early Kyrenaian narrative, acknowledging the significance of the gods in navigating the

interconnected network of Mediterranean polities. In particular, Thomas Harrison asserts

that natural phenomena, as a form of inexplicable miracle, whether directly stated as divine

or simply mentioned as fortuitous, make up a distinct subset of divinely guided events in

the *Histories*.[100] Fittingly for a narrative that emphasizes navigation and exploration as an

avenue for cultural connection, divine will manifests itself especially often here in the form

of chance winds. This is the case in Korobios's chance discovery of Platea (ὑπ' ἀνέμων

ἀπενειχθεὶς, 4.151.2) and the arrival of the Samians at Tartessos (their journey is explicitly

named θείῃ πομπῇ χρεώμενοι, 4.152.2). Thus, the narrative not only claims the foundation

of *apoikia* as the product of divine will but it also promotes the role of the gods in the

establishment of cross-cultural relationships and discovery.

This analysis of the first half of the Kyrenaian narrative (4.145-158.3) suggests

several conclusions. First, Herodotos elevates genealogy and intra-Hellenic relationships

through his discussion of the lineage of Battos. He places a premium on the role of the

oikistēs in defining the character of his *apoikia*, but also establishes the importance of civic

identity to the process. Next, the narrative promotes a worldview through two major

instances of interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks that encourage the reader to

imagine cultures as homogenous units and to reflect positively on intercultural

relationships. And finally, divine will and oracles ordain the foundation of Kyrene and the

---

[100] Harrison 2000, 92–100. He specifically considers the case of Korobios and the Samians at pages 99-100.

many productive interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks that occur during the process. Herodotos presents readers with a view of the distant past in which populations, regardless of culture or ethnicity, act generally benevolently; issues of *stasis* find peaceful resolution; and all involved parties benefit. By the final settlement of Kyrene, readers should recognize the dangers of not complying with the gods, but feel confident in both the Kyrenaians' respect for the oracle and their role at the center of a web of Mediterranean-wide interactions.

Part 2: Conflict and Crisis after the Foundation of Kyrene

Herodotos treats the process of Hellenic exploration and settlement abroad as a positive phenomenon that expands connections between peoples. However, in the latter half of the Kyrenaian narrative, the *Histories* point to a pattern of misfortunes that characterize the lifetime of an *apoikia* after settlement. For example, following the foundation of Kyrene, familial, civic, and ethnic strife abound as initially small actions and misinterpretations of divine will result in progressively larger and more destructive conflicts. As was the case in the latter half of the Phokaian narrative, the Kyrenaian narrative denotes much of the ensuing discord in terms of separation, diminution, and failed familial and intercultural relationships. In this section, I first discuss the event that divides the two portions of the Kyrenaian micro-narrative, the oracle at 4.159.3. Next, I track the account's emphasis on division and reduction as both prosperity and productive interactions cease and the *apoikia* begins to suffer. From that point, I discuss intercultural relations and the increasingly ambiguous cultural identity that characterizes this section.

Lastly, I consider the rejection of divine will as a particular impetus to the breakdown of cultural relations and categories of behavior.

A Misinterpreted Oracle and Societal Divisions at Kyrene

The misinterpretation of a critical oracle in the history of Kyrene explains the many conflicts that occur at the *polis* in the latter half of the narrative and serves as the turning point in this foundation story. Some fifty-six years after the foundation of Kyrene, during the rule of Battos II, Herodotos recounts a spontaneous Pythian oracle concerning Kyrene:

> Ἕλληνας πάντας ὥρμησε χρήσασα ἡ Πυθίη πλέειν συνοικήσοντας Κυρηναίοισι Λιβύην· ἐπεκαλέοντο γὰρ οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ἐπὶ **γῆς ἀναδασμῷ**. ἔχρησε δὲ ὧδε ἔχοντα·
> ὃς δέ κεν ἐς Λιβύην πολυήρατον ὕστερος ἔλθη
> **γᾶς ἀναδαιομένας**, μετά οἵ ποκά φαμι **μελήσειν**. (4.159.2-3)

> The Pythia stirred all Greeks to sail in order to live together with Kyrenaians in Libya. For the Kyrenaians were calling for a **partition of the land**. And she proclaimed the oracle thus:
> *Whoever should come to much-desired Libya later*
> *Than* **the partition of land**, *I say that someday afterward* **they will regret it**.

According to the prevailing interpretation, the Pythia was encouraging Greeks to settle immediately at Kyrene and warning them that those who came to the *polis* after the partition of land would regret the missed opportunity.[101] The Greeks responded accordingly by flocking en masse to the fledgling *apoikia*, a decision that almost immediately produced regional tension and conflict (4.159.4).

I suggest that, from the perspective of the narrative, the crises that arise at Kyrene result from an error in deciphering this particular oracle. Rather than encouraging

---

[101] Chamoux 1953, 134–6; Austin 2008, 204–5; Baragwanath 2017, 25.

settlement before the partition is completed, I argue that the oracle implicitly suggests that

negative outcomes will occur in the fallout of the dividing of Kyrenaian land. The crux of

the issue lies in whether the Pythia intends to encourage hasty immigration to Kyrene or to

warn against coming to the *apoikia* after the land has been divided. That is to say, whether

the character of the regret, more literally the "care" (μελήσειν), of later settlers will arise

from missed profit or from the *stasis* that befalls the polity after the partition. The historical

response and that which Herodotos recounts for us was a mass migration, but the chaos

and strife that result from the oracle, which I discuss in full in the following pages, suggests

that the narrative intends for readers to retroactively perceive that oracle was actually a

warning against migration.

  Immediately following the oracle, language of separation and diminution becomes

increasingly common in the narrative. The earliest instance of the language of separation is

the so-called "partition" of the land (γῆς ἀναδασμῷ), literally a cleaving apart of the

territory of Libya. In fact, this specific phrase appears regularly in unstable political

situations that relate to revolutions and violent political conflict.[102] Accordingly, the

division immediately causes intercultural *stasis*, as the indigenous Libyans respond with

their own uprising:

> περιταμνόμενοι γῆν πολλὴν οἱ περίοικοι Λίβυες καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν, τῷ οὔνομα
> ἦν Ἀδικράν, οἷα τῆς τε χώρης στερισκόμενοι καὶ περιυβριζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν
> Κυρηναίων, πέμψαντες ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἔδοσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς Ἀπρίῃ τῷ Αἰγύπτου
> βασιλέϊ. (4.159.4)

---

[102] The noun ἀναδασμός and its verbal form ἀναδατέομαι, only appear three times in the *Histories*, all in the Kyrenaian *logos.* The division and redistribution of land in ancient Greece and specifically the phrase γῆς ἀναδασμῷ appears in the context of political upheaval and revolutionary behavior in the writings of several authors (Dem. 24.149, Thuc. 5.4.2, Diod. 11.86.3, Arist. *Pol*. 1305a.4). This instance is perhaps distinct from other historical events, because the division is of Libyan land rather than preexisting Kyrenaian territory, which incenses the foreign population rather than citizen landholders. For more information, see How and Wells 1912, 354.

> The Libyan neighbors and their king, whose name was Adikran, were cut off from much of the land. Having been deprived of country and wantonly injured by the Kyrenaians, they sent to Egypt and gave themselves to Apries, the king of Egypt.

The immediate impact of the Hellenes' misinterpretation of the Delphic oracle was a breakdown in Libyan-Kyrenaian relations so great that the indigenous population pledged themselves to a neighboring power in order to subdue the heedless expansion of Kyrene.[103] Herodotos also describes the Libyans in this instance as "cut off" (περιταμνόμενοι), further underscoring the importance of communal divisions in this episode. Remarkably, Herodotos declares that after, the Kyrenaian victory over the Libyan-Egyptian forces, the defeat was so severe that the Egyptians revolted from Apries, their king because they expected foul play (4.159.6).[104] For more on this revolt, see pages 77-8. Accordingly, not one but two instances of public uprising follow the partition of Kyrenaian land, creating a chain of causation that originated with the misinterpretation of the Delphic oracle.[105]

In addition to the breakdown of stable international relations, separation and diminution characterize the civic incidents at Kyrene that Herodotos recounts, which he intertwines with intensifying intra-familial strife in the Battiad dynasty. After the conflict with Egypt, the narrative jumps forward to the foundation of Barke, the first secondary

---

[103] For a more historical, as opposed to historiographical, perspective on these events, see Austin 2008, particularly pages 196-205.

[104] "In return for these things (namely, their heavy defeat against Kyrene), the Egyptians, blaming them and Apries, rebelled from him;" ἀντὶ τούτων Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ ταῦτα ἐπιμεμφόμενοι Ἀπρίῃ **ἀπέστησαν** ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

[105] For more on Herodotean causation in general, see Immerwahr 1956. For a discussion on the role of causation in the Kyrenaian narrative, see Baragwanath 2017.

foundation of Kyrene.[106] The narrative records that a schism in the Battiad dynasty directly

prompted the foundation of Barke, the first division between Hellenes in Libya.

> τούτου δὲ τοῦ Βάττου παῖς γίνεται Ἀρκεσίλεως, ὃς βασιλεύσας πρῶτα τοῖσι ἐωυτοῦ ἀδελφεοῖσι **ἐστασίασε**, ἐς ὅ μιν οὗτοι ἀπολιπόντες οἴχοντο ἐς ἄλλον χῶρον τῆς Λιβύης καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἐωυτῶν βαλόμενοι ἔκτισαν πόλιν ταύτην ἣ τότε καὶ νῦν Βάρκη καλέεται· κτίζοντες δὲ ἅμα αὐτὴν ἀπιστᾶσι ἀπὸ τῶν Κυρηναίων τοὺς Λίβυας. (4.160.1).

> The child of Battos (II) was Arkesileos (II), who quarreled with his brothers when he was first ruling, and these people, leaving him, came to another part of Libya. On their own responsibility, they founded this *polis*, which then and now is named Barke. And while founding it, they convince the Libyans to revolt from the Kyrenaians.

Furthermore this political and familial division precipitates another intercultural conflict as

the Libyans revolt from Kyrene with encouragement from the Hellenes who had just

deserted the *apoikia*. Thus, the narrative depicts divisions at all levels of society: in the

family, in the *polis*, and between cultural groups. And finally, the rebellion results in a

massive Kyrenaian defeat (4.160.3) and then the murder of the current king Arkesileos II

by his brother Learkhos (Ἀρκεσίλεων μὲν κάμνοντά τε καὶ φάρμακον πεπωκότα ὁ

ἀδελφεὸς Λέαρχος ἀποπνίγει, 4.160.4), who is in turn killed by Eryxo, the wife of the

murdered king (Λέαρχον δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Ἀρκεσίλεω δόλῳ κτείνει, τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Ἐρυξώ,

4.160.4).[107] At this point, the enumeration of conflicts threatens to pitch the narrative into

farce, as Herodotos describes the shredding of the fabric of the Battiad dynasty, Kyrenaian

society, and Libya in general.

---

[106] Secondary foundations are polities founded by *apoikiai*. This was a common occurrence and many significant Greek *apoikiai* are secondary foundations, for instance Poseidonia, Selinos, and Epidamnos.

[107] "First, Learkhos, strangled Arkesileos II, his brother, who was sick and had consumed a drug. But then the wife of Arkesileos II, whose name was Eryxo, killed Learkhos by cunning."

Furthermore, the eventual break in Herodotos's dense catalog of political strife in Kyrene involves yet more division after the Pythia tells them to bring in a mediator from Mantinea. They appoint, Demonax,, who arrives and seeks to remedy the problems at Kyrene by splitting the citizen body of the *apoikia* into three tribes (τριφύλους ἐποίησέ σφεας) that correspond with the major civic backgrounds of the polity: Theran and Libyan, Peloponesian and Kretan, and Islander (Θηραίων μὲν καὶ τῶν περιοίκων μίαν μοῖραν ἐποίησε, ἄλλην δὲ Πελοποννησίων καὶ Κρητῶν, τρίτην δὲ νησιωτέων πάντων, 4.161.3).[108] The portioning out of the population achieves temporary success but at the cost of segmenting the polity, separating the previously homogenous body into factions.

These divisions eventually prove the demise of Demonax's reforms, when Arkesileos III, who inherited the rule from his father Battos, destabilizes the state to regain certain kingly powers lost in the reforms. Herodotos first recounts that Arkesileos, "having revolted was defeated and fled to Samos" (**στασιάζων** ἐσσώθη καὶ ἔφυγε ἐς Σάμον, 4.162.2).[109] Here, Samos reappears in the Kyrenaian narrative, but in a distinctly different capacity. Rather than conducting trade abroad, the Samians serve as host to the ejected dynast of Kyrene. Whereas the narrative previously described the Samians as friends to the Kyrenaians, they are now allies only to the Battiads. In this change, we can perceive further separation, this time the division between ruler and polity. This division is emphasized as the humbled king then gathers an army at Samos to conquer his own people. Moreover, he accomplishes this end through the promise of a renewed division of the land of Kyrene (ἐπὶ

---

[108] "He made one portion from the Therans and the neighboring Libyans, another from the Peloponnesians and Kretans, and a third of all the island peoples." On the identity of the perioikoi, whom I take to be Libyans, see n. 123.

