

# RUTHENIA CLASSICA AETATIS NOVAE

A Collection of Works by  
Russian Scholars in Ancient  
Greek and Roman History

Ancient History

Franz Steiner Verlag

Edited by Andreas Mehl /  
Alexander V. Makhlayuk /  
Oleg Gabelko

## CONTENTS

<i>Andreas Mehl</i> Preface.....	7
Abbreviations.....	9
List of Illustrations.....	11
<i>Alexander V. Makhlayuk,</i> <i>Oleg L. Gabelko</i> Classical Studies in Russia at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century: A Collective Portrait in Contemporary Context.....	13
<i>Mikhail F. Vysokii</i> Ancient Greek Legislation on Sicily: The Laws of Charondas .....	31
<i>Igor E. Surikov</i> Herodotus and the Philaids .....	45
<i>Eduard V. Rung</i> Herodotus and Greek Medism .....	71
<i>Maxim M. Kholod</i> On the Financial Relations of Alexander the Great and the Greek Cities in Asia Minor: The Case of <i>Syntaxis</i> .....	83
<i>Ivan A. Ladynin</i> A Fragment of an Early Hellenistic Egyptian Clepsydra from the State Hermitage, St. Petersburg (Inv. No. ДБ 2507a): A Native View of Early Macedonian Rule in Egypt.....	93
<i>Svyatoslav V. Smirnov</i> The Elephant Chariots at Daphne: An Aspect of the Ideological Policy of Antiochus IV.....	117
<i>Yuri N. Kuzmin</i> The Macedonian Aristocratic Family of Harpaloi-Polemaioi from Beroea.....	123
<i>Roman V. Lapyrionok</i> Some Critical Notes on Peter Brunt's Reconstruction of the Conduct of the Roman Census .....	133

<i>Yevgenij V. Smykov</i> Sulla in the East: Venus contra Dionysum.....	145
<i>Anton V. Korolenkov</i> Mithridates and Sertorius.....	159
<i>Oleg L. Gabelko</i> A Historical and Epigraphic Commentary on Hysicrateia's Epitaph.....	173
<i>Alexander V. Makhlayuk</i> The Roman Citizenry in Arms: The Republican Background and Traditions of the Imperial Army.....	185
<i>Konstantin V. Markov</i> The Concepts of 'Democracy' and 'Tyranny' in the Speech of Agrippa (Cassius Dio LII. 1–13): Conventional Rhetoric or Political Theory? .....	215
Contributors .....	233

## HERODOTUS AND GREEK MEDISM\*

*Eduard Rung*  
(Kazan Federal University)

The aim of this paper is to consider Herodotus' attitude toward medism as a reflection of the Greek understanding of this phenomenon not only during the Persian Wars, but also in the age of Pericles when Herodotus composed his work. It is plain that the tendency to medism was very powerful in the Greek world throughout the period of Greco-Persian conflict and that it represented the converse of the Greek patriotic movement for freedom.<sup>1</sup> It is also certain that medism affected the greater part of Greece, leaving only 31 Greek *poleis* in central Greece and the Peloponnese united with one another in the Hellenic League of 481 BC.<sup>2</sup>

The most common definition of medism sees it as Greek collaboration with the Persians.<sup>3</sup> David Graf, it is true, has claimed that “medism embodied social and cultural aspects in its indictment of activity in the interests of Persia. ... collaborators with the Great King had rejected the peculiar manner of life characteristic of the Greek world in favour of the corrupting life-style of the East,” and he adduced in support of this claim the use of the verbs ἐλληνίζειν and βαρβαρίζειν to mean “to speak or act like Greeks” or “like barbarians” and the medizing behaviour of Pausanias, whom he considered to be the “classic illustration of this accusation.”<sup>4</sup> But Christopher Tuplin has challenged this interpretation, arguing that medism was a concept of extremely tight definition, it was as “a matter of fact anti-Greek, anti-libertarian collaboration with Persia [which] had very few extra-political implications.”<sup>5</sup>

In what follows I propose to consider Herodotus' representation of medism during the Persian Wars on the basis of the assumption that medism was mainly a political movement. Herodotus is the authority who provides us with the fullest explanation of medism,<sup>6</sup> but he does not clarify its origins or the limits of its application.

\* I would like to express my sincere thanks to Professor Christopher Tuplin (University of Liverpool, UK) for polishing the English version of this paper.

1 On the idea of Greek freedom during the Persian Wars see Momigliano, A. 1979, 139–151; Ostwald, M. 1995, 42–51; Isaac, B. 2004, 270–283; Raaflaub, K. 2004, 58–89.

