An Other View: Intersectionality and Identity in Classical Greece

by

Anna-Maria Helena Cornelia Cornel

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2022

Doctoral Committee:
Professor Sara Forsdyke, Chair
Associate Professor Aileen Das
Professor Richard Janko
Associate Professor Ian Moyer

Anna-Maria Helena Cornelia Cornel
acornel@umich.edu
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7530-9147

© Anna-Maria Helena Cornelia Cornel 2022

For everyone—past, present, and future—
with lived experience in the in-between.

Acknowledgements

Petit à petit l'oiseau fait son nid was one of the first phrases I learned during my stay in Nice, France in the summer of 2016. My host said it in response to my frustration as I made mistake after mistake, being able to read and understand more French than I could (and can) speak. Many people who have gotten to know me well have told me one version or another of this saying over the years. Some told me that it is okay to be a tortoise, others simply reminded me to put one foot in front of the other and take everything one step at a time. I return to this French idiom, however, for its imagery of building a nest. In my eleven years in the United States of America I created a home for myself in two different cities, an academic home in the field of Ancient Studies, and perhaps most importantly, a home in myself. I am grateful for all who supported me over the years and have seen me (as Aileen Das put it recently) grow from a baby bird into an eagle.

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to Sara Forsdyke, who met with me as much as I needed, read every draft, allowed me to talk through my ideas, and guided and reassured me along the way. I am also grateful to the other members of my committee: Aileen Das supported me in pursuing unorthodox approaches; Richard Janko's close reading of my work and detailed annotations were much appreciated; Ian Moyer suggested interesting and productive readings from various disciplines and provided space to discuss big ideas.

Countless others have encouraged and helped me in a variety of ways. I am grateful for the support and friendship of many people I met through the University of Michigan, but

especially Caspian Goggin, Emily Lamond, Christian Axelgard, Justin Barney, Leah Borquez, Clara Bosak-Schroeder, Amy Pistone, Brandon Rumsey, Rob Santucci, and Jacqui Stimson. I also wish to thank other UM faculty and staff who supported me in my journey: Netta Berlin, Michelle Biggs, Catherine Brown, Ben Fortson, Sarah Kandell, Anna Moyer, Ruth Scodel, Fritz Swanson, and Arthur Verhoogt.

My thanks should also go to the members of communities beyond the University of Michigan that have helped me by cheering me on, sharing their own wisdom, and providing me with perspective. Thank you, Carol and Pete Sickman-Garner of Spun, as well as all Spun staff and regulars, for the welcoming and inclusive space and community. During the pandemic stage of candidacy, the support of the ADHD-Hive community was invaluable. I thank them for holding space, discussing their experiences, and sharing their daily lives. Furthermore, thank you to Tatyana and Amy, who supported my personal growth and never doubted that I would succeed.

I cannot imagine being the person I am today without my family. I want to thank my parents, José Sluiter and Erik Cornel, for allowing me to spread my wings to various destinations unfamiliar and unknown. I thank them and my siblings, Max, Ivo, and Sara, for their love and support. Finally—even though he cannot read these words—I want to acknowledge the support of Jude, my cat, who provided ample distraction, entertainment, and comfort.

Table of Contents

Dedication ..... **ii**
Acknowledgements ..... **iii**
Abstract ..... **iv**
Chapter I Introduction **1**

Lived Experiences *3*
Intersectionality *4*
Previous Scholarship *8*
Overview of Chapters *13*

Chapter II Herodotus and the Mule: Polyethnic Parentage and Multiple Identities in Ancient Greece **16**

Cultural Characteristics and Ethnic Boundaries *19*
Features of the Ethnic Group *23*
Beyond Binary Oppositions *28*
Cyrus (I.55; I.91; I.107-I.122) *31*
Creating Ethnic Identity and Social Status 33
Social Status: Ascription and Performance 37
Polyethnic Potential 42

Skyles and Anacharsis (IV.76-80) *45*
Foreign Relatives and Relative Foreignness. 46
Matters Concerning Religion and Politics 49

Children on Lemnos (VI.138) *53*
When the Men are Away... (IV.1-IV.4) *56*
Conclusion *63*

Chapter III From Fish to Amazons: Gender in Herodotus' *Histories* **65**

Previous Scholarship *67*
Cultural Relativity of Gender Roles 70
Customary Approaches to Antithetical Customs 72

Socio-Economic Inequality: Babylonian Customs (I.196-199) *74*
Kandaules' Wife (I.8-12) *79*
Objectification 80
Agency and Ability 81

