Herodotus and the Emergence of the Demagogue Tyrant Concept

von Ivan Jordović, Novi Sad

Professor Karl-Wilhelm Welwei zum 80. Geburtstag

Many scholars have argued that social resentment and division were among the major causes of internal conflict in ancient Greece, and that civil strife was in fact an issue of "class struggle."[1] Recently, however, a number of arguments have been presented in opposition to this view.[2]

This perception of class conflict has been greatly influenced by the concept of the power-loving demagogue, who exploits social animosities by manipulating the lower classes with the aim of establishing tyranny. This concept emerged only in the fourth century B.C. and was first put forward by Plato, who influenced many Greek authors,[3] and through them, modern scholarship.[4] Recently, however, scholars have expressed doubt over the historical foundation of this concept.[5]

---

[1]   Cf. de Ste. Croix (1981); Austin/Vidal-Naquet (1984) 22-27, 114-117; Finley (1987) 1-23, 108-111.

[2]   Cf. Welwei (1975) 12f.; Nippel (1980) 120f.; Lintott (1982) 252-263; Gehrke (1985a) 309-354. These counter-arguments should not be identified with the view that within the Greek *polis* there was no social resentment or conflict; rather, they address the fact that the thesis regarding class conflict is not historically grounded. It is necessary to bear in mind that the separation between rich and poor presented in the sources was strongly influenced by the personal, philosophical and political viewpoints of the authors. Cf. Gehrke (1985a) 320-325, 328-339; id. (1985b) 133-150; see also Ruschenbusch (1978) 24-54; Lintott (1982) 239-251; Piepenbrink (2001) 37ff. Winterling argues that civil war was not a "class struggle" which aimed at annulling social inequalities caused by economic differences, however, he does not share Gehrke's view that the classification of rich and poor is "an empty cliché"; see Winterling (1993) 179-205.

[3]   Plat. *Rep*. 565e-566a, 566e, 568c-569c, Aristot. *Pol*. 1305a7-27, 1310b12ff., 1315a31ff.

[4]   Cf. Stroheker (1958) 37, 39ff., 53, 150ff.; Frolov (1973) 90f., 96ff., 106; Finley (1979) 89, 102f.; Lintott (1982) 199f., 260f.; Austin/Vidal-Naquet (1984) 117-119; Sanders (1987) 133f.; Berger (1992) 41ff., 57f., 64; Sordi (1992) 20; O'Neil (1995) 44, 54, 73, 75, esp. 81; Demandt (1995) 173; Zahrnt (1997) 162f.; see also Berve (1967) 216, 222-226; Deininger (1993) 58ff.; Hofer (2000) 215.

[5]   Cf. Heuss (1971) 20; Spahn (1977) 79-83; Stahl (1987) 60-73, 105, 134f.; Stein-Hölkeskamp (1989) 141-153; Barceló (1993) 84; de Libero (1996) 393f., 400-402; Schütrumpf/Gehrke (1996) 487, 549; cf. also Nippel (1980) 120f.; Gehrke (1985a) 309-339; v. Wees (2002) 76f., 81. What is most emphasized is the fact that Dionysius I, whom many scholars consider a role model for the demagogue tyrant, did not rise to power as a champion of the poor (Aristot. *Pol*. 1305a26ff., 1310b29ff.); cf. Jordović (2005) 255-262; id. (2007) 19-30; id. (2008) 136-146; contra Stroheker

If Plato's concept of the demagogue tyrant was not historically grounded, then debate concerning its origin must be reopened. The first aim of this paper is to show that Herodotus laid the groundwork for Plato's concept of the demagogue tyrant.[6] Herodotus' well-known 'Constitutional Debate' will be a particularly useful piece of evidence in demonstrating this thesis since it is the result of Greek political thought and in it one can recognize a thought process which contains all the essential elements of Plato's concept of demagogue tyrant.[7] The second aim is to identify the influences and motives that led Herodotus to formulate the concept of the patron tyrant.[8] In this respect the Athenian political experience will be in the centre of attention.

In this fictitious debate between three Persian aristocrats over the best system of government, democracy, oligarchy and monarchy, or tyranny, were for the first time placed in opposition.[9] Otanes, favouring democracy, expressed the traditionally negative view of tyrannical rule.[10] Darius replied that monarchy in fact emerged from democracy. He argued that the rule of the people engendered evil-mindedness (κακότης), causing the 'bad' to dominate and join forces to the detriment of the commonwealth. This state of affairs continued until one man became the leader of the people (προστάς τοῦ δήμου), bringing an end to such evil-doing.[11] The multitude paid tribute to him, ultimately electing him as their monarch.[12] Darius' explanation implies that the said champion of the people could not be included in the 'bad', since he must confront them in or-

---

(1958) 4; Heuss (1971) 29, 33ff.; Lintott (1982) 185f., 240, 246, 249; Gehrke (1985b) 150; Schütrumpf/Gehrke (1996) 487; see also Berve (1967) 353; Ungern-Sternberg (1987) 1145f., 1151.

6   This paper does not question the fact that Plato was influenced by other authors such as Aristophanes and Thucydides, as well as political figures like Pericles, Cleon and Alcibiades. However, such influences have already been thoroughly discussed, and therefore this paper purposely focuses on Herodotus. Herodotus' influence on Plato has been underemphasized, and thus a further aim is to highlight this influence.

7   Hdt. 3.80-82; cf. Bringmann (1976) 266-279; Bleicken (1979) 152f., 156; Alonso-Núñez (1998) 25-29; Mann (2007) 195f.; Maricki-Gadjanski (2004) 75ff.; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 472f.

