

# *Tyrannos, Rhētōr, and Strategos: Herodotus' Athenian Artemisia*

Nick Ackert  
Harvard University  
Classical Languages and Literature  
Class of 2017

**Abstract:** *Portrayed as the charismatic Queen of Halicarnassus, shrewd adviser to the Xerxes, and fearless admiral at the Battle of Salamis, Herodotus' Artemisia boldly transgresses into the traditionally male-dominated spaces of tyrant, orator, and general. While some have interpreted Artemisia's lack of punctilio as emblematic of a Persia so politically and culturally backwards that even women (viewed by Greeks as the inferior sex) were entrusted with authority, the significance of her narrative may be more complex. In light of recent scholarship about Herodotus' generally favorable presentation of women, it appears that each of Artemisia's three appearances - Histories 7.99, 8.68-69, and 8.87-88 – actually serve to liken the Queen to her Athenian foes. An interpretation of Artemisia as fundamentally Athenian reminds us that the rigid, binary association of a “feminine East” and a “masculine West” in Greek historiography should be called into question.*

## Overview<sup>†</sup>

Few case studies have complicated current discussions about the representation of women in Classical Greek literature like the Histories' portrayal of Artemisia, tyrant-queen of Herodotus' own Halicarnassus and loyal ally to Xerxes. As roughly contemporary texts like Xenophon's Oeconomicus suggest, the ideal Greek woman was passive and subservient to the instruction of her older husband; her sphere of influence was relegated to the management of the oikos rather than the political and military affairs of the polis (6.12-7.43, 9.11-10.1). Through Perikles' misogynistic funeral oration, Thucydides' Peloponnesian War similarly suggests that during conflict, Athenian wives could be models for all Greek women by serving their embattled husbands as attendants who were never spoken of (2.45.2). Throughout the five chapters of her narrative in the Histories (7.99, 8.68-69, and 8.87-88), however, Artemisia's characterization and behavior subscribe to no such expectations.

Introduced as the mixed daughter of a Cretan mother and a Halicarnassian father who assumed political power after the death of her husband (7.99), Artemisia purportedly served as both a respected adviser to Xerxes (8.68-69) and a warrior-commander who personally directed five ships against the Greeks at Salamis (8.87-88). Her lack of punctilio embodied by her courage and masculine spirit, makes her an object of amazement (ὑπὸ λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης and θῶμα, 7.99.1); even the narrative voice of Herodotus cannot seem to believe her deeds, despite implicit attestations to both their veracity and the *Histories'* methodological integrity.<sup>‡</sup>

The three temporally segregated components of Artemisia's narrative – (1) her introduction as tyrant-queen, (2) her council to Xerxes, and (3) her role as naval commander – each underscore Artemisia's boldly unconventional invasion of distinctly masculine power spaces which would doubtlessly have shocked the reader: those of *tyrannos*, *rhētōr*, and *strategos*. In context of recent scholarship demonstrating a surprisingly favorable presentation of

---

<sup>†</sup>All English translations taken from Robert B. Strassler's *Landmark Herodotus*; Greek text provided by the Perseus Project.

<sup>‡</sup>The opening of Artemisia's first chapter, “τῶν μὲν νῦν ἄλλων οὐ παραμέμνημαι ταξίαρχων ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος” (7.99.1), seems defensive; Herodotus claims to know the names of the other Persian fleet commanders despite identifying only Artemisia to maintain his legitimacy. The forward position and chiasmic framing of τῶν ... ταξίαρχων around οὐ παραμέμνημαι reads emphatically.

women throughout the *Histories*, however, I argue that an interpretation of Artemisia as merely a foil for a backwards, effeminate, and morally reprehensible Persia governed by “women on top” is too simplistic.

Through a brief survey of secondary literature concerning Herodotean women and a close reading of 7.99 (Artemisia as *tyrannos*), 8.68-69 (as *rhētōr*), and 8.87-88 (as *strategos*), I hope to demonstrate that despite her unorthodox transgression of gender norms in these contexts, Herodotus’ Artemisia appears fundamentally Athenian. Rather than demonizing Artemisia as an Eastern “other,” the historian seems to employ her unusual re-appropriation of masculine space to craft an especially memorable reflection of political behavior common to the Classical Greek *polis*.