2 On the Hellenic League see Brunt, P. 1993, 47–83; Kienast, D. 2003, 43–77.

3 This meaning of medism is described by the Greek phrase τὰ Μήδων φροσῆναι – sympathy with the Medes – which occurs in Herodotus and lexicographers (Hdt. VIII. 34; Schol. Thuc. I. 95. 5; Suid., s.vv. μηδίζω, μηδισμός, Phrynich. Attic. s. v. μηδίζω; Ps.-Zonar., s. v. μηδισμός). On the origins of the terminology of medism see Hahn, I. 1981, 59–66; Rung, E. 2005, 14–35.

4 Graf, D. 1984, 15. Some authors follow David Graf's conception of medism. See Steinhilckes, E. 1999, 1001; Surikov, I. 2000, 129; 2004, 326.

5 Tuplin, Chr. 1997, 162–163.

6 All modern scholarship on medism may be divided into three groups: the first group includes works devoted to the terminology of medism and its significance (Myres, J. 1936, 97–105;

It is thus impossible to say for certain when or in what circumstances the concept of medism appeared for the first time or to determine whether it can only properly be used of Balkan Greeks who surrendered to the Persians in the 490–480s B.C. or was current since the time of the Persian conquest of Ionia by Cyrus the Great in the 540s B.C. and might have been applied to the Greeks of Asia Minor who collaborated with the Persians in that period.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, Herodotus does provide us with sufficient information to reveal the patterns and types of medism and explain its causes.

Herodotus uses the term *μηδισμός* and its cognates about 34 times and in all cases he connects it with pro-Persian activities either of Greek states or peoples or of Greek politicians, mainly in connection with the Persian Wars. There are no allusions to medism in extant Greek poetry and historiography before Herodotus and only a few allusions to it after Herodotus completed his *Histories* in the first decade of the Peloponnesian War.<sup>8</sup>

Herodotus uses the actual word *μηδισμός* only three times (IV. 165; VIII. 92; IX. 88). (In all other cases he uses the verb *μηδίζειν*, in the sense ‘to side with the Persians’, to describe the pro-Persian attitude or actions of various Greek peoples and individuals.)<sup>9</sup> In the first of these passages Herodotus applies the term to Arcesilaus, the king of Cyrene (IV. 165): after his death, the historian reports, his mother Pheretime fled to Egypt and asked Aryandes for refuge on the grounds that her son had been killed because of his medism (*διὰ τὸν μηδισμὸν ὃ παῖς οἱ τέθνηκε*) (IV. 165). This is almost the first appearance of the concept of medism in Herodotus’ *Histories* (the phrase *τοὺς μὴ μηδίζοντας* has already been encountered in IV. 144) and there are three observations to make. Firstly, the context is not the Greco-Persian Wars, and use of the term may authentically reflect a stage at

Jonkers, E. 1948, 78–83; Gugel, H. 1979, 1133; Graf, D. 1984, 15–30; Tuplin, Chr., 1994, 235–256; 1997, 155–185); the second group deals with the importance of medism in classical Greece (Wolski, J. 1973, 3–15; Hegyi, D. 1974, *passim*; Gillis, D. 1979, *passim*); the third group includes all works that consider the medism of Greek states and individuals without specific reference to its terminology: Thessaly (Westlake, H. 1936, 12–25; Keaveney, A. 1995, 30–38; Robertson, N. 1976, 100–120); Boeotia (Buck, J. 1979, 107–120; 1987, 54–60); Caryae (Huxley, G. 1967, 29–32; Vickers, M. 1985, 3–28); Athens (McGregor, M. 1940, 71–95; Holladay, A. 1978, 174–191; Gillis, D. 1969, 133–145), etc. The literature devoted to the medism of Pausanias and Themistocles is more extensive.

- 7 Most scholars date the origin of medism to the sixth century B.C.; they connect it with the pro-Persian activity of some Asian Greeks in the period of the Persian-Lyidian War and the Persian conquest of Asia Minor in 550–546 B.C. (Myres, J. 1936, 97–105; Jonkers, E. 1948, 78–83; Holladay, A. 1978, 174–175; Graf, D. 1984, 30). This conjecture is probable, but the evidence is still not conclusive.
- 8 There are only about 12 references to medism in the late fifth and fourth century B.C.: Thuc. I. 95. 5; 135. 2 (Pausanias); III. 34. 1 (in Colophon); III. 62. 1–2; 63. 1; 64. 1 and 5; 65. 1 (Thebans); Xen. *Hell.* III. 1. 6 (Gongylus of Eretria); Isocr. IV. 157 (some Athenians accused of medism); Dem. XXIII. 205 (Themistocles); LIX. 95 (Thebans); Arist. *Ath. pol.* 25. 3 (Themistocles). For references to medism in the Hellenistic and Roman periods see Tuplin, Chr. 1997, 158–162.
- 9 *μηδίζειν*: VI. 109; VII. 139, 172, 174, 205–206, 233; VIII. 30–31, 34, 51, 73, 112; IX. 8, 17, 31, 87; *μηδίζοντες*: IV. 144; VI. 64; VII. 138–139; VIII. 144; IX. 15, 40, 67, 86, 106.