Hierarchies of Status and Gender: Kandaules' wife (I.8-12), Atossa (III.134) and Scythian Women (IV.1) *85*
Wise Advisers: Cyno (I.111-112), Sesostris' wife (II.107), and Gorgo (V.51; VII.239) *92*

Cyno (I.111-112) ... 93
Sesostris' Wife (II.107) ... 94
Gorgo (V.51, VII.239) ... 95
Monumental Memories: Cheops' daughter (II.126); the Nitocrises (I.187; II.100) ... *97*
Cheops' Daughter (II.126) ... 97
Nitocris of Babylon (I.187) ... 98
Nitocris of Egypt (II.100) ... 100
Beyond the Gender Binary: Amazons (IV.110-117) ... *101*
Approaching the Amazons ... 102
The Amazons and Gender Systems ... 104
Herodotus' Perspective ... 108
Sauromatians and other Amazonian Afterlives ... 112
Conclusion ... *113*
Chapter IV A Life of One's Own: The Story of Neaira ... 115
Sources and Scholarship ... *116*
Citizenship Terminology ... *123*
Against Neaira ... *133*
Against the Law—Which Law? ... 134
Sunoikein: to Live Together in Marriage and… ... 136
But Surely, She's a *xenē?* ... 141
Metic ... 150
Conclusion: Other Metic Women ... *157*
Epilogue ... *162*
Chapter V Conclusion ... 164
Chapter Conclusions ... *165*
Further Research ... *169*
Diversity Now and Ancient ... *173*
Bibliography ... 175

Abstract

This dissertation examines how ancient people's multiple intersecting identities affected their lived experiences of the ancient world. I argue that to understand history, we must grasp how individuals navigated on the ground the societal norms and ideals relating to their multiple identities. I employ the concept of intersectionality to unpack how a person's ethnic identity, gender, and legal and social statuses interact and construct unique lived experiences. Both texts examined in this dissertation, namely Herodotus' *Histories* and Apollodoros' *Against Neaira*, deal with individuals on the margins and with multiple different vectors of identity. My research demonstrates that the marginalization of people results from the conflict between a person's various identities and the societal standards, which assume a person only has the singular identity with which the law or norm is concerned.

The chapters of this dissertation explore the dynamic interactions between ethnic identity, gender, legal and social status. Chapters II and III focus on narratives in Herodotus' *Histories*, while Chapter IV focuses on the speech *Against Neaira.* In chapter II, I analyze how the ethnic identity is constructed socially through attribution by others and through an individual's self-ascription. I investigate individuals who find themselves in between standard categories of ethnic identity. In particular, I examine four case studies of polyethnic individuals, people born to parents from different ethnic groups. I conclude that polyethnic people are allowed flexibility to identify with either of their parents' ethnic groups, so long as they do not disrupt the socio-political order.

In chapter III, I explore Herodotus' treatment of gender. The examples in this chapter demonstrate a greater complexity of female characters in Herodotus' *Histories* than previous studies. I call attention to portrayals of female agency beyond their ability to transfer and legitimize men's power. Not only do women act in a broader variety of circumstances, but they also use power structures based on other identities than gender to their own advantage. Both men and women are capable of great deeds, as well as horrible ones. I further argue that Herodotus recognizes the cultural relativity of gender systems. In particular, I show that Herodotus portrays the Amazons as coming from a non-binary society.

In chapter IV, I present a new perspective on immigrant women in Athens through an investigation of the case of Neaira. I re-evaluate Athenian civic terminology, in particular the terms *astos/astē* and *xenos/xenē*, and argue that these were terms indicating belonging and non-belonging in Athens, in contrast to the orthodox view that these were formal legal terms. In a close reading of *Against Neaira*, I demonstrate that Apollodoros fails to prove his claim that Neaira was *xenē*. I further show how he attempted to mitigate his lack of evidence. I argue that Neaira, although clearly a metic, was in fact an *astē* instead of a *xenē*.