8   For the sake of clarity I shall use two *termini technici*: "demagogue tyrant" and "patron tyrant". The first term describes an unscrupulous demagogue who, out of utterly selfish motives, incites the people against the elite by manipulating social animosities. It is thus that he manages to become a tyrant, ultimately turning his back on the *demos*. The second term implies a προστάτης τοῦ δήμου who also craves autocratic power, however, he protects the people from the abuse of the 'bad' and powerful. As a result, he succeeds in seizing absolute power, but even then, he keeps the well-being of the people in his mind. Therefore, he is a tyrant who strongly resembles a good monarch.

9   Cf. Bleicken (1979) 151; Meier (³1995) 489f. Herodotus predominantly used the terms τύραννος, βασιλεύς and δεσπότης as synonyms (Berve [1967] 195, 627; Flory [1987] 120; Hartog [1988] 334).

10   Hdt. 3.80,2-6.

11   Cf. Zoepffel (1974) 76.

12   Hdt. 3.82,4-5.

der to protect the *demos*.[13] His rise to power is the outcome of his attempt to achieve the good for all. Darius therefore does not contradict himself when he states that an autocrat provides the best for his people and that monarchy had in fact brought freedom to the Persians.[14]

In both goal and method, Plato's "demagogue tyrant" is very similar to the concept of the "patron tyrant" put forward by Darius in Herodotus' account. However, there is a significant difference between the two in terms of their treatment of and motive towards the people. According to Plato, a dema-gogue, or leader of the people, is the most immoral individual in the *polis*. Based on purely selfish motives, he incites the *demos* against the elite, only to turn his back on the former once he attains power, terminating the unrestricted free-dom that had previously prevailed.[15] Plato, it seems, has taken Herodotus' line of argumentation regarding a beneficent ruler and turned it around, thus trans-forming the concept of the patron tyrant into that of the demagogue tyrant.

The question then arises regarding the origin of Herodotus' concept of the patron tyrant.[16] Given the setting in which he placed his dialogue, it seems reasonable to search for an answer in his *logoi* of the Asiatic despots. Among those *logoi*, the one concerning Deioces is the most instructive, since the means by which he became king of the Medes bears a strong resemblance to the con-cept of the patron tyrant outlined in the 'Constitutional Debate'.[17] The *logos* of Deioces is not merely an anecdote concerning the foundation of the Median monarchy. In fact, along with the account of Peisistratus' rise to power and tyranny, it provides the most detailed description of the emergence of a par-ticular system of government in Herodotus.[18] This *logos*, like the 'Constitutio-nal Debate', is distinguished by abstractness, rationality and the absence of both divine and novelistic elements.[19]

---

[13] Cf. Leppin (1999) 29.
[14] Hdt. 3.82,2, 5.
[15] Plat. *Rep*. 564a, 569b-c.
[16] One option is the case of Pittacus, one of the seven sages, whom Aristotle took as a crown example for his concept of the *aisymnetes* tyrant, elected by the people in order to fight the emigrants (Aristot. *Pol*. 1284a35-1285b2); cf. Schütrumpf (1991) 542f., contra Libero (1996) 325-327; Hölkeskamp (1999) 219-223. Herodotus mentions Pittacus, but only briefly; he does not mention his tyranny (Hdt. 1.27).
[17] Hdt. 1.95,2-101; cf. Stroheker (1953) 386; Gammie (1986) 178; Sancisi-Weerdenburg (2000) 1-5.
[18] Cf. Waters (1985) 131; Georges (1994) 176-181; Walter (2004) 78; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 149.
[19] See Barceló (1993) 167; Walter (2004) 79; Dewald (2003) 27.

Herodotus characterizes Deioces as a wise man (ἀνὴρ σοφός), who from an early stage secretly wanted to seize absolute power (ἐρασθεὶς τυραννίδος).[20] Since there was a great degree of lawlessness in Media at that time, Deioces endeavoured to increase his reputation by exhibiting a love of justice. First elected as a judge in his township, he then became famous throughout Media on account of his just decisions. Other Medes began pleading their cases before him, until all of Media relied on him alone for meting out justice. Deioces then announced publicly that he no longer wished to occupy the seat of judgement, as it forced him to neglect his personal affairs. This statement provoked a debate among the Medes, and it was in this context that the friends of Deioces suggested he be made king, arguing that such an action would put an end to the lawlessness in Media. Their suggestion was widely approved by the Medes, and Deioces was elected king.[21] Once inaugurated, Deioces built Ecbatana and unified all the Medes. He remained throughout his reign a rigorous protector of justice.[22]

Deioces came into power by acting for the good of all and supported by the will of the people, remaining righteous and just even after he became the absolute ruler of the Medes.[23] The similarities to the concept of the patron tyrant presented by Darius in the 'Constitutional Debate' are clear. The only departure from Darius' thesis is that Deioces wanted tyrannical power for himself from the very beginning, and that he intentionally deceived the people to achieve such power. No special importance should be attached to this difference, however, especially if the broader context of the Persian debate is taken into account. Darius, elected king following the debate, also longed for absolute power at an early stage and managed to obtain it through cunning.[24] Deioces' rise to power was the starting point of the Median *logos*, employed by Herodotus as an introduction to his account of the rise of Persia under Cyrus the Great,[25] an account which emphasizes the kinship between Astyages, the last king of the Medes, and Cyrus, the first Persian monarch.[26]