[109] Now and later in Kyrenaian history, the two polities maintained close relations in part because of their shared status as Persian-controlled states (Austin 1990, 301–2).

γῆς **ἀναδασμῷ**, 4.163.1), an assurance that recalls the Delphic oracle that marked the beginning of Kyrene's travails.

The last instance of division in the Kyrenaian narrative is in some ways the most severe. Pheretime, the mother of Arkesileos III, upon learning of the death of her son, travels to Egypt and urges the Persians in Egypt to attack Kyrene in order to avenge her son. Herodotos describes her behavior thus: ἀπικομένη δὲ ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἡ Φερετίμη Ἀρυάνδεω ἱκέτις ἕζετο, τιμωρῆσαι ἑωυτῇ κελεύουσα, προϊσχομένη πρόφασιν ὡς διὰ τὸν μηδισμὸν ὁ παῖς οἱ τέθνηκε (4.165.3).[110] This instance of separation exceeds previous examples in that it represents a breakdown of cultural identification. If the Kyrenaian queen is to be believed, this moment declares the medizing of Arkesileos, a division between the Kyrenaians and the free Greek world. Pheretime also separates herself from her Hellenic identity and the polity that her family had been responsible for and positions herself as its enemy by inciting a foreign invasion.[111]

Accordingly, the latter half of the Kyrenaian narrative details an extensive history of divisive actions in the past of the *apoikia*. Starting with an oracle that called for the partitioning of Kyrene, cleavages in the Hellenic polity at Kyrene emerged in quick order. Moreover, the *stasis* extended to other cultures, as Herodotos recounts revolts and insurgency by Libyans and Egyptians both against Kyrene and among themselves. The resulting perspective of the narrative inspires little faith in the now-deposed Battiad

---

[110] "Having arrived in Egypt, Pheretime sat at the knee of Aryandes as a suppliant, bidding him to avenge her, holding forth the excuse that her child had died for him on account of medizing."
[111] In many ways, this moment is the ostensible crux of the narrative and the rationale for its inclusion in the *Histories*, because it is Pheretime's supplication of the Persians that serves as the provocation for the Persian conquest of Kyrene. As described by Herodotos (4.167.3), the plight of Pheretime was probably an excuse to conquer a region that the Persians already desired, but explaining the motivation for Pheretime's action is the explicit intention of the Kyrenaian narrative. For more on this passage and its function in the narrative, see Immerwahr 1956, 243–7.

dynasty. Herodotos does recall a single instance of unity at the narrative's end, however, in the Barkaians response to a Persian herald. When he asks who killed Arkesileos, the citizens "all assumed responsibility, for they had suffered many and terrible things at his hands" (ὑπεδέκοντο πάντες· πολλά τε γὰρ καὶ κακὰ πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, 4.167.2). Though Pheretime divided herself from her Hellenic identity and loyalty, the Barkaians retain a sense of community, a rare assertion of collective strength, possibly included to stand as a statement of strength against Persian rule in a narrative that ends on an exceptionally bleak note.

Nevertheless, the greatest impact of the language employed throughout this section is the breakdown of the networks established in the first portion of the narrative. But the divisions between the various polities do not emphasize distinct and competing cultures; instead they eliminate the certainty behind categories of Hellenic and non-Hellenic behavior. Here the intent of the narrative emerges as Herodotos emphasizes fractures in the Greek settlements in Libya to blur cultural distinctions.[112]

Collapsing Distinctions Between Greeks and non-Greeks

Herodotos deliberates at great extent over matters of Hellenic and non-Hellenic identity in the latter part of the Kyrenaian narrative. As previously discussed, the Kyrenaian narrative displays an interest in establishing a Greek genealogy for the *oikistēs*

---

[112] It is certainly no coincidence that the ethnography that follows this narrative outlines the customs of the Libyans, presenting a vision of cultural mores distinct from the Greek one and, in fact, internally differentiated as well. Though it would be outside the bounds of our discussion to delve into the relationship between the Kyrenaian narrative and the Libyan *logos*, the two micro-narratives certainly present opposing visions of Greek and Libyan cultural identity and encourage readers to perceive the Libyan ethnography in light of the earlier events.

of the polity and for the *polis* itself.[113] The second portion of the story displays a wide

spectrum of behavior by individuals and groups identified as Hellenic that moves from

conforming with Greek stereotypical norms to resembling deeply non-Greek ones. The

description of such a wide range of conduct obscures cultural and ethnic identities just as

the language of division within the passage emphasizes partitions and disunity.

First, the narrative's emphasis on intra-familial intrigue and violence represents a

gruesome, but conventionally Greek motif.[114] No fewer than three instances of violence

between closely linked family members occur in the narrative as a whole, two of which

occur in the latter half of the Kyrenaian narrative (4.160.4); indeed, the cycle of violence

between Arkesileos II, Learkhos, and Eryxo may in fact encourage readers to associate the

Battiad dynasty to the House of Atreus and other heroic families. Herodotos's recollection

of an oracle demanding the establishment of a temple to the Erinyes of Laios and Oedipos

encourages this perspective (4.149.2). In this sense, the narrative portrays the Battiads as

deeply Hellenic and of a particularly (albeit negative) mythological character.

In contrast to the plausibly heroic characterization of earlier Battiads, the particular

type of violence that Arkesileos III engages in casts him as a decidedly villainous character

and a non-Hellenic variety of *tyrannos*. Herodotos describes how Arkesileos burns down a

tower filled with Kyrenaian dissidents, his own citizens: ἑτέρους δέ τινας τῶν Κυρηναίων

ἐς πύργον μέγαν Ἀγλωμάχου καταφυγόντας ἰδιωτικὸν ὕλην περινήσας ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως

---

[113] For discussions on the role of blood line in the articulation of Greek identity in Herodotos and elsewhere, see Hall 2002a; Zacharia 2008.

[114] Myths about the House of Atreus and the Theban cycle represent some of the most prominent representations of the murder of family members in both ancient and modern contexts. For a discussion of the dynamics of familial relationships in Herodotos, see Katz Anhalt 2005.

ἐνέπρησε (4.164.2).[115] In the scope of the *Histories*, the burning of live subjects places him

amongst a set of largely non-Greek rulers.[116] His cruelty exceeds the norms of tyrannical

Greek behavior and defines him as distinctly "other."[117] Furthermore, directly after

describing the Kyrenaian ruler's tyrannical behavior and his demise, Herodotos discusses

how Aryandes, a Persian Satrap, was killed by Darius for his excessive ambition (4.166).

The juxtaposition of Aryandes's story, a tale that uses his tyrannical aspirations and death

to meditate on "forms of tyrannic power," with the desires and failings of the Kyrenaian

ruler further connects the Battiads to tyrannical non-Greek *topoi*.[118] Pheretime, the mother

of Arkesileos, even declares after his death that her son had medized (4.165.2), further

condemning the tyrant and establishing his identity at the intersection of Greek and non-

Greek. Thus, Arkesileos III, in contrast to his progenitors, behaves violently in accordance

with non-Greek stereotypes.

Furthermore, Pheretime recurs throughout the latter half of the narrative and

beyond as an individual of uncertain cultural identity. Her behavior certainly separates her

from her identity as a Kyrenaian and a Hellene, but it does not immediately implicate her as

yet another *barbaros*; instead, her behavior lies somewhere on the spectrum between

Greek and non-Greek. She seeks refuge and aid at Greek Salamis in Cyprus, where she is

rebuffed in her attempts to secure an army (4.162.2-5), and at Egypt, where she finally

---

[115] "Some others of the Kyrenaians fled into a great tower, the private property of Aglomakhos, a private citizen. Arkesileos III, having heaped wood around the tower, set it aflame."
[116] Griffiths 2006, 138 names this category of rulers as a "holocaust set" and includes in its ranks an Egyptian Pharaoh (2.111), the brother of Sesostris (2.107), and the Greek Polycrates (3.45), though his story is "toned down" in comparison to the non-Greeks and Arkesileos III.
[117] For a discussion of the non-Hellenic or barbarian stereotypical behavior in Greek literature, see Vlassopoulos 2013, 164–214.
[118] Kurke 1999, 68–70.

secures her army (4.165.2-3).[119] Cyprus is another area of ambiguous and often hybridistic cultural identity in the Hellenic mindset.[120] Pheretime also clashes with Hellenic gender norms; Euelthon, the ruler of Cyprian Salamis, informs her of as much when he presents her with wool and a golden spindle and distaff in response to her petition for an army (4.162.5). Furthermore, Herodotos informs us that she governed Kyrene instead of her son when he abandoned Kyrene for fear of the Delphic oracle: ἡ δὲ μήτηρ Φερετίμη, τέως μὲν ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐν τῇ Βάρκῃ διαιτᾶτο ἐξεργασμένος ἑωυτῷ κακόν, ἡ δὲ εἶχε αὐτὴ τοῦ παιδὸς τὰ γέρεα ἐν Κυρήνῃ καὶ τἆλλα νεμομένη καὶ ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα (4.165.1).[121] Here, the Kyrenaian queen's initiative and control of society harmonize with the behavior of a number of other women in the *Histories*, some of whom are of a similarly liminal cultural identity or are distinctly non-Hellenic.[122] In his depiction of Pheretime's enterprise and desire for control, Herodotos presents a vision of Pheretime that also conforms with the behavior of some transgressive women from mythology, such as Klytaimnestra and Medeia.

    Herodotos also integrates Greek and non-Greek characteristics through his discussion of names and civic reforms. Notably, the reforms of Demonax of Mantinea unify the non-Greek inhabitants of Kyrene with their Greek cohabitants by incorporating them

---

[119] I would be remiss not to also mention her behavior later in book 4, though it is outside the bounds of the present discussion. Upon the Persian conquest of Barke, she impales the citizens and cuts the breasts off the women of the *polis*, an act that she is later punished for by the gods with brutal death (4.202-5). For more on Pheretime in the later portion of book 4, see Munson 2001, 186–8.

[120] See Iacovou 2008 for a history of Cyprus with a particular emphasis on the complex processes of cultural exchange that occurred there.

[121] "His mother Pheretime, while Arkesileos lived in Barke because he had brought evil upon himself, herself maintained the privileges of the son in Kyrene both administering other matters and sitting in the council."

[122] In particular, Pheretime appears in some instances to behave similarly to Artemisia (7.99, 8.67-9), the wife of Kandaules (1.8-12), the Egyptian Nitokris (2.100.2-3), and Amestris (9.108-112) Munson 1988, 94–5. Indeed, Flory 1987, 41–7 traces the motif of the "clever, vengeful queen" throughout the course of the *Histories* and all of its most notable examples are either not Greek or are Greeks of questionable status (i.e. Pheretime and Artemisia).

into a tribe with the Kyrenaians of Theran ancestry (Θηραίων μὲν καὶ τῶν περιοίκων μίαν μοῖραν, 4.161.3).[123] This act masks the differences between the two cultural groups and reminds readers of the Therans' prior history of cultural unification (4.147.3-148.1). Because of the diverse origins of Kyrene and the many cultures present at the *apoikia*, it ought not surprise us that the reforms of a man from mainland Greece, an outsider with a different cultural identity, do not meet with extended success. Moreover, the ruler of the Barkaians, an offshoot of the Battiad dynasty, receives the Libyan name Alazeir (Ἀλάζειρ), passively attesting to the intermarriage of Kyrenaian and indigenous populations.[124] Beyond exhibiting non-Greek behavior, the giving of non-Greek names to Greek individuals further demonstrates the narrative's interest in obscuring the distinction between cultures.[125]

Human Error and Divine Punishment

Lastly, let us consider the role of oracles and the neglect of divine will in the latter part of the Kyrenaian narrative. As we shall see, the failure to adequately respond to Delphic oracles produces significantly more violent outcomes than those instances in the

---

[123] A degree of uncertainty persists on the specific identity of the *perioikoi* that Herodotos implicates in this section, but the common interpretation is that they were the indigenous Libyans who had joined the settlement (Macan 1895, 115; Asheri, et al. 2007, 690).

[124] For Alazeir as a Libyan name, see Asheri, et al. 2007, 693. For a discussion of intermarriage and its role in promoting cultural hybridity in the contexts of *apoikiai*, see Graham 2001, especially pages 330-1 on Kyrene.

[125] In fact, intermarriage and cultural assimilation appears to have been a historical reality at Kyrene and throughout Greek Libya. Moreover, this practice looks to have persisted throughout the history of the *polis* rather than ceasing after several generations (Austin 2008, 209).

earlier part of the foundation story.[126] In many ways, the rejection and neglect of oracles is a trait that Herodotos ascribes to the Kyrenaian project as a whole, but the latter half of the narrative establishes the particular capacity for that disregard to result in violence. Herodotos emphasizes that trait in his description of Arkesileos III, whose neglect of the gods results in violence on two occasions: first, his attempt to reverse the designs of Demonax (4.162.1) and, second, his violent return to Kyrene against the advice of the Pythia (4.163.3-164.4).[127] However, the most important oracle of the narrative (oracle 7 in the list on pages 55-6) the Pythia's proclamation about the settlement of Kyrene (4.159.2-3). The incredible violence that followed the misinterpretation of this prophecy presents us with the first indication of the categorical differences between the two portions of the narrative.