## The Women of Herodotus

A careful survey of women in Herodotus conducted by Carolyn Dewald suggests that the *Histories* generally defy “a general contempt for women, a tranquil certitude of their natural inferiority to men, and consequently, for half the population, a life resembling modern penal servitude” that seemed to permeate Classical Greek culture.<sup>1</sup> Dewald has identified 375 separate depictions of women throughout the *Histories*, either as a group (e.g. women and children), named (Artemisia, Amestris, etc.), or unnamed (the wife of Canduales or the wife of Masistes, among others).<sup>2</sup> From the vast scope of her data, Dewald concludes convincingly that the majority of these women – even those who threaten the patriarchy of their husbands – do so as agents of preservation who uphold societal norms (*nomoi*), especially when these practices are threatened by the behavior of their spouses.<sup>3</sup> They are not irrational slaves to either hysteria or a supposedly reprehensible female nature (*phusis*).<sup>4</sup> She notes:

Herodotus’ portrait of women emphasizes their full partnership with men in establishing and maintaining social order. When he mentions clichés about women or femininity in the abstract ... [it] is usually in order to undercut them. When he portrays women as passive figures in the context of family politics ... they indicate several kinds of danger that the family confronts: aggression from without, natural causes and political strife from within. When he portrays women as actors who themselves determine the outcome of events ... they articulate and transmit the conventions of their societies to others and work creatively within the constraints of their individual situations in order to accomplish their goals.<sup>5</sup>

Throughout history as Herodotus conceives of it, men and women appear to maintain a partnership which almost desegregates the *oikos* and the *polis*, treating the stability of each as equally inalienable components of a greater whole into which both seamlessly intertwined.

Dewald’s interpretation of the tale of Kanduales’ unnamed wife (1.8-1.12) is particularly illustrative. She conspires against her husband because his plot to expose her naked to his bodyguard Gyges breached the Lydian social contract of sexual modesty – a custom mutually forged and upheld by both male and female. In successfully convincing Gyges to assassinate Kanduales, the wife acts as a defender of Lydian propriety and founds a flourishing new dynasty which will continue to uphold it.<sup>6</sup> The same can be said of Amestris, the wife of Xerxes, who has her daughter-in-law Artaynte (already married to Xerxes’ son) brutally mutilated and her family killed because she submits to Xerxes’ affections (9.108-13). Like Kanduales’ wife, Amestris’ reaction was extreme but intended to safeguard the integrity of her dynasty and its sexual mores against what Dewald calls “husbandly abuse.”<sup>7</sup> It hardly seems coincidental that these two

similar stories frame the entirety of the *Histories*, chiasmatically encapsulating the other references to women within.

Stephanie Larson concludes that Herodotus even seems to condone the behavior of the women involved in these incidents.<sup>8</sup> Regarding the tale of Gyges, she points to Herodotus' use of *aidōs* as a *hypax legomenon* (1.8.3), noting that the term invites the reader to consider Kanduales' wife as a protector of the systemic sexual modesty it evokes.<sup>9</sup> Larson also argues that the omission of her name, and that of Artaynte's mother whose refusal of Xerxes' advances led to his seduction of Artaynte instead (and Amestris' ensuing wrath), were deliberate, stylistic choices meant to evoke veneration.<sup>10</sup> Given that the names of respectable women were deliberately omitted from the records of Athenian law courts to respectfully underscore their role as crux of the *oikos* and its male inhabitants, Larson argues:

By omitting their names, the historian encourages his audience to reconsider the roles these women play in their stories: through anonymity, Herodotus portrays these two royal queens as dutiful and respected members of their households and thereby implicitly emphasizes the concern they exhibit in maintaining female propriety.<sup>11</sup>

This conclusion seems consistent with other instances of name suppression throughout the *Histories* – including the memorialization of the three hundred Spartans killed at Thermopylae (7.224), who are not referenced individually to emphasize the gravitas of their collective sacrifice.<sup>12</sup>

Herodotus' favorable presentation of women as defenders of *nomos* who are just as important to the enterprise of societal stability as their male partners makes it unlikely that Artemisia's behavior is solely meant to illustrate a profligate Persia. In Herodotus' world, women are entitled to independence and agency – the same sort of independence and agency that Artemisia embodies as *tyrannos*, *rhētōr*, and *strategos* in his narrative.