which medism and Persian treason were not yet related to each other; secondly, the term is applied to an individual not to a state, and the passage may be considered Herodotus' first reference to an individual's medism; and thirdly, medism is a form of political action, since we hear about Arcesilaus' surrender of Cyrene to the Persians and payment of regular tribute, but no other cultural implications appear in Herodotus' account. Herodotus' other two uses of the term μηδισμός are in relation to the policy of Aegina during Datis' and Artaphernes' expedition to Greece in 490 B.C. (VIII. 92) and the behaviour of the Theban Attaginus during the invasion of 480–79 B.C. (IX. 88).<sup>10</sup>

It is possible to distinguish between the medism of Greek states/peoples and the medism attributed to certain prominent individuals. Most Greek communities surrendered to the Persians in 480 B.C. – either on the eve of Xerxes' invasion of Greece or during its course – but there were some Greek peoples who sided with the Persians even before 480 B.C. We know about the case of Aegina, which medized in 490 B.C. (Hdt. VI. 64; VIII. 92) but was eager to struggle for Greek freedom in 480 B.C. (VIII. 46; 86; 91–93; IX. 28). The Aleuadae of Larissa in Thessaly made advances to the Persians shortly after Xerxes' accession in 486 B.C. (VII. 6; 130), but most Thessalians were unwilling to support them in their intrigues, as became clear at the start of Xerxes' invasion (VII. 172; 174).<sup>11</sup> Herodotus regarded as medism any pro-Persian policy on the part of Greek states during the Persian Wars and, in his account, the medism of the Greek states and peoples may have been connected with the Persian heralds sent to Greece by Darius in 491 (Hdt. VI. 48–49; VII. 32; 133) and by Xerxes in 481 (VII. 32; 132–133) to demand earth and water.<sup>12</sup>

The list of medizing Greek *poleis* and peoples given by Herodotus (VII. 132) includes both those who surrendered to the Great King because of the military threat (small Greek communities in northern and central Greece) and those who collaborated with the enemy voluntarily (Thebans and Thessalians). The thousands of Greeks who fought on the side of the Persians at the battle of Plataea (50,000: Hdt. IX. 32; Plut. *Arist.* 18. 7; 40,000: Aristodem. 104 f. 1. 2. 3 = P. Oxy. 27. 2469 s. 2), were all whole-hearted medizers.

Herodotus considers fear of the Persians (δείμα μέγα) to be one of the main factors that prompted medism in Greek *poleis* and peoples:

Those of them who had paid the tribute of earth and water to the Persians were of good courage, thinking that the foreigner would do them no harm, but those who had refused were afraid (ἐν δειματι μεγάλῳ) since there were not enough ships in Hellas to do battle with the invader; furthermore, the greater part of them had no stomach for grappling with the war, but were making haste to side with the Persians (μηδιζόντων δὲ προθύμως) (VII. 138; cf. VIII. 36; trans. by A. D. Godley).

10 Herodotus (IX. 88) reports Pausanias' decision that the sons of Attaginus did not share the guilt of their father's medism (ἀπέλυσε τῆς αἰτίας, φάς τοῦ μηδισμού παιδᾶς οὐδὲν εἶναι μεταιτίους).

11 Cf. VII. 172: Θεσσαλοὶ δὲ ὑπὸ ἀναγκαίης τὸ πρῶτον ἐμήδισαν ὡς διέδεξαν ὅτι οὐ σφί ἦνδανε τὰ οἱ Ἀλευάδαι ἐμχανῶντο. On the medism of Thessaly see Westlake, H. 1936, 12–35; Brunt, P. 1953/4, 162–163; Robertson, N. 1976, 102–108; Keaveney, A. 1995, 32–38.

12 On these missions see Wery, L.-M. 1966, 468–488; Orlin, L. 1976, 255–266; Sealey, R. 1976, 13–20; Kuhrt, A. 1988, 87–99; Rung, E. 2007, 3–26.

Necessity was another motive. The oath of the Greeks in 481 B.C. imposed a general obligation to punish *poleis* that sided with the Persians without necessity – μὴ ἀναγκασθέντες (Hdt. VII. 132). Herodotus says that, if the Athenians had refused to fight, Sparta's allies would have been forced to abandon her – οὐκ ἐκόντων, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης – leaving her to fight alone or make a deal with Xerxes (VII. 139). Necessity, ἀναγκαίη, was what caused the Thessalians' decision to side with Persia in 480 B.C. (VII. 172). Herodotus does not connect this act of medism with direct treason.

The pro-Persian attitude of the political elite in Greek *poleis* was also a significant factor according to Herodotus' account: this was certainly so in the case of Thessalian medism (VII. 172; 174). This opinion may be compared with Thucydides' report of the Theban answer to Plataean accusations of treacherous conduct (medism) during the Persian Wars (Thuc. III. 56. 4; 62. 1):

Our city at that juncture had neither an oligarchic constitution in which all the nobles enjoyed equal rights nor a democracy, but that which is most opposed to law and good government and nearest to a tyranny – the rule of a close cabal (δυναστεία ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν εἶχε τὰ πράγματα). These, hoping to strengthen their individual power by the success of the Medes, kept down by force the people, and brought him into the town (III. 62. 3–4; trans. by R. Crawley).

