Spring 4-4-2017

Carian Greeks and Greek Scythians: The Hybridity of Greek and Barbarian Identity in Herodotus' Histories

Benjamin D. Leach

Spring 4-4-2017

Carian Greeks and Greek Scythians: The Hybridity of Greek and Barbarian Identity in Herodotus' Histories

Benjamin D. Leach

Benjamin Leach
Candidate

Foreign Languages and Literatures
Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Professor Lorenzo F. Garcia Jr., Chair

Professor Monica S. Cyrino

Professor Osman Umurhan

CARIAN GREEKS AND GREEK SCYTHIANS: THE HYBRIDITY OF GREEK AND BARBARIAN IDENTITY IN HERODOTUS' *HISTORIES*

by

BENJAMIN D. LEACH

B.A. ANCIENT HISTORY AND CLASSICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY 2014
B.A. GREEK AND LATIN. THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY 2014

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts
Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 2017

Acknowledgements

I would like to give my most sincere thanks to my thesis committee and the department as a whole for giving me the opportunity not only to develop this thesis but also to be part of this program. The three years that I have spent here at the University of New Mexico has allowed me to figure out my academic goals and research interests and it has been the perfect transition from undergraduate to graduate work.

To Dr. Lorenzo F. Garcia, my thesis advisor, I want to thank you for patience with me through the entirety of this project. Your near-encyclopedic knowledge of the Classics was a great boon to my research and writing, whether because you could suggest other scholarship that could strength my arguments or point out where I might have misinterpreted something. Also, thank you for asking me to present on Ann Bergren's article, "Helen's Good Drug: *Odyssey* iv.1-232." This article was instrumental for fitting my ideas into the current scholarship on Greek identity. It was an honor having you as my thesis advisor and chairman of my committee.

To Dr. Monica Cyrino, I want to thank you for providing extensive comments and corrections not only on my thesis, but also the other projects I have undertaken during my time at the University of New Mexico, such as my 2016 CAMWS paper. Your fresh eyes could pick out errors that I might have overlooked since I had been working on it for several months. Also, thank you for suggesting me to look at Maria Fragoulaki's *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Despite this book dealing mostly with Thucydides, I found this book extremely useful in figuring out Herodotus' usage of identity in the *Histories*.

To Dr. Osman Umurhan, I want to thank you for always getting me to ask the questions "Does this make sense" and "Why does this matter." Sometimes, when you have become extremely familiar with a scholar's work, you forget that the readers of your thesis might not be. Your advice made sure that I avoided these pitfalls. The response papers for your Greek and Latin seminars have no doubt helped me to think critically about scholarship, a skill that I will find vital for my future endeavors.

To Dr. Luke Gorton, I want to thank you for the linguistic and religious expertise that you have provided both for my writing project and for some useful information that I can pass down to my own students.

Finally, I would like to thank all the Classics graduate students, my ἑταῖροι, who were present at the University of New Mexico during my three year stay here. Thank you, Hong, Kelle, Dannu, Makaila, and Sam for being models of good graduate students for me when I first came here. Thank you, Ben, Luke, Molly, Sarah, and Beth for helping me finish strong. I hope I have set a good example for you all.

Carian Greeks and Greek Scythians: The Hybridity of Greek and Barbarian Identity in Herodotus' *Histories*

By

Benjamin D. Leach

B.A., Ancient History and Classics, The Ohio State University, 2014

B.A., Greek and Latin, The Ohio State University, 2014

M.A. Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies, University of New Mexico, 2017

Abstract

In my thesis, I discuss how Herodotus characterizes the similarities and differences between Greek and non-Greek identity. Herodotus provides his readers with a plethora of details about both Greek and non-Greek peoples in his *Histories*, which has offered scholars plenty of material to use in this topic. I argue that Herodotus purposefully highlights certain aspects that are shared by certain Greek and non-Greek peoples in order to provide a commentary on his own times. The first chapter focuses on the characters Phanes and Artemisia and how uses the same vocabulary to describes these two individuals, despite one being a Carian and the other a Greek. The second chapter focuses on the similarities between the Athenians, Ethiopians, Massagetae, and the Scythians and how Herodotus ties these failed invasion narratives together. I conclude that these invasion narratives are *exempla* to the Athenians and the givers of advice, such as Artemisia and Artabanus, are representations of Herodotus himself as warning Athens.

Table of Contents

Carian Greeks and Greek Scythians:

The Hybridity of Greek and Barbarian Identity in Herodotus' *Histories*

Introduction

Greek Identity

For years, scholars have examined how cultural identities have shaped the nations that they study. I wish to show that Greek identity, especially its construction in relation to foreign peoples, has more complexities than some scholars have given it credit. For ancient Greek ethnic identity, the focus has been placed upon the binary characteristic of Greek thought. That is to say, the Greeks see various identities in pairs: *Hellenes* "Greek" and *Barbaroi* "non-Greek speakers," male and female, citizen and foreigner, free and slave, as Paul Cartledge has illustrated.[1] Even Thales, according to Diogenes Laertius, is said to have held this view, as the following quotation from Diogenes Laertius reveals.

> ἔφασκε γάρ, φασί, τριῶν τούτων ἕνεκα χάριν ἔχειν τῆι Τύχηι· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐγενόμην καὶ οὐ θηρίον, εἶτα ὅτι ἀνὴρ καὶ οὐ γυνή, τρίτον ὅτι Ἕλλην καὶ οὐ βάρβαρος.
>
> For [Thales] used to say — it is said — that he was grateful to Fortune for these three things: first, that he was born a human and not a beast, then, that he was born a man and not a woman, and third, that he was born a Greek and not a *barbaros*.[2]

All of these categories of identity can be boiled down into a single binary relationship, the "self" and the "other." The Greeks use a negative relationship in order to establish what it means to be a "Greek." Anything that the Greeks did not identify as part

[1] Cartledge 1993: 11-12.
[2] Diogenes Laertius 1.33.

of themselves would be seen as "other," or not them.[3] Furthermore, as the Thales quote above shows, non-Greeks even were seen as being inferior to the Greeks. Language, for example, was one important means of showing this difference, since the term *barbaros* inherently denotes someone who does not speak Greek. As John Heath notes, Herodotus describes certain Egyptians and Ethiopians as sounding like birds (2.54-7) and bats (4.183), respectively, revealing that there might be an additional human/beast dichotomy tied to the Greek/non-Greek one.[4] Many scholars believe that this type of identity was formed after the victory of the coalition of Greek city-states over the Persians and during the rise and fall of the Athenian empire.[5] Simon Hornblower claims: "Persia gave the Greeks their identity, or the means for recognizing it."[6] Edith Hall describes how the Persian Wars were transformed into "symbols of the victory of democracy, reason, and Greek culture over tyranny, irrationality, and barbarism."[7] Even though some scholars believe that this "us versus them" identity first formed prior to the Persian Wars in the Greek colonies in Ionia, as seen in the above quote concerning Thales, this mind-set eventually found its way to the mainland when the Greeks clashed with the Persians.[8] In this thesis, however, I intend to shed light on how this binary system of identity is not adequate to describe how the Greeks imagined themselves and the various peoples surrounding them.

---

[3] John Heath (2005: 21, 194-197) claims that this view of foreign nations was not unique to the Greek in the Mediterranean world. The Old Testament reveals a negative outlook of the Israelites towards the Philistines. Seth was the Egyptian god of foreigners. Even Egyptians had a similar concept to *barbaroi* (in this case, people who do not speak the same language as the Egyptians), according to Herodotus (1.158). The main difference that Heath sees between the Greeks and these other cultures is that the Greeks produced ethnographic works and they used these comparisons to better understand themselves.
[4] Heath 2003: 200-201.
[5] See Gruen 2011: 9n1 and Isaac 2004: 257-261 for the *communis opinio* on this subject.
[6] Hornblower 1991: 11.
[7] E. Hall 1998: 102.
[8] See, for instance, Hartog 1988: 323-24; Hall 1989: 56-69; Hornblower 1991: 11; Cartledge 1993: 13, 38-39; Hall 1997: 44-46; Hall 2002: 175.

Furthermore, this binary nature, by which the Greeks perceived their own identity and contrasted it with foreign cultures, has come under criticism. As Erich Gruen describes it, cultural interactions are not a "zero-sum game," as is the winning of honor in the Homeric epics.[9] Since culture and identity, whether Greek or otherwise, are always changing due to these interactions, a simple "us versus them" system cannot adequately describe such complex societies. Stuart Hall demonstrates this idea when he says that identity is "always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation."[10] Therefore, due to the constant interchange of ideas between cultures, the theory that Greeks created their identity on a strict binary system[11] finds difficulty explaining any heterogeneous aspects of Greek identity and any shared characteristics with foreigners. For instance, John Hall argues this point when he mentions that, with few exceptions, Olympic victors in the sixth century B.C.E. came from one of the four major "ethnicities" of Greece,[12] while the others are either marginalized, like the Arcadians, or excluded, like the Boeotians or Aitolians.[13] Finally, Gruen argues that Herodotus presents idealized positive traits of both Greeks and *barbaroi* and then reveals how groups transgress these identities.[14] Therefore, even though the Greeks saw themselves as being bound by blood, language, religion, and similar practices, the Greeks themselves are not quite as homogeneous as the "self versus other" system would require them to be.

---

[9] Gruen 1993: 2.
[10] Hall 1990: 222.
[11] By "strict binary system" I mean that cultures can only be either Greek or barbarian, not anything in between.
[12] Ionians, Dorians, Aiolians, and Achaians.
[13] Hall 2003: 29-30.
[14] Gruen 2011: 30-31. For instance, during the conversation between Xerxes and Demaratus about the nature of the Greeks, the Spartan king tells Xerxes that the Greeks are ruled by their laws and customs (7.104). However, after the Greek triumph over the Persian forces and the subsequent capture of Thebes, the Spartan king, Pausanias, executed the pro-Persian ringleaders without trial (9.88).

If we were to call Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War the tragedy of Greek history because of the infighting between the Greeks after their triumph over Persia, then we could call Herodotus' *Histories* the celebration of this Greek victory. At the same time, however, Herodotus devotes a great portion of his work to the non-Greek peoples in the "known world" in the Greek view. Not only does he present these "barbarians" in a positive light on several occasions, he also casts the Greeks in a negative light and he even throws into question how "Greek" several of the major *poleis* in the anti-Persian alliance were. So the real question is how we should understand Herodotus' opinion on the Persian Wars and Greek ethnicity in general. Do his *Histories* celebrate the Greeks' victory over what was perceived as a far superior military force? Or does Herodotus, as Plutarch accuses him of doing in his *Malice of Herodotus*, maintain an affinity for these barbarian populaces?

In this thesis, I would like to argue that Herodotus, while recording the deeds of the victorious Greeks, is contemplating the implications of Greek and barbarian identity, which some scholars have viewed as mutually exclusive and binary in nature. Herodotus does this by presenting both the Greek and non-Greek peoples within his narrative. The beginning of Herodotus' work makes it clear why he would give such a substantial treatment to both these types of cultures: μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλέα γένηται, "so that the great and admirable deeds, some undertaken by Greeks and some by non-Greeks, not be without fame."[15] Herodotus both looks into the implications of particular events involving Greeks and barbarians and he plays with the expectations set for these two groups by the post-Persian

[15] Herodotus 1.2-4. I am using Hude's Oxford 1927 edition of Herodotus' *Histories*. All translations are my own.

wars Greek society. Therefore, this thesis will fit into the greater framework of scholarly work by adding more nuance to the binary system. With this said, I do not plan on reinventing the wheel, but rather retooling these categories and showing how the peoples about which Herodotus writes do not simply fit into one category or another.

Hybridity and the Intermingling of Cultures

As stated above, a common view of Greek identity in scholarship is that it creates an "us" versus "them" mentality. While recent scholarship has challenged the validity of this theory to a certain degree, this binary between Greekness and barbarity is still useful for understanding the Greek mindset. Ann Bergren has proposed an interesting method of tackling these binaries that appear in Greek literature. While discussing Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, Bergren argues that two seemingly opposite ideas, such as marriage/funeral or happiness/sadness, can blend together in meaning while still retaining their unique properties.[16] One example she provides is the double marriage of Menelaus' children, Hermione and Megapenthes. While a marriage is supposed to be a joyous occasion, the names of the two grooms changes the atmosphere of the wedding from happy to tense. By marrying off his daughter, Hermione, off to Neoptolemus, Menelaus does not keep the Trojan War in the past, but is forced to remember it. Furthermore, Neoptolemus' name means "new war." The symbolism in Neoptolemus' name and his relationship to the Trojan War mars the happy nature of the wedding. Also, Megapenthes' marriage can be seen as an imperfect version of his own father and uncle's marriages, since he is a bastard child. Just like Neoptolemus, the meaning of Megapenthes' name, which is "great

[16] Bergren 2008.

sorrow," also contradicts the idea of a joyful marriage. Both of these names have negative undertones that change the meaning of the marriages. Therefore, even though a wedding is supposed to be a time of celebration, the double marriage of Hermione and Megapenthes only brings back painful memories of the Trojan War and reveals that Menelaus does not have a legitimate heir. As a result, even though two concepts, such as happiness and sorrow, are exclusive from one another, the relationship between them can be changed and create a depiction of these concepts that one might not expect.

In her book covering kinship in Thucydides, Maria Fragoulaki applies a similar concept called hybridity[17], as a location where cultures interact and make cultural exchanges, such as loan words, technology, or cultural practices.[18] She describes hybridity as "the complex and fluid dynamics of the colonial encounter and the constant negotiation and mutual influences taking place."[19] This concept of hybridity seems to follow a pattern similar to what Bergren suggested in her comments about the *Odyssey*. While there can be a general idea of what it means to be Greek or Lydian or Persian, culture is not an inflexible, homogeneous monolith. Hybridity seeks to explain how different cultures influence one another via interaction. Herodotus shows this hybridity in two different ways. One way is direct interaction, such as the Greeks learning how to put handles and images on their shields, or the Greeks introducing pederasty to the Persians.[20] The second type, which will be the greater focus of this thesis, appears when Herodotus gives characters of different cultures and ethnicities similar attributes for narrative and plot purposes. One example of this, which will be pertinent for this study,

[17] Fragoulaki uses hybridity, middle ground, and third space as interchangeable terms.
[18] Fragoulaki 2013: 13, 55, 97, 210, 261, 283, 292, 294, 308, 315, 320, 339.
[19] Fragoulaki 2013: 13.
[20] Hdt. 1.171, 135.

can be found in the similarities between Artemisia and Phanes. Not only is there a direct interaction between their cultures when the Ionians took Carian women as wives during the foundation of their Asia Minor colonies,[21] but the similar characterization of these two figures draws attention to Artemisia and Phanes. Therefore, I will be using Bergren and Fragoulaki's methods to examine how Herodotus makes his Greek and non-Greek characters interact and consider what the consequences of these interactions are.

Chapter 1: Overview

In my first chapter, I will focus my attention on two similar characters in Herodotus' *Histories*, Artemisia and Phanes. I will first discuss the usage of θῶμα, "wonder," in the *Histories* and how it marks Artemisia as a particularly interesting character in Herodotus' eyes. After I have established how Herodotus always makes the Carians and the Ionians into a single unit, where you will always see one when the other is mentioned, I will turn to two characteristics that both Artemisia and Phanes have: their military prowess and their ability to give good advice. I will show how Artemisia is marked by θῶμα when these two characteristics appear out of place because of her gender. In his *Histories*, Herodotus makes a clear connection between someone's masculinity and their bravery. Whenever he deconstructs this concept, such as describing Artemisia as having military prowess despite her gender, Herodotus uses this θῶμα marker to draw attention to those cases. Finally, I will cover the importance of the archetypal wise advisor character that appears throughout the *Histories*.

[21] Hdt. 1.146.

Chapter 2: Overview

In my second chapter, I will consider two similar accounts that Herodotus describes in his *Histories*: Darius' invasion of Scythia and Xerxes' invasion of Greece. Many scholars, such as François Hartog and Rosaria Munson,[22] have examined these two stories. While these two scholars focus their attention primarily on the comparison of the Greeks and the Scythians, I will add two more narratives in the *Histories* to this discussion: Cyrus' war against the Massagetae and Cambyses' botched war against the Ethiopians, since these stories also have similar themes. I will discuss how the geographical location of these four nations[23] is relevant to an overarching theme in the *Histories* about the limits of a nation's martial power. Furthermore, I will add to Hartog and Munson's analyses by explaining the importance of the noun κέλης in Herodotus's creation of an analogy between Scythian horse nomadism and the Athenian navy. Finally, I will discuss how the Persian advisor, Artabanus, acts as the glue that connects all of the moving parts of these four separate wars. He does this both by being a participant in the Scythian and Persian Wars and also recalling the expeditions against the Massagetae and the Ethiopians and how Xerxes' invasion of Greece would be just as disastrous as these wars that were waged by his predecessors.

[22] Hartog 1988, Munson 2001.
[23] The Massegetae, the Ethiopians, the Scythians, and the Greeks.

Chapter 1: The Wonders of the Carian Greeks

Scholars have been suggesting for years that Greek thought was dominated by oppositional binaries, such as those mentioned in the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites."[24] In this list, which is preserved in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, ten oppositional pairs are mentioned: limited/unlimited, odd/even, singular/plural, right/left, male/female, at rest/in motion, straight/curved, light/dark, good/evil, and square/oblong. Moreover, not only are these terms paired as opposites, but also there is an understanding that one opposite in the pair is marked as better or superior in some way over the other.[25] Oppositional binary thinking about Greek ethnicity has made its way into scholarship about Greek history and Greek identity, so it comes as no surprise that the chapters in Paul Cartledge's *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* are structured in a similar way as the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites": Us/Them,[26] History/Myth, Greeks/Barbarians, Men/Women, Citizens/Aliens, Free/Slave, and Gods/Mortals.[27] In his third chapter, Alien Wisdom: Greeks v. Barbarians, Cartledge argues that the oppositional binary between Greek and non-Greek was formed after the Persian Wars (480-79 CE), and he emphasizes the freedom and independence of the Greeks against the tyranny and servility of the barbarians.[28] In her examination of Greek tragedy, Edith Hall

---

[24] Information about the table is preserved in Aristotle *Metaphysics* A5, 986a22-b2. For discussion see Burkert 1972, Zhmud 2012: 449-452, and Goldin 2015. For contemporary comparison with other binary systems, see Lloyd 1966: 32-41.
[25] See Goldin 2015: 184n36 for discussion on this concept of marked privilege.
[26] The first chapter of Cartledge's book discusses the relationship between our modern Western society and ancient Greece, which is both similar and different from us.
[27] Cartledge 1993.
[28] Cartledge 1993: 38-41.

reaches a similar conclusion.[29] Jonathan Hall nuances the development of Greek identity by arguing that the Greeks used two different methods of establishing what it means to be Greek.[30] These two ways of creating identity are, respectively, aggregate and oppositional. The aggregate method, which Hall asserts was how the Greeks understood themselves before the Persian Wars, used mythological founder figures to establish a link between various Greek cities as being part of the same subethnicity.[31] For example, city-states that identify with the Ionic Greek subethnicity trace their ancestry from the mythic character, Ion.[32] Furthermore, the Greeks also had city foundation myths including foreigners such as Cadmus as vital contributors in the establishment of those cities.[33] However, just as Cartledge and Edith Hall claim, Jonathan Hall also asserts that, after the Persian Wars, the Greeks transitioned from this aggregate model to the oppositional one, particularly due to the need to legitimize the Delian League, even after the Persian threat seemed to have been checked.