### Artemisia as Tyrannos (7.99)

Artemisia first appears in the catalogue of Xerxes' ships as an example of *thōmatā*, a Herodotean exemplum which identifies a single individual when discussing a larger whole (in this case, the non-Persian commanders of Xerxes' fleet).<sup>13</sup> Reasons for this focus remain unclear. Artemisia is certainly not an accurate representative of the bigger (male) group of Persian-allied admirals. It seems more likely that Herodotus had a personal fascination with her as a fellow Halicarnassian, or that her shockingly transgressive identity would have astounded readers as a manifestation of his stylistic romanticism (so-called *to muthōdes*) openly criticized by Thucydides (*Peloponnesian War*, 1.22.4). Herodotus writes:

[1] τῶν μὲν νῦν ἄλλων οὐ παραμένηται ταξίαρχων ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος, Ἀρτεμισίης δὲ τῆς μάλιστα θῶμα ποιεῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατευσαμένης γυναικός: ἥτις ἀποθανόντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆ τε ἔχουσα τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ παιδὸς ὑπάρχοντος νεηνίῳ ὑπὸ λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης ἐστρατεύετο, οὐδεμιῆς οἱ ἐούσης ἀναγκαίης. [2] οὐνομα μὲν δὴ ἦν αὐτῇ Ἀρτεμισίη, θυγάτηρ δὲ ἦν Λυγδάμιος, γένος δὲ ἐξ Ἀλικαρνησοῦ τὰ πρὸς πατρός, τὰ μητρόθεν δὲ Κρήσσα. ἡγεμόνευε δὲ Ἀλικαρνησέων τε καὶ Κώων καὶ Νισυρίων τε καὶ Καλυδνίων, πέντε νέας παρεχομένη (7.99.1-2).

[1] Although I am not mentioning the other subordinate commanders because I am not compelled to do so, I shall mention Artemisia. I find it absolutely amazing that she, a woman, should join the expedition against Hellas. After her husband died, she held the tyranny, and then, though her son was a young man of military age and she was not forced to do so at all, she went to war, roused by her own determination and courage.

[2] Now the name of this woman was Artemisia; she was the daughter of Lygdamos, by race part Halicarnassian on her father's side, and part Cretan on her mother's side. She led the men of Halicarnassus, Kos, Nisyros, and Kalymna, and provided five ships for the expedition. (Trans. Strassler)

The language emphasizes the unconventionality of her story – especially her status as a female tyrant-queen since political leadership was typically reserved for men. Moreover, the deliberate juxtaposition of στρατευσαμένης γυναικός (7.99.1) is especially striking; Artemisia's identity as a woman does not seem to inhibit her from “joining the expedition,” or more literally, “serving in war as a soldier.” Herodotus also employs the idiom ἔχουσα τὴν τυραννίδα (7.99.1) to describe her ascension to power; while it is not certain that this expression refers to the formal title of tyrant itself (it could conceivably refer to tyrant-like power), the suppression of Artemisia's husband – the former tyrant – seems to support an interpretation of the former. In either translation, the phrasing still suggests that after her husband's death, some mantle of political leadership was not thrust upon Artemisia. She willingly and actively grasped it with “determination and [manly] courage” (ὑπὸ λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης, 7.99.1). The verb *hēgemoneuō* in the next sentence (7.99.2), meaning “to lead the way” conveys the same subtext. Finally, the adjective *andreia*, typically reserved for men, conveys her more masculine character with little subtlety. Herodotus spends the remainder of the chapter describing how Artemisia even advocated for war with Greece of her own accord (οὐδεμιῆς οἱ εἰούσης ἀναγκαίης, 7.99.1) and lead the men of Halicarnassus, Kos, Nisyros, and Kalymna, actions which would conventionally fall under jurisdiction of the all-male *boulē* or *ekklēsia*.