The Kyrenaians, and most especially the Battiads, consistently misinterpret or neglect oracles, prompting violent action at Kyrene and elsewhere. Such is the case with the next oracle (8 in the list on pages 55-6), requested by the Kyrenaian polity and answered by Delphi, which demands the *apoikia* bring in a mediator to remedy their misfortunes. The *polis* quickly complies, procures the advice of Demonax, and institutes his reforms (4.161). Arkesileos III, however, rejects the reorganization mandated by the Pythia: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τούτου παιδὸς Ἀρκεσίλεω πολλὴ ταραχὴ περὶ τῶν τιμέων ἐγένετο. Ἀρκεσίλεως γὰρ ὁ Βάττου τε τοῦ χωλοῦ καὶ Φερετίμης οὔκ ἔφη ἀνέξεσθαι κατὰ τὰ ὁ Μαντινεὺς Δημῶναξ

---

[126] Those oracles that were not immediately obeyed during the initial half of the Kyrenaian narrative (4.150.3, 4.155.3) were followed by plagues or draughts. The same is not true of the second half of the *logos*.
[127] Harrison 2000, 153.

ἔταξε, ἀλλὰ ἀπαίτεε τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρεα. (4.162.1-2).[128] As a result, he sets himself up

as the head of a faction and then is defeated and banished to Samos—actions that all

characterize a civil war (4.162.3).

Soon after, Arkesileos III forgets yet another oracle and once again shows his

inherent negligence towards divine will. Having sought out oracular advice concerning his

return to Kyrene from exile, he is promised eight generations of Battiad rule at the *apoikia*.

To that promise the Pythia adds this warning:

> σὺ μέντοι ἥσυχος εἶναι κατελθὼν ἐς τὴν σεωυτοῦ. ἢν δὲ εὕρης πλέην ἀμφορέων, μὴ
> ἐξοπτήσης τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἀλλ' ἀπόπεμπε κατ' οὖρον· εἰ δὲ ἐξοπτήσεις τὴν κάμινον,
> μὴ ἐσέλθης ἐς τὴν ἀμφίρρυτον· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀποθανέαι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ταῦρος ὁ
> καλλιστεύων (4.163.3)

> You, however, be at peace when you return to your country. And if you find a kiln
> full of amphorae, do not bake the amphorae but send them out with the wind. If you
> bake the kiln fully, do not go to a place surrounded by water. If you do, you and the
> fairest bull will die.

Each component of the Pythia's instruction escapes Arkesileos's perception. Herodotus

explicitly states on two different occasions that he forgot the oracle (4.164.1, 164.3) and,

each time, an act of violence follows. The first time, after he returns to Kyrene, he demands

justice from his enemies for his exile, unleashes a civil war at Kyrene and sends some

citizens off to Cyprus to be killed (ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐς Κύπρον ἀπέστειλε ἐπὶ διαφθορῇ,

4.164.2). The second time, he burns alive other Kyrenaians who had sought refuge in a

tower (the metaphorical amphorae in a kiln)(4.164.2). After this act of violence, he finally

remembers the oracle and goes to Barke where he is killed along with Alazeir, the king of

the Barkaians (καὶ μιν Βαρκαῖοί τε ἄνδρες καὶ τῶν ἐκ Κυρήνης φυγάδων τινὲς

---

[128] "In this time of his son, Arkesileos (III), much trouble occurred concerning honors. For
Arkesileos (III), the son of Battos the lame and Pheretime, refused to endure the affairs that the
Mantinean Demonax arranged, and sought after the kingly privileges of his ancestors."

καταμαθόντες ἀγοράζοντα κτείνουσι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὸν πενθερὸν αὑτοῦ Ἀλάζειρα, 4.164.4).[129] In keeping with the violence that permeates the latter half of the Kyrenaian narrative, the outright rejection of or simple disregard for divine will bears distinctly vicious consequences. Moreover, the frequency of this apathy towards the gods, especially Apollo, represents the deep flaws and moral ambiguities surrounding Kyrenaian society in the narrative as Herodotos constructs it.

From the collected analyses of the second half of the Kyrenaian narrative, we may draw several conclusions. First, in terms of narrative structure, this section clearly distinguishes itself from its preceding portion through shifts in language and a change in subject matter. Herodotos introduces language (i.e. words like ἀναδασμός and στασιάζω) that emphasizes the factionalism and fracturing of society in and around Kyrene. Spurred on by the misinterpretation of a crucial Delphic oracle, conditions at the *apoikia* spiral into chaos. Moreover, a diminution in moral behavior clearly accompanies the divisions in society, which results in increasingly deleterious and horrific behaviors by the Greek actors in the narrative.

Second, Herodotos's emphasis on culturally ambiguous behaviors by Greeks produces a confused image of identity that lessens the distinctions between "Greek" and "non-Greek." The Battiad dynasty presents readers with a combination of conventional Greek behaviors and a variety of brutal behavior that conforms with the stereotypical actions of *barbaroi*. Lastly, Herodotos demonstrates the eventual crisis precipitated by Kyrenaian failure to properly adhere to divine will. The general inability of Hellenes to

---

[129] 4.164.2: "Arkesileos III sent them to destruction in Cyprus." 4.164.4: "The Barkaian men and some of the exiles from Kyrene recognized him walking in the *agora* and killed him, and also his father-in-law Alazeir."

conform to oracular demands, punished prior to the foundation of Kyrene to a lesser extent, provokes violence at all levels of society. Altogether, the latter half of the narrative depicts no less than the breakdown of Greek cultural exceptionalism, a collapse that resonates throughout the *Histories* as I discuss in the third chapter. Absent the distinctions between Greek and non-Greek traits and behavior, the narrative advances a universal perspective on culture that acknowledges political boundaries and relationships but questions discrete cultural identities.

Concluding Remarks

The Kyrenaian narrative has two clear portions that communicate many of the issues inherent in apoikism and connect the process of Greek settlement abroad to the structure of the *Histories*. Initially, the foundation story of Kyrene provides readers with a narrative that involves itself in the construction of a Hellenic identity defined through its multiplicity. The complicated ancestry of Battos emerges as a central issue in this effort, as Herodotos develops Kyrene's connections with both Greek and non-Greek polities. These relationships, whether genealogical, mercantile, or political, establish Kyrene as a node in a network of complex interactions. Herodotos incorporates oracles and divine will as proofs of the validity of his own narrative and of the ordained nature of Hellenic settlement in Libya. Moreover, the gods play a role in guiding effective intercultural relations. Through these various, but related methodologies, the narrative establishes a quasi-mythological setting for the foundation of first Thera and then Kyrene that is characterized by the presence of effective conflict resolution and mutually beneficial relationships between various polities.

However, prosperity and peaceful relations at Kyrene do not persist, but instead degenerate into *stasis* and moral dissolution as the narrative shifts from mythological time into more recent history. Various strands of intentionality appear in the breakdown of propriety and established order at Kyrene. Herodotos progressively blurs the distinctions between Greek and non-Greek behavior, again through his characterization of members of the Battiad dynasty, the very lineage through which the narrative established Kyrene's Hellenic credentials. In this way, he merges Greek and barbarian cultures while simultaneously emphasizing the division and the fracturing of Kyrenaian society. These two narrative moves make it difficult for the characters in the narrative and readers alike to understand the developing situation and to recognize cultural traits and categories of behavior. The micro-narrative creates erratic confusion from a previously stable and structured foundation.

Through his careful design of the Kyrenaian narrative, Herodotos actively embeds the *apoikia* in a Mediterranean-wide network that includes Greeks and non-Greeks. In the frame of this narrative, the Hellenes are able to fit themselves into a framework of unified cultures that engage peaceably with one another until certain Kyrenaian actors fail to remember or correctly interpret Delphic oracles. These failures result in the breakdown of cultural boundaries and civic stability after the Kyrenaians expand their territory to the detriment of others.

CHAPTER 3: ECHOES OF THE COLONIAL NARRATIVES IN THE *HISTORIES*

Up to this point, we have analyzed the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives to understand the sequence and themes of each foundation story. Three themes appear most clearly throughout both stories: Hellenic identity, empire and expansionism, and the relationship between human error and divine will. When these motifs appear in other parts of the *Histories*, they encourage readers to draw inferences between these various moments and the events of the colonial narratives. The themes of the micro-narratives, therefore, underscore some of the central arguments of the macro-narrative.[130]

To address the most important resonances of the colonial narratives with other events in the *Histories*, I will divide my analysis into three parts. These sections correspond with the three major themes that emerged in the course of my first two chapters. First, I discuss instances where Herodotos treats the idea of cultural identity similarly to how he presents it in the colonial narratives. I consider the Egyptian revolt against Apries as a moment where cultural affiliation becomes blurred and directly relates to the Kyrenaian narrative. I also discuss Herodotos's many declarations of the foreign origins of Greek customs and, indeed, Greek people, with a particular focus on the mixed barbarian origins of the Athenians. Second, I dedicate the bulk of this chapter to analyzing the many instances of harmful expansionism that occur throughout the *Histories*. Here, I cite the Ionian revolt narrative, the Kroisos *logos*, and the many instances of Persian and Athenian conquest, to

---

[130] Baragwanath 2015, 24–31 suggests that Herodotos encourages inferences between events in the *Histories* in a manner similar to the structuring of some tragedies.

understand a pattern in the *Histories* that resembles the colonial narratives and warns

against imperialism and the excessive desire for power. I pay special attention to the

similarities between the rise of Athens and the events of the Phokaian narrative. Third, I

describe how Herodotos consistently depicts gods punishing humans because of their

misinterpretation of divine will rather than mere chance. Just as in the colonial narratives,

the *Histories* repeatedly demonstrate that the misfortunes that befall an individual or a

society occur from a failure to adequately comprehend the advice of the gods. My

discussion of these three themes attests to the extent to which the events of the colonial

narratives resonate throughout the *Histories*.

Part 1: Hellenic Identity in the Colonial Narratives and Beyond

First, we must consider the relationship between perceptions of Hellenic identity in

the foundation stories and those in the remainder of the *Histories*. Throughout the

Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives, Herodotos portrays cultural identity, Hellenic or

otherwise, as the product of a process of exchange and movement. In both narratives, the

polities made a transition in geographical space, moving from their respective *metropolis* to

the site of their *apoikia*. They also interacted with a number of non-Greek peoples.

Throughout these events, both narratives increasingly considered the distinctions between

Hellenes and non-Hellenes. The sum total of this dynamic process of exchange is a vision of

cultural identity that depends on a culture's relationship to a broader network of

interconnected peoples.

The cultural relationships and transitions in identity that we analyzed in the foundation stories occur in similar patterns throughout the rest of the *Histories*. This consistency can help us understand the role of colonial narratives in clarifying the broader arguments of the history. To this end, I will first analyze a moment where the events of the Kyrenaian narrative relate directly to a discussion of identity elsewhere in the narrative (2.161-3, 169). I will then turn to consider other passages where Herodotos enumerates the facets of Hellenic identity that are the product of cultural exchange. The exchanges range from the physical, the trading of goods and the migration of peoples, to the abstract, the adoption of customs and the spread of various deities. Through this discussion, we will see that Herodotos perceives fluctuations in Hellenic identity and suggests that individuals and communities have the capacity to become more Greek or less Greek. All of this occurs within a framework where Herodotos nominally recognizes the existence of distinctions between cultures.

The rebellion of the Egyptians against their king Apries (2.161-3, 169) provides a case study of an event that comments upon issue of cultural affiliation and identity and has an explicit connection to a colonial narrative. In this conflict, the relationship between ruler and subject breaks down, and cultural connections lose meaning in the violence that ensues. The first war fought between the Kyrenaians and Egyptians (4.159.4-6, see pages 60-1) provokes this rebellion in Egypt as Herodotos describes it. The Kyrenaians defeated the forces of the Egyptian king Apries so soundly that his Egyptian citizens decided to revolt, thinking he had knowingly sent them to their deaths to secure his rule (2.161.4). This uprising sparks a clash where the Egyptian citizens are set apart from their ruler, who

guards himself with foreigners. Herodotos emphasizes the reversal of cultural affiliations in this situation:

> εἶχε δὲ περὶ ἑωυτὸν **Κᾶράς τε καὶ Ἴωνας ἄνδρας** ἐπικούρους τρισμυρίους, ἦν δέ οἱ τὰ βασιλήια ἐν Σάι πόλι, μεγάλα ἐόντα καὶ ἀξιοθέητα. **καὶ οἵ τε περὶ τὸν Ἀπρίην ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἤισαν καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἄμασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ξείνους** (2.163.1-2)

> He (Apries) had around himself thirty thousand mercenaries, Karians and Ionians. His palace was in the city of Sais, a great thing that is worth seeing. Apries and his troops were advancing against the Egyptians and Amasis and his troops were advancing against the foreigners.