Not all scholars speak about the binary and aggregate nature of Greek ethnicity as operating in the same way, however. In recent years, scholars like Erich Gruen and Joseph Skinner have argued that the relationship between Greek and non-Greek is more complex than a simple oppositional binary.[34] For instance, Gruen notes that Herodotus, although he does compare and contrast the Greeks and the barbarians, does not always represent the Greeks as the superior group.[35] Skinner supports a similar view when he

---

[29] Hall 1989 notes that there is no equivalent term for βάρβαρος in the ancient cultures of China, Egypt, and Mesopotamia (4). See Hall 1989: 4n4 for information on the terms that they did use.
[30] Hall 2002.
[31] For instance, Ionian, Doric, Aeolic, Achaian, and other Greek subethnic groups could express their specific identity through mythology about their founders.
[32] Hall 1997: 43. For discussion, see Konstan 1997.
[33] See West 1997 for discussion of Eastern influences on literature, mythology, and religion.
[34] Gruen 2011a; Skinner 2012.
[35] Gruen 2011b: 70.

claims that Herodotus problematizes the Greek-barbarian polarity by blurring the lines between them.[36] He argues that the Greeks display their own virtue while at the same time committing barbaric acts of retribution and servility.[37]

Thus the problem here is the conflict between the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites," in which there is one marked opposite that has a perceived superiority or privilege over its pair, and the ideas of scholars, such as Gruen and Skinner, who argue that Herodotus provides a complicated picture beyond that of simple binaries in his construction of Greek and non-Greek identity. How could Herodotus represent Greeks as not always being superior to barbarians when these oppositional pairs, such as those that Cartledge, E. Hall, and J. Hall argued to fundamental to Greek identity, are supposed to be unequal? I intend to utilize this established scholarship to address this problem by arguing that Herodotus blurs the line between these categories even while working within a binary conception of identity as he does in the proem of the *Histories*. Although the two end points of Greek and non-Greek are set as a general concept, Herodotus shows in his historiography that these concepts actually blend together in reality. The point at which these two concepts interact is what Maria Fragoulaki calls the middle ground, or "hybridity."[38] Therefore, while an oppositional analogy for identity existed in Greek thought, the complexity of the relationship between Greek and the other is influenced by more variables than a simple "us versus them" mentality. As I will discuss, Herodotus, too, does not always adhere to these strict binary conceptions of identity.

---

[36] Skinner 2012: 238-239.
[37] See Skinner 2012: 239 n18 for further discussion and examples in both Herodotus and in secondary scholarship.
[38] Fragoulaki 2013.

Herodotus himself spoke of Greeks and others in binary language in his proem when he said that his purpose for writing his inquiry was to make sure μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ **μὲν** Ἕλλησι τὰ **δὲ** βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, "that the great and wondrous achievements, accomplished by both the Greeks and the foreigners, may not become without fame."[39] In this passage, Herodotus uses semantic and syntactical markers to note the difference between the two groups mentioned. Syntactically, he utilizes the μέν / δέ construction in order to further emphasize the relationship between the actions accomplished by the two groups.[40] Semantically, Herodotus, at least on the surface, seems to follow the same formula as the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites" with Ἕλλησι and βαρβάροισι, "Greeks" and "foreigners."[41] In this case, the terms Ἕλλησι and βαρβάροισι are being contrasted as the creators of the aforementioned actions. However, unless we assume that one of the opposites in this pair is superior to the other, as in the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites," there is no indication in this statement alone, other than that Ἕλλησι appears before βαρβάροισι, that one group is held in higher esteem in relation to the other.[42] On the contrary, Herodotus has decided that both groups, the Greeks and the non-Greeks, are worthy of κλέος, of immortality granted from poetry (or rather prose in this case).[43] Therefore, even though the μέν / δέ construction does hint at a contrast between the Greeks and non-Greeks, Herodotus does

---

[39] Hdt. 1.3.
[40] Smyth notes that μέν/δέ "serves to mark stronger or weaker contrasts of various kinds" (§2904). See Denniston 1950: 359-374 (especially 369-74) for his entry on μέν. See Denniston 1952 for a discussion of antithesis and how it appears in Greek prose with the μέν/δέ construction.
[41] For discussions on the term βάρβαρος, see Cartledge 1993 (especially chap. 3), E. Hall 1989: 3-19, J. M. Hall 2002: 111-2, 175-89, and Skinner 2012: 249-50.
[42] Pelling 2008: 79-81 notes how, just as both the Greeks and Trojans suffer during the Trojan War, Herodotus too claims that both Greeks and barbarians suffer equally. Also consider Herodotus' reputation for being a barbarophile, especially in Plutarch's *On the Malice of Herodotus*.
[43] See Nagy 1999: 8 §15-18 for a short discussion on how a poet procures κλέος for himself by the promulgation of his poetry. Also see Pelling 2008 for Homer's influence on Herodotus.

not explicitly holds one group as superior to the other, but rather views both worthy of being remembered.

In this chapter, I examine two individuals who on the surface would fit into this Greek-barbarian binary: Artemisia of Halicarnassus and Phanes of Caria.[44] Despite the difference in their ethnicities, Artemisia and Phanes have similar characteristics. Moreover, Herodotus frames the narratives that surround these individuals in a similar manner. Following Munson's terminology, the similarities between Artemisia and Phanes create an implicit and "vertical" comparison.[45] This is important since, as Munson notes, Herodotus has to convince a disbelieving audience that the other (the Carian Phanes) is similar to themselves (Greek Artemisia).[46] Because of this characterization, Artemisia and Phanes, I argue, are examples of ethnic hybridity because, after comparing and contrasting these two individuals, one could conclude that they are essentially the same character, with their ethnicity and gender being the only markers that separate them.[47] As a result, these similar characteristics are not caused by ethnic and gender identity since they are the common denominators between Artemisia and Phanes, whereas their specific ethnicity and gender are not. This is in sharp contrast to what we see in Aeschylus' *Persae*, for example, in which servitude and the tolerance of tyranny is attributed to the Persians and the opposite to the Greeks.[48] Therefore, Artemisia and Phanes break this

---

[44] This comparison is not only pertinent for Herodotus because he is from Halicarnassus, but the paternal side of his family is Carian (see Hornblower 1982: 10 and n4, 14 and n69). This mixed blood heritage is attested by Herodotus at 1.146 when he mentions that the Ionians took Carians as their wives.
[45] Munson 2001: 46: "Whereas horizontal analogy is based on the notion that phenomena recur with variations, vertical analogy brings out the similarity of situations on different planes, so that one becomes a sign for the other." See Munson 2001: 45-47 for further explanation.
[46] Munson 2002: 101. See also pages 100-123 for Munson's discussion on how Herodotus makes the Lydians and Scythians seem similar to the Greeks.
[47] Similarities include: Bravery in war, ability to give sound advice, and betrayal of their kinsmen. For Phanes, see Hdt. 3.4. For Artemisia, see 7.99, 8.68A, 8.87, and 8.102.
[48] *Pers*. 181-199.

mold of Aeschylus' *Persae*, in which ethnicity clearly determines certain character traits, such as servility, because even though they are ethnically different, their ethnicity does not cause these two individuals to act in completely different ways.[49] In this chapter, I demonstrate how the barbarians are not a uniform group by discussing how Artemisia, a Greek, blurs the line between what it means to be Greek and barbarian when she is compared to Phanes, a Carian.

θῶμα ποιεῦμαι as a Marker of Awe

In Book VII, Herodotus provides what can be aptly described as a Catalogue of Ships for Xerxes' military, describing the various ethnic groups that composed the Persian invasion force.[50] At the end of this lengthy passage, Herodotus reports the names of the admirals and captains who led the Persian king's army. In the final chapter, Herodotus neglects to give any further information about these military commanders with one exception:

> τῶν μέν νυν ἄλλων οὐ παραμέμνημαι ταξιάρχων ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος, Ἀρτεμισίης δὲ τῆς μάλιστα θῶμα ποιεῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατευσαμένης γυναικός.
>
> Since I am not compelled [to do so], I now have not made note of the other commanders, but I especially make a marvel of Artemisia, a woman having lead troops against Greece.[51]

The Greek noun θῶμα acts as a marker for someone or something that Herodotus deems worthy of mention.[52] Aristotle ties θῶμα and its verbal relative θαυμάζειν to a sense of

[49] See Beller and Leerssen 2007: 6, 38-41, 315 for a discussion on how the various groups of barbarians were merged into a singular and homogenous group.
[50] Hdt. 7.60-99.
[51] Hdt. 7.99.1.

bewilderment.[53] With this in mind, Herodotus, as the narrator, guides the reader from this astonished state to one of knowing. As Jessica Priestley has noted, θῶμα is built on *θε-, the Greek root for "seeing."[54] John Dillery expands on this in his discussion of its verbal form, θεάσασθαι, saying that it not only marks something noteworthy, but something noteworthy to both Herodotus and to his audience.[55] As I will demonstrate, θῶμα not only represents something that can be seen, but also something that Herodotus either claims to have seen in person or to have learned about in consultation with someone who has seen it. In this case, when the marker appears here, Herodotus provides some background on this unique character who plays a supporting role during Xerxes' invasion of Greece, instead of her male peers.[56] Although it does not seem like a coincidence that he focuses on a fellow Halicarnassian, Herodotus provides three reasons why Artemisia is so exceptional: her willingness to serve Xerxes, her military expertise, and her ability to give good advice to Xerxes.

First, he mentions Artemisia's motivation for leading her city's forces:

> ἥτις ἀποθανόντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτή τε ἔχουσα τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ παιδὸς ὑπάρχοντος νεηνίεω ὑπὸ λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης ἐστρατεύετο, οὐδεμιῆς οἱ ἐούσης ἀναγκαίης.
>
> This woman, after her husband died and once she took up the tyranny, was leading her troops on account of her courage and manliness, even though her son has become a young adult and there was not any obligation for her [to do so].[57]

---

[52] See Munson 2001: 232-265 for an in-depth discussion of Herodotus' usage of θῶμα. Munson specifically mentions that θῶμα marks anything that is different, including things or people that are eerily similar to the Greeks.
[53] Nightingale 2001: 43.
[54] Priestley 2014: 57-58. Also, note how θέατρον also has this same root in it, hinting that it too is something that is worth watching.
[55] Dillery 2008: 248-249.
[56] Except for the four admirals (τοῦ…ναυτικοῦ ἐστρατήγεον, Hdt. 7.97.1), the other ten commanders (ταξιάρχων, 7.99.1) are not mentioned after this passage. Artemisia, on the other hand, appears at 8.68-9; 87-8, 102-3 and is mentioned in 8.93.
[57] Hdt. 7.99.1. This is a continuation of the passage cited above.

In this passage, Herodotus uses several marked terms to highlight why his audience should care about this woman's uniqueness. The terms λῆμα and, in particular, ἀνδρηίη here feel out of place as descriptors of Artemisia since, as Karen Bassi notes, "manliness" is tied with martial prowess and warfare.[58] Moreover, Artemisia is such an unusual character, according to Herodotus, because not only was she one of the best military leaders in the Persian camp, but also she joined the cause not out of necessity but out of her own free will, as revealed by the phrase οὐδεμιῆς οἱ ἐούσης ἀναγκαίης. Although this passage could be referring to the fact that she had a son of adult age who could have easily gone in her own stead, Sarah Harrell brings up another possible interpretation of Artemisia's motivation. Harrell argues that, unlike the other Persian soldiers, who were compelled to fight for Xerxes, Artemisia's free will in the choice of whether or not to help the Persian king distinguishes herself from her Persian allies.[59] Therefore, even though she aids Xerxes, Artemisia's free will to do so contrasts with the other allies' inability to choose and references Demaratus' claim that the Greeks only yield to νόμος.

As the second reason for Artemisia's exceptional nature, Herodotus mentions that her ships were second only to the Sidonian fleet, further reinforcing Artemisia's military ability.[60] Third and finally, out of all of Xerxes' subordinates, the king valued the advice of Artemisia the most, according to Herodotus who notes that she gives the Persian king γνώμας ἀρίστας, the "best advice."[61] However, Herodotus does not expect us just to trust his word about Artemisia's usefulness. Instead, he illustrates how she gives Xerxes

---

[58] Bassi 2003: 31. See 30-46 for a further discussion of ἀνδρηίη and other similar words from the same root in Herodotus and other Greek authors (Homer, tragedians, etc).
[59] Harrell 2003: 81; cf. Munson 1988. See Hdt. 7.99.1 for the passage where Herodotus mentions that the Greeks are only ruled by νόμος, while the Persians and their allies are compelled to fight for Xerxes.
[60] καὶ συναπάσης τῆς στρατιῆς, μετά γε τὰς Σιδωνίων, νέας εὐδοξοτάτας παρείχετο, "After the Sidonians, it was considered that her ships were the most reputable of the entire military force" (Hdt. 7.99.3).
[61] πάντων τε τῶν συμμάχων γνώμας ἀρίστας βασιλέι ἀπεδέξατο, "And of all of his allies, she gave the best advice to the king" (Hdt. 7.99.3).

γνώμας ἀρίστας later in his *Histories*.[62] Thus, Artemisia's ability to give good advice to Xerxes establishes her as one of the archetypal counsel-bearer characters that Herodotus has used throughout his work, such as Solon and Croesus. All three of these attributes – her "manliness," her superior navy, and her ability to give advice – all make her worthy of θῶμα in Herodotus' eyes because these characteristics appear in a woman, whose gender is usually not associated with these qualities.[63] Therefore, the use of θῶμα here marks the unusual interaction between masculine attributes and a female character.

In this passage, Herodotus uses a specific phrase – θῶμα ποιεῦμαι (7.99.1) – in order to highlight the remarkable nature that Artemisia displays in his narrative. In order to appreciate the force of Herodotus' θῶμα ποιεῦμαι, let us examine the two other places within Herodotus' *Histories* where the phrase appears. In isolation, this construction means "I make wonder of something."[64] In Book I, while the Spartans are trying to recover the bones of Orestes, one official by the name of Lichas was sent to Tegea, where, as the phrase suggests, he discovered something that marveled or bewildered him.[65] In this case, Lichas was stupefied by the ironworking technology that the Tegeans had (or at least one Tegean blacksmith).[66] The blacksmith, in turn, reveals to the Spartan that he has not seen anything yet if the foreigner believes that something as simple, at least to the Tegeans, as ironworking was some sort of mysterious technology. It turns out that the blacksmith had stumbled upon a presumably human skeleton that had a giant

---

[62] Hdt. 8.68A.1 and 8.102.1.
[63] Artemisia's "manliness" and ability to give advice will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.
[64] See LSJ entry 2 for θαῦμα. Syntactically, θῶμα indicates making a wonder of something in the accusative or of someone in the genitive case by itself or with the preposition περί.
[65] Hdt. 1.67-68.
[66] ἦ κου ἄν, ὦ ξεῖνε Λάκων εἴ περ εἶδες τό περ ἐγώ, κάρτα ἂν ἐθώμαζες, ὅκου νῦν οὕτω τυγχάνεις **θῶμα ποιεύμενος** τὴν ἐργασίην τοῦ σιδήρου, "Spartan guest, if you had seen the thing which I had, then you would be extremely bewildered, especially since you now happen to make a marvel of ironworking" (Hdt. 1.68.2).

stature. Lichas concludes that these bones belong to Orestes because he understands the various steps of ironworking to be metaphorically represented in the Delphic prophecy that would guarantee Spartan victory over the Tegeans.

The second appearance of this idiom, θῶμα ποιεῦμαι, appears in Book IX, when Mardonius rebukes his Thessalonian subordinates about the reputation of the Spartans.[67] However, Mardonius lets his Greek allies off the hook from what Mardonius believes is overestimating the Spartans and he turns to his own Persians.[68]

> Ἀρταβάζου δὲ **θῶμα** καὶ μᾶλλον **ἐποιεύμην** τὸ [καὶ] καταρρωδῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους καταρρωδήσαντά τε ἀποδέξασθαι γνώμην δειλοτάτην, ὡς χρεὸν εἴη ἀναζεύξαντας τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰέναι ἐς τὸ Θηβαίων ἄστυ πολιορκησομένους: τὴν ἔτι πρὸς ἐμεῦ βασιλεὺς πεύσεται.
>
> I found more shocking that Artabazus feared the Lakedaimonians and made know his cowardly advice that, after we packed up the army camp, it was necessary [for us] to go to the city of the Thebans and wait for a siege, because he feared them. The king will certainly hear this from me.[69]

As this passage shows, Mardonius goes light on the Thessalonians because they could not have predicted the Spartans' response to the overwhelming numbers of the Persians. Instead, he directs his ire towards Artabazus, another Persian general.[70] Again, Mardonius uses θῶμα ἐποιεύμην to convey his disbelief that someone who actually knew the strength of the Persian forces could have overestimated the Spartans' reputation. Just as in the case of the blacksmith, this idiom is used to express surprise at the situation. The

---

[67] Hdt. 9.58.2.

[68] This passage contrasts with the Battle of Thermopylae. In this battle, only the Spartans, Thespians, and the Thebans (the last were forced to stay) held their ground against Xerxes' army while the rest of the Greek army retreated in order to preserve it for another day of fighting. This clashes with what Mardonius experiences here, where even the Spartans retreat, unlike those forces led by Leonidas.

[69] Hdt. 9.58.3.

[70] Herodotus reveals the opinions of Artabazus and Mardonius on the correct course of action in 9.41. Mardonius wanted a swift military victory to crush the hopes of the remaining Greek forces. On the other hand, Artabazus wished to hold up in a defensive position (Thebans had grain supplies built up for this) and use diplomacy to pick off each city-state one at a time via bribes. Although we cannot say for sure that Artabazus' plan would have worked, the result of Mardonius' aggressive tactics was the Battle of Plataea, where the Persians lost and never recovered.

Tegean blacksmith believed that his craft should not be considered something worthy of awe when compared to his discovery of a giant human skeleton while trying to sink a well. In the same line of thought, Mardonius is stupefied that his fellow Persian, Artabazus, would underestimate Persia's own forces.

These two passages that use a variation of the phrase θῶμα ποιεῦμαι help contextualize what Herodotus is trying to convey about Artemisia' uniqueness. The idiom reveals that a viewer's bewilderment is tied to the unusual nature of the situation.[71] The narrator gives his audience additional information about Artemisia because he believes that the circumstances around her situation are quite exceptional. Besides the fact that she joined Xerxes' forces because of her λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης (her courage and manliness), Artemisia also has a grown son who could have lead the Halicarnassian forces in her stead. It was out of her own ambition instead of a necessity to act as a regent for an underage child that this Halicarnassian queen commanded her troops in battle during the Persian Wars.