This passage is important testimony about the Greek attitude to medism during the Peloponnesian War: the view could be taken that it was just the leaders of Thebes, not all its citizens, who were guilty of medism. Herodotus does describe Attaginus and Timegenides at Thebes as the leaders of the oligarchy – ἀρχηγέται ἀνὰ πρότους (IX. 86), but there are also several passages in which he represents *all* Thebans as very persistent medizers (IX. 40; 87). Scholars usually point to the personal motives for Herodotus' representation of the Thebans (cf. Aristophanes of Boeotia 379 f. 5). The Theban oligarchy in Thucydides' account is considered to be guilty of inviting the Persians to occupy the city, and one may compare and contrast the accusation directed against the Aleuad dynasty in Larissa (Hdt. VII. 6) and the Argive government (VII. 152) of having prompted Xerxes to invade Greece in the first place.

Another possible reason for medism was the fact that traditional rivalries between various Greek states and peoples prevented them from being unified with one another. Traditional enmity prevented the Thessalians and Phocians, Thebans and Thespians (Hdt. VIII. 50), Spartans and Argives (ibid. VII. 148–152) etc., from taking the same side in the Persian Wars (ibid. VIII. 27–30). Herodotus (VIII. 30) explicitly states that the Phocians sided with Persia because of their hostility to the Thessalians (τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Θεσσαλῶν) – if Thessaly supported the Greeks, Phocis would side with the Persians.

The position of Argos during the Persian Wars requires special comment. Herodotus does not include the Argives in his list of medizers in VII. 132 and never explicitly designates their position as medism.<sup>13</sup> He only refers to the Argive attitude

13 The closest approach is VIII. 73: after listing the nations (ἔθνη) of the Peloponnese, he continues: "all the remaining cities of these seven nations, except those I enumerated, stayed neutral.

toward Persia twice (VII. 148–152; IX. 12). In IX. 12 he reports that the Argives had promised Mardonius that they would prevent the Spartan army from leaving the Peloponnese in 479 – an undertaking they failed to fulfil, allegedly because of the Spartans’ eventual speed of movement. Earlier, in VII. 148–152, he reports controversial explanations of Argive unwillingness to participate in the war: the reduction of population as the result of losses in the battle of Sepeia; a prediction from the Delphic oracle; a mythical relationship between Argives and Persians through their lineage from the legendary ancestor Perseus; the enmity of the Spartans. Some scholars argue for Argive neutrality, though this opinion looks like an improbable modern suggestion.<sup>14</sup> Herodotus referred to the friendship (VII. 151: φιλιή) which originated in the treaty concluded between the Argives and Xerxes on the eve of his invasion of Greece. Such a treaty, if it indeed existed, might have been made on the terms of giving ‘earth and water’ to the Great King (as had been demanded of the Athenians in the negotiations at Sardis in 507/6 B.C. [Hdt. V. 73], and of other Greeks by Persian heralds in 491 and 481 B.C.). A treaty with the Great King on such conditions implied the subjugation of Argos to the Persians and may be considered an act of medism. Herodotus chooses to be silent on the true nature of Argos’ position during the Persian Wars, and may even be trying to justify the Argives’ medism. This might be explained by the subsequent rapprochement of Argos and Athens in the First Peloponnesian War (from 461 B.C.). Contemporaries, by contrast, did not differentiate the medism of Argos from that of Thebes and Thessaly, as becomes evident from Plutarch’s story about the proposal of the Spartans to drive the Argives out of the Delphic Amphictiony after the Greek victory (Plut. *Them.* 20).<sup>15</sup>

Medism and treachery (προδοσίη) are not the same thing in Herodotus’ account, and it is possible that the two things were distinguished from one other in the Persian War period itself as well as in Herodotus’ lifetime. Herodotus applied the terminology of medism to medizing states and peoples that sided with the Persians under the pressure of the military threat, but only those who collaborated with the enemy willingly could be considered traitors. This tendency on Herodotus’ part was stressed by Plutarch, who in his *De Herodoti malignitate* 864d blames him for being willing to justify the medism of the Thessalians but not that of the Thebans. Herodotus associated medism with treason only in cases in which he saw medism as treason against the *whole of Greece*. He says the Athenians in 490 B.C. sent their

If I may speak freely, by staying neutral they medized” (εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέρως ἔξεστι εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι ἐμῆδιζον) (trans. by A. D. Godley).