Yet Herodotus' tone appears far from critical or disgusted; he describes Artemisia in her position as *tyrannos* as though she is a salient reflection of the political status quo facing the rest of Greece. Olivia Munson has noted that Artemisia's behavior seems far more Athenian than Eastern since Herodotus focuses as much on her *choice* to go to war as her status as a woman making that choice.<sup>14</sup> “Autonomy with regard to political choices,” she argues, “is generally a prerogative of the Greek side, and especially of the Athenians, not of the Eastern peoples. With small resources and voluntary bravery Artemisia is free like a Greek within a huge force where even the leaders are slaves and all are compelled to serve.”<sup>15</sup> Munson identifies other passages (including 7.132, 148-152, 157-163, 168, and 8.66.2) where Greek political leaders and their democratic *poleis* are similarly compelled to choose between neutrality or an alliance with Xerxes.<sup>16</sup> Artemisia must make the same decision, but freely and without duress.

In summary, despite the pointed language which frames her first appearance as transgressive or “other,” Artemisia appears as a Greek leader with a calculated stake in the same political controversy embroiling the entirety of the Peloponnesus. Like an Athenian, she has the freedom of political choice and opts to participate in the war – a freedom unavailable to Xerxes' troops who are forced to. Even while ruling on the fringes of Persian control as *tyrannos*, Artemisia operates within a markedly Athenian sphere as a reflection of the sort of decision-making facing other *poleis* during the Persian Wars.<sup>§</sup>

### Artemisia as *Rhētōr* (8.68-69)

---

<sup>§</sup> Note that debate over the significance of *tyrannos* as an Eastern or barbaric term is complicated by Athens' own history of tyranny under the Peisistratids (whose leadership in fact brought a golden age to Athens) and others, which lies beyond the scope of this analysis.

After a lengthy interlude, Artemisia returns in Book 8 as a respected adviser to Xerxes during his war council. Responding directly to the Persian Mardonios who advocates for a naval conflict, Artemisia defends her own plan to engage the Greeks on land. Herodotus' reconstruction of her speech serves as a striking example of Athenian oratory. It is not insignificant that Mardonios himself has no speech, emphasizing Artemisia's unusual leadership all the more. While Artemisia correspondingly transgresses into distinctly masculine space by performing as a *rhētōr*, her dialogue overall seems to reflect strategies of Athenian oratory more than the alienness of its speaker.

In line with the conventions of persuasion, Artemisia begins by justifying her own position through false modesty, ingratiating herself to the audience. She beseeches Mardonios to advocate to Xerxes on her behalf, speaking to him directly in the vocative (εἰπεῖν μοι πρὸς βασιλέα, Μαρδόνιε, ὡς ἐγὼ τάδε λέγω, 8.68.α.1) as though she is his inferior. Xerxes is only addressed through *oratio obliqua* in the remainder of the speech, creating an artificial distance between her and the king to convey her supposedly humbler position. In doing so, however, she effectively ignores Mardonios' role as liaison, rendering such a division between her and Xerxes superficial. Artemisia then lists her own qualifications through litotes: "I have not proven to be the worst fighting in her [Xerxes'] naval battles off Euboea, nor have I performed the least significant of feats," she claims (οὔτε κακίστη... οὔτε ἐλάχιστα... 8.68.α.1). The anaphora of *oute* followed by a superlative is simultaneously self-deprecating *and* self-promoting. Her masterful introduction then closes with a tricolon of rhetorical questions reflecting the critical issues at stake, followed by a sycophantic comment about Xerxes' ability to crush his political opponents:

τί δὲ πάντως δέει σε ναυμαχίῃσι ἀνακινδυνεύειν; οὐκ ἔχεις μὲν τὰς Ἀθήνας, τῶν περ εἵνεκα ὀρμήθης στρατεύεσθαι, ἔχεις δὲ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα; ἐμποδῶν δὲ τοι ἴσταται οὐδεῖς; οἱ δὲ τοι ἀντέστησαν, ἀπὴλλαξαν οὕτω ὡς κείνους ἔπρεπε (8.68.α.2).

And why is it necessary for you to risk another sea battle? Do you not already hold Athens, the very reason for which you set out on this campaign? And do you not have the rest of Hellas too? No one is standing in your way; those who have stood against you have ended up as they deserved (Trans. Strassler).