This dissertation demonstrates that intersectionality allows us to understand the dynamic tension between identities and how they affect a person's lived experience. It is thus a productive lens with which to appreciate diverse experiences of the ancient world

Chapter I
Introduction

> After the second emergency Zoom call that week, I sit outside on the stairs and stare at the empty parking lot. I tell myself I should be working on my dissertation, but all I really need is to stop thinking about everything for just one minute. Although everyone has been supportive, there is no simple solution to the real problem. On July 6, 2020, the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) released a new ruling that prohibits international students from entering or remaining in the country if their course loads are completely online.
>
> Sitting in the small sliver of shade, I open my laptop. On Google Docs, I am working on an "emergency leave plan" that I care share with family and friends. I have researched the procedures of emigrating a cat to the Netherlands. I have decided which belongings I want to ship home, which I could take on a plane, and which I would leave behind. My apartment can be cleaned out by friends, provided they wait a few days to mitigate the risk of Covid-19. I check my phone. No covid test results yet. Another uncertainty.
>
> Even though I have lived, studied, and worked in the United States for almost ten years, my presence here is fragile. I have always known my visa was contingent upon my following of rules and laws, but I never realized how these could simply change from one day to the other. Strangers do not tend to recognize that I am not "one of them" until I pronounce the "th" in Netherlands more like a "d." I often express myself better in English than in my mother tongue and Ann Arbor is more home to me than any town in my fatherland. I belong here, yet I now am more foreign, more resident alien than ever before.

In the narrative above I explore my experience after the ICE ruling of July 6, 2020. Most international students in the US were affected by this ruling and will have gone through similar processes as I describe in the second paragraph. Nevertheless, this experience is also uniquely my own. In the third paragraph, for instance, I narrate the dissonance I was feeling between my legal status as a resident alien, the way that Americans often ascribe me a non-foreign status, and my personal understanding of where I belong. In addition to the tension between ascribed and

internal identities, my experience was affected by multiple other vectors of my identity. Although my identity as a resident alien was most salient, my emergency leave plan was clearly affected by my marital status, my age, my cat-parentage, and my socio-economic position. My narrative thus illustrates three main points that I highlight in my dissertation. One: the relevance of lived experiences, the way an individual experiences the world as opposed to the norms and ideals according to which society expects an individual of a particular identity (citizen, mother, enslaved person, etc.) to experience the world, to understanding history. The narrative illustrates the importance as my reflections describe the impact of the ruling in a way that facts alone are not able to convey. Two: lived experiences are strongly affected, if not determined, by an individual's identity. Three: a person's identity is not a neat array of legal statuses, but a messy amalgam of identities that involve both how one sees themselves and how they are seen by others.[1]

In this dissertation, I approach lived experiences of ancient people with a specific eye to how that experience differs for a variety of individuals with diverse and multiple identities. As we read ancient texts, I argue, we must unpack the various vectors of identity and their interaction. Only then will we be able to approach an understanding of the messy reality of the individual's experience of the ancient world. In this introductory chapter, I first discuss the texts included in this dissertation and my primary approach, namely the theory of intersectionality. Secondly, I offer an overview of the main trends in scholarship of the ancient Greek world to which I am responding. While there is almost no scholarship that adopts an explicitly

[1] A secondary reason for my inclusion of this narrative is to document the circumstances under which this dissertation was written. The bulk of the writing happened during the Covid-19 pandemic and all its social, cultural, political, and economic consequences. During the summer of 2020, I was working on the Neaira chapter; the irony (or serendipity?) of working on metics when the ICE ruling happened was not lost on me.

intersectional approach to the ancient world, I review various approaches that overlap with this methodology. In particular, I highlight work done on ethnicity, feminist approaches, and LGBTQ+ studies. Next, I discuss other parts of my methodology, such as close reading. Finally, I provide a summary of the body chapters, which are connected through my use of intersectionality to reveal lived experiences and understand the dynamic tension between identities.

Lived Experiences

Uncovering the lived experience of ancient, marginalized people is hindered by the nature of our textual primary sources, which are predominantly written by Greek men with high social status. In my analysis it was therefore important to consider the positionality of the writer with regards to the subject matter. Additionally, I chose the texts for this project with an eye to the inclusion of depictions of marginalized people, such as women, enslaved people, and foreigners. Both Herodotus in his *Histories* and Apollodoros in the speech *Against Neaira* deal with individuals on the margins and people with multiple different vectors of identity. With one historiographical text from the 5th century and one legal prosecutorial speech from the 4th century, my dissertation may seem to have a bit of an odd collation of texts. Yet I propose that both texts provide fertile ground for exploring the construction of identity in the ancient world.