Establishing the concept of the patron tyrant in its Persian-Median context provides only a partial answer to the question of Herodotus' influence on the emergence of the concept of demagogue tyrant, since the latter was strictly Greek in character. Nevertheless, there are indications that Herodotus placed

---

[20]   Hdt. 1.96,1-2.
[21]   Hdt. 1.96,2-98,2.
[22]   Hdt. 1.98,3-101.
[23]   Hdt. 1.100; cf. Bichler (2000) 235.
[24]   Hdt. 3.82,1, 85; cf. Bringmann (1976) 267, 276, 278f.; Reinhardt (1989) 163; Dewald (2003) 30.
[25]   Hdt. 1.95; Dewald (2003) 28; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 61.
[26]   Hdt. 1.108-117, 120-121.

the concept of the patron tyrant in a Greek context as well. Plato alludes to Herodotus' Lydian *logos* in his description of the manner in which the demagogue becomes a tyrant by quoting Herodotus' account of the oracle given to Croesus by the Pythia in Delphi.[27]

In Herodotus' Lydian *logos*, Croesus is presented as the prototype of the Asian despot who falls victim to absolute power despite many warnings.[28] Herodotus uses Croesus, the last king of Lydia, as a paradigm for the Persian despot. Croesus initiates the conflict between Asia and Europe and he is the first Asian despot to act unjustly against the Greeks, subjugating a number of them. Further, it is with him that oriental presumption and Hellenic σωφροσύνη are first placed in opposition. His hubris and πλεονεξία lead to his inevitable downfall.[29] Herodotus elaborates on the paradigmatic character of Croesus by contrasting the king with the Athenian legislator Solon, placing the account in an Athenian context.[30] In Herodotus' account, Croesus, already on the pyre, remembers his conversation with Solon, and admits to Cyrus that he would have given much wealth so that all the sovereigns of the world could converse with the lawgiver.[31]

There is a direct connection between Croesus' *logos* and that of Deioces, indicated by the place allotted by Herodotus to the latter in his *Histories*. Deioces' rise to power separates the two central events of the first book: the downfall of Croesus and the rise of Cyrus the Great. Herodotus associates Cyrus with Solon twice. First, directly, when Croesus' story about his encounter with Solon convinced Cyrus to spare the king, and second, indirectly, when Croesus attempted to take over Solon's role as a 'wise counsellor', having been unable to prevent the Persian king, blinded by hubris, from falling victim to the self-perpetuating dynamics of expansion.[32]

The parallels drawn between Solon and Deioces should dispel any remaining doubts over whether Herodotus wanted his audience to establish a link between the Lydian *logos* and his account of Deioces. Scholars have not given much attention to this parallel, most likely because of Herodotus' curiously ambiva-

---

27 Plat. *Rep*. 566c.
28 Cf. Pohlenz (1937) 11f.; Raaflaub (1987) 241-246.
29 Hdt. 1.5,3-6,1, 29-33; cf. Regenbogen (1961) 123f.; Raaflaub (1987) 241-246; Long (1987) 64f.; Erbse (1992) 10, 12, 29f.; Heuss (1995) 70f.; Dewald (2003) 33-35, 43; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 66.
30 Cf. Erbse (1992) 14, 21; Bichler/Rollinger (2001) 86.
31 Hdt. 1.86,3-5.
32 Hdt. 1.86,3-6, 88-90,1, 207-208, 212-214, cf. Erbse (1992) 29; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 65, 142, 212. This point is emphasized by the hubris of Cyrus the Great; cf. Flower (³2008) 282.

lent description of Solon.[33] Although the Athenian statesman is given a rather significant role to play in the Lydian *logos*, which occupies a prominent position in the *Histories*,[34] Herodotus says almost nothing about Solon's political and legislative activities. He notes that Solon wrote laws for the Athenians at their request, and then left Attica for ten years having previously obliged his fellow citizens not to repeal his laws during his absence.[35] When one looks more closely at Solon's conduct and attitude during his conversation with Croesus, it soon becomes clear that they represent the same values and thoughts outlined in his poems, and which must have been well known in the second half of fifth century B.C.[36] Solon rejects tyrannical power and the argument that it is a blessing to the people, and warns against the pernicious end that all despots will eventually face.[37] Solon instead emphasizes the well-being of the polis[38] as well as traditional values such as self-sacrifice, bravery, family and piety.[39] He is critical of wealth, favouring moderation, modesty and self-sufficiency.[40] The arrogant Croesus, blinded by his "blessedness," considers Solon's dismissal of the "blessings" of tyrannical power as simple ignorance.[41]

A fruitful comparison may be made between Deioces' *logos* and the political experience of the Athenians. As has already been noted, the two accounts of Deioces and Peisistratus comprise the only thorough presentation of the emergence of tyranny in Herodotus. It is clear that this is not a superficial overlap; Herodotus notes that the Medes enjoyed freedom (ελευθερίη) and autonomy (αὐτόνομος) before the monarchy was established, after they had been liberated from Assyrian domination.[42] The use here of the notions of freedom and autonomy, central concepts of Athenian democratic ideology, cannot be discarded as a coincidence.[43] The links to Solon are even more apparent; Deioces displays many central characteristics often attributed to famous Greek legis-

---

[33]   Cf. Raaflaub (2006) 399f.

[34]   Cf. Fornara (1971) 17ff., 36 n. 14; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 60, 66, 97f., 141f.

[35]   Hdt. 1.29.

[36]   Cf. Chiasson (1986) 249-262; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 98.

[37]   Sol. 33W.; Hdt. 1.32, 86,3-5; cf. Parker (1998) 155f. In dismissing the "blessing" of tyranny, Solon establishes a causal connection between action and inevitable punishment, as in the elegies of historical Solon.