These questions are carefully constructed as a crescendo, first describing Xerxes' hold over Athens, and then all of Hellas itself. Thus, Artemisia conducts herself like a persuasive orator using salient techniques and diction of the genre, concluding that it is not only practical but also *just* that she offers her opinion (τὴν δὲ ἐοῦσαν γνώμην με δίκαιον ἐστὶ ἀποδείκνυσθαι 8.68.α.1).

The remainder of her speech is carefully organized into thematically distinct components; 8.68.β offers a justification for a land battle that will starve out the Athenian defenders, while 8.68.γ outlines the disastrous consequences of a loss at sea due to the incompetence of Xerxes' Egyptian, Cyprian, Cilician, and Pamphylian allies, who are emphatically described at the end of a suspense building polysyndeton as "absolutely worthless" (τῶν ὄφελος ἐστὶ οὐδέν, 8.68.γ.1). With its tight organization, careful use of figures of speech, and diction which deliberately invokes the Athenian law court (especially δίκαιον ἐστὶ, noted above), Artemisia's council reads as a microcosmic reflection of an agonistic Athenian political debate.

Munson further supports this interpretation in arguing that Artemisia's rhetoric quintessentially constitutes Athenian practices regarding freedom of speech for the benefit of the state.<sup>17</sup> Artemisia's advice conflicts directly with that of Xerxes' top advisers, and the inclinations of the Xerxes himself – so much so that her supporters fear retribution and her detractors hoped

for it (8.69.1) – but she voices it regardless. Munson argues that her boldness is an example of *isēgoriē*, or

an essential principle of political life in democratic Athens: it results in the people's best efforts on behalf of the state. Herodotus first mentions it in order to explain why the Athenians became more eager fighters after the fall of tyranny (5.78). Later he describes its direct application in Athens in the face of Xerxes' imminent invasion (7.142-44). At that time, on two separate occasions, Themistokles, a private individual ... contributed his excellent opinions... to a community of men like himself, who chose to be persuaded without regard for official authorities ... or their most immediate personal advantage.<sup>18</sup>

Munson's connection between *isēgoriē* and modern conceptions of "freedom of speech" may be problematic because Athenian democracy and citizenship differ dramatically from modern parallels. Nevertheless, Artemisia's mirroring of Perikles as a consequence of engaging in *isēgoriē* compellingly ties her character to the spirit of the Athenian *polis*. As *rhetor* advocating for her own plan just as Perikles controversially argued for the navy and the fortification of the Piraeus, Artemisia's presentation and the arsenal of *figura rhetoricae* at her disposal seem distinctly Athenian.

### **Artemesia as Strategos: (8.87-88)**

Artemesia's narrative concludes on the waves of Salamis as Herodotus depicts her commanding the ships of Xerxes' fleet like a male general. Chased by an unnamed Attic vessel, she daringly rams her own ship into that of Damasithymos, King of the Kalyndians, to deceive her pursuer into mistaking her for either a Greek ally or a traitor to the Persian cause (8.87.2-4, 8.88.1). Her gambit is successful. Artemesia escapes, and observing from a distance, Xerxes mistakes Damasithymos' vessel for a Greek trireme and lauds Artemesia for her "victory;" conveniently, there are no Kalyndian survivors left to accuse her of betrayal (8.88.2-3).

A cursory reading of these events might suggest that Artemesia's strategy – which deviously entailed the sacrifice of her own troops – perpetuates the very image of deceit, trickery, and ultimately, failure associated with female political or military agency that Herodotus has thus far not only avoided, but also undermined. Artemesia's leadership is the only lens through which Herodotus chooses to describe the most significant naval battle in all of Greek history thus far. Her more prominent role in the battle almost suggests that Xerxes' defeat rests upon Artemesia shoulders alone as she is his star commander; the collapse of his entire empire could be consequently construed as a result of women in a position of authority. As Xerxes himself so famously remarks in praise of Artemesia at the end of 8.88.3, "My men have become women, and my women, men!" Any enterprise facing this reality must be doomed for failure.