Intersectionality

Since Crenshaw's foundational work in 1989, intersectionality has become a widespread concept in academia and social justice movements.[2] Crenshaw introduced the term as a metaphor to illuminate how the unique positionality of Black women at the intersection of race discrimination and sex discrimination renders them invisible in legal and social movement discourses. While the wide adoption of intersectionality has generated a focus on the multiply-disadvantaged and the multidimensionality of identity in general, its buzzwordification has obscured the metaphor's original intervention in antiracist and feminist movements.[3] Black women, Crenshaw explains, are not just oppressed in terms of gender, nor just in terms of race; they often experience double discrimination and "sometimes, they experience discrimination as Black women—not the sum of race and sex discrimination, but as Black women."[4] Simple addition of identities ignores the complex ways in which identity categories interact and create a new category. Black women are othered and possibly discriminated against in women's rights movements due to their race, and in black rights movements due to their gender. The concept of intersectionality thus problematizes the existing categories and the insistence on using their categorical analyses that obscure Black women's experiences.

Although the theory of intersectionality was developed to call attention to the oppression of Black women in the legal systems of the United States of America, I apply the concept of intersectionality to the ancient Greek world. Intersectionality is not just a productive frame to examine the interactions of identities, but it especially offers an insight into systemic oppression, which appears to be a transhistorical reality. Additionally, it is a key concept of critical race

[2] Crenshaw 1989.
[3] Carastathis 2016.
[4] Carastathis 2016, 149.

theory. While the modern American conceptualization of race does not map neatly onto the ancient world—e.g., skin color was not racialized in the same manner—the ancient Greeks did employ racialized thinking. Race and ethnic identity are both socially constructed. Although much of my discussion of constructed difference between groups of people can be understood as racecraft, for the purpose of this dissertation, I use the term ethnic identity, and not race, in line with most Herodotean scholarship.

Both Carastathis, author of *Intersectionality: Origins, Contestations, Horizons*, and Berger & Guidroz, editors of *The Intersectional Approach: transforming the academy through Race, Class, & Gender* engage with the misinterpretations of 'intersectionality' in their work. Both agree that the theory of intersectionality can offer a productive frame of analysis to reveal and challenge systemic and personal interactions of identities and power.[5] Carastathis emphasizes 'intersectionality's' ability to "make visible categorical exclusion" and to urge the reconceptualization of categories and identities as 'coalitions', which can "help us avoid positivist and essentialist constructions of identity and subjectivity."[6] Since as scholars of the ancient world we study cultures of the past, we cannot use intersectionality to change how the participants of these cultures understand identity. Yet the recognition that identities are not essentialist categories, but conceptualized differently in every culture, urges us to be conscious of our own culturally dependent understanding of identity categories. Furthermore, this reconceptualization has made intersectionality, as Berger and Guidroz note, useful as "a methodological principle for taking multiple interactive processes into account," and thus for analyzing both the ancient identity categories and the processes by which they were constructed.[7]

[5] Carastathis 2016; Berger and Guidroz 2009.
[6] Carastathis 2016, 11.
[7] Berger and Guidroz 2009, 102.

The benefits of using intersectionality as a framework are visible in my dissertation in variety of ways. In every chapter, I call attention to the categorical marginalization of people. In Chapter II, I highlight the marginalization of polyethnic individuals in Herodotus' *Histories*. Although some of polyethnic individuals, such as Skyles and Cyrus, are of high social status, their polyethnic identity ultimately challenges their acceptance in society. The marginalization is here a result of the tension between one's ethnic identities and their social status. Similarly, in my chapter on *Against Neaira*, I examine the tension between her social inclusion as a resident of Athens and her legal exclusion as a foreigner. Furthermore, the case of Neaira sheds light on other individuals with overlapping identities, such as Aspasia, who was also a *metoikos* in Athens. In the second chapter on Herodotus, I focus not only on the agentive portrayal of women, but also bring to the foreground the lack of agency for enslaved people. Furthermore, one can see the multiple interactive processes in the way that some women overcome restrictions on their agency through their exploitation of enslaved people. I use intersectionality to demonstrate how the multiple intersecting identities are in tension and lead to their marginalization from normative social order.