[38]   Sol. 4, 32, 36W; Hdt. 1.30,3-4; cf. Immerwahr (³1982) 531f. On Solon, see also Welwei (1992) 150-206; Raaflaub (2001) 89-99.

[39]   Sol. 4, 4b-c, 13, 23, 24W; Hdt. 1.31,2-5; cf. Scanlon (1994) 146f.

[40]   Sol. 13, 23W.; Hdt. 1.32,4-9. Solon's negative attitude towards the wealthy is evident in his statement that one of the advantages of the poor is that they have happiness and healthy children (Hdt. 1.32,6).

[41]   Hdt. 1.33; Sol. 33W.

[42]   Hdt. 1.95,2.

[43]   Raaflaub (2004) 147-160, 203-247.

lators.[44] One of these is overcoming the "pre-political state" of total lawlessness.[45] Herodotus uses the term ἀνομίη in two crucial places when describing the state in Media before Deioces.[46] Solon uses the term δυσνομίη[47] in his *Eunomia* poem, relating it to ἀνομίη,[48] εὐνομίη[49] is mentioned as the antithesis to both terms. Herodotus directly associates Deioces and the notion of εὐνομίη, Solon's ideal.[50] The connection between Solon and Deioces is also reflected in the fact that the rise of the latter is almost "obsessively" associated with terms of the stem δικ; Solon elevated justice into the heavenly sphere, establishing a clear link between its existence and the welfare of the polis.[51] Herodotus' characterization of Deioces as a wise man is also of note, as Solon was traditionally counted among the seven sages. In Croesus' *logos*, Solon's wisdom is repeatedly emphasized.[52]

According to Herodotus, apart from having overcome a state of lawlessness, Deioces also encouraged the Medes to leave their small towns and live together in Ecbatana, "whose longest wall was about the length of the wall that surrounded the city of Athens."[53] In this statement, Ecbatana is directly compared to Athens, further, it illustrates the notion, conceived of fairly early on, that some of the famous legislators, besides passing laws, also framed constitutions.[54] As far as Solon himself is concerned, the Athenians considered him as the founder of their democracy in late fifth century B.C., but that does not negate the possibility that he was acknowledged as one of the founding fathers of their constitution even earlier.[55]

---

[44] Cf. Hölkeskamp (1999) 42, 48f.; see also Irwin (2005) 223ff.

[45] This motive exists in Sisyphus' fragment, credited to Critias, at Anonymus Iamblichi and Isocrates (DK 88 B25, 89,6,1ff.; Isokr. *Or*. 4,39); cf. Hölkeskamp (1999) 49. The same motive is also attributed to Lycurgus (Hdt. 1.65,2, 4; Thuc. 1.18,1; Plut. *Lyc*. 2,5); see Hölkeskamp (1999) 49.

[46] Hdt. 1.96,2, 97,2.

[47] Sol. F4W.31 = F3D.31= 3.G.-Pr.31; cf. Stahl (1992) 396-398.

[48] Cf. Raaflaub (2004) 55, 94, 252; Lewis (2006) 56f.

[49] Sol. 4W.32; Hdt. 1.97,3; Lewis (2006) 57; Stahl (1992) 396-399; Walter (2004) 84.

[50] Sol. 4W.32; Hdt. 1.97,3.

[51] Hdt. 1.96,1-97,1; Sol. 4W, 13W; cf. Flory (1987) 124; Lateiner (1989) 276 n. 32; Walter (2004) 83; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 149; Mülke (2002) 121, 251-255; Lewis (2006) 74-80; see also Stahl (1987) 229f.

[52] Hdt. 1.30,2, 86,3-4. Solon is directly linked to the seven sages in Herodotus as well (Hdt. 1.27).

[53] This comparison is significant in that it illustrates that Herodotus deliberately avoided using the term *polis* for Ecbatana. This is not unusual, since it was not a Greek city; however, a *polis*, when ruled by a tyrant, loses the characteristics which make it such an entity; see Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 149f.

[54] Aristot. *Pol*. 1273b32ff., 1274b18f., 1296a18ff.; Schütrumpf (1991) 363; Hölkeskamp (1999) 42, 49f., 53.

[55] Cf. Ruschenbusch (1958) 398-424; Mossé (2004) 242-259; Rhodes (1981) 345-347; Munn (2000) 135.

Three parallels illustrate the emergence of the concept of the patron tyrant and further emphasize the fact that Herodotus' characterization of Deioces was strongly influenced by Solon. Both Deioces and Solon were elected by the people to influential positions within the community by broad public consensus, on account of the exceptional reputation they enjoyed.[56] In both cases, a smaller group of powerful men were responsible for the tense socio-political situation, and the majority suffered the consequences of the former's injustice.[57] Like Herodotus, Solon indicated in his elegies that such a situation threatened to generate tyranny.[58] In both Herodotus' *Histories* and Solon's poems, the common people contributed to the establishment of tyranny out of ignorance and imprudence, and because they were discontented with the difficult state of affairs.[59]

It is here that the similarities end and the differences begin. The differences are fewer but they are all the more remarkable because they paradoxically confirm our results so far. In his elegies, Solon makes it clear that when he was chosen as mediator he had an opportunity to get hold of tyrannical power with the help of the people, and that the only reason why he did not was that he did not want to harm his *polis*.[60] He was willing to suffer being considered imprudent by some fellow citizens, and many of the common people were unsatisfied with his reforms.[61] The most famous instance of Solon's moral fortitude was his ten-year-long voluntary exile from Athens, during which time the laws he passed would remain unchallenged.[62] Herodotus was well aware of this action, best illustrated by the fact that at the very beginning of Croesus' *logos*, the only piece of information provided about Solon is his departure from Athens.[63] Deioces, on the other hand, consciously abused his position as judge in order to win the people's support and seize power as tyrant.[64] The difference between their actions becomes even more apparent if we take into account the fact that Deioces accomplished his aim in almost the same way as Solon did. Whereas Solon left Athens so that the laws would remain unchanged, Deioces withdrew from the public life in order to become a tyrant.