θῶμα as a Marker for Cultural Difference

Besides the three cases of the idiom θῶμα ποιεῦμαι just discussed in Herodotus, the word θῶμα itself appears in 32 additional chapters.[72] As in the examples discussed, Herodotus uses θῶμα to describe unusual cases, such as unbelievable stories, natural

[71] Hdt. 7.99 and 9.58 both have first-person singular subjects, with the narrator and Mardonius as the respective subjects. At 1.68, the subject is second-person singular, referring to Lichas, although the construction of the conditional phrase hints that the huge skeleton is also a marvel to the first-person subject, the blacksmith.
[72] Note that the adjectival form is used in the proem.

wonders, monumental building projects, and peculiar cultural practices.[73] Thus, as François Hartog states in his study of Herodotus, the θῶμα that appears in the *Histories* prompts the narrator to mention particularly astonishing or unusual events, things, or people.[74] These marvels, however, are not relegated to something that seems exotic to the Greek listener. Instead, Herodotus provides examples from both Greeks and barbarians, which allows him to satisfy the goal that he set out in his proem: to tell of marvels (θωμαστά) of both Greeks and non-Greeks. One example that is particularly pertinent to the discussion of 7.99 appears in Book I. While discussing natural wonders, Herodotus says the following about Lydia:

> θώματα δὲ γῆ ἡ Λυδίη ἐς συγγραφὴν οὐ μάλα ἔχει, οἷά τε καὶ ἄλλη χώρη, πάρεξ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Τμώλου καταφερομένου ψήγματος.
>
> And Lydia very much so does not have wondrous things for written record and especially not of the sort that other land[s] have, except for the golden dust that is brought down from Mount Tmolos.[75]

In this example, we observe Herodotus' method of focusing on specific detail. Herodotus begins by declaring that the subject matter at hand does not have anything worthy of report; but he then points out that there is an exception to this deficiency of newsworthy information, a θῶμα that becomes even more exceptional because there are no other details available for discussion.

The Herodotean θῶμα marks an object worthy of particular interest and fascination. One reason Herodotus uses this marker is to bring up some sort of cultural difference or similarity in his narration. For instance, Herodotus marks the Ethiopian Fish-Eaters' diet of milk and meat as unusual, while he also describes the Scythians as

---

[73] See Priestley 2014: 55 on θῶμα used to mark cultural difference.
[74] Hartog 1988: 236.
[75] Hdt. 1.93.1.

amazed when they discovered that they had been fighting women instead of men after their first conflict with the Amazons.[76] As Hartog points out, the significance of the comparison does not become noteworthy until they enter into the same system.[77] In this paper, I will be following a similar methodology that Munson used. By using her methodology, the significance of these two examples is apparent because Herodotus uses θῶμα as a marker of something he wants his audience to notice. In the episode about the Fish-Eaters, Herodotus is making an implicit contrast between the diet of these particular Ethiopians and that of his Greek audience.[78] The Scythian Amazonomachy would be both explicit and implicit. On the one hand, Herodotus is explicitly making a contrast between the Scythians and the Amazons, namely that there is a gender reversal in the role of "warrior" in both groups' societies. On the other hand, there is also an implicit comparison because his Greek audience would recognize that the above explicit comparison could be applied to themselves. Just like the Scythians, the Greeks too only have men as the warriors, unlike the Amazons.[79] Therefore, the marker, θῶμα, helps Herodotus raise specific questions, including those about ethnicity, by isolating passages and magnifying their significance.[80]

Artemisia's usefulness in understanding how Herodotus shows how the boundaries between Greek and non-Greek are blurred becomes clear when we see how he creates an implicit comparison between her and the Carian mercenary, Phanes. The similarities between Artemisia and Phanes, indeed, do not seem coincidental. In fact, the

[76] For the Fish-Eaters, see Hdt. 3.23. For the Scythian Amazonomachy, see Hdt. 4.111.
[77] Hartog 1988: 212.
[78] The latter of which would probably have been the Mediterranean Triad: barley, wine, and olives.
[79] See Hartog 1988: 216ff for his discussion of the comparison between the Amazons, Scythians, and the Greeks in this passage.
[80] Munson 2002: 251.

implicit comparison between Artemisia and Phanes highlights the uniqueness of Artemisia by describing a character, like Phanes, who would not be seen as unusual for possessing certain traits (military finesse, sound advice, etc). These same traits, as I have already discussed above, is what makes Artemisia unique. Within Herodotus' narrative, the Carians and the Ionians are constantly paired together.[81] The first instance of this joining of these two ethnic groups happened early in the Ionian colonization of Asia Minor. According to Herodotus, since the Ionian colonists did not bring their own women, they took wives from the local Carian population after they murdered the women's fathers.[82] Then, along with some Ionians, some Carians aided the restoration of the Pharaoh Psammetichus and were as a result granted land on the Nile by the Egyptian ruler.[83] During the Ionian revolt against the Persians, the Carians rose up with their Greek brethren.[84] When they were included in Xerxes' invasion force, the Carian and Ionian forces were still grouped together.[85] Finally, during Xerxes' invasion of Greece, when Themistocles sent word to the Ionians to rise up against their Persian overlords, he also requested that they pass the word to the Carians.[86] In Herodotus' own words, the fact that even the Ionians with the purest bloodlines[87] still had Carian blood in their veins is precisely why these two groups are paired together, even though one group is Greek and the other would be considered βάρβαροι. While scholars are divided on whether

---

[81] I am using Ionia as a general term for the Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor and not specifically for those which are ethnically Ionic.
[82] Hdt. 1.146; also note the parallel with the Roman story of the Rape of the Sabine women (Livy 1.9-13)..
[83] Hdt. 2.152, 154; when Psammetichus settled the Ionians and Carians, they were each given land on opposite banks of the Nile. Also note the parallel with Menelaus being shipwrecked in Egypt in Euripides' *Helen*.
[84] Hdt. 5.103.
[85] Hdt. 7.97.
[86] Hdt. 8.22.
[87] Hdt. 1.146: νομίζοντες γενναιότατοι εἶναι Ἰώνων, "and those who thought themselves to be the best born of the Ionians."

Artemisia had any Carian blood in her family,[88] Herodotus' intertwining of the Ionians and the Carians strengthens the implicit comparison between Phanes (a Carian) and Artemisia (a Greek) because it sets a precedent where the Carians and the Greeks are closely connected in Herodotus' narrative.

Betrayal on Both Sides

Betrayal is one theme that overlaps in both Artemisia and Phanes' stories and makes these two individuals worthy of comparison. As I have argued above, Herodotus repeats episodes when comparing two separate cultures. In this case, Herodotus shows the similarities that appear when both a Greek and non-Greek betray their own. Artemisia obviously betrayed the Greeks because she was helping the Persians invade Greece. Although her betrayal cannot be solely determined from the side for which she fought, since the Greeks who were compelled out of necessity to help the Persians were not seen as betraying their fellow Greeks, Herodotus gives specific evidence for Artemisia.[89] Not only did the Peloponnesians propose that all the medizing Ionians be removed from their lands and replaced by more loyal kinsmen, but the Athenians also placed a bounty for Artemisia's capture.[90] Likewise, Phanes, who also happens to hail from Halicarnassus, aided the Persians in invading a foreign nation.[91] This time, Phanes left behind his fellow Carian and Ionian mercenaries in Egypt to help Cambyses conquer that territory.[92] Once

[88] See Harrell 2003: 81-4 for a discussion about Artemisia's family heritage and possible Carian descent.
[89] Hdt. 8.22.
[90] Hdt. 9.106; 8.93.
[91] Artemisia fights for Xerxes in the second invasion of Greece against her fellow Greeks, while Phanes aids Cambyses against the Egyptians, who had Ionian and Carian mercenary allies.
[92] Hdt. 3.4; this story foreshadows Xerxes' invasion of Greece, placing the Egyptians, Carians, and Ionian mercenaries in the role of the Greeks in that narrative. Note that the outcome is different (i.e. the Egyptians lose).

his fellow mercenaries discovered his treachery, they decided to enact the harshest punishment that they could, by killing Phanes' children who were still in their custody.[93] And just like Artemisia, Phanes had a price on his head, in his case ordered by the current Pharaoh, Amasis.[94]

Herodotus also provides a possible reason why Phanes defected to the Persians. According to what Herodotus could discover, Phanes held a grudge against Amasis.[95] However, Herodotus does not speculate any further on the matter, leaving ambiguous Phanes' motivation for betrayal beyond being personal. While Herodotus does not assign a similar reason to Artemisia's medizing, he does provide us with an example of where a personal grudge might have influenced her decision-making. During the Battle of Salamis, while fleeing from the Athenian forces, Artemisia rammed through one of her own non-Greek allies in order to escape capture by the Athenians.[96] Herodotus offers two opinions on what happened: either Artemisia had a grudge against Damasithymus, the king of the Calydonians, or the aforementioned king was just in the wrong place at the wrong time.[97] While Herodotus cannot confirm the existence of personal grudges held by Phanes and Artemisia, he does provide the possibility that their actions were motivated by such grievances. Therefore, even though Phanes was a non-Greek Carian while Artemisia was a Halicarnassian, Herodotus use these repeated plot points in order to show that this betrayal is not a character trait of only one ethnicity, but rather one that is

---

[93] Hdt. 3.11.
[94] And just like Artemisia, Phanes also eludes his enemies, preventing his own capture.
[95] Hdt. 3.4.
[96] Hdt. 8.87; as mentioned previously, the Athenians would later set a reward for her capture, which adds another dimension to Artemisia's motivation to escape.
[97] Hdt. 8.87; Herodotus lists three opinions, but the first two deal with Artemisia having a fallout with the Calydonian king and intentionally ramming through his ship.

shared across cultural lines. As a result, repeated patterns in Herodotus' narratives signals a similarity between what Herodotus desires to be compared.

ἀνδρεῖα and Bravery in War

It would be too simplistic, however, to conclude that Artemisia and Phanes are just examples of bad Greeks and non-Greeks. Instead, these two characters are far more complex than that since they have positive as well as negative characteristics. Herodotus even describes both Artemisia and Phanes with two similar positive traits: their martial prowess and ability to provide good advice to the king under whom they are serving. I have already discussed how Herodotus does this with Artemisia: she is compelled by her λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης (her courage and manliness) to lead the Halicarnassian forces, which were the second best squadron in Xerxes' multinational force, only behind the Sidonians. In addition, she also is able to give γνώμας ἀρίστας, "best advice," to Xerxes, which makes Artemisia a valuable asset to the Persian king.

Phanes is similarly characterized: ἦν τῶν ἐπικούρων τῶν Ἀμάσιος ἀνὴρ γένος μὲν Ἁλικαρνησσεύς, οὔνομα δέ οἱ Φάνης, καὶ **γνώμην ἱκανὸς** καὶ **τὰ πολεμικὰ ἄλκιμος,** "There was amongst Amasis' mercenaries a man from Halicarnassus, Phanes by name, both **capable in respect to counsel** and **brave in war.**"[98] Just as he does with Artemisia, Herodotus uses γνώμη to describe Phanes' ability as an advisor. While these two instances of γνώμη[99] work slightly differently in the passages in which they appear, these

[98] Hdt. 3.4.1. Bold text is my own emphasis.
[99] At Hdt. 3.4.1, γνώμην is a Greek accusative of respect, showing what Phanes is capable of doing. At 7.99.3, γνώμας is modified by the adjective ἀρίστας and the object of ἀπεδέξατο. Nevertheless, each of these instances indicates that both Phanes and Artemisia are good at giving advice. Artemisia's ability is just qualified by making her advice better than all of Xerxes' subordinates.

descriptions emphasize their subjects' abilities for giving advice. As I discuss later in this chapter, Herodotus provides specific examples that support his statements later in each narrative.[100] Furthermore, the phrase τὰ πολεμικὰ ἄλκιμος attests to Phanes' military experience. Not only does his status as an ἐπίκουρος support his military finesse, but this short description helps establish Phanes' status as a warrior, which becomes important when he advises the current Persian king, Cambyses, on how to invade Egypt so that the king can incorporate it into the Persian Empire. Therefore, as military leaders, both Artemisia and Phanes provide a vital service to their respective rulers, showing how both a Greek and non-Greek leader can fulfill what is essentially the same role.

In Artemisia's case, Herodotus' choice of using ἀνδρηίης is especially peculiar. Elsewhere in the *Histories*, this word appears seven additional times. Two of these examples deal solely with the subject's military prowess. The first use refers to the Lydians.

> ἦν δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἔθνος οὐδὲν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ οὔτε **ἀνδρηιότερον** οὔτε **ἀλκιμώτερον** τοῦ Λυδίου.
>
> During this time, there was no people in Asia either **more manly** or **more brave** than the Lydian.[101]

Herodotus links together these two related concepts, which individually are linked to Artemisia and Phanes, respectively. In a later passage, Herodotus describes Cyrus in a similar way after he had been identified as royalty and returned to his biological parents: Κύρῳ δὲ ἀνδρευμένῳ καὶ ἐόντι τῶν ἡλίκων **ἀνδρηιοτάτῳ** καὶ προσφιλεστάτῳ, "when Cyrus grew up and became the most courageous and beloved of those his age."[102] Although this passage mentions Cyrus before his subsequent conquests that would

[100] For Phanes, see Hdt. 3.4.3-3.11, for Artemisia, see 8.68A.1 and 8.102.1.
[101] Hdt. 1.79.3.
[102] Hdt. 1.123.1.

eventually form the Persian Empire, the description of the future Persian king is significant since he was considered to be the most courageous or manly before his future military exploits.

So far, besides Artemisia, only men have been described with this term. However, there are several accounts that use both masculine and feminine genders to qualify what it means to be courageous or manly. In Book I, during the Lydian war against the Milesians, Alyattes accompanied his troops with particular musicians, including those playing the αὐλοῦ γυναικηίου τε καὶ ἀνδρηίου, "high and low-pitched flutes."[103] Although this particular example deals with different types of musical instruments, the usage of terms that literally mean feminine and masculine at such an early point of his *Histories* sets up and influences the other narratives, especially Artemisia's, that use this masculine-feminine binary to clarify what it means to be courageous or manly.

One such situation appears in Book II, when the Egyptian Pharaoh, Sesostris, set out to subdue the various peoples that lived near the boarders of Egypt.[104] For each nation that Sesostris conquered, he erected a pillar that had been inscribed with a certain message depending on how well these people fought against him. The narrative divides the conquered people into two groups: those who fought well and those who did not. The first group is described as **ἀλκίμοισι**, "brave," and δεινῶς γλιχομένοισι περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίης, "they strived extraordinarily on account of their freedom."[105] For these men, Sesostris left pillars with his own name (ἑωυτοῦ οὔνομα), the name of his nation (τῆς

[103] Hdt. 1.17.1.
[104] Hdt. 2.102.
[105] Hdt. 2.102.4.

πάτρης), and that it required his military might to overcome these people.[106] And those who were not as fortunate to be natural warriors[107] received nearly identical monuments to the ones that the first group (**ἀνδρηίοισι**) received, except that the latter's were marked as women due to their cowardice.[108] Again, just as in the description of Lydian military prowess, ἀνδρηίοισι and ἀλκίμοισι are used in conjunction in order to qualify how courageous and manly the first ethnic group was and how cowardly the second ethnic group was in comparison. As we will see, the inclusion of gender into the qualification of courage produces an interesting situation where Artemisia, a woman, would be better described with these two key words than the rest of Xerxes' army, who are all men.

Herodotus also mentions a second narrative that is similar to the one above about Sesostris and his conquests. Just as in the two narratives concerning Phanes and Artemisia, here Herodotus is pointing out some sort of similarity between the people who were conquered by the Egyptians and the Persians. In Book IV, Darius has crossed into Europe and has begun subjugating any people whom he happened to fall upon, much as Sesostris did in Egypt. The following passage shows how Darius dealt with the Thracians:

> Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν Σαλμυδησσὸν ἔχοντες Θρήικες καὶ ὑπὲρ Ἀπολλωνίης τε καὶ Μεσαμβρίης πόλιος οἰκημένοι, καλεόμενοι δὲ Σκυρμιάδαι καὶ Νιψαῖοι, **ἀμαχητὶ** σφέας αὐτοὺς παρέδοσαν Δαρείῳ· οἱ δὲ Γέται πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπόμενοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν, Θρηίκων ἐόντες **ἀνδρηιότατοι** καὶ δικαιότατοι.
>
> For the Thracians, who held possession over Salmydessus and who live above the towns of Apollonia and Mesambria, who were called the Scyrmiadi and the Nipsaei, gave themselves up to Darius **without a fight**: but the Getai, who were

[106] ὡς δυνάμι τῇ ἑωυτοῦ κατεστρέψατο σφέας, "how he subjugated them with his own might," Hdt. 2.102.4.
[107] ὅτεων δὲ ἀμαχητὶ καὶ εὐπετέως παρέλαβε τὰς πόλιας, "and those whose cities [Sesostris] captured without a fight and without breaking a sweat," Hdt. 2.102.5.
[108] καὶ δὴ καὶ αἰδοῖα γυναικὸς προσενέγραφε, δῆλα βουλόμενος ποιέειν ὡς εἴησαν ἀνάλκιδες, "and in addition he, wishing to clearly mark how they were cowardly, inscribed on their pillars the genitals of a woman" (Hdt. 2.102.5).

> **the bravest** and most just of the Thracians, because they turned to folly, were immediately enslaved.[109]

Although the outcome for the Thracians was almost opposite that of the people subjugated by Sesostris,[110] the dichotomy between the brave and the weak seems to be delivering a similar message as the previous passage. The ἀνδρηιότατοι, "the most courageous," will be those who are the most skilled in warfare, while those who give up ἀμαχητὶ, "without a fight," are described as cowards and lesser than the first group. And even though this passage does not have the gendered terminology that the previous two passages had, the similarities between this passage and the one about Sesostris in Book II make it difficult not to infer the same relationships implied in the last passage. Herodotus did not explicitly call the Scyrmiadi and the Nipsaei women, but the repetition of the same narrative makes it easy to apply these gendered terms to these two groups of Thracians.