One of the pitfalls of intersectionality is the universal application of the concept without critical engagement. As shown above, lack of critical engagement with the theory has produced frequent misinterpretation of intersectionality and thus undermined Crenshaw's intended intervention. Critical engagement with the sources to which you apply the theory is also a necessity. Rachel Luft, in her chapter "Intersectionality and the Risk of Flattening Difference," argues for the "periodic use of single-issue tactics:" to focus on one particular category of identity.[8] When it is assumed that each identity functions in the same manner, we risk "flattening

[8] Luft 2010, 101.

the differences" between categories and continue the "myth of equivalent oppressions."[9] Thorough understanding of the system's specific logics is thus necessary, requiring historical specificity, to understand how each identity-based group is constructed, conceptualized, and oppressed. Once understood, 'single-issue tactics' can also be strategically effective for intervention in systems of oppression, while default application of intersectionality "without attendant antiracist, anticlassist, and antisexist practices" would merely be "the appropriation of 'race, class, gender' language for the progressive currency it brings."[10]

Since the subject of this study is a culture from approximately 2500 years ago, it is impossible for anyone to use intersectionality to intervene in their systems of oppression. Furthermore, judging ancient cultures for their practices does not further our understanding of the culture. In a similar vein, it can be argued that we should understand scholarship from decades ago within their own cultural framework. Yet I find it necessary to point out the problematic nature of both certain ancient practices and previous scholarship; the negative, troublesome attitudes and beliefs expressed regarding marginalized individuals ought not to be perpetuated. Although the results of my study have no direct bearing on the living conditions of individuals from the past, condoning outdated attitudes toward marginalized people of the past can affect modern people with similar identities. By righting the historical record, I thus want to do justice to ancient and modern people alike.

Although many scholars have examined the ethnicity, gender, legal and social status in the ancient world, few have explicitly used the theory of intersectionality. Books that focus on a specific identity category often include some discussion of overlapping identity, e.g., works on women in the ancient world often discuss enslaved women and foreign women. Although these

[9] Luft 2010, 104.
[10] Luft 2010, 103.

discussions can highlight more marginalized subgroups, this work does not unpack complicated, multiple identities nor how vectors of identity interact and construct unique lived experiences.

The only published study in ancient Mediterranean studies that explicitly engages with intersectionality presents two limited examples of the theory's application to ancient literary sources in order to demonstrate the need for more in-depth intersectional analysis of ancient texts. Marianne Kartzow, a biblical scholar at the University of Oslo, has used an intersectional approach to biblical texts.[11] She combined intersectionality with memory studies to examine marginal figures and discourses. In her introduction she explains that she uses intersectionality "to destabilize ancient and new power structures and ways of organizing identity that employ gender, class, race, and so forth."[12] By nuancing these categories, Kartzow challenges their stability. Like Kartzow, I use intersectionality to examine identity categories and to point out tensions in the text, which both destabilizes the texts' orthodox interpretations and goals and problematizes the conventional power structures.

Previous Scholarship

In this section, I position my dissertation in response to a few major trends in scholarship in the field of classical studies and ancient Mediterranean history. First, I discuss how my dissertation both builds on and nuances approaches focused on alterity and binarism from the 1980s. Second, I discuss the work of two scholars that have shaped my approach to identity and its construction. In particular, I highlight how a constructionist view of identity allows for the study of modern concepts in the ancient world. Third, I show how I complicate feminist

[11] Kartzow 2012.
[12] Kartzow 2012, 16.

approaches of past scholarship. Finally, I review the work of some individual scholars with whom I share approaches.

One trend in scholarship from the 1980s is focus on alterity and binarism. In Herodotean studies, François Hartog wrote a seminal work, *The Mirror of Herodotus* that demonstrated how the idea of the Self and the Other are interdependent.[13] In particular, he highlights how Herodotus uses the shared knowledge of the Greeks to depict Others in familiar terms. Around the same time, Edith Hall argued that portrayals of Others in Greek tragedy function to create and affirm the Greeks' self-identity.[14] While Hartog and Hall offered an innovative view of Greek-foreign relationships and revealed an important dimension of Herodotus' narrative technique, their approach overlooked the complexity of the ancient world. My work on polyethnic individuals, for instance, depicts a much more complex picture of the ancient world.

My approach to alterity and binarism results from my own lived experience. As a non-binary person, my very existence complicates a commonly presumed binary, namely the gender binary. Although I was assigned female at birth and socialized to assume the role of a woman in society, I discovered during my time at the University of Michigan that I am not a woman. In the last three to four years, I have had to question my own gender. I analyzed my own experiences and evaluated whether I was a "masculine" or "butch" woman or not a woman at all. I realized that I was neither a woman nor a man, finding myself in a space that can be described as both "in-between" and "beyond" the binary. Just as with other presumed binaries in the world, such as light/dark or good/bad, the actual experience of gender has gradations between these two extremes and is more complicated altogether. My understanding of gender is closer to a 3d model, mapping the axes of gender identity, gender presentation, and gender ascription.