---

[56] Cf. Stahl (1987) 190.
[57] The account of the rise of Deioces concerns total lawlessness. Nevertheless, it is a logical conclusion since the connection between Deioces and the 'Constitutional Debate', in which all the blame is attached to the unjust minority, was established earlier. In Solon's opinion, the people assume part of the blame, however the powerful minority are the main culprits (Sol. 4, 9W).
[58] Sol. 4, 9, 11, 32, 33, 34W; Hdt. 1.96,2-98,2, 3.82,4.
[59] Sol. 4, 9, 11W; cf. Spahn (1977) 128; id. (1993) 361; Wallace (1997) 14.
[60] Sol. 32, 33, 34W; cf. Cobet (1981) 51.
[61] Sol. 7, 32, 33, 34, 36W; cf. Spahn (1977) 121f., 125, 127-130; Wallace (2007) 69ff.
[62] Aristot. *Athen. Pol.* 11,1; Plut. *Sol.* 25,6-28.
[63] Hdt. 1.29.
[64] Hdt. 1.97,1-2; cf. Harris (2006) 297-299.

Bearing in mind all the similarities and differences between Solon and Deioces mentioned here, several conclusions seem justified. First, Herodotus' concept of the patron tyrant laid the foundation for Plato's concept of the demagogue tyrant. Second, this concept was strongly influenced by Athenian political experience and Solon's elegies. Third, by comparing Deioces with Solon, Herodotus wished to prove that the differences between the Hellenes, or the Athenians, and the Persians were much more significant than generally assumed, and that they do not only boil down to differences in the system of government.[65] The 'Constitutional Debate' and the account of Deioces make it clear that in Herodotus' opinion, the Medes, just like the Persians, enjoyed freedom of choice at one point, but, unlike the Athenians, they chose despotism instead of freedom.[66] This difference is all the more striking since Herodotus' outline of Peisistratus' tyranny reveals that the Athenians also faced this choice but, despite a long struggle, they finally chose freedom and democracy. Fourth, the concept of the patron tyrant can be applied to Herodotus' portrayal of Peisistratus' rise to power and his rule over Athens, despite some noticeable differences.[67]

These conclusions are significant for several reasons. Herodotus considered Cleisthenes and not Solon as the father of the Athenian democracy, precisely because he was convinced that the struggle between freedom and tyranny in

---

[65] Cf. Raaflaub (1981) 265.

[66] Cf. Hunter (1982) 215f.; Immerwahr (1982) 528f.; Thomas (2000) 117; Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 67f.

[67] First, Herodotus associates Solon with Croesus before Croesus' death, although the connection is not historical. The encounter of Solon and Croesus thus took place at the same time as Peisistratus' rise to power (Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella [2007] 99). This placement was intentional; Peisistratus' rise to power is described precisely within the Lydian *logos* (Hdt. 1.59-64). The prophecy which, according to Herodotus, convinced Peisistratus to attack the Athenians without warning near Pallene is also significant, in that the last obstacle to Peisistratus' rise to power was removed in this way. In the prophecy, as in one of Solon's elegies, tyrannical power is compared to a fishing net (Hdt. 1.62,4; Sol. 33W). Apart from these circumstances, some considerable similarities exist between Herodotus' Peisistratus and Deioces. There was conflict in Attica even before Peisistratus became involved on the political stage (Hdt. 1.59,3-4). Peisistratus became famous by capturing Nisaea in the war against Megara, in addition to other accomplishments prior to his joining the struggle for power (Hdt. 1.59,4; cf. Walter [2004] 87 and n. 57). Peisistratus came to power three times, each time deceiving the Athenians; cf. Waters (1971) 21f. First, there was a fictitious assassination, second, a religious ruse, and third, an olive branch extended to exiles of Attica, preventing them from uniting against him (Hdt. 1.59,4-5, 60,3-5, 63,2-64,1). Peisistratus' bodyguards also played a prominent role. They were crucial when he carried out the first coup, and were central to his regime after he achieved lasting power (Hdt. 1.59,5-6). Two parallels must be highlighted. One is that Peisistratus did not repeal city government and laws, but ruled in accordance with them, and the other is that the idea of one man holding power in Athens had an effect contrary to the one it had in Media and Persia, in that the loss of freedom caused Athens' weakness (Hdt. 1.59, 64,3, 5.66,1, 78); Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella (2007) 67.