In a third episode, Herodotus uses a similar repetition technique to compare certain characters with gendered terms that are associated with courage and cowardice. In this passage Book VII, Herodotus interrupts his main narrative for a brief digression about Gelon, the tyrant of Syracuse, and his heritage in Gela, a city-state in southern Sicily. Herodotus mentions that some individuals were exiled from Gela for political reasons.[111] However, a certain Telines, an ancestor of Gelon, was able to return these exiles home with nothing other than ἱρὰ τούτων τῶν θεῶν, "the sacred instruments of the

---

[109] Hdt. 4.93.
[110] That is, the nations that Sesostris had to exert himself to overcome were almost celebrated, while the equivalent "bravest" nation among the Thracians was thrown into slavery, instead of just becoming a subject state, as the other Thracians presumably became.
[111] Hdt. 7.153.

goddesses."[112] Herodotus concludes that he finds this story to be a marvel (θῶμα) because Telines was able to accomplish this deed, and his reasoning for this statement is that only extraordinary men achieve accomplishments like what happened in this story.[113] What made Telines, at least in Herodotus' eyes, not ψυχῆς τε ἀγαθῆς καὶ ῥώμης ἀνδρηίης, "noble soul and a manly strength," was because there was a local rumor that he was θηλυδρίης τε καὶ μαλακώτερος, "like a woman and rather soft."[114] This particular episode is extremely relevant to Artemisia because, according to Herodotus, these two individuals perform actions that bewilder (θῶμα) him because they break the established expectations for people with a feminine nature. Telines, despite being a man, is described as being effeminate. Artemisia, on the other hand, would be included here because of her gender, notwithstanding that she is described as being manly or courageous. What's more is that these two individuals were able to accomplish something that required ἀνδρηίη, despite part of their identity being bound with femininity, the inverse of this quality. Therefore, one use of θῶμα is when it marks the blurring between two binaries, such as male and female.[115]

The final passage that uses ἀνδρεῖος comes in the closing book of Herodotus' *Histories*. In this passage, the narrator offers an aside about Hegesistratus of Elis.[116] We learn that after he had committed a crime against the Lacedaemonians, Hegesistratus was condemned to death. In order to escape death, Hegestistratus sawed off part of his foot so that he could release himself from his bonds and escape imprisonment. Miraculously, this

---

[112] Hdt. 7.153.3.
[113] τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ ἔργα οὐ πρὸς [τοῦ] ἄπαντος ἀνδρὸς νενόμικα γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ψυχῆς τε ἀγαθῆς καὶ ῥώμης **ἀνδρηίης**, "deeds such as these are not accomplished by an ordinary man, but by one with a noble soul and manly strength," Hdt. 7.153.4.
[114] Hdt. 7.153.4.
[115] See Pelling 2006 for an in-depth discussion about "manliness" and the implications when someone who transgresses their gender identity displaces courage.
[116] Hdt. 9.37.

maimed man was able to elude recapture by the Lacedaemonians. According to Herodotus, Hegestistratus' actions were described as follows:

> αὐτίκα δὲ ἐμηχανᾶτο **ἀνδρηιότατον** ἔργον πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν: σταθμησάμενος γὰρ ὅκως ἐξελεύσεταί οἱ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ ποδός, ἀπέταμε τὸν ταρσὸν ἑωυτοῦ.
>
> and at once he concocted **the most courageous** action of all which we know of because, after he considered how he might travel with what remains of his foot, he cut off the flat of his own foot.[117]

In addition, the Lacedaemonians were ἐν **θώματι** μεγάλῳ, or "in a state of great bewilderment," when they discovered that their prisoner had escaped and only a part of a foot remained.[118] As in the previous example, Hegesistratus' actions require some quantity of ἀνδρηίη in the person trying to accomplish it. In this case, Hegesistratus needed the bravery to risk dying from his self-inflicted injury in order to escape Lacedaemonian custody. Furthermore, this act of bravery shows that Hegesistratus was willing to do anything in order to get himself to safety, just like Artemisia did in the Battle of Salamis when she plowed straight through an allied ship to escape Athenian capture, who paradoxically created a better reputation for herself in the eyes of Xerxes.

As the previous examples demonstrate, Herodotus' usage of ἀνδρηίη and its adjectival form, ἀνδρεῖος, have two definite connotations. It describes both an individual's military prowess and his — or her — ability to perform actions that would be deemed as a θῶμα by either the narrator or a character within the *Histories*. By examining the other cases of ἀνδρηίη and ἀνδρεῖος in Herodotus' text, we can put together a more distinct image of what these terms mean in the Artemisia and Phanes passages. Also, since he utilizes a repetitive structure when narrating the various stories

---

[117] Hdt. 9.37.2.
[118] Hdt. 9.37.3.

in his historical work, Herodotus is emphasizing the subject matter of each related passage. In Artemisia and Phanes' cases, these two Halicarnassians gain the reputation of being valuable military assets to whichever Persian king was reigning at that time and being willing to do anything to escape from dire situations. Artemisia, on the one hand, was willing to sink an allied ship in order to prevent herself from being captured by the Athenians. Phanes, on the other hand, was able to sneak away to Persia from Egypt without being intercepted, even though his children were still in the hands of his fellow Ionian and Carian mercenaries. Thus, even though both these characters have a reputation for betrayal, the complexity of their characters reveals that they are more than a negative exemplum of a traitorous Greek or non-Greek, but that they are instead fleshed out characters with both positive and negative traits.

The Wise (Wo)Man

Herodotus continues to highlight similarity between Artemisia and Phanes by demonstrating how both these characters are givers of good advice. Phanes, on the one hand, is described as γνώμην ἱκανὸς, "capable in respect to counsel."[119] Herodotus uses the same noun, γνώμη, when talking about Artemisia's ability to give advice.[120] However, as mentioned above, Herodotus also provides specific examples of these two characters giving advice to a Persian king. In Book III, after Phanes had escaped Egypt and arrived at the court of Cambyses, he found the Persian king at a loss as to how he

[119] Hdt. 3.4.1.
[120] πάντων δὲ τῶν συμμάχων γνώμας ἀρίστας βασιλέϊ ἀπεδέξατο, "and of all of his allies, she gave the best advice to the king," Hdt. 7.99.3.

could invade Egypt.[121] Not only does Phanes give the Persian king valuable intelligence about Egypt, but he also suggests that Cambyses ask for safe passage through the lands of Arabia.[122] As a result of Phanes' advice, Cambyses was able to lead his forces into Egypt and incorporate its lands into the Persian Empire.

Likewise, Artemisia provides similar information to Xerxes during his invasion of Greece. She first tells Xerxes that it was a mistake for his forces to attack the Greek fleet at sea because, as she describes it, οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες τῶν σῶν ἀνδρῶν κρέσσονες τοσοῦτό εἰσι κατὰ θάλασσαν ὅσον ἄνδρες γυναικῶν, "their men are better than ours at sea, just as much as men are stronger than women."[123] Although Xerxes, to the surprise of all of his commanders, praises Artemisia for her advice, he nevertheless goes with the majority opinion. And as Artemisia predicted, Xerxes' fleet is defeated at the Battle of Salamis. Then, after this naval disaster, Artemisia suggests that Xerxes should return home, while Mardonius is left behind to make the best of the situation.[124] Her reasoning for this is that, if Xerxes left Mardonius in charge and if the Greeks defeated his general, Xerxes would be safe in Persia and would be able to prepare another invasion if necessary. However, if Xerxes were to remain and get captured, this would spell disaster for the entire Persian Empire. Unlike the first time, Xerxes listens to Artemisia's advice and follows it.[125] And for the second time, Artemisia predicted the correct course of action, since Mardonius is

---

[121] Hdt. 3.4.
[122] ἐπελθὼν φράζει μὲν καὶ τἆλλα τὰ Ἀμάσιος πρήγματα, ἐξηγέεται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔλασιν, ὧδε παραινέων, πέμψαντα παρὰ τὸν Ἀραβίων βασιλέα δέεσθαι τὴν διέξοδόν οἱ ἀσφαλέα παρασχεῖν, "And after he came, [Phanes] divulges the current affairs of Amasis, and he reveals this course of action, suggesting this, that [Cambyses], after he sent [an envoy] to the king of the Arabians, to ask of him to provide a safe passage for him," Hdt. 3.4.
[123] Hdt. 6.68.
[124] Hdt. 8.102.
[125] Hdt. 8.103.

eventually crushed by the Greek coalition and only Artabazus returns with a decimated Persian army.

As both the usage of γνώμη[126] when describing them and their individual stories reveal, both Artemisia and Phanes are givers of counsel. In Herodotus' *Histories*, a multitude of characters fulfill this role, such as Solon, Croesus, Bias of Priere, and even the Scythians. Richmond Lattimore separates these givers of counsel into two categories: the Tragic Adviser and the Practical Adviser.[127] The Tragic Adviser, who is usually ignored, tells his advisee what one should not do in a specific situation. When the advisee ignores the advice of these counsel-bearers, some sort of disaster befalls the ruler or people. On the other hand, the Practical Adviser, instead of saying that a certain plan is ill-advised, gives an alternative to the situation so that the best possible outcome might happen for the advisee. Although the advisee does not always listen to this type of adviser, more often than not he does and he therefore succeeds in his endeavor. Following these categories, Artemisia would be both a Tragic and Practical Adviser. Her advice before the Battle of Salamis is Tragic — she tells Xerxes not to engage at Salamis; while her advice after the same battle is Practical — she tells Xerxes that he should head back to Persia and allow Mardonius to mop things up. Phanes, on the other hand, would be a Practical Adviser because he tells Cambyses what he needs to do to be successful.

---

[126] Herodotus uses γνώμη over 160 times in the *Histories*. These can be separated into two categories: opinions that Herodotus holds about a particular event and the opinions of certain characters in the narrative. In this study, I am interested in the second category, as these opinions are usually involved with decision-making and advice.

[127] See Lattimore 1939: 25-28 for a comprehensive list of characters who fall into each of these two categories.

Therefore, the ability to give good advice transcends the categories of ethnicity in Herodotus, just as νόμος does.[128]

Besides the examples given for Artemisia and Phanes, the episode of Croesus and Solon provides another example of a ruler who ignores a wise man's advice and suffers for it later.[129] In this narrative, Croesus and Solon discuss what determines someone who has lived a good life. Solon's message was that you could not make a conclusion about a man's life until he has passed away. Although at this point Croesus dismisses Solon's words, after he has experienced several misfortunes, such as the death of his son[130] and the ruin of his kingdom,[131] Croesus finally understands what Solon was trying to prove to him. An example of a non-Greek performing as counsel-bearer, besides Phanes,[132] is when the Scythians advise the Ionians, who are guarding the Ister bridge, to destroy Darius' last escape route back to Persia.[133] In this episode, it almost appears as if Herodotus is using the Scythians as a mouthpiece to rebuke the Ionians for their decision. Because all the tyrants[134] of the various Ionian cities cherished their own position as rulers more than the wellbeing of both their fellow Greeks and the other barbarian nations that have been placed under the Persian yoke, the Ionians decide to allow the bridge to stand. This scene is an indictment against the Ionians, that if they would have followed the Scythians' advice, Darius would have been cut off in Europe and the Persian Empire

---

[128] See Hdt. 3.38 where Darius concludes that νόμος is present in all cultures, while each culture can express it in different ways.
[129] Hdt. 1.30-3.
[130] Hdt. 1.44-5.
[131] Hdt. 1.86.
[132] Phanes would be a Practical Adviser. He tells Cambyses how to invade Egypt.
[133] Hdt. 4.133-39. The Scythians are Practical Advisers here. They tell the Ionians what to do (yet they are ignored).
[134] Miltiades is the only tyrant who agrees with the Scythians. After he returned to Athens in time for Darius' invasion of Greece, Miltiades comes up with the "hammer and anvil" strategy that would rout the Persian forces at Marathon.

would have been crippled. Therefore, due to the Ionian tyrants' inaction, they allowed both Darius' and Xerxes' invasions of Greece. What further condemns the Ionians is that their revolt against the Persians, in which the Athenians intervened, was one reason why Darius invaded Greece in the first place. Therefore, just as we saw in the episodes involving Phanes and Artemisia, this ability to give good advice is not limited to either Greeks or barbarians, but rather is accessible to both groups. And this is supported by Herodotus' repeated usage of both Greek and non-Greek givers of good advice in his narratives.

Both the Artemisia and Phanes examples, along with the other episodes of the counsel-givers, demonstrate how this ability to give sound advice is not a strictly Greek or non-Greek attribute. On the contrary, Herodotus' narratives produce a middle ground where both Greeks and non-Greeks can fulfill this role. Greeks can provide advice to other Greeks.[135] Non-Greeks can pass on words of wisdom to other non-Greeks.[136] These two groups can even interact with the other, giving one another counsel.[137] This conclusion brings to mind the passage from Pindar that Herodotus cites after he narrates the story of Darius comparing the customs of the Greeks and the Callantians: νόμον πάντων βασιλέα, "custom is the king of all."[138] Although this quote, as Cartledge points out, describes how each culture believes that its own practices are the correct way, it also applies to the above situation.[139] While each culture might have a different opinion on

---

[135] Bias gives advice to the Ionians about colonizing Sardinia, Hdt. 1.170.
[136] Phanes and Cambyses (see above), Sandanis gives military counsel to Croesus, but is ignored, Hdt. 1.71
[137] Besides the aforementioned episodes of Artemisia giving advice to Xerxes, another example of a Greek advising a non-Greek is when Bias convinces the Lydians to halt shipbuilding program because the Ionians were master sailors, Hdt. 1.27. The Scythians telling the Ionian tyrants to destroy the bridge that they were guarding so that Darius and his army would perish in Europe is an example of a non-Greek advising a Greek.
[138] Hdt. 3.38.
[139] Cartledge 1993: 59.

what is the correct course of action in a particular situation, Herodotus portrays these counsel-bearers in a way that allows both Greeks and non-Greeks to fulfill these roles and therefore displaying how this ability transcends the cultural and ethnic identity of the character.

Conclusion

Finally, Herodotus' family heritage may have allowed him to provide insightful observations about ethnicity and ethnic identity where a "full-blooded" Greek might not.[140] Since Herodotus had a Carian father, he may have been the perfect individual to comment on this ethnic hybridity that arises in the interactions between the Ionians and the Carians. Artemisia and Phanes are paradigms of this mixed heritage that Herodotus has, each depicting one aspect. By portraying both Artemisia and Phanes in a similar light, Herodotus makes them occupy this middle ground where the close proximity of their cultures (Ionian/Doric and Carian) results in a blending at the intersection of the two cultures. This reading is further strengthened by Herodotus' claim that the Greek settlers of Asia Minor (particularly the Ionians) took Carian wives, which also causes a blending of cultures at the point of interaction. These two characters' attributes are not the result of either being one ethnicity or the other. Their military prowess, capacity to give good advice, treachery against their own people, and tendency to hold a grudge are not the result of a single identity. Instead, since these two figures have almost identical characterizations besides their primary ethnic identity, the hybridity created by the

[140] See Cartledge 1993: 38 and Hornblower 1982.

interactions between Ionia and Caria allows these two ethnically different characters to have similar personalities.

Since he has a unique perspective on identity due to his own heritage, Herodotus has to use θῶμα (and other related terms) as markers for these interesting interactions between the Greeks and the barbarians. Just as Munson pointed out, Herodotus utilizes θῶμα as a tool to his audience an uncomfortable truth: that the barbarians are not quite as different as they are made to seem.[141] Herodotus uses Artemisia and Phanes (but especially the former) as one way to express this eerie conclusion that Greeks and barbarians are not polar opposites, like the items listed in the Pythagorean "Table of Opposites." Besides her gender and ethnicity, Artemisia, as portrayed by Herodotus, is just like Phanes. And the fact that Artemisia, since she is a woman, has masculine traits, like courage in battle, makes this comparison even more uncomfortable because Artemisia, the Greek, is the one who is transgressing the boundaries of gender, not Phanes. As a result, θῶμα, as seen in 7.99, acts as a signal to the audience that what Herodotus is about to tell them might challenge their preconceptions of ethnicity.

Therefore, while the Greek-barbarian binary does exist in Greek thought, the narratives of Herodotus indicates that there is also room for this middle ground where Greek and non-Greek interact and exchange ideas. These separate concepts of Greek and barbarian are imperfect in the sense that there is a fluidity where individuals can enter into this space of hybridity. This space allows these figures to take on characteristics that are associated with the other culture. As possible representations of Herodotus' own mixed heritage, Artemisia and Phanes, along with the other depictions of the coupling of the Ionians and the Carians, dwell in this area where cultural and ethnic characteristics

[141] Munson 2001: 233.

are blurred. Because these two cultures interact within this middle ground, Herodotus attributes similar characterizations to both the Greek and the non-Greek, despite the fact that they are ethnically different.

Chapter 2: "Greek" Scythians

While there are numerous questions that Herodotus tried to answer in his *Histories*, one such question, as Launay has asked, was why did some nations succumb to the military dominance of the Persians and yet others did not?[142] Why could the urbanized civilizations of the Near East, such as Egypt, Babylonia, and the Lydians, not withstand Persian imperialism, while other nations, such as the nomadic Scythians, whose ways of life were vastly different than that of the Greeks, were able to escape from the Persian war machine and even beat it back? In Book 4 of his *Histories*, Herodotus proposes a possible reason why the Scythians could have outmatched the Persians, while those nations who were more like the Greeks could not.

> τὸ δὲ μέγιστον οὕτω σφι ἀνεύρηται ὥστε ἀποφυγεῖν τε μηδένα ἐπελθόντα ἐπὶ σφέας, μὴ βουλομένους τε ἐξευρεθῆναι καταλαβεῖν μὴ οἷόν τε εἶναι. τοῖσι γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ἢ ἐκτισμένα, ἀλλὰ φερέοικοι ἐόντες πάντες ἔωσι ἱπποτοξόται, ζῶντες μὴ ἀπ᾽ ἀρότου ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ κτηνέων, οἰκήματα τε σφι ἢ ἐπὶ ζευγέων, κῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν οὗτοι ἄμαχοί τε καὶ ἄποροι προσμίσγειν;
>
> But in this way the greatest thing has been discovered by them so that no one, who comes against them, can flee, and that those who want to find and overpower them are not able to do so, because they do not have either established towns or fortifications, but they are nomads and horse archers, who live not from the fields but from their cattle, and their abodes rest upon their oxen's backs. How could these people not be unconquerable and impossible to reach?[143]

Herodotus has identified, at least in his opinion, that the nomadic lifestyle of the Scythians was the reason why they were able to prevent Persian occupation. Just as Napoleon would discover centuries later during his invasion of Russia,[144] the Persians

---

[142] Launay 2010: 3.
[143] Hdt. 4.46.2-3.
[144] Although the Russians were not nomads in this example, they still use the same military strategy, which I will go into greater details in this chapter, such as utilizing scorched-earth tactics. I also find it noteworthy that the Russians, both during the Napoleonic Wars and the Second World War, have possession over the same territory as the Scythians. Obviously, people have a difficult time invading Russia.

found that it was nearly impossible to conquer an enemy who had Mother Nature on their side and who did not have any capturable cities that could force capitulation.