- 14 On Greek neutrality during the Persian Wars see Phillipson, C. 1911. 2, 304 ff; Bauslaugh, R. 1991, 93–98; Bederman, D. 2001, 215 ff; Viviers, D. 1995, 257–269; Troncoso, V. 2001, 365–375; Vanicelly, P. 2004, 199–217. On Argive neutrality see Kelly, Th. 1974, 81–82; Gillis, D. 1979, 61–62; Isaac, B. 2004, 272.
- 15 Plutarch himself blames Herodotus for misrepresenting the Argives’ position in the Persian Wars and speaks of Argive neutrality as a well-known fact (ἅπαντες ἴσασι: *De Her. malign.* 863B). He also argues that the Argives were unwilling to cooperate with the Persians against the Greeks in the attack on the Peloponnese (863F). However, Plutarch cannot be trusted here, since his judgments are aimed against those of Herodotus and may also reflect the same Greek public opinion which was expressed less explicitly in Herodotus’ work.



envoys to Sparta to blame the Aeginetans for treason against Greece (προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα: VI. 49). In 480 B.C. the Phocians rejected the Thessalian proposal to surrender to Persia, stating that they might side with the Persians (μηδίξειν) but would never willingly become the betrayers of Greece (VIII. 30). The terminology of treason also occurs in the passages devoted to the shield-signal during the battle of Marathon (VI. 124: προδίδωμι) and the position of the Athenians as the saviours of Greece (σωτήρες τῆς Ἑλλάδος: VII. 139; VIII. 144).

Diodorus of Sicily called all Greeks who sided with the Persians προδόται and notably avoided the term μηδισμός in all sections of his work in which he related the Persian Wars and their aftermath. He lists the Greek peoples who surrendered to Persia and speaks of them as προδόται τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας (XI. 3. 1); in other passages Diodorus mentions the accusations of προδοσία against Pausanias (XI. 46. 1; 54. 2–3) and Themistocles (XI. 54. 5; 55. 4, 8; 56. 2), occasionally using the verb προδίδωμι (XI. 44. 4; 54. 4). Diodorus was not influenced by current politics, did not care about historical accuracy or the exact meanings of the terms he found in his sources, and chose to use in his work such terms as were more comprehensible for his contemporary readers. Aristodemus and Plutarch, by contrast, tried to retain the phrasing of their sources and that is why they preserve the terminology of medism;<sup>16</sup> but it is hardly possible that they also realized the real difference between medism and treachery, since they use the two terms interchangeably.<sup>17</sup>

Herodotus referred also to medism by individuals, but rarely commented on it in greater detail than Thucydides did in the case of Pausanias. He mentions the medism of members of the Greek political elite (Arcesilaus of Cyrene: IV. 165; the Aleuadae of Larissa: VII. 6; IX. 1; 58; Attaginus and Timagenides of Thebes: IX. 15–16; 86–88) as well as co-operation with Persia by people such as the Arcadians (VIII. 26) or Hegesistratus (IX. 37–38) who did not belong to the ruling class. In contrast with his treatment of the medism of states and peoples, Herodotus was usually not interested in reporting the causes of individual medism. Was individual medism connected with the fact that the persons in question belonged to the circle of Greek autocratic leaders (like the tyrants in Asia Minor under Persian rule before the Ionian revolt)<sup>18</sup> and hoped to benefit from the foreign invader?<sup>19</sup> Or did they have a material stimulus for their treacherous conduct, like the Greeks who collaborated with the Persians in the post-war period? These are questions to which Herodotus provides no answer.

Herodotus does mention some actions by individual Greek medizers that might have been considered signs indicating their treacherous behaviour, that is medism.

16 Aristodemus 104 F1 (1. 1; 2. 4; 3. 1; 8. 1); Plut. *Them.* 7. 2; 21. 7; *Aristid.* 16. 2; 18. 6, 7; and see especially his *De Herodoti malignitate*, where he follows Herodotus' terminology.

17 Aristodemus, for example, in his *epitome* used the terminology of medism four times, and he seven times applied the term προδοσία to the acts of Pausanias (F 1.4. 1; 6. 2–3; 8. 1–2) and Themistocles (F 1. 10. 1). Plutarch defined the conduct of Pausanias as treachery several times (*Them.* 23. 1; *Cim.* 6. 2; *De Her. malign.* 855F).

18 On the attitude of Greek tyrants in Asia Minor to the Great Kings before the Persian Wars see especially Graf, D. 1985, 79–86; Austin, M. 1990, 289–306.

19 Hornblower, S. 1983, 18.

Thus, Attaginus invited Mardonius and 50 Persian nobles to a banquet in Thebes before the battle of Plataea in 479 B. C. (IX. 16). Plutarch, who was well acquainted with local Boeotian tradition (*de Herodoti malignitate* 864f), considered Attaginus' medism to be due to his personal ties with the Great King of Persia: he became φίλος καὶ ξένος of Xerxes because of Demaratus, with whom he was linked by ties of guest-friendship.