The breakdown of *philia* connections between the Egyptian king and his subjects is readily apparent as Apries sends foreigners to fight his own Egyptian subjects. Not only do the conventional bonds that unite a society fail, but cultural identity becomes similarly ambiguous. Herodotos emphasizes this dissonance between Apries and the Egyptians in the word order of his narrative, juxtaposing the two parties to demonstrate their separation (οἵ τε περὶ τὸν Ἀπρίην ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους). The lawful leader of the Egyptians surrounds himself with foreigners and uses them to assault his fellow countrymen.[131]

Indeed, the behavior of Apries here looks ahead to the Battiad dynasty's own failure to maintain their Hellenic affiliation. Two books later, Herodotos recounts that Arkesileos III abandons the Kyrenaian people and gathers a mercenary army at Samos (4.163.1), while his mother, Pheretime, later flees to Egypt and secures the assistance of a Persian army (4.165.2-3). These passages are thus connected in theme, the breakdown of a ruler's cultural identity, as well as in historical causation, the foundation of Kyrene in Libya. Seeing the two passages in tandem, we can appreciate the commonality of this issue and perceive the underlying frailty of the cultural identities. Divisions in society emerge quickly and, at

---

[131] In addition to a statement about cultural affiliation, the autocrat's use of foreign mercenaries is a common trope in Greek literature in general. For more on this subject, see Arist. *Pol*. 1303.b.l-2. For scholarly discussions, see Robinson 2000, 190–1, 197.

the moment of this separation, cultural affiliations cease to have any meaning. Herodotos

pays special attentions to these fluctuations throughout his history.

In addition to this moment, the *Histories* abound with discussions that present a

vision of Hellenic identity that recalls the colonial narratives. First, the genealogy of specific

Hellenic polities merits some attention. I will take the origins of the Athenians as an

example. Just as Herodotos was keen to note the many ancestors of the people that lived in

Kyrene (Spartans, Phoenicians, Minyans, Therans, Kretans, and Libyans), he also explores

the multicultural origins of Athens at various points.

In particular, Herodotos asserts a Phoenician connection to Athens. Echoing the

Phoenicians' incorporation into the Hellenic *apoikia* at Thera, he describes the Phoenician

ancestry of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, two of Athens' most famous citizens.[132] He claims

that the Gephyraeans, an Athenian line of which both tyrannicides were members,

descended from a group of Phoenicians that arrived in Greece with the expedition of

Kadmos (οἱ δὲ Γεφυραῖοι, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ φονέες οἱ Ἱππάρχου, ὡς μὲν αὐτοὶ λέγουσι,

ἐγεγόνεσαν ἐξ Ἐρετρίης τὴν ἀρχήν, ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω, ἦσαν Φοίνικες

τῶν σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικομένων Φοινίκων ἐς γῆν τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίην καλεομένην, 5.57.1).[133]

Herodotos further states that Athens welcomed them into the ranks of their citizens upon

certain conditions (Ἀθηναῖοι δέ σφεας ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι ἐδέξαντο σφέων αὐτῶν εἶναι πολιήτας,

5.57.2).

---

[132] Thukydides also narrates the history of the two Athenians (6.54-59) but makes no mention of
their Phoenician ancestry.

[133] "The Gephyraeins, of whom the murderers of Hipparkhos were a part, that they themselves say
initially had come from Eretria, but I found from having looked into the matter closely that they
were Phoenicians from those Phoenicians who arrived with Cadmus at the land now called
Boeotia." The assertion that Gephyraians were Phoenician is thought to be a fiction invented by
Herodotos. For more on the Gephyraians and other motives for Herodotos to ascribe them a
Phoenician heritage, see Parker 1996, 288–9; Hornblower 2013, 173–7.

This passage complements an earlier discussion of Athens' Pelasgian heritage. Early in the *Histories*, Herodotos devotes several chapters to describing the autochthony of the Athenian people. Here, he writes that the citizens of Athens descend from the barbarian Pelasgians and then connects their learning of Greek to the moment of their becoming Hellenes (τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐὸν Πελασγικὸν ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε, 1.57.3).[134] In this passage, the genealogy of the Athenians is completely non-Hellenic and the only things that establishes them as Hellenes is their adoption of the Greek language.

From these two passages, several things becomes clear about Athenian identity that recall the colonial narratives' own understanding of the broader structures of cultural identity. First, just like the Kyrenaians and Phokaians, connections to non-Hellenic peoples pervade the Athenians' early history. Like the Kyrenaians, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, the great heroes of the Athenian democracy, were of Phoenician descent. Moreover, the pride of Athens, its autochthony, necessitates the admission that the *polis* as a whole descends from *barbaroi*. Thus, specifically in terms of genealogy, the Athenians are, at best, of mixed heritage and, at worst, not Greeks at all.

The crux of this issue, just as we saw in both of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives is that Greek identity is a complex and mutable idea. The Athenians and Kyrenaians exemplify the truth that barbarians can become Greeks, a fact that Herodotos acknowledges explicitly in his discussion of Athenian heritage: ἀποσχισθὲν μέντοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ ἐὸν ἀσθενές, ἀπό σμικροῦ τεο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁρμώμενον αὔξηται ἐς πλῆθος πολλόν, Πελασγῶν μάλιστα προσκεχωρηκότων αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βαρβάρων

---

[134] "The Attic people, being Pelasgian, learned the Hellenic tongue at the same time as they became Greek." For a discussion of autochthony in the *Histories*, see Pelling 2009, 479–83.

συχνῶν (1.58.1).[135] This flexibility is true of other Hellenic polities in the *Histories* as

well.[136] Conversely, Herodotos demonstrates that cultures regularly considered to be

barbarian can, in fact, have Greek heritage and even be Greek when he describes the

complicated heritage of the Makedonians (5.22, 8.139).[137] This wide ranging discourse on

the origins of the Greek peoples contributes to the image of Hellenic identity emerging

from a network of Greek and non-Greek people.

　　Herodotos complements this vision with his descriptions of the mixed heritage of

Greek customs. In a remarkable discussion of Greek culture's debt to the Egyptians,

Herodotos writes that Greeks learned the proper rituals for the worship of Dionysos

(2.49.1-2), the names for almost all of their gods (2.50.1-2), the conduct of assemblies

(πανήγυρις) and processions (πομπαί) (2.58), and the proper treatment of temples (2.64.1)

from the Egyptians. At other points he acknowledges customs or knowledge that the

Hellenes adopted from the Phoenicians (5.58.1) and the Karians (5.88.1) among others. The

colonial narratives too reinforce the perception of custom as dynamic; for instance, the

Agullaians seek advice from the Delphic oracle and subsequently adopt Hellenic gymnastic

and equestrian contests. As Tim Rood writes, this process of diffusing and absorbing

cultural traditions "blurs the boundaries between different peoples: people change as they

come into contact with others and learn their habits."[138]

---

[135] "Being weak when they split from the Pelasgian people, starting from a small number at first, they have grown into a great crowd because many other barbarian peoples and especially the Pelasgians have joined them." The text is corrupt. I follow Wilson's emendation.

[136] For the barbarian origin of Thebans, see Euripides, fr. 819 Kannicht, Hdt. 2.49; 5.57-61. Herodotos also declares the Ionians to be of the mixed origins (1.146).

[137] The issue of Makedonian heritage and the question of whether or not they are Greek was the subject of consistent debate during the Classical and Hellenistic periods. For more on this see Hall 2001, 168; Hornblower 2013, 117–8.

[138] Rood 2006, 303.

Thus, many episodes in the *Histories* investigate the nature of Greek culture, just as the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives do. Herodotos devotes other parts of his narrative to discussing similar issues like the interrelatedness of Mediterranean culture. Through these micro-narratives we can perceive a representative sample of Herodotos's own ideas about the relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks and the fundamental reality of human identity. The cumulative weight of this discussion induces us to look skeptically on the clearest assertion of the structure of Greek identity, the Athenians' patriotic assertion of Hellenic exceptionalism to the Spartans (8.144.2): αὖθις δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὸν ὅμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι.[139] Each of the four categories (shared blood, language, religion, and custom) that unites the Greek peoples is clearly more complicated than the Athenians let on. In fact, one might convincingly argue from other moments in the *Histories* either that no genuinely Greek people exist or that a great number of *barbaroi* merit this label in addition to those most conventionally termed Hellenes.

Part 2: Colonial Narratives as Herodotean Commentary on Expansionism

Perhaps the most crucial function of the colonial narratives in the *Histories* is their portrayal of the adverse results of aggressive expansionist policies. Apoikism necessitates the occupation and inhabitation of foreign land by one tactic or another. Herodotos shapes

---

[139] "And in turn, Greekness is a matter of being of the same blood and tongue and there are shared shrines and sacrifices of the gods and similar customs, and it would not be a good state of affairs for the Athenians to be their betrayers." This passage has received much attention from scholars. Discussions of the passages and ideas within it include Hall 2002b, 172–205; Bowie 2007, 235–8; Zacharia 2008.

his accounts of the Phokaian expedition and the settlement of Kyrene to emphasize the violence and greed that arise after this. Moreover, as I have demonstrated in the prior chapters, he consistently attests to the fact that this expansionism corrupts the virtue of the society. In the case of the Phokaian narrative, a descent into piracy followed their settlement at Alalia and precipitated a catastrophic naval encounter and the cessation of Phokaian naval prowess. Likewise, the Kyrenaian narrative positively characterizes the settlement of Thera and Kyrene, but notes the breakdown of social order at the *polis* and a string of iniquitous actions after Kyrene further expands into Libya and establishes secondary *apoikiai*, such as Barke.

Indeed, the depiction of the struggling settlements at Kyrene and Alalia exemplifies a principal motif of the *Histories*: the deleterious effects of greed and expansionism on a society.[140] To that end, the characterizations that Herodotos makes in the course of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives specifically align with patterns of Persian and Athenian behavior that he emphasizes elsewhere. In an effort to analyze the various ways in which the foundation stories echo throughout the macro-narrative, my discussion will be in three parts. First, I discuss the reappearance of the Phokaians during the Ionian revolution (6.11-7) as a reminder of the continued decline of the Phokaian people. Next, I describe the similarities between the expansionism involved in the foundation stories and the stories of Kroisos and the conquests of the Persian empire. Lastly, I explore the parallels between the early moments of Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives and the rise of Athens to understand how Herodotos manipulates the history of these *apoikiai* to shape his audience's reception of Athenian expansionism.

---

[140] For a broader discussion of imperialism, expansionism, and communal greed in the *Histories*, see Evans 1991, 9–40; Pelling 1997; Balot 2001, 99–135.

Dionysios of Phokaia and the Continued Decline of Phokaia

The Ionian revolt against Persian rule is a marked event in the narrative of Herodotos. The author, himself an Ionian Greek from Halikarnassos, makes no attempt to restrain his own disdain for the cowardice of the Ionians and their slavish nature.[141] He consistently emphasizes their indolence and their willingness to be governed by tyrants or kings rather than expend the effort necessary for freedom and self-governance. Near the end of the narrative of the Ionian revolt, Herodotos introduces Dionysios of Phokaia, a notably bold and demanding military leader who rises to the leadership of the Ionian fleet and promises victory if the Ionian sailors decide to expend the requisite effort (6.11.2-4). The Ionians, after a week of hard labor, decide that it would be better to accept their destined slavery (τὴν μέλλουσαν δουληίην, 6.12.5) than work any longer. Thus, when the battle finally occurs, Dionysios notes the hopelessness of the Ionian situation, steals three enemy ships and embarks on a journey of piracy, beginning with the Phoenicians and ending with the Carthaginians and Etruscans around Sicily (6.17).

This battle and the narrative surrounding it relate to our discussion in several ways. First, Dionysios carefully chooses his words to recall the earlier Phokaian narrative when he speaks to the Ionians. In particular he begins his speech by declaring, "Ionian men, our affairs are balanced on a razor's edge, whether we are to be free or slaves - and **runaways at that**" (ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἢ εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἢ δούλοισι, καὶ **τούτοισι ὡς δρηπέτῃσι**, 6.11.2). This moment is filled with a sense of déjà vu, recollecting Harpagos, his first conquest of Ionia, and the fall of the Greeks to the

---

[141] For more on Herodotos's characterization of the Ionian revolt, see Baragwanath 2008, 160–202. For a historical discussion of the causation and conduct of the revolt, see Murray 1988.

Persian empire. With his mention of runaways (δρηπέτῃσι), Herodotos especially emphasizes the Phokaians and Teians who fled from Ionia.[142] Dionysios, who almost certainly descended from the Phokaians that refused to abandon their homes and chose to face subjugation, now speaks out against slavery by asserting his own desire to be free rather than a runaway. He echoes his ancestors opposition to leaving Ionia, linking this moment with the earlier narrative. In part, this invocation serves to remind readers of the events of the Phokaian narrative at a crucial juncture in the history because the Ionian revolt precedes and partially causes the Persian invasion of Greece.