Many scholars have noted the numerous comparisons that Herodotus seems to be making in his *Histories* between the various nations, both Greek and non-Greek, just as my analysis in Chapter 1 revealed how Herodotus is purposefully crafting his narrative to highlight the similarities between Artemisia and Phanes. In my previous chapter, I relied on the methodology of both Hartog and Munson.[145] According to Hartog, Herodotus' narrative of the Scythians' relationship to the Persians prefigures the Athenians' relationship with the Persians:

> In relation to the Persians, the Scythians resemble what the Athenians were in relation to those same Persians. This recurrent analogy, which serves as a model of intellscorcheigibility for the Scythian expedition, results in the Scythians, in this instance, being turned into Athenians of a kind.[146]
>
> Sometimes it is all the mainland Greeks, or, rather, all the Greeks "moved with the best sentiments" toward Greece, who are said to be "like the Scythians." More often, though, the homology concerns the Scythians and the Athenians alone.[147]

As I have already mentioned, Munson separates the comparisons that Herodotus makes into two categories: explicit and implicit.[148] The main difference between these two groups is that Herodotus directly points out the explicit comparisons, while the implicit one requires the reader to connect the dots.[149] Munson's analysis of analogies in Herodotus' text seems to be indebted to Hartog's own discussion of this topic. In his *Mirror of Herodotus*, Hartog focuses much of his attention on the Scythians and uses that nation as his case study in order to shed light on how Herodotus makes these

---

[145] Hartog 1988; Munson 2001.
[146] Hartog 1988: 36
[147] Hartog 1988: 38-39
[148] Munson 2001: 50-2, 66-73.
[149] An illustrative example of the explicit comparison that Munson used appears in *Histories* 2.100.2, where Herodotus tells his reader that both the Egyptian and Babylonian queen had the name Nitocris. See Munson 2001: 51 for her discussion of this passage and explicit analogies in general.

comparisons. One key element that Hartog points out is that these comparisons are restricted by narrative constraints.[150] These narrative constraints, or necessities, are instances when Herodotus, while making these analogies, shoehorns certain situations or events into the narrative so that it might appear that history repeats itself. These narrative constraints are in a sense repeated patterns that Herodotus uses to emphasize the similarities between the stories. One example of these narrative constraints or patterns that Hartog discusses in his *Mirror of Herodotus* is the theme of revenge that appears in both the invasion of Scythia and of Greece.[151] Darius launched his invasion of Scythia under the pretense that he was exacting vengeance on the Scythians for the conquest of Asia by their ancestors.[152] Xerxes, on the other hand, was attacking the Greeks because of the humiliating loss that the Athenians handed to his father, Darius.[153] According to Hartog, since Herodotus wanted to make the invasion of Scythia look like a prelude to, or a foreshadowing of, the Second Persian War, he applied almost identical plot points onto the earlier story, such as the revenge plot.[154]

Both Munson and Hartog arrive at similar conclusions about Herodotus' implicit comparison between Darius' invasion of Scythia and Xerxes' invasion of Greece. They both focus on how nomadism as a strategy was utilized by both the Scythians and the Athenians against the Persians.[155] In the narrative about the invasion of Scythia, the Scythians are supposed to be understood as "quasi-Athenians," as Hartog refers to them,

---

[150] Hartog 1988: 35-40, 200.
[151] Hartog 1988: 38.
[152] Hdt. 1.103-6; 4.1.
[153] Hdt. 7.5.
[154] Other plot points include (but are not limited to) the crossing from Asia to Europe; the use of a bridge to cross a body of water (the Danube and the Hellespont); a council of the defending nation (Scythia and Greece) that shows a lack of cooperation between the different tribes/cities.
[155] Aldo Corcella's Book IV commentary in Asheri *et al.* 2007 also draws a similar conclusion when discussing the passages involving the description of Scythian nomadism.

since the narrative constraints that Herodotus imposed on the story foreshadow similar events that would take place in the Second Persian War.[156] Munson also highlights how Herodotus depicts how both the Scythians and the Spartans use language in discourse in a similar manner.[157] However, the comparison between the Scythians and the Athenians is imperfect. Both Munson and Hartog note that the Persians, during the Scythian invasion, transform into an infantry army, even though that is characteristic of the Greek army during the Persian Wars. There appears to be a dissonance in the comparison between these two wars since the Persians are characterized as the hoplite army. One would expect that the "quasi-Athenians" would be represented with a hoplite-style military, but since it is the Persians and not the Scythians who receive this attribute, the comparison does not quite match up. Hartog goes a step further and says that the narrative constraints that have transformed the Scythians into "quasi-Athenians" clash with Herodotus' ethnographic evidence on the Scythians.[158] Therefore, as a result of these contradictions, Herodotus' narrative cannot perfectly make two culturally different peoples seem the same in every manner.[159]

Another example of such a contradiction refers to Scythian nomadism. Although Herodotus does give some evidence that not all Scythians are nomads, such as the Callippidae, who are also known as Ἕλληνές Σκύθαι, "Greek Scythians,"[160]since he

---

[156] Hartog 1988: 198.
[157] Munson 2001:114-118.
[158] Hartog 1988: 198.
[159] See Hartog 1988: 49, where he says that Herodotus' analogy between the invasions of Scythia and Persia cannot accommodate all three identities (Scythian, Greek, and Persian) without being imperfect comparisons. The example Hartog uses, as I have already mentioned, is that the Persians are portrayed as being a hoplite army while the Scythians are not.
[160] See Hdt. 4.17-20 for the examples of non-nomadic Scythians. As I will explain, a major aspect of nomadism in Herodotus' narrative is the lack of agriculture. However, as this section of Herodotus' *Histories* suggest, there were Scythians who either used agriculture for self-subsistence, or for making money from those who did eat agricultural products.

emphasizes the importance of the nomadism of a particular group of Scythians in the defeat of Darius' army, this aspect of nomadism has become ingrained in the archetypal image of a Scythian in Greek thought. As Hartog argues, as a result of this stereotyping of the Scythians, even though Herodotus forces the plot points of the Second Persian War onto the invasion of Scythia via the narrative constraints, the fact of Scythian nomadism remains an obstacle for a perfect analogy.[161] Furthermore, Hartog makes the claim that, even though Herodotus imposes similar narrative patterns on the Scythians and the Athenians concerning the strategy of nomadism, such as sending their women and children away to safety and refusing to engage the Persians unless on their own terms, the Scythians cannot be seen as "quasi-Athenians" because the Scythians are viewed as nomads and the Athenians were not.[162]

However, I intend to show how Herodotus constructs these historical episodes, that appear connected, with multiple layers of narrative constraints, which are the repeated plot points and archetypes that appear in multiple stories in the *Histories*. Many scholars have thoroughly covered the relationship between the Second Persian War and Darius' invasion of Scythia, which would be an example of two stories that Herodotus has made to look as if they follow a similar plot. In both episodes, the Persian army is required to cross over a recently constructed bridge from one continent (Asia) over another (Europe). Furthermore, the Persian king justifies these wars by claiming that he is only seeking retribution for past ills that their enemies' ancestors inflicted upon the Persians. These wars also present peril to the Persian monarchy, since the empire could collapse if the Persian king happens to be captured or trapped in the foreign land that he

[161] Hartog 1988: 193-199.
[162] Hartog 1988: 56-57.

was invading. Finally, the Persians are always repelled by their targets, although the defenders are not able to capture the Persian king before he escapes. I, however, wish also to show how two other wars that have received less attention — at least by modern scholars — also follow many of the narrative constraints from above. These two wars are Cyrus' failed invasion of the Massagetae and Cambyses' disastrous campaign against the Ethiopians. Moreover, I disagree with Hartog that Scythian nomadism clashes with the narrative constraints of the narrative. In fact, I believe that the Scythian nomadism is mirrored in Herodotus' account of the Second Persian War since Herodotus establishes an extended metaphor that compares horses and grasslands to ships and the ocean. The crux of this argument hinges on the word κέλης, which, depending on its context, can mean either a horse or a ship. Once we have established that Herodotus is aware of the comparison of the ocean and grasslands via κέλης, we can then apply this metaphor to the wars against the Greeks and Scythians. Through this lens, we can see how the Scythian horsemanship and the Athenian naval prowess are supposed to be referential of one another.

Furthermore, I intend to argue that Herodotus is attempting to make his narrative a paradigm of the danger of empire through his description of these four failed expeditions of the Persians (the Massagetae, Ethiopians, Scythians, and Greeks).[163] While so far I have focused on the parallels between the Scythians and the Athenians, I will also take into account other nations, namely the Massagetae and the Ethiopians, who are also subject to some of the same narrative constraints or patterns as the Scythians and the

[163] This point about overextension of the military is especially relevant during Herodotus' own time. Although Herodotus probably had already completed his *Histories* (or he might even have passed away) by the time the Sicilian Expedition occurred during the Peloponnesian War, his advice seems very similar to that which Pericles gave the Athenians, telling them that they should not expand the war to other places while they still have open hostilities against Sparta and the Peloponnesian League.

Athenians. By using all these examples, my claim is that Herodotus is trying to tell his Greek audience that since the Persians, the greatest empire at that time, failed to conquer lands at the edges of their own world, the same might happen to them if they tried to wage wars beyond their capacity. As Kurt Raaflaub argues, Herodotus makes numerous allusions to events of his own day so that he can draw the attention of his audience towards those current events.[164] One way that Raaflaub illustrates his point is by proposing that Artabanus' criticism of Mardonius during the Second Persian War hints at the Mytilenian debate and the negative role of slander.[165] Similar to the example that Raaflaub gives, the four wars that I will discuss in this chapter[166] also prompt the audience of Herodotus' *Histories* to recall Athens' own ambitions and whether they, too, are repeating the same errors of the past Persian kings.

What is the past error of the Persian kings? According to Herodotus, it is the hubris of the Persian king, who believes that the majesty of his empire and the resources at his disposal can overcome any task. The Persian kings overstep their bounds by trying to gain control over lands out of their reach. This hubris is best illustrated by Xerxes when he states his intent to attack Greece in Book 7.

> εἰ τούτους τε καὶ τοὺς τούτοισι πλησιοχώρους καταστρεψόμεθα, οἳ Πέλοπος τοῦ Φρυγὸς νέμονται χώρην, γῆν τὴν Περσίδα ἀποδέξομεν τῷ Διὸς αἰθέρι ὁμουρέουσαν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ χώρην γε οὐδεμίαν κατόψεται ἥλιος ὁμουρέουσαν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ, ἀλλά σφεας πάσας ἐγὼ ἅμα ὑμῖν μίαν χώρην θήσω, διὰ πάσης διεξελθὼν τῆς Εὐρώπης.
>
> If we subdue these men and the men at their borders, those who dwell in the land of Pelops the Phrygian, we will make the Persian land border up against the lofty realm of Zeus. Nor indeed will the sun look down upon any land bordering up

[164] Raaflaub 1987.
[165] Raaflaub 1987: 229. See Hdt. 7.10 for Artabanus' criticism of Mardonius and Thuc. 3.42 for the Mytilenian debate.
[166] Cyrus' war against the Massagetae, Cambyses' war against the Ethiopians, Darius' war against the Scythians, and Xerxes' war against the Greeks.

> against our own, but I, having acquired them going through all of Europe together with you, will make a single land.[167]

In this passage, Xerxes' error is twofold. First, much like the Tower of Babel in the Book of Genesis,[168] Xerxes seeks to make himself almost equal to a god. Herodotus is emphasizing that Xerxes is crossing the boundary of what a mortal is permitted to do and what (hypothetically) only a god can do. The second error, which to a modern reader might recall the old phrase "the sun will never set on the British Empire," brings up an issue of the difficulty of maintaining an empire and of expanding it once it has already grown to encompass many nations. Herodotus illustrates this point elsewhere in his *Histories*. In Book 7, Artabanus points out that the land and the sea can become an enemy of a large army.[169] During much of the pre-modern era, unless a supply train was established to support them, armies had to live off the land. With this fact in mind, Artabanus is concerned that the size of Xerxes' army cannot be supported by the land that they are invading.[170] The same can be said about his navy, which would require more havens and ports than Greece had in order to preserve the Persian ships from catastrophe at sea. Therefore, Herodotus uses these narratives as a warning to the Athenians not to follow in the footsteps of the Persians by striving after goals beyond the city's means.

At the Edges of the Earth

In early Greek thought, the known world (referred to as the οἰκουμένη) was surrounded by a boundless river called Ὠκεανός. The intersection between the earth and

---

[167] Hdt. 7.8γ.1
[168] Genesis 11:1-9.
[169] Hdt. 7.49.
[170] Cf. Cambyses' invasion of Ethiopia in 3.25, where he does not make proper preparations for the war and as a result the soldiers in his army cannibalize one another.

the mythological Ὠκεανός, which is seen as a boundary between them, is often referred to as πείρατα or πείρατα γαίης, literally "boundaries" and the "boundaries of the earth."[171] Romm suggests that Herodotus, while he does still retain some vestiges of this mythical image of the world, such as the ἐσχατιαί ("most distant lands"),[172] rejects the idea of an encircling river.[173] Instead, Herodotus prefers to base his worldview on information that he could reliably examine or test, something he could not do with the claims of the poets. Therefore, in order to explain his lack of knowledge of some distant lands, Herodotus designates specific parts of the world as ἐρῆμοι, "empty spaces." These ἐρῆμοι are where human (and even animal) habitation ends.[174]

According to Romm, Herodotus positions these ἐρῆμοι in every cardinal direction except in the west.[175] In the east, he cites Book 3 Chapter 98, where Herodotus says that there is a desert to the east of where the Indians live.[176] To the north, there was a frozen wasteland beyond the most northerly Scythian tribes.[177] And to the south, there is also a desert in Libya — what we would now refer to as the Sahara — that is devoid of all life.[178] Romm notes Herodotus' use of the Greek singular form of ἐρῆμοι (ἐρῆμος) or a related abstract noun ἐρημία ("desert, wilderness") as markers for those locations where

---

[171] See Bergren 1975: especially 22-23, 202-215 for a further discussion of this term and how it was described in archaic Greece.
[172] See Romm 1992: 38-41for his discussion of the ἐσχατιαί. These distant lands are similar to the Garden of Eden in Genesis or the Golden Age of Men in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.
[173] See Hdt. 2.23, 4.8, and 4.36 for Herodotus' opinion about the river Ὠκεανός.
[174] Romm makes a curious observation that Herodotus does not explore whether there could be other civilizations (and therefore other habitable lands) on the other side of the ἐρῆμοι. See Romm 1992: 36.
[175] See Romm 1992: 35 note 72. In this note, Romm cites two other scholars (Hannelore Edelmann and Guy Lachenaud) whose work Romm uses to support this claim.
[176] Ἰνδῶν γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ **ἐρημίη** ἐστὶ διὰ τὴν ψάμμον, "For towards the east of the Indians, there is an emptiness because of the sand" (Hdt. 3.98.2).
[177] Νευρῶν δὲ τὸ πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον **ἔρημον** ἀνθρώπων, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, "And to the north of the Neuri, it is devoid of men, as far as we know" (Hdt. 4.17.2).
[178] ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς ὀφρύης ταύτης, τὸ πρὸς νότου καὶ ἐς μεσόγαιαν τῆς Λιβύης **ἔρημος** καὶ ἄνυδρος καὶ ἄθηρος καὶ ἄνομβρος καὶ ἄξυλος ἐστὶ ἡ χώρη, καὶ ἰκμάδος ἐστὶ ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδέν, "And beyond this ridge and into the interior of Libya, this land is devoid of man, beast, rain, and foliage, and there is not any moisture in that place" (Hdt. 4.185.3).

Herodotus has identified one of the ἐρῆμοι. However, I disagree with Romm's assessment that the west is lacking in an ἐρῆμος, as the following passage illustrates:

> ἐπεὶ Σατάσπης γε ὁ Τεάσπιος ἀνὴρ Ἀχαιμενίδης οὐ περιέπλωσε Λιβύην, ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πεμφθείς, ἀλλὰ δείσας τό τε μῆκος τοῦ πλόου καὶ τὴν **ἐρημίην** ἀπῆλθε ὀπίσω, οὐδ᾽ ἐπετέλεσε τὸν ἐπέταξε οἱ ἡ μήτηρ ἄεθλον.
>
> When Sataspes, the son of Teaspis, an Achaemenid, did not sail around Libya, even though was sent on this task, but since he feared the length of the voyage and the **emptiness**, he went back, and he did not complete the task which his mother assigned him.[179]

While one could argue that this could be a second ἐρῆμος that is located in the south, since Sataspes was attempting to circumnavigate the entirety of Africa, I believe that this passage demonstrates that the Atlantic Ocean represents the western ἐρῆμος. This vast body of water prevented Sataspes from continuing his voyage around Africa. Therefore, Herodotus uses these ἐρῆμοι as bounds to the world that his *Histories* discuss.

Why is establishing these four limits important? If one were to map out the four nations that escaped Persian imperialism, it would become apparent that each one of these nations inhabits one of the four cardinal directions. As recounted by Herodotus, these four civilizations were the Massagetae,[180] the Ethiopians,[181] the Scythians, and the Greeks. Herodotus locates the Massagetae in the distant east: τὸ δὲ ἔθνος τοῦτο καὶ μέγα λέγεται εἶναι καὶ ἄλκιμον, οἰκημένον δὲ πρὸς ἠῶ τε καὶ ἡλίου ἀνατολάς, "And this nation [the Massagetae] is said to be great and warlike and they live towards dawn and the rising

[179] Hdt. 4.43.1. I find it peculiar that Romm cites this exact passage in Romm 1992: 16 because it shows that he knew about this episode, but did not discuss it with the other ἐρῆμοι.
[180] Hdt. 1.201-214.
[181] Here, I mean the μακρόβιοι αἰθίοπες, the long-lived Ethiopians, who Cambyses failed to reach, let alone conquer, with his army. However, Herodotus notes that Cambyses did subdue some Ethiopians who lived near Egypt and near Mt. Nysa (see Hdt. 3.97 for this account). Also, Herodotus mentions that there is also a separate group of Ethiopians who live in Asia near the River Indus. These Ethiopians were incorporated into Province #17, which includes territory around modern day Pakistan.

of the sun."[182] The Massagetae are marked out as the far-eastern nation that foiled the Persians. The μακρόβιοι Ethiopians are described as οἰκημένους δὲ Λιβύης ἐπὶ τῇ νοτίῃ θαλάσσῃ, "who live in Libya by the South Sea."[183] The Ethiopians' geographic opposite are the Scythians. They live in the far north, around the top of the Black Sea. Therefore, Herodotus has set up several nations that live on the edges of the οἰκουμένη: the Massagetae in the east, the Scythians to the north, and the μακρόβιοι Ethiopians to the south.

While these first three nations fit neatly into those three cardinal positions, the location of Greece is a little more precarious. The Greeks believed themselves as being in the center of the οἰκουμένη, as illustrated by the fact that they called Delphi the ὀμφαλός of the world. Moreover, one could list several other nations that live further to the west than the Greeks, such as the Carthaginians. And the Carthaginians would be an interesting possibility because Cambyses had planned on attacking them, but his Phoenician underlings refused to wage war against their own daughter-city.[184] However, I believe Herodotus is shrewdly crafting his narrative so that he can provide a different perspective of the οἰκουμένη. That is, since he dedicates a good portion of his *Histories* to the history of Persia, Herodotus has set up these four nations in each of the four cardinal directions so as to place Persia in the center. While I am by no means arguing that Herodotus personally believed that Persia was located in the center of the οἰκουμένη, which would contradict the Greek view that Delphi holds this position, Herodotus does make it necessary for his audience to perceive Persia as inhabiting this position at least in

[182] Hdt. 1.201.
[183] Hdt. 3.17.1.
[184] Hdt. 3.17, 19. Note the contrast between the relationships of the Carthaginians and the Phoenicians and that of the Greeks and their colonists. The Phoenicians refused to attack Carthage, but Artemisia aided Xerxes in invading Greece.

his narrative since the structure of his *Histories* focuses on the Persian Empire's interactions with these four directions.