Herodotus states that among the Greeks who were present in Xerxes' army were the Aleuadae Thorex of Larissa (IX. 1; 58) and his brothers, Eurypylyus and Thrasydaeus (IX. 58). In his *Thessalian Polity* Critias explained the medism of Thessalians through their adherence to luxury:

All agree that the Thessalians were most luxurious among the Greeks in their dress and life-style and that is why they encouraged the Persians to attack Greece. They admired their luxury (ἡ τρυφῆ) (apud Athen. 662f).

This does not, I think, mean that the Thessalian aristocracy was seeking to adopt the Persian life-style, but only that the Thessalians shared the same values as the Persians. In any event, Critias' judgment, uttered in the late fifth century and preserved in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* out of its literary context, should not necessarily be regarded as a valid contemporary explanation of medism three generations earlier.

When Herodotus mentions some Arcadian deserters (αὐτόμολοι ἄνδρες ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας) who came to Xerxes' military camp, he explains their decision to be useful to the Persians (ἐνεργοὶ βουλόμενοι εἶναι) by their lack of the necessities of life (βίου τε δεόμενοι) (VIII. 26). This is the only occasion on which Herodotus both mentions collaboration of ordinary people with the Persians and provides an explanation of its cause. It is impossible to say whether he considered the desertion of the Arcadians as true medism or as treason.

Herodotus' account of medism in Athens deserves special consideration. The 'Father of History' never used the terms μηδισμός, μηδίξειν in relation to the Athenians, even when he reports the story of the Athenian embassy to Sardis in 507/6 B. C. (V. 73) and mentions that there were rumours of treacherous conduct by the Alcmeonidae in the course of the battle of Marathon (VI. 121; 124). Some scholars have referred to medism in Athens before the Persian Wars,<sup>20</sup> and A. J. Holladay states that the sending of envoys in 507/6 was the first sign of medism under the democracy.<sup>21</sup> But this is not Herodotus' way of putting it and he does not even seem to consider the embassy an outrageous event in the context of Athenian political history. Moreover, there are doubts as to whether the terminology of medism was widespread in Greece before the Persian Wars. The Athenians may have made contact with the Persians simply because they had been in contact with the Lydians on earlier occasions.

It is also doubtful whether Herodotus considered as medism the collaboration of Hippias, son of Pisistratus, with the Persians. In 511/0 B. C. Hippias fled to Sigeum, a hereditary possession of the Pisistratids, and later moved to Lampsacus, where his brother Hegesistratus was tyrant and a subject of Darius I (V. 63. 3; 91;

20 How, W., Wells, J. 1912. 1, 40; Walker, E. 1930, 158.

21 Holladay, A. 1978, 178.

94. 1; cf. Thuc. VI. 59. 3–4). Herodotus refers to Hippias' collaboration with the Persians during the period between his flight from Athens and the battle of Marathon (V. 96; VI. 102; 107–109). But was Hippias a medizer? I strongly suspect that none of the Greeks categorized him thus, and the same goes for certain other Athenians and non-Athenian Greek emigrants to the Persian Empire (Demaratus, Dicaeus, various Athenian aristocrats). Supporters of Hippias in Athens under the leadership of Hipparchus son of Charmus (φίλοι τῶν τυράννων: Arist. *Ath. pol.* 22. 4) might have been suspected of medism, but Herodotus is silent on the subject.<sup>22</sup>

The key for our understanding of Greek views on medism lies in the fact that those Greeks who sided with Persia before the mission of Darius I's heralds to Greece<sup>23</sup> might reasonably have been considered by contemporaries not as medizers but rather as subjects of Persia – or “slaves of the King,” according to Greek views on Persian social hierarchy.<sup>24</sup> In the period of the conflict with Persia an accusation of medism usually resulted in flight to Persia, but the converse does not apply. This is very clear from the account of the medism of Pausanias in Thucydides (I. 95. 5; 132–134) and other authors (Duris 76f.14; Diod. XI. 46. 1; 54. 2–3). Pausanias was accused of medism for the first time on the basis of alleged treacherous conduct after the expulsion of the Persians from Greece, but none of the charges against him was conclusive. After his release he lived at Coloniae, a small town in Asia Minor which had been awarded to him by Xerxes, and he was prosecuted after more cogent evidence had been assembled. The Athenians also accused Themistocles of medism before his desertion to Persia (Thuc. I. 135. 2), when alleged proof of his medism and treachery emerged from the investigations into Pausanias.