Moreover, the reference to the earlier foundation story presents us with an opportunity to see again the condition of the Phokaians, exemplified by Dionysios. The Phokaian sailor has a heroic air to him that recalls the virtues of his ancestors prior to the Persian conquest, but he falls victim to the same vices that they do in Book 1: ὁ δὲ ἰθέως ὡς εἶχε ἔπλεε ἐς Φοινίκην, γαύλους δὲ ἐνθαῦτα καταδύσας καὶ χρήματα λαβὼν πολλὰ ἔπλεε ἐς Σικελίην, ὁρμώμενος δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ληιστὴς κατεστήκεε Ἑλλήνων μὲν οὐδενός, Καρχηδονίων δὲ καὶ Τυρσηνῶν (6.17).[143] His turn to looting the Karthaginians and Etruscans again recalls the Phokaian narrative, specifically the Battle of Alalia. The memory of this battle, entirely the result of the Phokaians' greed and abuse of their neighbors, encourages readers to perceive the descent of Dionysios into piracy as the product of the same vices that ruined his ancestors.

---

[142] δρηπέτης (δραπέτης in Attic) technically refers to a runaway or fugitive, but it is especially used in reference to runaway slaves. Its connotation makes it an appropriate word both for Dionysios's immediate purposes as well as to refer to the earlier events of the narrative. Herodotos, however, does not used the word δρηπέτης to refers to the Phokaians earlier in the *Histories*.

[143] "And he (Dionysios) sailed to Phoenicia as directly as possible, and then, after sinking some merchant vessels and taking a lot of money, he sailed to Sicily. From this point on he established himself as a pirate, attacking the Karthaginians and the Etruscans, but none of the Hellenes."

The reintroduction of the Phokaians, through the character of Dionysios, into the narrative has many implications for our interpretation of the macro-narrative. Dionysios is a stirring character, filled with a near-heroic vigor that is generally absent from the Ionians in Herodotos's narrative. Thus, his role as a reminder of the earlier Phokaian narrative and the destructive effects of their expansionism coupled with his own descent in a similar sequence to his forebears is particularly striking. Most importantly, Herodotos prompts us to recall this pattern of vigorous expansion and moral decline in colonial narratives just before the Persians begin their own incursions into Greece.

Kroisos: The First Warning Against Rampant Expansion

Before discussing the Persians, let us consider the actions of Kroisos, who Herodotos crafts as the first character to exemplify the destructive pattern of avarice and violence directed against neighbors. Indeed, the Phokaian and Kyrenaian micro-narratives participate in a system of behavior that begins with the discussion of Lydian history. Herodotos frames the Kroisos *logos* as a cautionary tale from the outset (1.6.2), citing the infamous Lydian king for his role as the first barbarian to subjugate Greeks (κατεστρέψατο) and force them to pay tribute (ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγήν). From the perspective of specifically imperial practices, the early citation of forced tribute represents a particularly suggestive inclusion on Herodotos's part and indicates the criminality of Kroisos's actions.[144] Kroisos, just as the Persians will, operates on a scale that is both

---

[144] For a discussion of imperial tribute (φόρος) in the *Histories* and its pointedly negative imperialist connotations see Stadter 1992, 795–8.

broader and more complex than either the Phokaians or the Kyrenaians, but the colonial

narratives share structure and themes with the sequence of the Kroisos *logos*.

In chronological order, Herodotos describes Kroisos's rise to hegemony, then

emphasizes the Lydian king's excess in breaking cultural boundaries, and resolves his

discussion with quotes from the Delphic oracle that highlight the seriousness of the tyrant's

misjudgment. This structure echoes the very same sequence that he employed in the

colonial narratives, reflecting a pattern that Herodotos perceives in expansionist polities.[145]

In particular, the narrative attracts attention to the terrible magnitude of Kroisos's

conquests through its enumeration of all fourteen peoples that Kroisos subjugated, three of

whom were Greek tribes (Ἴωνες, Δωριέες, Αἰολέες, 1.28). Kroisos embodies an excess in his

conquests and a rapacity that only the Persian emperors exceed over the course of the

Histories.[146]

Despite his lust for conquest, Kroisos's initial victories are not responsible for his

eventual downfall. Instead, it is his own misinterpretation of an oracle and subsequent

traversing of physical and cultural boundaries that result in the end of Lydian hegemony.[147]

In a pattern that resembles the events of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narrative alike,

Kroisos asks the Pythia about his desire to cross the Halys river and invade Persia and,

upon hearing the answer, interprets the oracle's response as an encouragement of his own

interests. The gods, ever vague and ambiguous, advise him that "he will destroy a great

---

[145] For more on patterns of expansion in Herodotos's narrative, see Pelling 2006, 153–5.
[146] Herodotos provides a similar but even longer list of people subjugated by the Persians when he enumerates the tribute that various polities owed to the Persian empire at 3.90-5.
[147] The Kroisus *logos* is one of the most discussed sections in the entirety of the *Histories*. It is generally understood to be representative of the major concepts of the broader macro-narrative and to function as a sort of introduction to readers that guides ideal interpretation of later events. For discussions of the micro-narrative, see Kindt 2006; Pelling 2006.

empire if he marches on Persia" (οἱ μὲν ταῦτα ἐπειρώτων, τῶν δὲ μαντηίων ἀμφοτέρων ἐς

τὠυτὸ αἱ γνῶμαι συνέδραμον, προλέγουσαι Κροίσῳ, ἢν στρατεύηται ἐπὶ Πέρσας, μεγάλην

ἀρχὴν μιν καταλύσειν, 1.53.3).[148] Herodotos writes that Kroisos was overjoyed by this

response, "expecting very much to destroy the kingdom of Kyros" (πάγχυ τε ἐλπίσας

καταλύσειν τὴν Κύρου βασιληίην, 1.54.1). In the same manner that the Phokaians will

misinterpret the meaning of their oracle, Kroisos fails to understand the significance of the

Pythia's words. This negligence to properly appreciate divine will is a hallmark of the

violent expansionist policies that characterize the colonial narratives and the Kroisos *logos*

alike.

Furthermore, Herodotos explicitly details the geography of the Halys River, the

border between the territory of the Lydian and Persian empires, in order to emphasize the

significance of physical boundaries between peoples and the consequences of breaching

them. In the buildup to the military expedition, he declares, "For the border of the empire

of the Medes and that of the Lydians was the Halys River" (ὁ γὰρ οὖρος ἦν τῆς τε Μηδικῆς

ἀρχῆς καὶ τῆς Λυδικῆς ὁ Ἅλυς ποταμός, 1.72.1). Herodotos emphasizes the river's

significance as a physical and cultural boundary by describing it at length (1.72-5). In doing

so, he underscores the significance of the river as the physical border between Asia Minor

and Persian territory, but also a cultural border that divides the territory via an oath sworn

by both peoples (1.74).[149] Likewise, Herodotos presents an anecdote, though he later

disavows it, that describes Kroisos as having actually altered the course of the river to

invade Persia (1.75.4-6). Thus, the breach of this boundary exceeds cultural mores and

---

[148] "They asked these things, and the judgments of both oracles agreed, saying to Kroisos that if he marched on Persia, he would destroy a great empire."

[149] For discussions of the role of physical boundaries in the *Histories*, see Immerwahr 1966; Harrison 2007.

societal expectations and is predicated on a misinterpretation of divine will. The behavior

of Kroisos here resonates with the later sovereigns of the Battiad dynasty who expanded

the boundaries of Kyrene beyond their natural position and continuously thirsted to regain

control of their *polis* despite the violence it involved.

In a similar way to how Arkesileos III died after violently pursuing power against

warnings of the Pythia, Kroisos receives a fate that befits his expansionism and excessive

desire for conquest. The Lydian empire, like the polities of our colonial narratives, is

humbled by a neighbor. Furthermore, Herodotos instructs his readers to interpret the

doom of Kroisos as the product of his own failures to properly respond to divine will. In a

remarkable defense of her own prophecy, the Pythia describes Kroisos's own

misinterpretation of divine will:

> κατὰ δὲ τὸ μαντήιον τὸ γενόμενον οὐκ ὀρθῶς Κροῖσος μέμφεται· προηγόρευε γὰρ οἱ Λοξίης, ἢν στρατεύηται ἐπὶ Πέρσας, μεγάλην ἀρχὴν αὐτὸν καταλύσειν. τὸν δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα χρῆν εὖ μέλλοντα βουλεύεσθαι ἐπειρέσθαι πέμψαντα κότερα τὴν ἑωυτοῦ ἢ τὴν Κύρου λέγοι ἀρχήν. οὐ συλλαβὼν δὲ τὸ ῥηθὲν οὐδ' ἐπανειρόμενος **ἑωυτὸν αἴτιον ἀποφαινέτω**· (1.91.4)

> And with respect to the earlier oracle, Kroisos does not blame it correctly. For, Loxias prophesied to him that he would destroy a great empire if he marched on Persia. And if he was going to consider in a proper was as regards these things, he should have sent someone to ask whether he was talking about his own empire or that of Kyros. But because he did not comprehend the declaration and inquired into nothing, **let him show himself to be responsible**.

The Pythia's honest response to Kroisos's inquiry demonstrates Herodotos's own belief in

the necessity of human meditation on divine will. Kroisos interpreted the declaration of

Apollo within the confines of his own desires, thinking himself fit to understand the subtext

of divine speech. Unlike many other episodes in the *Histories*, Herodotos explicitly details

the failure of the Lydian king here and goes even further to show that the gods hold him

personally responsible. At later moments, the narrative expects readers to infer that the

failures of other peoples in matters of divine will occur because of the same errors that Kroisos committed.[150]

Thus, the Kroisos *logos* is intimately bound to the issues of divine will and expansionism that pervade the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives. Through a brief analysis of some particularly important moments in Herodotos's history, we can perceive that he shapes Kroisos as an example of the consequences that follow the immoderate pursuit of power and land. The Phokaians were humbled for their piracy, the Kyrenaians capitulated to Persian rule as a consequence of their own rapacity, and the Lydians became Persian subjects as a result of their own overzealous pursuits and lack of respect for their neighbors. These narratives resonate with one another to help us understand the argument against expansionism within the *Histories.*

Apoikism *and Persian Expansionism*

The Persians particularly exemplify the pattern of expansion that we see in the colonial narratives. Furthermore, the Persians are intimately bound with the foundation stories in the *Histories* because the conquests of Kyros and Kambyses provide the context for Herodotos to recount the histories of these *apoikiai.* Through several examples of the imperialist actions and debates of the Persians we will see how their behavior resonates with that of the Kyrenaians and Phokaians. Indeed the histories of all three peoples present a similar trajectory of success, expansion, and then failure that reflects the macro-narrative's treatment of imperialism.

---

[150] Another similar instance of divine will interpreted for personal gain is the story of Euenos and the Apollonians (9.93-4). For more on this pattern in Herodotos, see Stadter 1992, 792–4.

As was the case with Kroisos, Herotodos regularly depicts the Persians exceeding their own boundaries.[151] The Persians' arrival at Delos (6.97-8) and Xerxes's excavation of a canal past Mount Athos (7.22-4) typify a disinterest in observing the natural boundaries of human society. Furthermore, the narrative repeatedly displays the excessive violence of the Persian kings, for instance Kambyses's mangling of the corpse of Amasis (3.16.1-4) and Xerxes's mutilation of the body of Leonidas (7.238.1). We can see these actions as analogous to the brutality of Arkesileos III and Pheretime, consistent with the conventional behavior of tyrants.[152] So entrenched is the need to conquer new lands in Persian culture that Herodotos depicts the expansionism itself as a *nomos* of the Persian people (3.134; 7.8).[153] Thus, the Persians occupy a privileged position within the *Histories* as a population that has so thoroughly embraced the greed and desire for conquest that war has become customary to them. While the colonial narratives depict polities declining because of their own greed, the Persians represent the end product of this sequence, a society that is defined by a need to expand.

None of this is to say that Herodotos presents the Persians as an entirely negative example. At times, Herodotos describes the Persians with exceedingly positive language and attributes impressive bravery to some of their rulers and warriors.[154] This layered

---

[151] Scullion 2006, 193 argues that Herodotos does not look negatively upon breaches of cultural boundaries but is, in fact, intrigued by them. Stadter 1992, 785–95; Munson 2001, 85–7 argue to the contrary. The fascination of Herodotos with the breaching of geographical boundaries also does not necessitate his approval of them.

[152] For the similarities and personal ties shared by Greek tyrants and Persian kings in the *Histories*, see Austin 1990, 302–6

[153] The characterization of expansionism and conquest as a *nomos* of the Persian culture has consequences for how we should understand Persian behavior in the *Histories*. For more on this topic, see Fisher 1992, 370–3; Baragwanath 2008, 242–9.