Furthermore, Greece does not need to occupy the furthest corner of the west to fulfill this role in Herodotus' narrative framework. If we were to examine the Massagetae and the Scythians, neither of these two nations inhabits the extreme of its cardinal direction. As I have mentioned above, the various Indian nations lie closest to the eastern ἐρῆμος. The same can be said about the Scythians. The Hyberboreans[185] are supposedly the most northerly nation, since, according to the reported tradition of the Delians, they had to travel through Scythia in order to come to Delos.[186] Moreover, in Greek literature, the location of the Hyperboreans (as their name also suggests) is linked with the North Wind, Boreas, and that position keeps moving further and further away from the civilized world as the Greeks began to explore the known world.[187] In his discussion about the evolution of the location of the Hyperborean homeland in Greek literature, Bridgman argues that Herodotus' version of the Hyperboreans existed north of the Caspian Sea.[188] This link with Boreas establishes the Hyperboreans as living in the far north, far away from civilization. Therefore, as the locations of the Massagetae and the Scythians reveal, Greece does not need to occupy the far-western position in Herodotus' depiction of his world, since the two previously mentioned nations do not fulfill that role either. As a result, these four nations only need to inhabit lands in the four cardinal directions.

---

[185] See Romm 1989 and Brown 2011 for further discussions about the Hyberboreans as a nation on the edge of the known world.
[186] Herodotus, however, seems very skeptical of the existence of the Hyperboreans. He mentions that Hesiod and Homer (in the *Epigoni*, the authorship of which Herodotus calls into question) talk about the Hyperboreans. For the Delian tradition about the Hyperboreans, see Hdt. 4.33-35.
[187] Bridgman 2005: 27-37, 40, 44, 49, 58.
[188] Bridgman 2005: 30, 47, 48, 55, 59, 64.

Again, one might ask why is this relevant or important? Many scholars have already noticed the narrative similarities between Darius' invasion against Scythians and Xerxes' against the Greeks.[189] According to Hartog, Herodotus forces the narrative of the invasion of Scythia to match that of the Second Persian War. However, I would argue that Herodotus takes this comparison even further. Not only does Herodotus make the narratives of the Persian invasions of the four nations that I have noted mirror one another, but he also creates parallels outside of the narrative. For instance, Herodotus depicts the Massagetae as nomadic people, like the Scythians, both in their appearance and in their customs:

> Μασσαγέται δὲ ἐσθῆτά τε ὁμοίην τῇ Σκυθικῇ φορέουσι καὶ δίαιταν ἔχουσι.
>
> And the Massagetae wear the same clothes and have the same lifestyle as the Scythians.[190]

Herodotus expands on the above statement in the next chapter by telling the reader more about the similar lifestyles (δίαιταν) of the Scythians and the Massagetae.

> σπείρουσι δὲ οὐδέν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ κτηνέων ζώουσι καὶ ἰχθύων· οἳ δὲ ἄφθονοί σφι ἐκ τοῦ Ἀράξεω ποταμοῦ παραγίνονται· γαλακτοπόται δ᾽ εἰσί.
>
> And they do not sow crops, but they live on livestock and fish, which are abundantly available from the river Araxes: and they drink milk.[191]

That most important point in this passage is that Herodotus uses the phrase σπείρουσι δὲ οὐδέν ("and they do not sow crops"). Since the Massagetae do not have agriculture and live on other sources of food (cattle and fish), they can be viewed as nomads.

Herodotus also claims that the Ethiopians are nomads. As he explains in a passage in Book 2: ἔχεται δὲ τῆς νήσου λίμνη μεγάλη, τὴν πέριξ **νομάδες Αἰθίοπες** νέμονται,

---

[189] See, for instance, Hartog 1988, Munson 2001, and Corcella's Book IV commentary in Asheri et al. 2007.
[190] Hdt. 1.215.1.
[191] Hdt. 1.216.3-4.

"And a large lake was near this island, around which the **nomadic Ethiopians** live."[192] According to his commentary on Book 2, Alan Lloyd argues that these νομάδες Αἰθίοπες are "explicitly distinguished from their sedentary neighbours in the valley."[193] This is confirmed later in the same passage, where Herodotus tells his audience what you will find up river from the nomadic Ethiopians: καὶ ἔπειτα ἥξεις ἐς πόλιν μεγάλην τῇ οὔνομα ἐστὶ Μερόη· λέγεται δὲ αὕτη ἡ πόλις εἶναι μητρόπολις τῶν **ἄλλων** Αἰθιόπων, "And then you will come into a great city whose name is Meroe: and it is said that this city is the metropolis of the **other** Ethiopians."[194] Combined with the fact that the Ethiopians in Book 3 bury their dead περὶ τὴν πόλιν, "around their city,"[195] the ἄλλων in this passage marks off these Ethiopians as different from the nomadic Ethiopians whom Cambyses did subjugate because they live in a city, Meroe.

Although Herodotus makes it clear that the nomadic Ethiopians are not the same people as those who Cambyses desired (and failed) to conquer,[196] it is still significant that one group of Ethiopians are nomads. Moreover, the diet of the μακρόβιοι Ethiopians is extremely similar to the Scythians and the Massagetae: σίτησιν δὲ εἶναι κρέα τε ἑφθὰ καὶ πόμα γάλα, "their food was boiled meat and their drink milk."[197] In addition, the response of the Ethiopians to what the Persians eat — namely bread — reveals that, like the Massagetae and Scythians, the μακρόβιοι Ethiopians do not grow crops. The king of the

---

[192] Hdt. 2.29.4.
[193] Asheri et al. 2007: 260.
[194] Hdt. 2.29.6.
[195] Hdt. 3.23-4
[196] Although Herodotus uses the city of Elephantine as a point of reference in both passages (one about the nomad Ethiopians and the other about the μακρόβιοι "long-lived" Ethiopians), Herodotus claims that the latter group is significantly different from all other nations, when he says: νόμοισι δὲ καὶ ἄλλοισι χρᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς φασι κεχωρισμένοισι τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὴν βασιληίην, "And they say that [these Ethiopians] make use of different customs, much different from other men and especially in terms of their kingship" (Hdt. 3.20.2). See further Asheri et al. 2007: 260.
[197] Hdt. 3.23.1. Also note that Herodotus had Cambyses send the Ἰχθυοφάγοι, "the Fish-Eaters" to the μακρόβιοι Ethiopians, which completes the reference to the Massagetae passage.

μακρόβιοι Ethiopians, upon being shown the kind of food that the Persians lived on (bread), responds: πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Αἰθίοψ ἔφη οὐδὲν θωμάζειν εἰ σιτεόμενοι κόπρον ἔτεα ὀλίγα ζώουσι, "To these things [what the Fish-Eaters said and showed] the Ethiopian said that he was not at all surprised that they lived for so few years since they eat dung."[198] Therefore, even though the μακρόβιοι Ethiopians are not technically nomads, they do share some characteristics with the nomadic Massagetae and Scythians, specifically their diet.

So, what does this mean for our understanding of how Herodotus is representing the Greeks and, more specifically, the Athenians? The Greeks obviously live in settled homes and cities and practice agriculture and do not have the same non-grain diet that the Massagetae, the Scythians, and the Ethiopians follow. And yet, Herodotus seems to be drawing connections between these nomadic peoples and the Athenians: how are we to conceive of the Athenians as nomadic? The only way we can describe the Greeks, and specifically the Athenians, as nomads is to examine the military strategy that the Athenians used during the Second Persian War.

At that time, the Athenians received two cryptic prophecies from the oracle at Delphi that urged the Athenians to flee their beloved city.[199] The Athenians decided it meant that they needed to rely on their navy and therefore the majority of the Athenian population abandoned the city for either their ships or other Greek cities where their families would be safe. In Book 8, the Corinthian Adeimantus uses the phrases τῷ μὴ ἐστὶ πατρὶς, "for that man who does not have a country," and ἀπόλι ἀνδρί, "for a man without a city," to taunt Themistocles and the Athenians in general:

---

[198] Hdt. 3.22.4.
[199] Hdt. 7.140-143.

> Ταῦτα λέγοντος Θεμιστοκλέος αὖτις ὁ Κορίνθιος Ἀδείμαντος ἐπεφέρετο, σιγᾶν τε κελεύων τῷ μὴ ἔστι πατρὶς καὶ Εὐρυβιάδην οὐκ ἐῶν ἐπιψηφίζειν ἀπόλι ἀνδρί· πόλιν γὰρ τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα παρεχόμενον οὕτω ἐκέλευε γνώμας συμβάλλεσθαι.
>
> While Themistocles was saying these things, the Corinthian Adeimantus again attacked him, ordering him to be quiet since he had no homeland and ordering Eurybides not to allow a man without a city to cast a vote. When Themistocles could produce evidence that he had a city, then he bid him to share his opinions.[200]

Themistocles, the Athenian admiral, responds by saying (with Herodotus narrating his answer):

> Τότε δὴ ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης κεῖνόν τε καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους πολλά τε καὶ κακὰ ἔλεγε, ἑωυτοῖσί τε ἐδήλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη καὶ πόλις καὶ γῆ μέζων ἤ περ ἐκείνοισι ἔστ' ἂν διηκόσιαι νέες σφι ἔωσι πεπληρωμέναι· οὐδαμοὺς γὰρ Ἑλλήνων αὐτοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀποκρούσεσθαι.
>
> Then Themistocles spoke many and bad things against him [Adeimantus] and the Corinthians, and he made it clear in his speech that so long as they had two hundred manned ships, the Athenians had both a city and a land greater than theirs, and that none of the Hellenes could repel them if they attacked.[201]

Hartog argues that this passage confirms that the Athenians are not nomads because the city of Athens still exists – although it is still under Persian occupation – and the Athenians still live on in their navy.[202] While I agree with Hartog that "Athens" will never die as long as their men exist, I disagree that this passage shows that the Athenians cannot be seen as nomads. In fact, I believe that it is quite the opposite.

In order for the Athenians to copy the strategy that the Scythians used to defeat Darius and the Persians, they must, at least narratively, transform into nomads. Since they abandon their city, the Athenians become nomads because they will not capitulate to the Persian demands if the Persians occupy their city-state. They are free from the restrictions

---

[200] Hdt. 8.61.1.
[201] Hdt. 8.61.2.
[202] Hartog 1988: 56-57.

that a city might possess during a war. For Hartog, the difference between the Athenians and the Scythians is that the Scythians did not have a reason to defend their land, unlike the Athenians, who abandon their city in hopes of saving it in the future. Hartog makes his opinion clear:

> But the defense of a town clearly had no meaning for the Scythians. It is one thing to abandon the territory in order to defend the town, but if there is no town the very concept of territory loses its meaning. Possessing no town, are not the Scythians in effect also without territory? For them, there are only pasturelands.[203]

In Book 4, while they were trying to convince the other nations who live around Scythia to help them against the Persians, the Scythians use the term χώρη, "territory" whenever they mention their country.[204] Nomads do not simply wander around aimlessly from place to place. Instead, they migrate from one location to another, where they know they can reliably sustain themselves. Furthermore, the Gelonians, who agree to help the Scythians, are city-dwellers.[205] Even though the Scythians might not have a city to stake their claim on the lands they live on, this does not mean that the Scythians do not have any less of a reason to stand up against the Persians than the Athenians did. Even if the χώρη that the Scythians mention are only "pasturelands," as Hartog calls their territory, their speech to their neighbors reveals that the Scythians still have an attachment to their lands. Otherwise, the Scythians would pack up their belongings and seek new pastures.[206]

---

[203] Hartog 1988: 51.
[204] Hdt. 4.118.
[205] See Hdt. 4.108-9 for Herodotus' mention of the city-dwelling Gelonians.
[206] See Hdt. 4.11, where Herodotus tells the story he believes is the most plausible origin for the Scythians. In this narrative, the Scythians are forced off their lands by the Massagetae and move to their present location.

Is it a Ship or a Horse?

One way Herodotus had available to make the comparison between Scythian nomadism and Athenian naval nomadism was to apply a common metaphor in Greek literature that uses grassland and plains imagery to describe the sea. Poseidon would be an obvious example of this metaphor. Besides being the Greek god of the sea, Poseidon also has strong ties with horses, which usually live in grasslands. Some of his common epithets, such as Ἵππιος, show how the Greeks saw the connection between Poseidon and horses.[207] Therefore, in Greek thought, there is a metaphorical understanding of the ocean as a flat plain of salt water. Although one might be tempted to accept the above evidence to support the parallel between Scythian nomadism and the Athenian naval nomadism, Herodotus actually provides us with his own example of this analogy. The term that he uses in order to accomplish this effect is κέλης. According to Liddell, Scott, and Jones *Greek Lexicon*, κέλης can either mean a "riding-horse" or a "fast-sailing ship."[208] Herodotus reveals that he understands this metaphor between the ocean and grasslands by using both definitions of this word.

Herodotus uses the first definition of κέλης in Book 7 Chapter 86, while he narrates the catalogue of the Persian multinational army. In this passage, he describes the Indian cavalry as follows: ἤλαυνον δὲ **κέλητας** καὶ ἅρματα, "And the [Indians] rode swift

[207] For Poseidon Ἵππιος, see Bacchylides, fr. 17: 99-100; Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.30.4, 5.15.5, 6.20.18, 7.21.7-9, 8.10.2, 8.14.5, 8.36.2 8.37.10, 8.25.7. For Pegasos (offspring of Medusa and Poseidon), see Hesiod, *Theogony* 281. For Poseidon's role in horsemanship, see *Il*. 23.307 and Pindar, *Pyth*. 6.50.
[208] *Od*. 5.371 has a particularly interesting usage of κέλης. In this scene, Odysseus rides on a plank in the sea, just as if he were riding a horse.

horses and chariots."[209] In this passage, it is important to note that Herodotus uses κέλης here as an alternative for ἵππος, "horse," especially since Herodotus uses ἵππος in the same passage when describing what animals the Indians use to draw their chariots. While this word choice could illustrate that a κέλης is a horse one would ride, while a ἵππος is one you would use to pull a chariot, the main point is that in this passage, Herodotus has begun to set up the sea-grassland analogy by using this specific word over a more common word like ἵππος. While this instance of κέλης by itself cannot prove that Herodotus is using the analogy, the combination of both usages, as we will see in the next passage, will help solidify the comparison.

In Book 8 Chapter 94, Herodotus uses the second meaning of κέλης. In this passage, the Corinthians encounter a small vessel while they were fleeing from Salamis. Herodotus describes the event as follows: ὡς δὲ ἄρα φεύγοντας γίνεσθαι τῆς Σαλαμινίης κατὰ τὸ ἱρὸν Ἀθηναίης Σκιράδος, περιπίπτειν σφι **κέλητα** θείῃ πομπῇ, "And as those who had fled were at the holy site of Athenian Sciras at Salamis, they came upon a ship by divine direction."[210] Although Herodotus uses the same word as he did in Book 7, it is obvious that κέλης in this context does not mean a horse, but rather a naval vessel. As a result, it appears that Herodotus understood the metaphor of describing the ocean as a plain since in two separate passages he distinguishes between the two meanings. By using both meanings of κέλης, Herodotus has set up the grassland-sea analogy. While these two instances of κέλης do not appear in any of the four invasion narratives,[211] the fact that Herodotus uses them creates an implicit understanding that the reader of the *Histories*

[209] Hdt. 7.86.1.
[210] Hdt. 8.93.2.
[211] Cyrus and the Massagetae, Cambyses and the Ethiopians, Darius and the Scythians, and Xerxes and the Greeks.

should also apply this metaphor constructed through κέλης to these invasion stories. Therefore, since Herodotus displays his understanding of this metaphor through κέλης, we can also conclude that his comparison between Scythian horse nomadism and Athenian naval nomadism was intentional.

Why You Should be a Nomad

Artabanus, a Persian advisor, who also happens to be the brother of Darius and the uncle of Xerxes, performs a particularly interesting role in Herodotus' narrative. First of all, Artabanus takes on the part of the wise man whose expedient advice is ignored by his Persian king.[212] During the Scythian conquest, Herodotus describes Artabanus' role in Book 4 Chapter 83 as follows:

> Ἀρτάβανος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος, ἀδελφεὸς ἐὼν Δαρείου, ἐχρήιζε μηδαμῶς αὐτὸν στρατηίην ἐπὶ Σκύθας ποιέεσθαι, καταλέγων τῶν Σκυθέων τὴν ἀπορίην. ἀλλ᾽ οὐ γὰρ ἔπειθε συμβουλεύων οἱ χρηστά, ὃ μὲν ἐπέπαυτο.
>
> Artabanus, the son of Hystaspes, the brother of Darius, begged [his brother] not to make an expedition against Scythia, explaining the difficulty of reaching the Scythians. But he did not persuade [Darius], although he was giving good advice to him, and he dropped the matter.[213]

This passage obviously looks back at Chapter 46 in the same book, which I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, since Artabanus is referring to the difficulties that a nomadic enemy would pose. As Herodotus will explain in the later chapters of Book 4, Darius was foiled in his quest to exact vengeance against the Scythians precisely for this reason. Since there were no cities he could capture and since he could not force a decisive battle against the enemy king, Darius was forced to engage in a war of attrition, which

---

[212] See Lattimore 1939 and my discussion in Chapter 1 above.
[213] Hdt. 4.83.1-2

favored the Scythians. Furthermore, the Scythians used several strategies that complemented their nomadic lifestyle. First, Herodotus tells us that the Scythians implemented scorched-earth tactics:

> ταῦτα ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ἐπύθοντο οἱ Σκύθαι, ἐβουλεύοντο ἰθυμαχίην μὲν μηδεμίαν ποιέεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανέος, ὅτε δὴ σφι οὗτοι γε σύμμαχοι οὐ προσεγίνοντο, ὑπεξιόντες δὲ καὶ ὑπεξελαύνοντες τὰ φρέατα τὰ παρεξίοιεν αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰς κρήνας συγχοῦν, τὴν ποίην τε ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκτρίβειν.
>
> When the Scythians learned the news that was returned, they decided to not engage in open battle, since allies were not added to them, but instead, while gradually retreating and driving their cattle away, to give up and fill in their wells, and to uproot the grass from the earth.[214]

The Scythians are hoping that they can wear out the Persians via a war of attrition. Since ancient military forces rely on the countryside to maintain themselves, by devastating their own country, which the Persians would have otherwise done, the Scythians would hinder the Persians' ability to remain in their lands without starving. This risk of running out of food is paralleled in Book 3 when the Persian expeditionary force against the Ethiopians cannibalized themselves after Cambyses did not make proper arrangements for their food supplies.[215] Herodotus also shows this strategy in Chapter 130. Here, the Scythians would actually leave behind just a little bit of supplies for the Persians in order to give them false hope that they could survive in the harsh Scythian environment.[216]

Then, the second part of the Scythian strategy is the mobility of their forces. As the above quote shows, the Scythians would not allow the Persians to engage them unless it was on their own terms. When Darius asks the Scythian king why he is making them play this game of cat and mouse, Idanthyrsus gave this response:

---

[214] Hdt. 4.120.1.
[215] Hdt. 3.25.
[216] Hdt. 3.30.