In general, Herodotus' work shows that the phenomenon of medism is mainly associated with the development of Greco-Persian antagonism during the Persian Wars themselves. Herodotus reports Greek opposition to medism in several cases: one of the first oppressive actions against medizing states was undertaken by Cleomenes I of Sparta, who had invaded Aegina after 490 B. C. on the basis of the accusations of medism brought by the Athenians (VI. 49–50; 73; cf. Paus. III. 4. 3). On the eve of Xerxes' invasion, the Greeks, as has already been mentioned,

entered a sworn agreement (τὸ ὄρκιον), which was this: that if they were victorious, they would dedicate to the god of Delphi the possessions of all Greeks who had of free will surrendered themselves to the Persians (VII. 132; trans. by A. D. Godley).<sup>25</sup>

22 On the political struggle in Athens before the Persian Wars see McGregor, M. 1940, 71–95; Holladay, A. 1978, 174–191; Kinzl, K. 1977, 199–223; Surikov, I. 2000, 165–188; 2005; 2006, 295–347.

23 Holladay, A. 1978, 175.

24 On the Greek representation of the King's subject as “slave of the King” (δούλος τοῦ βασιλέως) see Missiou, A. 1993, 377–391; Briant, P. 1996, 336–338, 524; Isaac, B. 2004, 266–267; Petit, Th. 2004, 181; Rung, E. 2005, 254–256; Sources: Hdt. III. 140; VII. 8; VIII. 102; 4.

25 Cf. the oath of Plataea: Tod. II. 204, 33–34, καὶ νικησας μαχόμενος τοὺς βαρβάρους δεκατεύσω τὴν Θηβαίων πόλιν. It is not certain why the inscription mentions the Thebans specially, but not any other Greek medizers. The authenticity of the oath of Plataea has been the

Herodotus, however, does not report that patriotic Greeks actually undertook the systematic destruction of medizing *poleis* as the agreement required, though, of course, he mentions some actions directed against medizers. The most notorious of these were Pausanias' capture of Thebes (IX. 86–88) and Leutychides' expedition to Thessaly (VI. 72; cf. Pausanias III. 7. 8; Plut. *De Herod. malign.* 859D), both of which events took place soon after the battle of Plataea in 479 B.C. Otherwise Herodotus does not stress internal conflicts among the Greeks themselves (such as between the Hellenic League and the medizers) after the expulsion of Xerxes from Greece. Among other sources much the same is true, although the anonymous *Vita Pindari* reports a story of the burning of Thebes by Pausanias, and Vitruvius (1. 5) refers to similar Greek treatment of Caryae and the elimination or enslavement of its population.

One may conclude that Herodotus explains medism as it would be explained by his contemporaries. He does not disclose any thoughts of his own about the concept of medism and does not directly express his own attitude to it; but he does enable us to see that it was a significant phenomenon in the period of Persian Wars and to understand something of its causes.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, M. M. 1990: Greek Tyrants and the Persians, *CQ* 40, 289–306.
- Bauslaugh, R. A. 1991: *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*, Berkeley.
- Bederman, D. J. 2001: *International Law in Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Buck, R. J. 1979: *A History of Boeotia*, Edmonton.
- Buck, R. J. 1987: Boiotians at Thermopylae, *AHB* 1, 54–60.
- Briant, P. 1996: *Histoire de l'Empire perse. De Cyrus a Alexandre*. Paris.
- Brunt, P. A. 1953, The Hellenic League against Persia, *Historia* 2, 135–163 (Reprinted in P. A. Brunt, *Studies in Greek History and Thought* [1993], 47–83).
- Connor, W. R. 1968: *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Gillis, D. 1969: Marathon and the Alcmeonids, *GRBS* 10, 133–145.
- Gillis, D. 1979: *Collaboration with the Persians*, Wiesbaden.
- Graf, D. 1984: Medism: the Origin and Significance of the Term, *JHS* 104, 15–30.
- Graf, D. 1985: Greek Tyrants and Achaemenid Politics, in J. W. Eadie & J. Ober.(eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian. Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, Lanham, 79–123.
- Gugel, H. 1979: *Medismos*, in: *DKP* III, 1133.
- Habicht, C. 1961: Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege, *Hermes* 89, 1–35.
- Hahn, I. 1981: Die Begriffe auf -ισμός, in: E. C. Welskopf (Hrsg.), *Soziale Typenbegriffe. Untersuchungen ausgewählter altgriechischer sozialer Typenbegriffe und ihre Fortleben in Antike und Mittelalter IV*, Berlin, 52–99.
- Hegyí, D. 1974: *Μηδισμός. Perzsabarát irányzat görögországban i. e. 508–479* (The tendency towards friendship with Persia in Greece in the period 508–479), Budapest (in Hungarian).
- Holladay, A. J. 1978: Medism in Athens 508–480 B. C., *G&R* 25, 174–191.
- Hornblower, S. 1983: *The Greek World, 479–423 B. C.*, London.
- How, W. W., Wells, J. 1912: *A Commentary on Herodotus* 1, Oxford.

subject of debate since ancient times (cf. Theopompus 115 f. 153; Habicht, C. 1961, 11–16; Connor, W. 1968, 81–82).