Athens had not ended by the end of sixth century B.C.[68] These parallels indicate another possible motive for the emergence of the concept of patron tyrant. The first Athenian democratic politician accused of aspiring to tyranny was not Alcibiades, but Pericles, favoured by Herodotus.[69] Unlike any other democratic leader either before or after his lifetime, Pericles dominated the political life of his city. Due to his exceptional influence, Pericles' opponents accused him of seeking tyrannical power through the support of the people, and compared him to Peisistratus.[70] Herodotus himself made similar allusions.[71] Therefore, it is conceivable that the concept of the patron tyrant was also influenced by Pericles' outstanding position in Athens.[72] This implies that another purpose of the patron tyrant concept was to illustrate that something similar could not occur within the setting of Athenian democracy of the fifth century, but only in sixth century B.C. In addition, Herodotus indicated that the Athenians, unlike the Medes and the Persians, ultimately chose freedom and democracy, since autocratic rule was not typical of them. As Herodotus repeatedly emphasizes, it was the Alcmaeonidae with whom Pericles had strong family ties, and who were the most ferocious opponents of Peisistratus' tyranny and the fiercest fighters for freedom and the rule of the people.[73]

Literature

Alonso-Núñez, J.M., Die Verfassungsdebatte bei Herodot, in: Schuller, W. (ed.), Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum (Darmstadt 1998) 19-29.

Asheri, D./Lloyd, A./Corcella A., A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV, ed. by O. Murray & A. Moreno (Oxford 2007).

Austin, M./Vidal-Naquet, P., Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im alten Griechenland (München 1984).

Barceló, P., Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland (Stuttgart 1993).

Berger, S., Revolution and Society in Greek Sicily and Southern Italy (Stuttgart 1992).

Berve, H., Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen (München 1967).

---

[68] Hdt. 6.131,1, 5.66, 69,2, 78; cf. Raaflaub (1995) 8f.; Scott (2005) 430.

[69] Cf. Ehrenberg (1956) 106; Jordović (2005) 135-139; Lehmann (2008) 33f.

[70] Plut. *Per.* 16,1-2; Telekleid. frg. 45 K.-A.; Kratin frg. 73, 114, 118, 171, 258 K.-A.; cf. Schwarze (1971) 40ff., 59ff., 171f., 185ff., Klein (1979) 503ff.; Podlecki (1998) 175f.; Jordović (2005) 135f.; McGlew (2006) 164-173.

[71] Hdt. 6.131,2, cf. 5.56,1, 92,3; cf. Schubert (1994) 7f.; Spahn (2000) 25; Jordović (2005) 135; Scott (2005) 29f., 430f.

[72] Thuc. 1.127,3, 139,4, 2.65,4-10; Plut. *Per.* 3, 8-9, 13, 16; cf. Wüst (1935) 55; Bringmann (1976) 274.

[73] Hdt. 5.62-63,1, 6.121, 123-124; cf. Scott (2005) 405-408.

Bichler, R., Herodots Welt. Der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte (Berlin 2000).

Bichler, R./Rollinger, R., Herodot (Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 2001).

Bleicken, J., Zur Entstehung der Verfassungstypologie im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr., in: Historia 28 (1979) 148-172.

Bringmann, K., Die Verfassungsdebatte bei Herodot 3,80-82 und Dareios' Aufstieg zur Königsherrschaft, in: Hermes 104 (1976) 266-279.

Chiasson, Ch.C., The Herodotean Solon, in: GRBS 27 (1986) 249-262.

Cobet, J., König, Anführer, Herr, Monarch, Tyrann, in: Welskopf, E.Ch. (ed.), Soziale Typenbegriffe im alten Griechenland und ihr Fortleben in den Sprachen der Welt, Bd. 3 (Berlin 1981) 11-66.

Deininger, J., "Krise" der Polis? Betrachtungen zur Kontinuität der gesellschaftlichen Gruppen und der inneren Konflikte im Syrakus des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., in: Dietz, K./Henning, D./Kaletsch, H. (eds.), Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Festschrift für A. Lippold (Würzburg 1993) 55-76.

de Libero, L., Die archaische Tyrannis (Stuttgart 1996).

Demandt, A., Antike Staatsformen. Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte der Alten Welt, (Berlin 1995).

de Ste. Croix, G.E.M., The Class Struggle in the Ancient World (London 1981).

Dewald, C., Form and Content: The question of Tyranny in Herodotus, in: Morgan, K.A. (ed.), Popular Tyranny. Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece (Austin 2003) 25-58.

Ehrenberg, V., Sophokles und Perikles (München 1956).

Erbse, H., Studien zum Verständnis Herodots (Berlin/New York 1992).

Finley, M.I., Das antike Sizilien. Von der Vorgeschichte bis zur arabischen Eroberung (München 1979).

Finley, M.I., Politics in the Ancient World (Cambridge 1987).

Flory, S., The Archaic Smile of Herodotus (Detroit 1987).

Flower, M., Herodotus and Persia, in: Dewald, C./Marincola, J. (eds.), The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus (Cambridge [3]2008) 274-289.

Fornara, C.W., Herodotus. An Interpretative Essay (Oxford 1971).

Frolov, E., Die ersten Unternehmungen und die Machtergreifung Dionysios' des Älteren, in: Klio 55 (1973) 103-122.

Gammie, J.G., Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?, in: Journal of Near Eastern Studies 45 (1986) 171-185.

Gehrke, H.-J., Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (München 1985a).

Gehrke, H.-J., Die klassische Polisgesellschaft in der Perspektive griechischer Philosophen, in: Saeculum 36 (1985b) 133-150.

Georges, P., Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience. From the Archaic Period to the Age of Xenophon (Baltimore/London 1994).

Harris, E.M., Solon and the Spirit of the Laws in Archaic and Classical Greece, in: Blok, J.H./Lardinios, A.P.M.H. (eds.), Solon of Athens. New Historical and Philological Approaches (Leiden/Boston 2006) 290-317.

Hartog, F., The Mirror of Herodotus. The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History (Berkeley 1988).

Heuss, A., Aristoteles als Theoretiker des Totalitarismus, in: A&A 17 (1971) 1-44.