> οὐδέ τι νεώτερον εἰμὶ ποιήσας νῦν ἢ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνη ἐώθεα ποιέειν. ὅ τι δὲ οὐκ αὐτίκα μάχομαι τοι, ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο σημανέω. ἡμῖν οὔτε ἄστεα οὔτε γῆ πεφυτευμένη ἐστί, τῶν πέρι δείσαντες μὴ ἁλῷ, ἢ καρῇ ταχύτερον ἂν ὑμῖν συμμίσγοιμεν ἐς μάχην. εἰ δὲ δέοι πάντως ἐς τοῦτο κατὰ τάχος ἀπικνέεσθαι, τυγχάνουσι ἡμῖν ἐόντες τάφοι πατρώιοι.
>
> And I am not doing anything new now other than I am accustomed to do in peace. And I will explain this reason why I do not immediately fight you. For there are no cities or cultivated land for us, about which we fear that you might take or destroy, and [as a result] we more quickly rush into battle with you. And if it is absolutely necessary to come into this quickly, our fathers' graves happen to be present for us.[217]

This passage seems to be what Hartog used to support his claim that Scythian nomadism prevents them from becoming full "quasi-Athenians." However, while this passage does show that the Scythians do not have cities or agriculture, it also shows that they still have an attachment to their land. Idanthyrsus mentions their ancestors' graves.[218] Furthermore, Idanthyrsus' point about their migratory habits is that, even if the Persians were to capture one portion of Scythia, then his people could just move on to another location. This is just the Scythians' advantage in war: capturing or laying waste to their land would not be as detrimental to them as it would be to a city-dwelling nation. By combining both their scorched-earth tactics and their nomadic mobility, the Scythians waged a war of attrition that successfully forced Darius and his men to leave. Therefore, Herodotus confirms that Artabanus was indeed συμβουλεύων οἱ χρηστά, "giving good advice to [Darius]" because of how disastrous the invasion of Scythia turned out to be.

The next time the reader sees Artabanus is in Book 7 when Xerxes was deciding whether to invade Greece. However, Artabanus' part in this narrative has now been expanded beyond just the "wise man" whose advice is ignored and eventually turns out to be correct. Herodotus uses him as a reminder to his reader about the connections in the

---

[217] Hdt. 4.127.

[218] Cf. Hdt. 3.23-4, where the Ethiopians bury their dead περ τν πόλιν, "around their city."

narratives that he wanted the reader to make, namely how these three previous narratives foreshadow and mirror the events of the Second Persian War. The passage that illuminates this role of reminding the audience of these events the most happens after Artabanus was commanded to sleep in Xerxes' bed so that he might also experience the divine dreams that were commanding Xerxes to invade Greece.

> ἐγὼ μέν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, οἷα ἄνθρωπος ἰδὼν ἤδη πολλά τε καὶ μεγάλα πεσόντα πρήγματα ὑπὸ ἡσσόνων, οὐκ ἔων σε τὰ πάντα τῇ ἡλικίῃ εἴκειν, ἐπιστάμενος ὡς κακὸν εἴη τὸ πολλῶν ἐπιθυμέειν, μεμνημένος μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ Μασσαγέτας Κύρου στόλον ὡς ἔπρηξε, μεμνημένος δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐπ᾽ Αἰθίοπας τὸν Καμβύσεω, συστρατευόμενος δὲ καὶ Δαρείῳ ἐπὶ Σκύθας.
>
> King, since I, being such a man, have seen already many great powers fallen by inferior competition, I was not allowing you to yield to your youthfulness, because I know how perilous it is to desire many things, since I remember the journey of Cyrus against the Massagetae, how it ended, and I remember that journey of Cambyses against the Ethiopians, and I was part of the expedition with Darius against the Scythians.[219]

By mentioning these past events, especially by placing these words into the mouth of a "wise man" archetype, Herodotus also emphasizes the characters who play that role in those other narratives. In the first event that Artabanus mentions, Croesus was the character who gave sage advice to Cyrus. Just like Artabanus, Croesus is not only of the opposite opinion of the other advisors of the Persian king, but also uses his own past experiences to give him a better perspective on the situation.[220] While Croesus does not propose an anti-war argument, his advice does prove to be better than the other advisors because, although Cyrus died in battle, his heir had been sent back home (which allowed for a relatively smooth transition to a new ruler) and it put a stop to some of the momentum that the Massagetae could have had if they had won the battle on Persian soil.

---

[219] Hdt. 7.18.2.
[220] Hdt. 1.207.

In addition, with Artabanus' mention of Cambyses and his failed invasion of Ethiopia, Herodotus is recalling a specific passage since, unlike the other three invasion narratives, Cambyses did not have a "wise man" character to try to persuade him against his rash decision to attack Ethiopia without proper provisions.[221] Just like his predecessor and his descendants, Cambyses was launching an invasion of Ethiopia in order to exact vengeance for the slight that the Ethiopian king made against the gifts he sent with the Fish-Eaters.[222] However, unlike these other Persian kings, Cambyses did not have a character who fulfilled the "wise man" archetype and who therefore could not attempt to dissuade the Persian king from his current course of actions. Instead, the narrator plays this role:

> εἰ μέν νυν μαθὼν ταῦτα ὁ Καμβύσης ἐγνωσιμάχεε καὶ ἀπῆγε ὀπίσω τὸν στρατόν, ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρχῆθεν γενομένῃ ἁμαρτάδι ἦν ἂν ἀνὴρ σοφός· νῦν δὲ οὐδένα λόγον ποιεύμενος ἤιε αἰεὶ ἐς τὸ πρόσω.
>
> If Cambyses, when he had learned of these accounts [i.e. they were out of supplies], had changed his mind and led his army back, he would have been a wise man after his first fault: but, as it were, he did not take any account of it and continually pressed forward.[223]

Since the narrator is not a character in Herodotus' *Histories* and as a result cannot interact with Cambyses, this passage can almost be seen as the author's biased hindsight interpretation of the situation. However, the narrator's comments still provide the same information that a "wise man" character would have given. In addition, Herodotus has an advantage over the characters in his *Histories*. And even if the narrator could interact with the characters in Herodotus' *Histories*, Cambyses might still have ignored him.

---

[221] Hdt. 3.25-26.
[222] Cyrus attacked the Massagetae because Tomyris refused his marriage proposal (Hdt. 1.205), Darius invaded the Scythians because of the latter's previous conquest of Asia (Hdt. 1.13-6; 4.1), and Xerxes wanted to avenge the defeat of his father in Attica (Hdt. 7.5-11). For Cambyses' reason for invading Ethiopia, see Hdt. 3.21-25.
[223] Hdt. 3.25.5.

Unlike these characters, Herodotus has the benefit of his research on the topics and events discussed in his work. His hindsight allows Herodotus the ability to provide commentary on the actions of the characters of his narrative. Therefore, this passage establishes the narrator as a giver of advice, even though his words cannot be heard by the characters in the *Histories*.

Moreover, the passage where Artabanus recalls the three previous vain wars that Xerxes' predecessors had undertaken also shows him playing a second role, a model for a reader who understands Herodotus' message. Artabanus' statement here can almost be seen as meta-narrative, as he reminds the audience about the previous narratives that are relevant to Herodotus' point, just in case a not-so-attentive reader happened to miss the connections.[224] He acts as the final ingredient to Herodotus' extended framework that ties the invasion narratives together. In fact, Artabanus goes a step beyond just recalling those past wars in Book 7 when he uses those memories to advise Xerxes not to repeat the same mistakes of the past Persian kings. Although Artabanus does change his mind about the war due to the divine signs he receives during a dream that commanded the Persians to go to war,[225] he still makes the connection that Xerxes' invasion of Greece would not turn out any better than the wars of his predecessors. By using the lessons he had learned from Darius' invasion of Scythia, along with the stories of Cyrus' death at the hands of the Massagetae and Cambyses' disastrous campaign against the Ethiopians, Artabanus gives the following advice in Book 7:

---

[224] This narrative technique is often referred to as recapping. An example would be how some television series show footage from previous episodes to remind the viewer about past events on the show that will be important for understanding the current episode. See Mittell 2010: 78-79 and Kozak 2016 for more on this technique.

[225] Compare the beginning of Book 2 of the *Iliad*, where Agamemnon is also tricked by a dream into launching a vain attack against the Trojans.

> σὺ δὲ ὦ βασιλεῦ, μέλλεις ἐπ᾽ ἄνδρας στρατεύεσθαι πολλὸν ἔτι ἀμείνονας ἢ Σκύθας, οἳ κατὰ θάλασσάν τε ἄριστοι καὶ κατὰ γῆν λέγονται εἶναι. τὸ δὲ αὐτοῖσι ἔνεστι δεινόν, ἐμὲ σοὶ δίκαιον ἐστὶ φράζειν.
>
> And you, my King, are about to wage war against men who are far more superior than the Scythians, who are said to be the best at both sea and land. And it is right for me to reveal to you the danger that is present there.[226]

As both a giver of advice and a meta-narrative reminder of past events, Artabanus' roles intersect so that he not only gives counsel to Xerxes, but also so that he becomes the mouthpiece for Herodotus to explain the message that he has been carefully building up to tell. By setting up the narrative constraints — i.e., those precise moments where history seems to repeat itself and the same kinds of efforts produce the same kinds of results—, the analogy between grasslands and the sea, and the geographical location of certain nations, Herodotus uses Artabanus to tie all these seemingly irrelevant and unrelated pieces together. And together, all of these pieces become a powerful argument that attempts to show how a nation should not overextend itself beyond its own capacity.

Looking forward to the last three books of his *Histories*, it becomes clear how Herodotus repeats the narrative constraints, that is to say, Herodotus' authorial decision to enforce particular plot points upon all four of the previously discussed invasion stories, and patterns that are linked to Scythian nomadism. To the Athenians, the destruction of their homeland did not deter them into capitulation. In a way similar to the Scythians, the Athenians twice abandoned their homes in Athens and took up their ships as their final defense against the Persians and both times the Persians found a ghost town waiting for them.[227] A similar scene actually appears in the invasion of Scythia in Book 4, where the Persians happen upon the abandoned city of Gelonus:

---

[226] Hdt. 7.10α.3.
[227] See Hdt. 8.40-1 and 9.3-6 for the two Athenian evacuations.

> ἐπείτε δὲ ἐς τὴν τῶν Βουδίνων χώρην ἐσέβαλλον, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ἐντυχόντες τῷ ξυλίνῳ τείχεϊ, ἐκλελοιπότων τῶν Βουδίνων καὶ κεκενωμένου τοῦ τείχεος πάντων, ἐνέπρησαν αὐτό.
>
> But when they came into the land of the Boudini, when there they found a city of wooden walls after the Boudini had left and it was empty, they burned it to the ground.[228]

Therefore, just like the Scythians, or more accurately like the inhabitants of Gelonus, the Athenians had no fear of the destruction of their fields and city. In fact, Themistocles, after the Greek victory at Salamis, highlights why the Athenians could allow their lands to be destroyed, when he says: καὶ τις οἰκίην τε ἀναπλασάσθω καὶ σπόρου ἀνακῶς ἐχέτω, παντελέως ἀπελάσας τὸν βάρβαρον, "And let anyone rebuild his household and diligently concern himself with sowing, after he has entirely driven off the foreigners."[229] Here, Themistocles shows that material objects, such as one's household possessions and crops, can be replaced. One can re-sow his field, assuming it is still the growing season, and can build a new home. However, human lives are more difficult to replace than plants or inanimate objects.[230] This is precisely what Athenian naval nomadism accomplished. By sacrificing replicable goods, the Athenians were able to preserve more of their citizens than if they had faced the Persians head-on, prior to the Battle of Plataea.

Another way that Scythian nomadism slips into the Second Persian War narrative is by using tactics to minimize the strengths of the Persians. The greatest strength of the Persians is the size of their military. A straight-up fight with the Persians would have been disastrous for either the Greeks or the Scythians. Instead, as I have already mentioned, the Scythians relied on starving out their enemies before the Persians could

---

[228] Hdt. 4.123.1 Also see Hdt. 4.108-9 for Herodotus' description of the Boudini and their Greek-like neighbors, the Gelonians.
[229] Hdt. 8.109.4
[230] Compare *Il*. 9.403-409 for the same sentiment.

claim a decisive victory. The same idea appears in the Second Persian War narrative, when Artabanus warns Xerxes about how the land and the sea can also be his enemy.[231] Herodotus confirms Artabanus' concerns as well. Prior to the Battle of Artemisium, a great storm arose and wreaked havoc on some of the Persian fleet because they could not properly dock their ships on the Greece coast, which was one of Artabanus' concerns.[232] Then, before the Battle of Plataea, the Greeks learned that Mardonius was running out of supplies.[233]

Furthermore, both the Scythians and the Athenians also played to their strengths in order to neutralize the advantage that the Persians had in their large numbers. Herodotus shows us how the Scythians deal with the Persians in the following passage after they had allowed the Persians to chase them for a while: αὐτῶν δὲ τοῖσι ὑπολειπομένοισι ἔδοξε πλανᾶν μὲν μηκέτι Πέρσας, σῖτα δὲ ἑκάστοτε ἀναιρεομένοισι ἐπιτίθεσθαι, "And it seemed right for those of the Scythians who remained behind to no longer lead the Persians on, but to attack those each time when they were gathering food."[234] By doing this, the Scythians could compensate for their fewer numbers than the Persians by picking off their enemy while they were away from the main contingent. In a similar way, the Greeks also tried to find a way to reduce the effect of the size of the Persian military. Prior to the Battle of Salamis, Themistocles explained the advantage that the Greeks would have over the Persians by staying beside Salamis instead of retreating to the Isthmus:

> ἢν δὲ τὰ ἐγὼ λέγω ποιήσῃς, τοσάδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι χρηστὰ εὑρήσεις: πρῶτα μὲν ἐν στεινῷ συμβάλλοντες νηυσὶ ὀλίγῃσι πρὸς πολλάς, ἢν τὰ οἰκότα ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου

[231] Hdt. 7.10A3. For the exact quote, see above on page 65 n 226.
[232] Hdt. 7.188-192.
[233] Hdt. 9.45.
[234] Hdt. 4.128.2.

> ἐκβαίνῃ, πολλὸν κρατήσομεν: τὸ γὰρ ἐν στεινῷ ναυμαχέειν πρὸς ἡμέων ἐστί, ἐν εὐρυχωρίῃ δὲ πρὸς ἐκείνων.
>
> And if you do the things which I say, then you will find so many useful benefits in them: first, we will very much be victorious when we engage their many ships with our few ships in this strait, if it turns out reasonably from this war: for fighting a naval battle in the strait is our advantage, just as fighting in the open water is theirs.[235]

While on the surface this might not seem the same, this Greek strategy, which they also used at Thermopylae, accomplishes the same goal as the Scythian battle plan: reduce the number of Persians that they have to engage at one time. The Greeks confined the amount of space that the large Persian navy could maneuver. This prevented the Persians from swarming the Greeks with superior numbers, as Themistocles suggested that they would if the Greek navy made their defense by the Isthmus of Corinth. Therefore, the Greek usage of their combined navy achieved similar results as the Scythian nomadism in their respective wars. Once the Greeks were victorious at sea (just as the Scythians demonstrated cavalry superiority over the Persians), they could dictate the supplies for the Persian land force and potentially trap them by destroying the Hellespont bridge, just as the Scythians in vain tried to convince the Ionians to trap Darius by destroying the bridge that the Persians used to enter Scythia.

Conclusion

In his discussion of how the Persian expedition against the Scythians and the Second Persian War uses similar plots, Hartog points out some the similarities and differences between these two peoples. One difference that Hartog noted was that, in

[235] Hdt. 8.60β.

Greek thought, the Scythians were synonymous with nomads. Hartog uses this difference to argue that, since the Athenians are not nomads and only they mimic the Scythian nomadism only as a strategy and not as a lifestyle, the Scythians can only be interpreted as imperfect Athenians.[236] Furthermore, Hartog believes that the fact that the Persian army is described as an infantry army in the expedition against the Scythians also makes it difficult to interpret the Scythians as representing the Greeks or the Athenians specifically. An infantry army, Hartog claims, is the mainstay of the Greeks, and this fact makes it difficult to interpret the Scythian expedition as a clear representation of the Second Persian War. However, now that we have examined how Herodotus uses various techniques to set up *exempla* of failed invasion attempts by the Persians, we should also consider the context of Herodotus' message. Since Herodotus was a contemporary of at least the Archidamian War (431-21 BCE), Herodotus must be making some sort of commentary on the Peloponnesian War. The lesson that he has placed in Artabanus' mouth in Book 7 sounds quite like what Pericles is reported to have told the people of Athens when discussing his philosophy of conducting the war:

> πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἔχω ἐς ἐλπίδα τοῦ περιέσεσθαι, ἢν ἐθέλητε ἀρχήν τε μὴ ἐπικτᾶσθαι ἅμα πολεμοῦντες καὶ κινδύνους αὐθαιρέτους μὴ προστίθεσθαι: μᾶλλον γὰρ πεφόβημαι τὰς οἰκείας ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίας ἢ τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων διανοίας
>
> And I even have many other reasons for hope of faring well, if you wish not to gain power while at the same time waging war and not to willingly take on risks, because I fear more of our domestic mistakes than the machinations of our enemies.[237]

Pericles is giving the same advice as Herodotus: do not go beyond your means and do not start other wars when you have not finished the one you are currently waging. Therefore,

---

[236] Hartog 1988: 44-52.

[237] Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* 1.144. Also remember that Thucydides prefaces his history by saying that the speeches that he records are not verbatim, but at least follow a similar thought as what might have been said.

by understanding the context in which Herodotus was writing, we can gain a glimpse into what his audience was like and what he was trying to advise them. Raaflaub argues that Herodotus made a conscious effort to fill his work with political meaning by alluding to current events.[238] As the examples that I have discussed in this thesis and the passages that Raaflaub cites show, Herodotus makes it clear to his audience why his history is relevant to the events of his day.

Hartog's issue with the Scythians becoming "quasi-Athenians" can be solved by using events contemporary to Herodotus' time to understand this passage and by applying the metaphor that has been established by κέλης to it. As I have argued above, Greek literature, including Herodotus, sees a connection between horses and the sea. Herodotus establishes this metaphor by using both usages of κέλης in his histories. If we apply this metaphor that has been established by κέλης, we can understand the Scythian cavalry as representing a navy (Athens' specifically). Furthermore, since the Persian forces have been transformed into an infantry (or hoplite) army, we might also conclude that Herodotus is trying to make his audience see the Persians as Greeks (specifically the Peloponnesians). Therefore, one interpretation of the Darius' expedition against the Scythians is that Herodotus uses the Scythians to represent the Athenians with their expertise in the usage of κέλητες (horses or naval vessels), while the Persians are supposed to represent the Spartans and the Peloponnesian League, since during the invasion of Scythia, Herodotus puts a huge emphasis on the infantry component of the Persian army. If we assume that the Scythians and the Persians can represent the Athenians and the Spartans, respectively, then we can interpret the Scythian expedition as not only a prelude to the Second Persian War, but also to the Peloponnesian War. Asheri

[238] See Raaflaub 1987.

notes that the mention of the Peloponnesian War in Book 7 Chapter 137 allows us to conclude that Herodotus had witnessed at least the first two years of the Archidamian War.[239] Therefore, due to this reference, we can conclude that the Scythian expedition can be a representation of the Peloponnesian War. I would also argue that Herodotus sets up this comparison to the Peloponnesian War in Book 1 while he was discussing the early history of Lydian.