Yet Emily Katz Anhalt and Sarah Lawrence College offer a more complex and compelling interpretation of 8.87-88. In noting that the passage emphasizes Xerxes' misapprehension of the events from afar as much as (if not more than) Artemesia's role in battle, they argue that the passage serves as Herodotus' methodological meta-commentary on the unreliability of *opsis*, or what is seen, in the interpretation of history.<sup>19</sup> Xerxes' own eyes mistake him; this critical misunderstanding foreshadows his downfall, echoing several other instances where the vulnerability of *opsis* similarly collapses entire dynasties. It begins with Kandaules, who upon *seeing* his wife believes she is the most beautiful of all women who must be shown off to Gyges (1.8.1), and continues in the story Peisistratus, who seizes power by parading a false Athena whom the Athenians *see* and mistake for the goddess herself (1.60.5), among other

examples.<sup>20</sup> Anhalt and College ultimately conclude that these stories validate Herodotus and his practice of historiography – as a mix of *opsis*, *akoē*, and *gnōmē*, his narrative provides a much more introspective and reliable record than sight alone.<sup>21</sup>

Finally, while Artemisia's behavior may be deplorable, her ruthless pursuit of self-interest is embodied by the Athenians – especially Themistokles, who similarly relies on trickery to ensure victory at Salamis. Munson notes that Themistokles similarly changes sides to secure escape for himself (8.109-10), and that his conditional loyalty is a broader reflection of the treacherous climate of *poleis* faced with difficult decisions over Medizing or maintaining loyalty during the Persian war.<sup>22</sup> Even at her most deceitful, Artemisia does nothing that the Greeks would not do themselves; she is more similar to the Athenians than different.

## Concluding Thoughts

Throughout the five chapters of her appearance in the *Histories*, Artemisia unconventionally navigates the traditionally male spaces of *tyrannos* (7.99), *rhētōr* (8.68-69), and *strategos* (8.87-8.88). However, she does so not only as a woman, but more importantly as an Athenian. Given Herodotus' generally favorable conception of women as agents who uphold cultural values by actively and independently defending the social integrity of the state, it seems unlikely that Artemisia is merely an “other” serving as a foil for a profligate Persia. Rather, she is a poignant reflection of the Classical polis influenced by the Persian crisis, rhetoric, and the emergence of both *isegoriē* and utilitarian individualism. The very gender-defying traits which confer Artemisia's androgynous identity in fact relate her to her Athenian foe.<sup>23</sup> Despite her status as an Ionian Greek, she is a cipher for the Athenian activity Herodotus may have witnessed while living in Athens.<sup>24</sup> If one of the greatest opponents of Athens is fundamentally Athenian herself, Herodotus may be offering a broader (and critical) commentary about the alienation of outsiders arising from Athens' own imperial aspirations. Another study beyond the scope of this analysis reviewing the presentation of Athenian-like “others,” will have to explore this possibility in greater depth.

It would be dangerous, however, to misconstrue Artemisia's presentation as a segue for a broader-scale reinterpretation of women in Classical Greece. Herodotus' historiography presents an illusory Mediterranean world necessarily influenced by conventions of his genre and carefully scripted theatrical tropes meant to enchant or amuse the reader. Moreover, as one case study dwarfed by centuries of literary misogyny from Hesiod to Thucydides, Artemisia's depiction cannot be a reflection of greater female agency in the polis. Finally, it is entirely possible that Artemisia may not be a real historical figure; her name is uncannily similar to *Artemisium*, an important battle of the Persian naval expedition that culminated with Salamis in which Herodotus' Artemisia participated. Could she be the personification of this conflict? Such an interpretation, however, may in fact strengthen this discussion by demonstrating that Artemisia is representative not of a single person, but of the broader conflict affecting the Classical *poleis* of the fifth century.

Nevertheless, as Dewald has argued, women appear incidentally throughout the *Histories* and are portrayed *as they were* in the background of *to genomēna*, or “facts and events;” their presentation seems far more fluid and natural since it does not involve a didactic thesis about their social behavior, as in Xenophon or Thucydides.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, Herodotus' Artemisia can still have important implications for our understanding of the connection between the polarities of East vs. West and male vs. female given her affiliation with Persia.