Heuss, A., Motive von Herodots lydischen Logos, in: Bleicken, J. (ed.), A. Heuss, Gesammelte Schriften in 3 Bänden (Stuttgart 1995) 68-102.

Hofer, M., Tyrannen, Aristokraten, Demokraten. Untersuchungen zu Staat und Herrschaft im griechischen Sizilien von Phalaris bis zum Aufstieg von Dionysios I. (Frankfurt a.M. 2000).

Hölkeskamp, K.-J., Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland (Stuttgart 1999).

Hunter, V., Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides (Princeton 1982).

Immerwahr, H.R., Tat und Geschichte bei Herodot, in: Marg, W. (ed.), Herodot. Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung (Darmstadt ³1982) 497-540.

Irwin, E., Solon and Early Greek Poetry. The Politics of Exhortation (Cambridge 2005).

Jordović, I., Anfänge der Jüngeren Tyrannis. Vorläufer und erste Repräsentanten von Gewaltherrschaft im späten 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (Frankfurt a.M. 2005).

Jordović, I., Demagogue Tyrant and Class Faction in Syracuse, in: Istraživanja 18 (2007) 19-30.

Jordović, I., On Hermocrates' Patriotism, in: Maricki-Gadjanski, K. (ed.), Evropske ideje, antička civilizacija i srpska kultura. Zbornik radova (Beograd 2008) 136-146.

Klein, R., Die innenpolitische Gegnerschaft des Perikles, in: Wirth, G. (ed.), Perikles und seine Zeit (Darmstadt 1979) 494-533.

Lateiner, D., The Historical Method of Herodotus (Toronto 1989).

Lehmann, G.A., Perikles. Staatsmann und Stratege im klassischen Athen (München 2008).

Leppin, H., Thukydides und die Verfassung der Polis. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Ideengeschichte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Berlin 1999).

Lewis. J., Solon the Thinker. Political Thought in Archaic Athens (London 2006).

Lintott, A., Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City (London/Canberra 1982).

Long, T., Repetition and Variation in the Short Stories of Herodotus (Frankfurt a.M. 1987).

Mann, Chr., Die Demagogen und das Volk. Zur politischen Kommunikation im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Berlin 2007).

Maricki-Gadjanski, K., ΙΣΟΝΟΜΙΑ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ: Dijalog ili moć, in: Maricki-Gadjanski, K. (ed.), Istina – oko Istorije. Antičke i moderne teme (Beograd 2004) 75-83.

McGlew, J., The Comic Pericles, in: Lewis, S. (ed.), Ancient Tyranny (Edinburgh 2006) 164-177.

Meier, Chr., Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen (Frankfurt a.M. ³1995).

Mossé, C., How a Political Myth Takes Shape: Solon, 'Founding Father' of the Athenian Democracy, in: Rhodes, P.J. (ed.), Athenian Democracy (Edinburgh 2004) 242-259.

Mülke, Chr., Solons politische Elegien und Iamben (Fr. 1-13, 32-37 West). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar (München/Leipzig 2002).

Munn, M., The School of History. Athens in the Age of Socrates (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2000).

O'Neil, J.L., The Origins and Developments of Ancient Greek Democracy (Lanham 1995).

Nippel, W., Mischverfassungstheorie und Verfassungsrealität in Antike und früher Neuzeit (Stuttgart 1980).

Parker, V., Týrannos. The Semantics of a Political Concept from Archilochus to Aristotle, in: Historia 126 (1998) 145-172.

Piepenbrink, K., Politische Ordnungskonzeptionen in der attischen Demokratie des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung zum philosophischen und rhetorischen Diskurs (Stuttgart 2001).

Podlecki, A.J., Perikles and His Circle (London/New York 1998).

Pohlenz, M., Herodot. Der erste Geschichtsschreiber des Abendlandes (Leipzig/Berlin 1937).

Raaflaub, K.A., Zum Freiheitsbegriff der Griechen. Materalien und Untersuchungen zur Bedeutungsentwicklung von ἐλεύθερος/ἐλευθερία in der archaischen und klassischen Zeit, in: Welskopf, E.Ch. (ed.), Soziale Typenbegriffe im alten Griechenland und ihr Fortleben in den Sprachen der Welt, Bd. 4 (Berlin 1981) 180-405.

Raaflaub, K.A., Herodotus, Political Thought, and Meaning of History, in: Boedecker, D./Peradotto, J. (eds.), Herodotus and the Invention of History, Arethusa 20 (1987) 221-248.

Raaflaub, K.A., Einleitung und Bilanz, in: Kinzl, K.H., DEMOKRATIA. Der Weg zur Demokratie bei den Griechen (Darmstadt 1995) 1-54.

Raaflaub, K.A., Political Thought, Civic Responsibility, and the Greek Polis, in: Arnason, J.P./Murphey P. (eds.), Agon, Logos, Polis. The Greek Achievement and its Aftermath (Stuttgart 2001) 72-117.

Raaflaub, K.A., The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece (Chicago/London 2004).

Raaflaub, K.A., Athenian and Spartan eunomia, or: what to do with Solon's timocracy?, in: Blok, J.H./Lardinios, A.P.M.H. (eds.), Solon of Athens. New Historical and Philological Approaches (Leiden/Boston 2006) 390-428.

Regenbogen, O., Solon und Krösus. Eine Studie zur Geistesgeschichte des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts, in: Dirlmeier, F. (ed.), Otto Regenbogen. Kleine Schriften (München 1961) 101-124.