> ὁ δὲ τὰ τε δένδρεα καὶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ ὅκως διαφθείρειε, ἀπαλλάσσετο ὀπίσω. τῆς γὰρ θαλάσσης οἱ Μιλήσιοι ἐπεκράτεον, ὥστε ἐπέδρης μὴ εἶναι ἔργον τῇ στρατιῇ
>
> And [Alyattes] thoroughly destroyed the trees and the harvest in the earth, and then he returned back home. For the Milesians were the masters of the sea, so there was no need of a siege for the army.[240]

An Athenian audience would without a doubt have seen the allusion to the Archidamian War, where the Spartans would annually send an invasion force into Attica and devastate the countryside. However, since Athens had the Long Walls to protect themselves and their navy to supply themselves, the Spartans could never besiege the city. Therefore, by using non-Greeks, such as the Persians and the Scythians to act in the place of the Greeks in his narratives, Herodotus could describe events that might seem unrelated, but at the same time give advice to his audience that was pertinent to the Greeks in his time.

As I have shown above, Herodotus emphasizes the consequences of an empire that has attempted to achieve something, usually through conquest, that is beyond their own means. Cyrus, after forming the Persian Empire, decided to add the lands of the Massagetae, in vain, to his own land holdings. Cambyses, since he felt slighted by the Ethiopians, recklessly rushed into a war without the proper preparations. Darius, with his

---

[239] Asheri 2007: 2
[240] Hdt. 1.17.2-3.

heart set on punishing the Scythians for their ancestors' conquest of Asia, found himself outmatched by a game of cat and mouse. And Xerxes, just like his father, launched an invasion with vengeance in mind. Herodotus connects all four of these nations by adding nomadic elements to each of them. All four of these kings tried to annex lands that were at the edges of their world view. Since we can see that Herodotus also makes clear allusions to the Peloponnesian War, it is evident for what Herodotus is trying to accomplish by narrating these four stories. He is showing the Athenians what can happen to them if they too aim for goals beyond their means.

Several years ago, scholars had overlooked the political nature of Herodotus' discourse. In the time since then, some scholars have tried to fill this void. Raaflaub notes that Herodotus has a keen interest in empires in his text. He argued that Herodotus depicts the tyrants and monarchs in his *Histories* like tragic characters who rise to power only to lose it all.[241] David Konstan states that Themistocles acts as a representation of the transition from Persian hegemony to Athenian empire because of his deep interest in money and using it for his own advantage, such as taking and giving bribes.[242] Thomas Harrison discusses how Herodotus depicts empire and imperial ambitions in the *Histories*, especially how individuals impact the state with their own ambitions and how states apply their own views upon the world.[243] Herodotus' text, as we have seen, definitely has a political message for the Athens of his age. As Raaflaub puts it, Herodotus becomes a giver of warning and advice to the Athenians.[244] He placed several

[241] Raaflaub 1987.
[242] Konstan 1987. A major part of Konstan's argument is that the Persians are very quantity-driven, while the Greeks, for the most part, are not. Xerxes is obsessed with counting the number of men and ships that he has, while the Spartans do not care how many Persians they will face at Thermopylae.
[243] Harrison 2009.
[244] Raaflaub 1987.

exempla in his text as a warning against the traps of unrestrained imperialism. Once he has done this, all Herodotus can do is hope that the Athenians do not follow in the footsteps of the Persian kings and ignore the good advice.

In conclusion, then, Herodotus uses the other, the non-Greek, in order to help him articulate a specific message about expanding one's borders to the Athenians. Since the culmination of the *Histories* is the showdown between the Greeks and the Persians, which emphasizes a Pan-Hellenic unity against a common, foreign foe, Herodotus has to use stories of non-Greeks to convey his warnings, so as to not explicitly undermine the Pan-Hellenic message. And Herodotus does not simply force one story in his *Histories* to mirror another. Herodotus connects relevant narratives by both repeating specific plot points and character traits in these stories and by building up other similarities in places outside of the relevant passages, such as the metaphor established by κέλης. Herodotus sets up his comparison of Artemisia and Phanes by repeatedly depicting the Ionians and the Carians joined together as a unit. And Herodotus does the same thing as he develops his advice that the Athenians should be mindful of their mortal limits, that they cannot act like the Persians and try to conquer lands outside of their capacity. Herodotus repeats this "vain war" narrative not twice, but four times, which emphasizes the importance of this lesson. In addition to these narratives, Herodotus first provides a Persian point of view in his narrative both by making the invasion plots focal points of the first several chapters and also situating the nations that were targeted by the Persian kings in all four cardinal directions around their empire. By using stories about non-Greek peoples, Herodotus is able to formulate a richer commentary on contemporary issues of his time, such as the Peloponnesian War.

Carian Greeks and Greek Scythians: Concluding Remarks

In the conclusion to his article in the 1987 issue of *Arethusa*, David Konstan makes a peculiar statement about Herodotus' views on empire.[245] He quotes another scholar, Henry Immerwahr, who said of Persia: "If one is to name one basic condition of Persian greatness that also causes their downfall, this would be an excess of unity, both internally and in the structure of their empire."[246] Konstan then notes that the Greeks are just the opposite, since they, "who are homogeneous in blood, language, and traditions… are incapable of concord."[247] If we take these arguments into account, should we read Herodotus as a critic of Pan-Hellenism and political unity? Is Herodotus calling for a return to the sub-ethnic ties that the Greeks used to establish relationships, a system that, as Jonathan Hall has argued,[248] dominated archaic Greece until after the Persian Wars and the foundation of the Delian League?

I am hesitant to make such a great leap of logic so as to say that Herodotus would have preferred an un-unified Greece that squabbled amongst itself rather than a coordinated anti-Persian, pro-Greek alliance. I believe quite the opposite, since, as I have argued in this thesis, Herodotus has a keen interest in the political climate of his own time (namely the Peloponnesian War) and at the very least, he was trying to remind his audience of a time when the Greeks banded together against a common enemy instead of killing themselves in wars against one another. A crucial point to understanding Immerwahr's comment that Persia was unified despite being a mixing pot of different

[245] Konstan 1987, especially starting at 70.
[246] Immerwahr 1966: 187.
[247] Konstan 1987: 73.
[248] See Hall 1997 and 2002.

nationalities and ethnicities is the contrast between freedom and slavery. For the Persians, the king had the final say in a decision. The Greek disunity is not what helped them beat off the Persians. In fact, Artemisia points out to Xerxes in the following passage that the Greeks' alliance will fall apart if he bides his time:

> τῇ δὲ ἐγὼ δοκέω ἀποβήσεσθαι τὰ τῶν ἀντιπολέμων πρήγματα, τοῦτο φράσω. ἢν μὲν μὴ ἐπειχθῇς ναυμαχίην ποιεύμενος, ἀλλὰ τὰς νέας αὐτοῦ ἔχῃς πρὸς γῇ μένων ἢ καὶ προβαίνων ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον, εὐπετέως τοι δέσποτα χωρήσει τὰ νοέων ἐλήλυθας. οὐ γὰρ οἷοί τε πολλὸν χρόνον εἰσί τοι ἀντέχειν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀλλὰ σφέας διασκεδᾷς, κατὰ πόλις δὲ ἕκαστοι φεύξονται.
>
> And I will show this, how I expect the matters of our enemies to turn out. If you do not rush out to engage a naval battle, but rather hold back your ships and remain near the land or even advance into the Peloponnese, you will easily, Lord, accomplish the things that you had in mind when you came here because the Greeks are not able for a long time to hold out against you, but you will scatter them and each of them will flee to their respective city.[249]

As this passage reveals, the Persians could have easily preyed on the loose coalition of the Greek city-states. However, Xerxes, even though he commends Artemisia for her advice, ignores it and proceeds to the Battle of Salamis as planned, with disastrous consequences for this decision. The Greek coalition finds itself in a similar situation prior to the Battle of Salamis. Just like the above example, there is a decision maker (Eurybiadas) and the wisdom giver (Themistocles). Eurybiadas has to decide whether to remain at Salamis or to flee to the Isthmus of Corinth. At first, Themistocles is able to convince Eurybiadas of remaining at Salamis because of the tactical advantages the narrow body of water would provide the Greek navy. [250] However, once news reached the navy's ears that Attica had fallen to the Persians, the Peloponnesians began to pressure Eurybiadas into fleeing from Salamis in order to defend their homes. Once he realized that his attempts to convince Eurybiadas to stay were about to be ruined, Themistocles

[249] Hdt. 8.68β.1-2.
[250] Hdt. 8.58-94.

"betrays" the Greeks to the Persians by telling the invaders to attack at once. Themistocles' actions seem quite peculiar when we think about how they fit into the framework of givers of wisdom. While it seems like Themistocles has sold out his compatriots, he also acts like an inverse of the advisor archetype, as I have discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Themistocles purposefully gave the Persians advice that was contrary to Artemisia's. Moreover, Themistocles' deception can be viewed as the medicine that the Greeks needed: by forcing the other Greeks' hands, Themistocles is able to place the Greeks in a favorable position for the naval battle.

Themistocles' unilateral action to make a decision for the Greeks, which was actually Eurybiadas' call, is also worth discussing. On the surface, it appears as if Themistocles is wielding an authority similar to the Persian kings: despite some of the Greeks desire to leave, Themistocles trumps any other decision. However, the king of the Scythians, Idanthyrsus, uses a similar tactic in Book 4. When Idanthyrsus sent word to the other Scythian nations for aid against the Persians, several tribes refused to join.[251] As a result of these rejections, Idanthrysus devised a plan where the Scythian army would retreat into the lands of the nations who refused to help.[252] Since the Persians were pursuing the Scythian cavalry, this plan inevitably drew these neutral parties into the war. What could Herodotus mean by narrating these two examples where a leader would force the hand of his compatriots? At first, the only visible difference between the decision made by Themistocles and Idanthyrsus and that by the Persian kings is that the former worked, while the latter often would end in disaster. I believe the motivation for these decisions is important. Themistocles and Idanthyrus, whose decisions might be

[251] Hdt.4.118-20.
[252] Hdt. 4.125.

considered ethically questionable, made the necessary call for saving their people. On the other hand, the Persian kings legitimized their attempts to annex more land with vengeance for past offenses, which were sometimes not justified. Herodotus uses these contrasting stories to highlight both the benefits and the risks of having decision making tied to a single individual. Themistocles and Idanthyrus' actions were justified because they were trying to preserve their nations, while the Persian kings only wished to expand their borders with often unjustified reasons.

Now that we have examined a few of the numerous examples of the wise advisor archetype, my analysis of Herodotus' desire to advise the Athenians on present day events, such as the state of the Athenian empire, helps sheds some light on why he uses these exempla. Herodotus provides stories of individuals who both disregard and accept prudent advice. These stories, such as those of the invasions of the Massagetae, the Ethiopians, the Scythians, and the Greeks, demonstrate that Herodotus felt the affairs of Athens would turn out similarly if they too were to reject good advice. In turn, we also need to make the assumption that Herodotus believes that hi-s advice is just like what his archetypal givers of wisdom offer in his narrative. Of all the characters who fall into the category of the archetypal wise advisor, Artemisia might be the most important figure for discussing Herodotus' position as a giver of advice to the Athenians. Artemisia, just like Herodotus, hails from the city-state of Halicarnassus in Asia Minor. Moreover, the link that Herodotus creates between not only Phanes and Artemisia but also the Carians and the Ionians in general through narrative constraints highlights his own supposed mixed heritage.[253] Just like Artemisia, Herodotus is a foreigner, a ξένος, in the city of Athens.

[253] That is to say, Greek and Carian.

In short, Artemisia and her relationship with Persia seems like an allegory for what Herodotus is trying to accomplish politically in his *Histories*. As I have shown, Artemisia has not once, but twice given Xerxes competent advice for conducting the war against the Greeks. The first time, when she tells Xerxes to adopt a strategy of patience and allow the Greeks' own disunity to scatter themselves, is ignored with disastrous consequences: the result is the destruction of a large portion of his navy. The second, on the other hand, where she tells him to escape so that he can lick his wounds and regroup his forces, is heeded and unlike the first situation, Xerxes benefits from this advice. Unlike his general, Mardonius, Xerxes was not trapped in Greece. Therefore, Artemisia's advice, I suggest, functions as a sort of microcosm of Herodotus' message to the Athenians. Herodotus, too, offers two options. The Greeks can either listen to his advice and follow a Periclean strategy of waiting out their enemy, by which they will prosper; or they can ignore him and accept the dire consequences of their heedless actions.

Bibliography

Almagor, Eran and Joseph Skinner, eds. 2013. *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Asheri, David, Alan Lloyd, and Aldo Corcella. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bassi, Karen. 2003. "The Semantics of Manliness in Ancient Greece." In Rosen and Sluiter 2003: 25-58.

Bergren, Ann. 1975. *The Etymology and Uses of "Peirar" in Early Greek Poetry*. American Classical Studies 2. New York: American Philological Association.

———. 2008. *Weaving Truth: Essays on Language and the Female in Greek Thought.* Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Bridgman, Timothy P. 2005. *Hyperboreans: Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts*. New York and London: Routledge.

Brown, Christopher G. 2011. "To the Ends of the Earth: Sappho on Tithonus." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 178: 21-25.

Burkert, Walter. 1972. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Translated by E. Minar. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cartledge, Paul. 1993. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Denniston, J. D. 1950. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd edition. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Denniston, J. D. 1952. *Greek Prose Style*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Dillery, John. 2008. "The ΘΕΑΤΗΣ: More Texts, Further Thoughts." *The Classical Journal* 103: 243-251.

Erikson, T. H. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.

Finkelberg, Margalit. 2005. *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Prehistory and the Greek Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forsdyke, Sara L. 2012. "'Born from the Earth': The Political Uses of an Athenian Myth." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12: 119-141.

Fragoulaki, Maria. 2013. *Kinship in Thucydides. Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garvie, A. F., ed. 2009. *Aeschylus: Persae*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldin, Owen. 2015. "The Pythagorean Table of Opposites, Symbolic Classification, and Aristotle." *Science in Context* 28: 171-193.

Graf, D. F. 1984. "Medism: The Origin and Significance of the Term." *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 104: 15-30.

Gray, Vivienne. 1995. "Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness." *American Journal of Philology* 116: 185-211.

Gruen, Erich S. 1993. "Cultural Fictions and Cultural Identity." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123: 1-14.

———. 2011a. *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

———. 2011b. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hall, Edith. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek self-definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hall, Jonathan M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1998. "Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 8: 265-283.

———. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 2003. "'Culture' or 'Cultures'? Hellenism in the Late Sixth Century." In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds., *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 23-34.

———. 2007. "Polis, Community, and Ethnic Identity." In H. A. Shapiro, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 40-60.

Harrel, Sarah E. 2003. "Marvelous *Andreia*: Politics, Geography, and Ethnicity in Herodotus' *Histories*. In Rosen and Sluiter 2003: 77-94.

Harrison, Thomas. 2009. “Herodotus on the American Empire.” *Classical World* 102: 383-93.

Hartog, François. 1988. *The Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* Translated by Janet Lloyd. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Heath, John. 2003. *The Talking Greeks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holland, Tom, trans. 2013. *Herodotus: The Histories*. New York: Penguin.

Hornblower, Simon. 1982. *Mausolus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1991. *The Greek World 479-323 BC*. London: Routledge.

Hude, Karl, ed. 1927. *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. 3rd edition. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Immerwahr, H. R. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. APA Philological Monographs 23. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University for the American Philological Association.

Isaac, Benjamin H, 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jin Kim, Hyun. 2013. “The Invention of the ‘Barbarian’ in Late Sixth-Century BC Ionia.” In Almagor and Skinner 2013: 25-48.

Konstan, David. 1987. “Persians, Greeks and Empire.” *Arethusa* 20, 1: 59-73.

———. 1997. “Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity.” *Diaspora* 6: 97-110.

Kozak, Lynn. 2016. *Experiencing Hektor: Character in the Iliad*. London: Bloomsbury.

Lattimore, Richmond. 1939. “The Wise Adviser in Herodotus.” *Classical Philology* 34: 24-35.

Launay, Robert. 2010. *Foundations of Anthropological Theory: from Classical Antiquity to early Modern Europe.* Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lloyd, G. E. R. 1966. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malkin, Irad. 2004. “Postcolonial Concepts and Ancient Greek Colonization.” *Modern Language Quarterly* 65: 341-364.

Marincola, John. 1987. “Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator’s Presence.” *Arethusa* 20: 121-137.

Mittell, Jason. 2010. “Previously On: Primetime Serials and the Mechanics of Memory.” In Marina Grishakova and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds., *Intermediality and Storytelling*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 78-98.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. 2013. *Herodotus: Volume 1: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past* Oxfrod: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 2013. *Herodotus: Volume 2: Herodotus and his World* Oxfrod: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

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

———. 1988. “Artemisia in Herodotus.” *Classical Antiquity* 7: 91-106.

Nagy, Gregory. 1999. *Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. 2nd edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nightingale, Andrea Wilson. 2001. “On Wandering and Wondering: ‘*Theôria*’ in Greek Philosophy and Culture.” *Arion* 9: 23-58.

Pearson, Lionel, and F. H. Sandbach, ed. and trans. 1965. *Plutarch’s Moralia*, Volume XI. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pelling, Christopher. 2006. “Homer and Herodotus.” In M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, eds., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Vergil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 75-104.

———.. 2013. “East is East and West is West — Or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus.” In R. V. Munson, ed., *Herodotus. Vol. 2: Herodotus and the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 360-379.

Priestley, Jessica. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raaflaub, Kurt A. 1987. “Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History.” *Arethusa* 20: 221-248.

———. 2003. “Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his time.” In Egbert J. Bakker, Irene de Jong, and Hans van Wees, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 149-186.

Romm, James S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1989. “Herodotus and Mythic Geography: The Case of the Hyperboreans.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 97-113.

Rosen, R. M. and I. Sluiter, eds. 2003. *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

Shapiro, Susan O. 1994. “Learning through Suffering: Human Wisdom in Herodotus.” *Classical Journal* 89: 349-355.

Skinner, Joseph E. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smyth, H. W. 1956. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Thomas, Rosalind. 2001. “Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus.” In Irad Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 213-233.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. 1983. *Myth and Thought among the Greeks*. London: Routledge.

Vlassopoulos, Kostas. 2013. “The Stories of the Others: Storytelling and Intercultural Communication in the Herodotean Mediterranean.” In Almagor and Skinner 2013: 49-75.

Waterfield, Robin. 2009. “On ‘Fussy Authorial Nudges’ in Herodotus.” *Classical World* 102: 485-494.

West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helikon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhmud, Leonid. 2012. *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*. Translated by Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.