[154] For more on the complex relationship between Herodotus and the Persians, see Flower 2006.

depiction of the Persians also echoes the images of the colonial populations in that they possess noble and virtuous qualities but have nevertheless fallen prey to their own desires.

The final micro-narrative of the *Histories* (9.122) provides the most relevant point to compare the colonial narratives to Persian behavior. Herodotos frames the micro-narrative as a flashback in which Artembares and Kyros discuss whether or not the Persians should move beyond their own boundaries to take another land. This passage has received thorough discussion from scholars for its commentary on Persian and Athenian expansionism as well as ancient theories of cultural dynamics (i.e. hard and soft cultures).[155]

The passage also resembles a discussion of the foundation of *apoikiai*. Artembares and Kyros depict any future territories as desirable and wondrous in a manner similar to how Herodotos presented Libya as what Emily Baragawanath calls an "object of desire" that is ripe for settlement.[156] For instance, Artembares tells Kyros that they currently possess a scant (ὀλίγην) and rugged (τρηχέαν) country, but that if they seized a better land they will be more admirable for many reasons (τῶν μίαν σχόντες πλέοσι ἐσόμεθα θωμαστότεροι, 9.122.2). Kyros responds negatively that, "in no way does the same land produce wondrous fruit and men capable in war" (οὐ γάρ τι τῆς αὐτῆς γῆς εἶναι καρπόν τε θωμαστὸν φύειν καὶ ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς τὰ πολέμια, 9.122.3). The words that I translate as "admirable" and "wondrous" are forms of the same Greek adjective θαυμαστός. The debate between Artembares and Kyros could easily be construed as a debate over whether or not send out an expedition to found an *apoikia*. The yearning for specifically better land and

---

[155] Some considerations of the passage include Munson, 2009, 469–70; Pelling, 1997; Stadter, 1992, 806–9.
[156] Baragwanath 2017.

better agricultural produce especially recalls the Kyrenaian narrative because of the polity's extended search for a desirable site for their *polis* and the eventual gain they receive from the region's climate. Herodotos calls the three seasons of Kyrene's harvest "worthy of wonder" (ἀξίας θώματος, 4.199.1), again using a form of θωμαστός.

Thus, the relationship between the characterization of Persia and *apoikiai* in the *Histories* demonstrates the similarities between the process of apoikism and imperial expansion in the mind of Herodotos. The Phokaians and Kyrenaians' settlement abroad and subsequent failure to interact moderately with their neighbors recalls the Persians' own particularly excessive expansionist policies. Within the frame of the *Histories*, the two contexts clearly produce similar societies and have the potential to end in the same severe communal iniquities.

Phokaia, Kyrene, and the Beginnings of the Athenian Arkhē

In Chapter 1, I noted several similarities between the Phokaian narrative and the events that occur at Athens (see pages 16-7) in the *Histories*. Indeed, the likenesses between the colonial narratives and the birth and expansion of the Athenian thalassocracy demand special attention if we are to understand fully the role of foundation stories in Herodotos's project.

The *Histories* pointedly manipulates the similarities between the Phokaian narrative and the account of Athens's more recent history in order to comment on and critique contemporary Athenian policies. This intricate composition involves first elevating the Athenians and describing their excellence, similar to the quasi-heroic descriptions of the

Phokaians. While glorying in the accomplishments of the Athenians, however, the history

also links the history of the *polis* to the Phokaian narrative through the polities' shared

reputation for naval prowess and expansionist policies. As we will see, Herodotos

illustrates the emergence of moral flaws among the Athenian people near the end of the

history that recall the decline of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian peoples, suggesting a

connection between specific patterns of expansionist behavior and societal well-being.

First, we must recognize the similarities between Athens, Kyrene and Phokaia in the

Histories, because these shared traits encourage the perception that these three polities all

follow a similar pattern. In particular the Phokaians and the Athenians pursue quite similar

paths. Both polities are famous naval powers that are renowned for facilitating and

conducting trade throughout the Mediterranean.[157] Likewise, the citizens of both Athens

and Phokaia choose to abandon their *polis* in order to ensure a life of freedom rather than

subjugation by the Persians.[158] The expansionism of Kyrene and Phokaia result in a

multitude of disasters for their citizens, many predicated on the disruption of their capacity

to engage productively with neighbors.

Herodotos characterizes Athenian behavior early in the *Histories* in a manner that

resembles that of the Phokaians and Kyreanians; he specifically describes Athens as a

metropolis whose settlers harm neighboring populations. We hear of Athens's role in the

Ionian migration (1.143-7), an expansion that Herodotos conflates with violence.

Specifically he writes that they murdered Karians and abducted their daughters to help

populate their new *poleis* (οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρυτανηίου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὁρμηθέντες καὶ

---

[157] For Herodotos's consideration of the seafaring of the Phokaians and Athenians, see 1.163.1-3 (Phokaians) and 7.144.1, 8.17-8 (Athenians).
[158] The Phokaians (1.164) and the Athenians (8.49-50) abandon their *poleis*. For my discussion of this topic, see pages 16-7.

νομίζοντες γενναιότατοι εἶναι Ἰώνων, οὗτοι δὲ οὐ γυναῖκας ἠγάγοντο ἐς τὴν ἀποικίην ἀλλὰ

Καείρας ἔσχον, τῶν ἐφόνευσαν τοὺς γονέας, 1.146.2).[159] Thus, Athens behaves no

differently in this early period from other *metropoleis,* and its actions during the process of

settlement are by no means unique. In fact, violence and ill-will towards neighboring

populations is a characteristic common to *apoikiai* in the *Histories.* Thus, the early history

of Athens suggests the possibility of future imperialist tendencies like those that we have

noted in the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives.

Nevertheless, most early mentions of Athens praise the *polis* and its citizens for their

virtue and excellence.[160] Whereas Herodotos lauded the Phokaians specifically for their

exceptional sailing abilities (1.163.1-3) and described at length the Kyrenaians'

mythological heritage (4.147; 154-6), he provides a much broader praise of Athens. He

proclaims the excellence of the polity most visibly at the foundation of the Athenian

democracy with specific relation to their newfound political equality (ἰσηγορίη). In

particular, Herodotos praises the Athenians following their victory over the Boeotians and

Khalkidians:

> Ἀθηναῖοι μέν νυν ηὔξηντο· δηλοῖ δὲ οὐ κατ' ἓν μοῦνον ἀλλὰ πανταχῇ ἡ **ἰσηγορίη ὡς ἐστί χρῆμα σπουδαῖον**, εἰ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τυραννευόμενοι μὲν οὐδαμῶν τῶν σφέας περιοικεόντων ἦσαν τὰ πολέμια ἀμείνους, ἀπαλλαχθέντες δὲ τυράννων **μακρῷ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο**. δηλοῖ ὦν ταῦτα ὅτι κατεχόμενοι μὲν ἐθελοκάκεον ὡς δεσπότῃ ἐργαζόμενοι, ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑωυτῷ προεθυμέετο κατεργάζεσθαι. (5.78)

> The Athenians now grew in strength. And it is clear not in one way but in all sorts of ways **that political equality is an excellent thing**. For when the Athenians were

---

[159] "Including among these people are the ones who started out from the *Prytaneion* of the Athenians and think themselves to be the most noble of Ionians. These men did not lead women into their *apoikia*, but took Karian woman, whose parents they murdered."

[160] Herodotos praises the Athenians elsewhere in the first half of his narrative: one of the two best Greek polities (1.56.2), the overthrow of the tyranny (5.55-65), Solon as an exemplary citizen (1.30-3).

> ruled by a tyrant they were better than none of their neighbors in war, but when they were freed from tyrants, **they became the first by much.** These matters clearly show, then, that when they were held back they behaved cowardly as constrained by a master, but when they were set free, each man was eager to labor for himself.

This declaration asserts the special virtue of the Athenian *politeia* and specifically explains the exceptional nature of Athens.[161] Prior to the events of the Persian War, this moment asserts the role of Athens as one of the foremost Hellenic polities. Moreover, Herodotos clearly emphasizes the freedom of the Athenians and the importance of political equality and self-governance to the flourishing of a polity.

The moment is not without nuance, however, for the expansionist policies of Athens reappear at the very same moment that Herodotos declares their preeminence. Between the dual Athenian triumphs over the Boeotians and the Khalkidians and his deliberation on the importance of ἰσηγορίη to Athens, Herodotos notes the settling of Athenian citizens in Eretria (νικήσαντες δὲ καὶ τούτους τετρακισχιλίους κληρούχους ἐπὶ τῶν ἱπποβοτέων τῇ χώρῃ λείπουσι, 5.77.2).[162] At this moment, the Athenians restart the process of expanding their own authority through settling their citizens abroad. The attainment of freedom at Athens becomes intertwined with the expansionist policy of the *polis*.[163] Herodotos suggests the significance of this event through the description of the settled population as

---

[161] For more on this passage and the dynamics surrounding the foundation of the Athenian democracy, see Ward 2008, 119–35.

[162] "They were victorious and left these 4,000 *kleroukhoi* in the country of the horse feeders (Euboia)."

[163] For more on the role of expansionism in Herodotos's depiction of the Athenian Empire and the relationship between freedom and empire, see Harrison 2009; Hornblower 2013, 226.

κληρούχους, *kleroukhoi* being a central component of the conquests of the Athenian *arkhē*.[164]

The Athenians begin to maltreat their neighbors and engage in conquests that recall the events of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narrative. Just as Kyrene expanded its hegemony throughout Libya, Herodotos describes multiple Athenian attempts to found *apoikiai* and assert their own authority abroad. The Athenians, led by Miltiades, son of Kypselos, founded an *apoikia* in the Thracian Chersonese by walling off the isthmus against neighboring populations (6.35-40). Here the *Histories* enumerates the various wars and difficulties that met them in their endeavour. Likewise, the narrative attests that another Miltiades, this the hero of Marathon and nephew of the earlier Miltiades, convinced the Athenians to grant him a navy to sack Paros by promising to make them rich (καταπλουτιεῖν) with gold that could be easily borne away (ὅθεν χρυσὸν εὐπετέως ἄφθονον οἴσονται, 6.132). Just as the expedition of his uncle met with a great many problems, the voracity of the Athenians at Paros does not end with glory and plunder but instead with utter failure. These historical events specifically hinge on increasingly rapacious policies at Athens.

The cumulative effects of Athenian expansionism have consequences for the moral fortitude of the *polis* as Athens begins to overlook some of its ties of cultural *philia*. Throughout the Persian War, the *polis* opportunistically asserts its hegemony over other Greeks. We can observe this in Herodotos's comment that the Athenians seize leadership of

---

[164] Suggestively, the term is only used twice in the *Histories* and both moments reference the Athenians settled at Eretria (6.100.1). For more on the significance of the reference to *kleroukhoi* to the *Histories,* see Hornblower 2013, 222–3. For a historical discussion of origin of the word, its meaning, and its use specifically as a form of control that is both imperial and colonial, see Figueira 1991, 41–53, 176–215.

the Hellenic navy after the war's end (8.3.2).[165] Yet more indicative of the moral decline of

Athens is Themistokles's extortion of Greek island states like Andros, Karystos, and Paros

(8.111-2) in the midst of an active war.[166] This violent behavior towards neighboring states

resembles the piracy of Phokaia, a similar sort of financial abuse, at the same time that it

looks forward to the future offenses of the Athenian *arkhē*. As Wolfgang Blösel writes, these

characterizations were specifically intended to address concerns about contemporary

Athenian behavior and "to warn them [the Athenians] of the dangers of unjust ἀρχή over

other Greeks."[167]

Beyond shared themes, the connection between Athens and the colonial narratives

of the history becomes even more explicit as the narrative progresses. In the dying

moments of the Persian War, the set of conclusions about apoikism and its potential

consequences that we have drawn throughout the *Histories* come to the fore. During the

debate over whether the Ionians should be relocated to mainland Greece or stand their

ground and remain in Asia Minor, two clear opinions emerge. The Spartans advocate for

their resettlement, while the Athenians refuse to allow Dorians to dictate policy in Ionia.

The Athenians frame their argument with their role as *metropolis* to the *apoikiai*:

Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκεε **ἀρχὴν Ἰωνίην** γενέσθαι ἀνάστατον οὐδὲ Πελοποννησίους **περὶ**

τῶν σφετέρων ἀποικιέων βουλεύειν (9.106.3).[168] The debate resolves in the Athenians'

favor and the Greeks accept the *poleis* of Ionia into the Hellenic League, a predecessor of the

---

[165] On the complicated nature of Athenian identity, in particular the tension between Athenian freedom and imperialism, see Stadter 2006, 247–50.

[166] Some scholars argue that Herodotos crafts his description of Themistokles in a manner that invokes the behavior of contemporary Athens (Blösel 2001, 190–7).

[167] Blösel 2001, 197.

[168] "It did not seem fit to the Athenians that the Ionian empire be abandoned nor to deliberate with the Peloponnesians concerning their own *apoikiai*."