As Norma Thompson has argued, Artemisia's presence among Xerxes' advisers naturally evokes a conflict between traditionally distinct spheres of public and private since women represent the *oikos* and men the *polis*.<sup>26</sup> The lack of division in Xerxes' Persia, she notes, is an implicit critique of a disorganized, despotic system which puts both men and women alike "at the mercy of the random fancies of the monarch;" such governance supports the link between governance by "women on top" and a politically backwards East.<sup>27</sup> Josine Blok agrees, noting that for Greeks, women are a sort of "seismograph of the general condition of a civilization or society. They are essential indicators of normality, and consequently, of transgressions of that normality."<sup>28</sup>

But Herodotean women like Artemisia are entitled to (and perhaps even lauded for) their participation, and in their depictions appear more Athenian than "other." Artemisia ultimately reminds us that the debate over whether or not we can continue to view Greek cultural perceptions of both gender and foreignness through the lens of a rigidly structuralist, binary association of a "feminine East" and a "masculine West" remains hotly contested.

## Notes

1. Carolyn Dewald. "Biology and Politics: Women in Herodotus' 'Histories,'" *Pacific Coast Philology* 15 (1980): 11.
2. Carolyn Dewald, "Women and Culture in Herodotus' Histories," *Women's Studies* 8 (1981): 94.
3. Dewald, "Women and Culture," 94 and Dewald, "Biology and Politics," 14.
4. Dewald, "Biology and Politics," 15.
5. Dewald, "Women and Culture," 94-95.
6. Dewald "Biology and Politics," 14.
7. *Ibid.*, 14.
8. Stephanie Larson, "Kanduales' Wife, Masistes' Wife: Herodotus' Narrative Strategy in Suppressing Names of Women: (Hdt. 1.8-12 and 9.108-14)," *The Classical Journal* 101:3 (2006): 225-244. 241.
9. *Ibid.*, 237.
10. *Ibid.*, 230 and 240-42.
11. *Ibid.*, 235-36.
12. *Ibid.*, 227-28.
13. Rosaria V. Munson, "Artemisia in Herodotus," *Classical Antiquity* 7:1 (1988): 91.
14. *Ibid.*, 95.
15. *Ibid.*, 1988, 95
16. *Ibid.*, 1988, 95 (footnote 17).
17. *Ibid.*, 1988, 97.
18. *Ibid.*, 1988, 97.
19. Emily Katz Anhalt and Sarah Lawrence College, "Seeing is Believing: Four Women on Display in Herodotus' Histories," *New England Classical Journal* 35.4 (2008): 277.
20. *Ibid.*, 277-78.
21. *Ibid.*, 277.
22. Munson, "Artemisia in Herodotus," 99-100.
23. *Ibid.*, 93-94.
24. Thank you to Samantha Blankenship from the Harvard Department of the Classics for proposing this interesting interpretation.
25. Dewald, "Women and Culture," 93-94.
26. Norma Thompson, "Public or Private? An Artemisian Answer," *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Series 3 7:1 (1999): 52.
27. *Ibid.*, 52.
28. Blok 2002, "Women in Herodotus' Histories," in *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, ed. Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong and Hans van Wees (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 227.

## Works Cited

- Anhalt, Emily Katz and Sarah Lawrence College. "Seeing is Believing: Four Women on Display in Herodotus' Histories." *New England Classical Journal* 35.4 (2008): 269-280.
- Blok, Josine. "Women in Herodotus' Histories." In *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong and Hans van Wees, 225-42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Dewald, Carolyn. "Biology and Politics: Women in Herodotus' 'Histories.'" *Pacific Coast Philology* 15 (1980): 11-18.
- . "Women and Culture in Herodotus' Histories." *Women's Studies* 8 (1981): 93-127.
- Larson, Stephanie. "Kanduales' Wife, Masistes' Wife: Herodotus' Narrative Strategy in Suppressing Names of Women: (Hdt. 1.8-12 and 9.108-14)." *The Classical Journal* 101:3 (2006): 225-244.
- Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. "Artemisia in Herodotus." *Classical Antiquity*, 7:1 (1988): 91-106.
- The Landmark Herodotus*, ed. Robert B. Strassler. New York: Anchor Books, 2007.
- Thompson, Norma. "Public or Private? An Artemisian Answer." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Series 3 7:1 (1999): 49-63.