- Huxley, G. 1967: The Medism of Caryae, *GRBS* 8, 29–32.
- Isaac, B. 2004: *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton.
- Jonkers, E.J. 1948: Μηδοί, τὰ Μηδικὰ, μηδισμός, in: *Studia varia Carolo Guilielmo Vollgrauff*, Amsterdam, 78–83.
- Keaveney, A. 1995: The Medisers of Thessaly, *Eranos* 93, 30–38.
- Kelly, Th. 1974: Argive Foreign Policy in the Fifth Century BC, *CPh* 69, 81–99.
- Kienast, D. 2003: Der Hellenenbund von 481 v.Chr., *Chiron* 33, 43–77.
- Kinzl, K. H. 1977: Athens: Between Tyranny and Democracy, in: *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory. Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, Berlin; New York, 199–223.
- Kuhr, A. 1988: Earth and Water, in: A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (eds), *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory*, Leiden, 87–99.
- McGregor, M. F. 1940: The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 BC, *HSCPh* Suppl. 1, 71–95.
- Missiou, A. 1993: ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ: the Politics of Translation, *CQ* 43, 377–391.
- Myres, J.L. 1936: Μηδίζεσθαι, μηδισμός, in: *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford, 97–105.
- Momigliano, A. 1979: Persian Empire and Greek Freedom, in: A. Ryan (ed.), *The Idea of Freedom. Essays in Honor of Isaiah Berlin*, Oxford, 139–151.
- Orlin, L.L. 1976: Athens and Persia ca 507 BC.: A Neglected Perspective, in: *Michigan Oriental Studies in honor of G. G. Cameron*, Ann Arbor, 265–266.
- Ostwald, M. 1995: Freedom and the Greeks, in: R. W. Davis (ed), *The Origins of Modern Freedom in the West*, Stanford, CA, 35–63.
- Petit, T. 2004: Xénophon et la vassalité Achéménide, in: C. J. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World*. Stuttgart, 175–199.
- Phillipson, C. 1911: *The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*. 2, London.
- Raaflaub, K. 2004: *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*, Chicago.
- Robertson, N. D. 1976: The Thessalian Expedition of 480 BC, *JHS* 96, 100–120
- Rung, E. 2005: Fenomen midizma v politicheskoj zhizni klassicheskoj Grecii (The Phenomenon of Medism in the Political Life of Classical Greece), *VDI* 3, 14–35 (in Russian).
- Rung, E. 2007: Praktika predostavlenija zemli i vody v greko-persidskikh otoshenijakh (The Practice of Giving Earth and Water in Greco-Persian Relations), *VDI* 4, 3–26 (in Russian).
- Sealey, R. 1976: The Pit and the Well. The Persian Heralds of 491 B.C., *CJ* 72, 13–20.
- Stein-Holkeskamp, E. 1999: Medismos, *DNP* 7, 1001.
- Surikov, I. 2000: *Iz istorii grecheskoj aristokratii pozdnearchaicheskoj i ranneklassicheskoj epokh* (From the History of Greek Aristocracy in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Period), Moscow (in Russian).
- Surikov, I. 2005: *Antichnaja Grecia. Politiki v kontekste epokhi* (Ancient Greece. Politicians in the Context of their Times). Moscow (in Russian).
- Surikov, I. 2006: *Ostrakizm v Afinakh* (Ostracism at Athens), Moscow (in Russian).
- Troncoso, V.A. 2001: Die neutralen Staaten in den Perserkriegen und das griechische Völkerrecht, in: D. Papenfuß und V.M. Strocka (Hrsg.), *Gab es das Griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Tagungsbeiträge des 16. Fachsymposiums der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung veranstaltet vom 5. bis 9. April 1999 in Freiburg im Breisgau*, Mainz, 365–375.
- Tuplin, C.J. 1994: Persians as Medes, in: H.Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A.T.Kuhr & M.C.Root (eds), *Achaemenid History VIII*, Leiden, 235–256.
- Tuplin, C.J. 1997: Medism and its Causes, *Transeuphratène* 13, 155–185.
- Vanicelly, P. 2004: Whose Side Are You On? in: V. Karageorgis and I. Taifacos (eds), *World of Herodotus*, Nicosia, 199–217.
- Vickers, M. 1985: Persepolis, Vitruvius and the Erechtheum Caryatids: The Iconography of Medism and Servitude, *RA* 1, 3–28.
- Viviers, D. 1995: Hérodote et la neutralité des Crétois en 480 avant notre ère, *Hermes* 123, 257–269.

- Walker, E. M. 1935: Athens and the Great Powers, in: *CAH* V, Cambridge.
- Westlake, H. D. 1936: The Medism of Thessaly, *JHS* 56, 12–25.
- Wery, L. M. 1966: Le meurtre des hérauts de Darius en 491 et l'inviolabilité du héraut, *AC* 35, 468–488.
- Wolski, J. 1973: ΜΗΔΙΣΜΟΣ et son importance en Grèce à l'époque des Guerres Médiques, *Historia* 22, 3–15.