Reinhardt, K., Herodots Persergeschichten. Östliches und Westliches im Übergang von Sage zu Geschichte, in: Becker, C. (ed.), Karl Reinhardt. Vermächtnis der Antike. Gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung (Göttingen 1989) 133-174.

Rhodes, P.J., A Commentary on the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981).

Ruschenbusch, E., ΠΑΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. Theseus, Drakon, Solon und Kleisthenes in Publizisitik und Geschichtschreibung des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., in: Historia 7 (1958) 398-424.

Ruschenbusch, E., Untersuchungen zu Staat und Politik in Griechenland vom 7.-4. Jh. v. Chr. (Bamberg 1978).

Sanders, L.J., Dionysios I. of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny (London/New York/Sydney 1987).

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H., The Tyranny of Peisistratos, in: Peisistratos and the Tyranny: Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (ed.), A Reappraisal of the Evidence (Amsterdam 2000) 1-15.

Scanlon, T.F., Echoes of Herodotus in Thucydides: Self-Sufficiency, Admiration, and Law, in: Historia 43 (1994) 143-176.

Schubert, Ch., Perikles (Darmstadt 1994).

Schütrumpf, E., Aristoteles, Politik III, Übersetzt und erläutert von E. Schütrumpf, in: Aristoteles Werke in Deutscher Übersetzung, Bd. 9, Teil 2 (Berlin 1991).

Schütrumpf E./Gehrke, H.-J., Aristoteles, Politik IV-VI, Übersetzt und eingeleitet von E. Schütrumpf, Erläutert von E. Schütrumpf und H.-J. Gehrke, in: Aristoteles Werke in Deutscher Übersetzung, Bd. 9, Teil 3 (Berlin 1996).

Schwarze, J., Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie und ihre historische und historiographische Bedeutung (München 1971).

Scott, L., Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6 (Leiden/Boston 2005).

Sordi, M., La Dynasteia in Occidente (Studi su Dionigi I) (Padova 1992).

Spahn, P., Mittelschicht und Polisbildung (Frankfurt a.M. 1977).

Spahn, P., Individualisierung und politisches Bewußtsein im archaischen Griechenland, in: Raaflaub, K.A. (ed.), Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike. Die nahöstlichen Kulturen und die Griechen (München 1993) 343-363.

Spahn, P., Perikles – Charisma und Demokratie, in: Nippel, W. (ed.), Virtuosen der Macht. Herrschaft und Charisma von Perikles bis Mao (München 2000) 23-38.

Stahl, M. Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates (Stuttgart 1987).

Stahl, M., Solon F 3D. Die Geburtstunde des demokratischen Gedankens, in: Gymnasium 99 (1992) 385-408.

Stein-Hölkeskamp, E., Adelskultur und Polisgesellschaft. Studien zum griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit (Stuttgart 1989).

Stroheker, K.F., Zu den Anfängen der monarchischen Theorie in der Sophistik, in: Historia 2 (1953) 381-412.

Stroheker, K.F., Dionysios I. Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus (Wiesbaden 1958).

Thomas, R., Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion (Cambridge 2000).

Ungern-Sternberg, J. v., Zur Beurteilung Dionysios' I. von Syrakus, in: Will, W./Heinrichs, J. (eds.), Zu Alexander d. Gr. (Amsterdam 1987) 1123-1150.

Wallace, R.W., Solonian Democracy, in: Morris, I./Raaflaub, K.A. (eds.), Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges (Dubuque 1997) 11-29.

Wallace, R.W., Revolution and a New Order, in: Raaflaub, K.A./Ober, J./Wallace, R.W. (eds.), Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece (Berkeley/Los Angeles 2007) 49-82.

Walter, U., "Da sah er das Volk ganz in seiner Hand." – Deiokes und die Entstehung monarchischer Herrschaft im Geschichtswerk Herodots, in: Meier, M./Pat-

zek, B./Walter, U./Wiesehöfer, J. (eds.), Deiokes, König der Meder. Eine Herodot-Episode in ihren Kontexten (Stuttgart 2004) 75-95.

Waters, K.H., Herodotos on Tyrants and Despots. A Study in Objectivity (Wiesbaden 1971).

Waters, K.H., Herodotus the Historian. His Problems, Methods and Originality (London/Sydney 1985).

Wees, H. v., Tyrants, Oligarchs and Citizen Militias, in: Chanaiotis, A./Ducrey, P. (eds.), Army and Power in the Ancient World (Stuttgart 2002) 61-82.

Welwei, K.-W., Die Darstellung politischer Krisen im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides, in: Alföldy, G. (ed.), Krisen in der Antike – Bewußtsein und Bewältigung (Düsseldorf 1975) 9-26.

Welwei, K.-W., Athen. Vom neolithischen Siedlungsplatz zur archaischen Großpolis (Darmstadt 1992).

Winterling, A., "Arme" und "Reiche". Die Struktur der griechischen Polisgesellschaften in Aristoteles' ‚Politik', in: Saeculum 44 (1993) 179-205.

Wüst, K., Politisches Denken bei Herodot (Diss. München 1935).

Zahrnt, M., Der Demos von Syrakus im Zeitalter der Dionysioi, in: Eder, W./Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (eds.), Volk und Verfassung im vorhellenistischen Griechenland (Stuttgart 1997) 153-175.

Zoepffel, R., Aristoteles und die Demagogen, in: Chiron 4 (1974) 69-90.

Assistant Professor Ivan Jordović
University of Novi Sad
Faculty of Philosophy
History Department
Dr. Zorana Djindjića 2
SRB–21000 Novi Sad
E-Mail: ivanjordovic@yahoo.de