Delian League and after that the Athenian *arkhē*.[169] This moment is a major nexus in the course of the *Histories* where the events of Herodotos's narrative converge with the contemporary events of Herodotos's lifetime. We can perceive the clear relationship here between the practice of apoikism and the fomenting of expansionism because it is Athens's very identity as a *metropolis* that legitimizes her argument. The many conclusions that have become clear from our close readings of the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives manifest in this moment, when the Athenians cite their colonial past as a rationale for further expansionism and control beyond their borders. Herodotos links the practice and results of apoikism with the future of Athens with all of the connotations that these micro-narratives bear with them. He calls attention to the cyclical nature of history and, with his description of the struggles of Phokaia and Kyrene, warns against the repetition of old mistakes.

Part 3: Divine Punishment for Human Error

The *Histories* presents divine will as a persistent force that affects individuals and societies in the macro-narrative just as it affects people and communities in the colonial narratives. Most importantly, Herodotos continuously demonstrates that divine punishments result from human misbehavior rather than chance alone. At various points in the *Histories* he establishes the responsibility of individuals to correctly interpret and honor the will of the gods or risk penalty. Likewise, he describes the hardships that people endure because of the gods as a product of their own failures, whether misinterpretation of an oracle or breaking an oath.

---

[169] For a discussion of the Hellenic League and its reception by various ancient authors, see Yates 2015.

Herodotos's narrative consistently demonstrates the causal relationship between humans' misinterpretation of divine will and their ensuing misfortunes.[170] This pattern emerged clearly in the course of the colonial narratives. The Phokaians's failure to recognize that the Pythia had instructed them to worship Kurnos rather than establish an *apoikia* at Kurnos impacted the history of the Phokaian polity. Likewise, the misinterpretation of a Pythian oracle seeming to encourage settlement at Kyrene produced an overpopulation problem that exacerbated inter- and intra-*polis* relationships at the site.

Kroisos's misinterpretation of the Pythian oracle (1.53.2-3) is perhaps the clearest equivalent to the failures of the *apoikiai,* as we have discussed previously (see pages 87-90). Many other narratives exhibit this behavior within the *Histories.* In particular, Kambyses's own failure to interpret divine will recalls the failures of the Phokaians. Visited by a dream in which a messenger announced that Smerdis had taken his throne, Kambyses immediately resolved to kill his brother Smerdis (3.30.2-3). It was only later, however, that he recognized his failure: πάντως δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι ἁμαρτὼν ἀδελφεοκτόνος τε οὐδὲν δέον γέγονα καὶ τῆς βασιληίης οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἐστέρημαι· Σμέρδις γὰρ δὴ ἦν ὁ μάγος τόν μοι ὁ δαίμων προέφαινε ἐν τῇ ὄψι ἐπαναστήσεσθαι (3.65.4).[171] Once again the crucial interpretation of divine will hinged on the proper understanding of a single word. Just as the Phokaians misinterpreted what the Pythia intended by Kurnos, so Kambyses chose the wrong Smerdis.

---

[170] Indeed, Rodkey writes that "Herodotus holds oracle-recipients morally responsible for their oracular interpretations, whether correct or incorrect." Rodkey 2015, 161.

[171] "I entirely missed the mark of what was to be; I became a fratricide with no need and was no less deprived of my kingdom. For indeed, it was Smerdis the Magos who the god pronounced to me in my dream would revolt."

Similarly, the death of Polykrates follows a pattern of human neglect of oracles that recalls the errors that resulted in the death of Arkesileos III. In a twofold oracle, the Pythia warned Arkesileos III not to pursue violence at home and, cryptically, not to bake a kiln full of amphorae. He neglected all of this advice and was murdered by the Barkaians after burning a tower to the ground that had been filled with his political opponents (for more on this oracle, see pages 66-7, 69-71). Similarly, both the *manteis* and his own daughter warned Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos, against sailing to meet with the Persian Oroetes. In particular, Herodotos notes that the daughter of Polykrates had had a dream where she had seen him hanging (ἐδόκεε οἱ τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ἠέρι μετέωρον ἐόντα λοῦσθαι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός, χρίεσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡλίου, 3.124.1).[172] The Samian tyrant ignored the portent entirely and so was crucified, fulfilling the oracle to the last word (3.125.4). At another point, Herodotos notes similar behavior by the Siphnians (3.57-8). Indeed, many divine punishments in the course of the narrative result not from any sort of chance but instead from human error. Regardless of whether the oracles appear in the course of the foundation stories or elsewhere, the results are consistent throughout the *Histories* for any who misinterpret them.

Lastly, the swearing of oaths occurs elsewhere in the *Histories* beyond the events of the Phokaian narrative (1.165.2-3) and merits some consideration. So far as we can tell, the Phokaians who break their oaths and return to Ionia receive no clear punishment, a phenomenon that is distinct in the macro-narrative where oath-breakers generally face

---

[172] "It seemed to her that her father was hanging in the air to be washed by Zeus, and to be anointed by Helios."

severe penalties.[173] That is not the case with their compatriots, the migrating Phokaians,

although those who departed for Italy probably received their punishments for their

misinterpretation of the Pythian oracle rather than the oath.[174]

Regardless, oaths occur with limited frequency in the history and receive generally

consistent treatment by Herodotos. Just as is the case with oracles and visions in the

Histories, Herodotos adopts a fairly unforgiving stance to willful failure to maintain oaths.

He articulates the implications of a violated oath most clearly in his discussion of

Leotykhides and the Athenians (6.86-7). Leotykhides, attempting to convince the Athenians

to stay true to a commitment, tells them a story about a man who broke his oath to a

stranger from Miletos. The gods punished this man, Glaukos, by eradicating his family line

(Γλαύκου νῦν οὔτε τι ἀπόγονον ἔστι οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἰστίη οὐδεμία νομιζομένη εἶναι Γλαύκου,

ἐκτέτριπταί τε πρόρριζος ἐκ Σπάρτης. 6.86D).[175] Having not only told his story but also

summarized its significance, Leotykhides still fails to convince the Athenians (6.87-94).[176]

The message that Leotykhides seeks to convey to the Athenians is explicit and defined

absolutely: it is the responsibility of a human to fully and precisely honor agreements and

oaths.

---

[173] Sommerstein and Torrance 2014, 299–303 argues that the most likely conclusion we are to draw from the situation is that the divine punishment for the Phokaian perjurers was likely delayed and could be expected at some point in the future. The continued existence of Phokaia in the time of Herodotos may have prohibited him from writing anything too direct.

[174] I discuss this at greater length pages 31-3.

[175] "Now there is not any descendent of Glaukos nor any family bearing the name of Glaukos; he has been utterly wiped out of Sparta."

[176] Leotykhides's final exclamation does well to summarize the message of the anecdote: οὕτω ἀγαθὸν μηδὲ διανοέεσθαι περὶ παρακαταθήκης ἄλλο γε ἢ ἀπαιτεόντων ἀποδιδόναι (6.86D). "So it is good not to think about something entrusted to your care other than to give it back when asked for."

Thus, the role of divine will in the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives is much the same as its role throughout the *Histories*. Whether divine punishments are enacted for the misinterpretation of divine will or the breach of oaths, Herodotos clearly underscores the importance of human error to incurring the wrath of the gods. Though the *Histories* is at times cagey in discussions of any sort of religious universality, there is consistency in its treatment of oracles and divine will as demonstrated by the connections between foundation stories and the rest of the narrative.[177]

From the collected analyses of this chapter, it is clear that the foundation stories are deeply interrelated with the overarching narrative of the *Histories* as well as its many digressions. The Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives are multivalent stories that address a broad variety of themes that resonate throughout the macro-narrative. Most importantly, colonial narratives negotiate between Hellenic and non-Hellenic cultures and present the ethical and political issues that accompany cultural and geographical expansion. Because of this capacity, Herodotos inserts these stories to comment upon the Persian and Athenian expansionism that comprises much of his history. Furthermore, these micro-narratives also afford him an opportunity to comment upon (and, to a degree, reject) the divide between Greeks and *barbaroi*.

The insights that we draw from the Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives echo throughout the *Histories* at some of its most important moments: the Kroisos *logos*, the Ionian revolt, Xerxes's crossing of the Hellespont, and the aftermath of the Hellenic victory over the Persians. The *Histories* encourages the view of history as interrelated. Herodotos

---

[177] For a discussion of Herodotos's ambiguous treatment of religion, see Gould 2013.

constantly seeks to demonstrate the cyclical nature of human history and to combat its

most damaging patterns.

CONCLUSION: THE ROLE OF COLONIAL NARRATIVES

Throughout this thesis I have endeavored to demonstrate the crucial role that colonial narratives play as nexuses of thematic significance throughout the macro-narrative of the *Histories*. The Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives, though of vastly different lengths, both address similar thematic issues and present a relatively unified idea of the relationship of the Greek people to the broader Mediterranean context. Herodotos not only uses these foundation stories to comment on issues of Hellenic identity, but he also crafts them to comment upon broader religious and ethical issues. The colonial narratives serve as powerful proofs of the dangers of expansionism to the moral core of a society and to its prosperity. They provide an example of Hellenes participating in violent and avaricious behavior. The actions of the Phokaians and the Kyrenaians correspond with those of non-Greek tyrants like Kroisos and the Persian kings and so contribute to a consistent warning against imperialism and the abuse of neighbors. Furthermore, they emphasize the risks that the Athenian *arkhē* was running during the time of Herodotos's composition.

The Phokaian and Kyrenaian narratives are distinct in the *Histories* as the most complete examples of foundation stories that result in a successful *apoikia*, but there are other examples.[178] In particular, the Dorieus episode (5.39-48) provides a powerful

---

[178] Other narratives that relate to apoikism include the Lydians at Tyrrhenia (1.94.5-7), the Phoenicians at Thasos (2.44.4), the Corinthians at Kerkyra (3.49.1), and the Lindians at Zankle (7.153.1).

example of the worst kind of colonial expedition.[179] Both of our *apoikiai* found their origins

in Delphic oracles, as was customary. Dorieus, however, observed no actions that were

expected of an *oikistēs*, but simply decided to found a *polis* (αἰτήσας λεὼν Σπαρτιήτας ἦγε

ἐς ἀποικίην, οὔτε τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι χρηστηρίῳ χρησάμενος ἐς ἥντινα γῆν κτίσων ἴῃ, οὔτε

ποιήσας οὐδὲν τῶν νομιζομένων, 5.42.2).[180]

What follows is a deluge of misadventures. The expedition of Dorieus becomes

involved in a litany of battles: first with the Makai, Libyans, and Karthaginians (5.42.3);

next with the Sybarites (5.44.1); then with the Phoenicians and Egestans (5.46.1); and

finally with the Segestans (5.46.2). Even after securing the advice of the oracle at Delphi

(5.43.1), Dorieus and his company do not exercise any sort of restraint but abuse every

population they encounter, regardless of whether they are *barbaroi* or Hellenes. So

excessive is the desire of Dorieus and the other Spartan settlers that they found no *apoikia*

but instead all perish in the many battles they initiate. Herodotos acknowledges that one of

the members of the expedition was successful in installing himself as tyrant of Selinus, but

even he met a violent death, killed by his own citizens while he sought sanctuary at an altar

to Zeus (5.46.2). This digression presents the worst possible series of events that could

occur in a colonial expedition because of the Spartans' irreverence toward custom and

divine will and their excessive expansionism.

Remarkably, Herodotos presents a judgment that is instructive for how we ought to

perceive the role of colonial narratives, and indeed, expansionist policies, in the entirety of

---

[179] For a discussion of the role of the Dorieus micro-narrative within the *Histories*, see Hornblower 2013, 148–9.

[180] "Having asked the Spartans for a group of people, he led them to an *apoikia*. He did not ask the Delphic oracle what land he should go to as a founder, nor did he do anything of what is customary." Considering this passage, Hornblower 2013, 154 writes that the decision to not consult the Pythian oracle was widely thought of as "dangerous" and that "the negative presentation is emphatic."

the *Histories*. Admonishing, Dorieus's avarice he writes, "For indeed, if he had done nothing

improperly and did what he had set out to do, he would have seized the land of Eryx and,

having taken it, he would have held it. And he and his army would not have been

destroyed" (εἰ γὰρ δὴ μὴ παρέπρηξε μηδέν, ἐπ᾽ ὃ δὲ ἐστάλη ἐποίεε, εἷλε ἂν τὴν Ἐρυκίνην

χώρην καὶ ἑλὼν κατέσχε, οὐδ᾽ ἂν αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ στρατιὴ διεφθάρη. 5.45.1). That an *oikistēs*

and settlers ought to do nothing beyond the settling of their *apoikia* is an appropriate

conclusion to draw from all of the foundation stories of the *Histories*.

Thus, we can perceive a unified purpose for the colonial narratives of Herodotos's

history. These stories consistently assert the value of moderation in settlement and the

importance of the adequate interpretation of divine will. They serve as touchstone

moments where Herodotos discusses critical themes that resonate throughout his

narrative. The foundation story and the concept of apoikism are valuable tools in the

assertion of ethical and practical behavior throughout the *Histories*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asheri, D., A.B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus I-IV*. Ed. Oswin Murray and Alfonso Moreno. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Attema, P. 2008. "Conflict or Coexistence? Remarks on Indigenous Settlement and Greek Colonization in the Foothills and Hinterland of the Sibaritide (Northern Calabria, Italy)." In *Meetings of Cultures in the Black Sea Region: Between Conflict and Coexistence (Black Sea Studies)*, edited by P.G. Bilde and J.H. Petersen, 67–99. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Austin, M. 1990. "Greek Tyrants and the Persians, 546-479 B.C." *Classical Quarterly* 40: 289–306.

———. 2008. "The Greeks in Libya." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account Of Greek Colonies And Other Settlements Overseas. Volume Two*, edited by G. Tsetskhladze, 187–218. Leiden: Brill.

de Bakker, M. 2016. "Herodotus on Maps and How to View the World." In *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*, edited by E. Barker, S. Bouzarovski, C. Pelling, and L. Isaksen, 81–100. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balot, R.K. 2001. *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

———. 2012. "The Mythic Plupast in Herodotus." In *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography*, edited by J. Grethlein and C.B. Krebs, 35–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2015. "Characterization in Herodotus." In *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterization in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, edited by R. Ash, J. Mossman, and F.B. Titchener, 17–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017 (Forthcoming). "History, Ethnography, and Aetiology in the Libyan Logos." In *Shaping of the Past: Greek Historiography and Epigraphic Memory*, edited by C. Konstantokopoulou and M. Fragoulaki. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Belfiore, E.S. 2000. *Murder Among Friends: Violation of Philia in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blösel, W. 2001. "The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: A Mirror of Fifth-century Athens." In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by N. Luraghi, 179–97. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boardman, J. 2001. "Aspects of 'Colonization.'" *Bulleting of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322: 33–42.

Bouzarovski, S., and E. Barker. 2016. "Movements and Transformations in Herodotean Topology." In *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*, edited by E. Barker, S. Bouzarovski, C. Pelling, and L. Isaksen, 155–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowie, A. 2006. "Herodotus on Survival: City or Countryside." In *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*, edited by I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen, 119–38. Leiden: Brill.

Bowie, A.M., ed. 2007. *Herodotus: Histories: Book VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calame, C. 2003. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2014. "Narrative Semantics and Pragmatics: The Poetic Creation of Cyrene." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, edited by L. Edmunds, 280–352. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Casson, L. 1971. *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chamoux, F. 1953. *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*. Paris: Éditions de Boccard.

Darshan, G. 2014. "The Origins of the Foundation Stories Genre in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Eastern Mediterranean." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133: 689–709.

Dewald, C. 1998. "Explanatory Notes." In *Herodotus: The Histories*, edited by R. Waterfield, 594–736. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1999. "The Figured Stage: Focalizing the Initial Narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides." In *Contextualizing Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue*, edited by T.M. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan, 221–52. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

———. 2012. "Myth and Legend in Herodotus' First Book." In *Myth, Truth & Narrative in Herodotus' Histories*, edited by E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker, 59–85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dominguez, A.J. 2004. "Greek Identity in the Phocaean Colonies." In *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton*, edited by K. Lomas, 429–56. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2011. "The Origins of Greek Colonisation and the Greek *Polis*." *Ancient West & East* 10: 195–207.

Dougherty, C. 2001. *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J.A.S. 1991. *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Figueira, T.J. 1991. *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fisher, N.R.E. 1992. *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Flory, S. 1987. *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Flower, M. 2006. "Herodotus and Persia." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 274–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Foxhall, L., H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, eds. 2010. *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Gaastra, J.S. 2014. "Shipping Sheep or Creating Cattle: Domesticate Size Changes with Greek Colonisation in Magna Graecia." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 52: 483–96.

Gagné, R. 2013. *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gailledrat, E. 2015. "New Perspectives on Emporia in the Western Mediterranean: Greeks, Etruscans and Native Populations at the Mouth of the Lez (Hérault, France) during the Sixth-Fifth Centuries BC." *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 28: 23–50.

Gehrke, H.-J. 2001. "Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond." In *Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by N. Luraghi, 286–313. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010. "Greek Representations of the Past." In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 15–33. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Giangiulio, M. 2001. "Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History: The Case of Cyrene." In *Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by N. Luraghi, 116–37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gould, J. 2013. "Herodotus and Religion." In *Herodotus: Volume 2: Herodotus and His World*, edited by R.V. Munson, 183–97. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graham, A.J. 1999. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2001. "Religion, Women, and Greek Colonization." In *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization*, 327–49. Leiden: Brill.

Griffiths, A. 2006. "Stories and Storytelling in the Histories." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 130–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hall, J.M. 2001. "Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek identity." In *Ancient Perspectives on Greek Ethnicity*, edited by I. Malkin, 159–86. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Hall, J.M. 2002a. *Hellenicity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, J.M. 2002b. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, J.M. 2015. "Ancient Greek Ethnicities: Towards a Reassessment." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58: 15–29.

Harrison, T. 2000. *Divinity and History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 2007. "The Place of Geography in Herodotus' Histories." In *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East*, edited by C. Adams and J. Roy, 44–65. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2009. "Herodotus on the American Empire." *Classical World* 102: 383–93.

Hodos, T. 2009. "Colonial Engagements in the Global Mediterranean Iron Age." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19: 221-41.

Hornblower, S., ed. 2013. *Herodotus: Histories: Book V*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

How, W.W., and J. Wells. 1912. *A Commentary on Herodotus: With Introduction and Appendices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hurst, H.R., and S. Owen. 2005. *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference.* London: Duckworth.

Iacovou, M. 2008. "Cyprus: From Migration to Hellenisation." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account Of Greek Colonies And Other Settlements Overseas. Volume Two*, edited by G.R. Tsetskhladze, 219–88. Leiden: Brill.

Immerwahr, H.R. 1956. "Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 87: 241–80.

———. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press.

Jahne, A. 1988. "Land und Gesellschaft in Kyrenes Frühzeit." *Klio* 70: 145–66.

Jones, C. 1999. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Katz Anhalt, E. 2005. "Polycrates and His Brothers: Herodotus' Depiction of Fraternal Relationships in the 'Histories.'" *Classical World* 98: 139–52.

Kim, H.J. 2009. *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China*. London: Duckworth.

Kindt, J. 2006. "Delphic Oracle Stories and the Beginning of Historiography: Herodotus' Croesus Logos." *Classical Philology* 101: 34–51.

———. 2016. *Revisiting Delphi: Religion and Storytelling in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lomas, K. 2015. "Colonizing the Past: Cultural Memory and Civic Identity in Hellenistic and

Roman Naples." In *Remembering Parthenope: The Reception of Classical Naples from Antiquity to the Present*, edited by J. Hughes and C. Buongiovanni, 64–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luraghi, N. 2006. "Traders , Pirates , Warriors : The Proto-History of Greek Mercenary Soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean." *Phoenix* 60: 21–47.

Ma, J. 2009. "The City as Memory." In *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, edited by B. Graziosi, P. Vasunia, and G. Boys-Stones, 248–59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macan, R.W. 1895. *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books*. London and New York: Macmillan.

Mackil, E.M. 2013. *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2002. "Exploring the Concept of 'Foundation': A Visit to Megara Hyblaia." In *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham*, edited by V.B. Gorman and E.W. Robinson, 195–228. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2003a. "Networks and the Emergence of Greek Identity." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18: 56–74.

———. 2003b. "'Tradition' in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene." In *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, edited by P. Derow and R. Parker, 153–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2004. "Postcolonial Concepts and Ancient Greek Colonization." *Modern Language Quarterly* 65: 341–364.

———. 2009. "Foundation." In *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by Kurt A Raaflaub and Hans van Wees, 374–394. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2015. "Foreign Founders: Greeks and Hebrews." In *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, edited by N. Mac Sweeney, 20–40. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Malkin, I., C. Constantakopoulou, and K. Panagopoulou, eds. 2009. *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean.* London: Routledge.

Marincola, J. 2008. "Odysseus and the Historians." *Syllecta Classica* 18: 1–79.

Mavrogiannis, T. 2004. "Herodotus and the Phoenicians." In *The World of Herodotus: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18-21, 2003*, edited by V. Karageorghis and I.G. Taiphakos, 53–71. Nicosia: Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis.

Meiggs, R., and D.M. Lewis, eds. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, L.G. 1997. *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World 435-323 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Morakis, A. 2011. "Thucydides and the Character of Greek Colonisation in Sicily." *The Classical Quarterly* 61: 460–92.

Morel, J.-P. 2006. "Phocaean Colonisation." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account Of Greek Colonies And Other Settlements Overseas. Volume One*, edited by G.R. Tsetskhladze, 358–428. Leiden: Brill.

Morris, I. 1986. "Gift and Commodity in Archaic Greece." *Man* 21: 1–17.

Müller, C. 2016. "Globalization, Transnationalism, and the Local in Ancient Greece." *Oxford Handbooks Online*: 1–28.

Munson, R.V. 1988. "Artemisia in Herodotus." *Classical Antiquity* 7: 91–106.

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

———. 2009. "Who Are Herodotus' Persians?" *Classical World* 102: 457–70.

Murray, O. 1988. "The Ionian Revolt." *Cambridge Ancient History* 4: 461–90.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2003. *Homeric Responses.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 2013. *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Niemeyer, H.G. 2006. "The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean. Between Expansion and Colonisation: A Non-Greek Model of Overseas Settlement and Presence." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account Of Greek Colonies And Other Settlements Overseas. Volume One*, edited by G.R. Tsetskhladze, 143–68. Leiden: Brill.

Olick, J.K., and J. Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 105–40.

Osborne, R. 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West." In *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edited by H. van Wees and N. Fischer, 251–69. London: Duckworth.

Özyiğit, Ö. 1994. "The City Walls of Phokaia." *Revue des Études Anciennes* 96: 77–109.

Papadopoulos, J.K. 2002. "Minting Identity: Coinage, Ideology, and the Economics of Colonization in Akhaian Magna Graecia." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 12: 21–55.

Papalas, A.J. 2013. "The Battle of Alalia." *Syllecta Classica* 24: 1–28.

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pelling, C. 1997. "East is East and West is West - Or are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus." *Histos* 1: 51–66.

———. 2006. "Educating Croesus : Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian Logos." *Classical Antiquity* 25: 141–77.

———. 2009. "Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date: Herodotus and Thucydides." *Classical World* 102: 471–83.

Purves, A. 2010. *Space and Time in the Ancient Greek Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, E. 2000. "Democracy in Syracuse, 466-412." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100: 189–205.

Rodkey, K. 2015. "Herodotean Oracles: Moral and Rational Responses to Ambiguity." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 20: 161–76.

Rood, T. 2006. "Herodotus and Foreign Lands." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 290–305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2016. "Mapping Distance in Herodotus and Thucydides." In *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*, edited by E. Barker, S. Bouzarovski, C. Pelling, and L. Isaksen, 101–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scullion, S. 2006. "Herodotus and Greek Religion." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 192–208. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, J. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, A.D. 2008. *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sommerstein, A., and A. Bayliss. 2012. *Oath and the State in Ancient Greece*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Sommerstein, A., and J. Fletcher, eds. 2007. *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society*. Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press.

Sommerstein, A.H., and I.C. Torrance. 2014. *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Stadter, P.A. 1992. "Herodotus and the Athenian 'Arche.'" *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* 22: 781–809.

———. 2006. "Herodotus and the Cities of Mainland Greece." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 242–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanford, W.B. 1964. *The Ulysses Theme*. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Steinbock, B. 2013. *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Thomas, R. 2000. *Herodotus in Context : Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Torrance, I.C. 2014. "Divine Responses to Perjury." In *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece*, edited by A.H. Sommerstein and I.C. Torrance, 295–303. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Visser, M. 1982. "Worship Your Enemy: Aspects of the Cult of Heroes in Ancient Greece." *The Harvard Theological Review* 75: 403–28.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2015. "Ethnicity and Greek History: Re-Examining our Assumptions." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58: 1–13.

Voskos, I., and a B. Knapp. 2008. "Cyprus at the End of the Late Bronze Age: Crisis and Colonization or Continuity and Hybridization?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 112: 659–84.

Ward, A. 2008. *Herodotus and the Philosophy of Empire*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Wear, G.D. 2016. "Alalia and the Aftermath." *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 3: 5–12.

Yates, D. 2015. "The Tradition of the Hellenic League Against Xerxes." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 64: 1–25.

Yntema, D. 2000. "Mental Landscapes of Colonization: The Ancient Written Sources and the Archaeology of Early Colonial-Greek Southeastern Italy." *BABESCH* 75: 1–49.

Zacharia, K. 2008. "Herodotus' Four Markers of Greek Identity." In *Hellenisms: CUlture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity*, edited by Katerina Zacharia, 21-36. Aldershot, OK: Ashgate.