[13] Hartog 1988.
[14] Hall 1989.

Intersectionality offers a useful model to deal with the various identities that further construct a person's lived experience. My own lived experience in the in-between, beyond the binary, thus provides me with a unique lens with which I approach the ancient world.

Just as I reject the binaries of Hartog and Hall concerning ethnic identity, I reject the dichotomies and binaries in existing work on women in Herodotus. Rosellini and Saïd use a systematic approach to link customs of foreigners to women's roles in their societies.[15] In a similarly systematic way, Dewald creates a catalog of women, contrasting active women to passive ones and their functions inside and outside the home. Both these studies elide intricacies of Herodotus' approach to gender, and especially gender roles. In my work, I bend the boundaries of these categories, for instance by paying particular attention to polyethnic individuals in Herodotus and to the precarious, nebulous position of Neaira in Athens as a long-term resident alien. I thus bring to light that there are people who exist beyond dichotomies and in in-between spaces.

Social constructivism was introduced to the field of classical studies in 1997 in Jonathan Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*.[16] In this work, Hall uses anthropological approaches to ethnicity to demonstrate the social construction of ethnic identity. Although I criticize Hall's prioritization of fictive kinship and descent as the ultimate determining factors of ethnicity, his recognition of the role that common culture, such as language, religion, and customs can play in the ascription of ethnic identity to another person is fundamental to my work. Similarly, David Halperin has emphasized the constructed natures of the homosexual identity.[17] While this modern concept cannot be found in the ancient world, Halperin shows it is comprised of "four

[15] Dewald 1981; Rosellini and Saïd 1978.
[16] Hall 1997.
[17] Halperin 2000.

pre-homosexual categories of male sex and gender deviance," namely effeminacy, pederasty or "active" sodomy, friendship or male love, and passivity or inversion.[18] By finding examples of these behaviors and characteristics in the ancient world, Halperin demonstrates the possibility to trace the history of homosexuality without imposing modern concepts upon the ancients. In my dissertation, like Hall and Halperin, I approach identity as a social construct. Furthermore, like Halperin, I am explicitly interested in finding ancient representations, cultural ancestors, of modern marginalized people. As a person belonging to marginalized social identity groups myself, I can attest to the importance of representation, not only in modern media, but also in ancient texts.

In addition to the overly simplistic (i.e., binary) and anachronistic categorization, I complicate a scholarly focus on depictions of powerful women in Herodotus. The celebration of so-called strong women has led to two tendencies with which I take issue. First, the attention to "strong" women has inadvertently led to praise of men and traditional masculinity. For example, Tomyris is discussed for her part in killing Cyrus and Artemisia for her participation in battle as a naval commander allied to king Xerxes.[19] Although the gendering of these actions as masculine could itself be problematized, scholarship rarely comments upon female characters' capabilities and actions in areas that are stereotypically feminized. Second, the focus on depictions of powerful women in Herodotus led to a disregard of their other identities. Although I agree that it is important to call attention to women's agency, the mere fact that a woman has power is not inherently to be celebrated. If we recognize women as complex characters with a multitude of identities, however, we can see how they use non-gender-based power structures, such as

[18] Halperin 2000, 109.
[19] Hdt. I.214; Hdt. 8.102.

free/non-free based, to their advantage. In this dissertation, I bring to light how women use their high social status and subject men of low social status.

Finally, I view my dissertation as aligned with the work of a few scholars in particular. Josine Blok, Edward Cohen, and Rebecca Futo Kennedy each re-read texts with an awareness of their own positionalities and challenge orthodox views.[20] In her work on Athenian citizenship, Blok recognized the presence of the feminine *politis* that parallels the more common masculine *politēs*. She argues that although there is asymmetry in terms of the frequency of usage and the content of women's citizenship was different than men's, no essential difference is articulated between the legal status of men and women as citizens. Cohen in his work on law and legal texts similarly insists that differentiation of terms is important and words such as *astos* and *politēs* ought not to be taken as both meaning "citizen." Kennedy makes a similarly philological intervention in her argument on metic women and *pallakia* through close reading of the primary texts. According to her *pallakia* was not a form of sex work but indicated a relationship with a certain level of stability and length. [21] For individuals who were not wanting to or not able to marry, *pallakia* functioned as an alternative, as a domestic partnership could nowadays. In her work, she further demonstrates the importance of uncovering lived experiences in order to reach a more complete understanding of history. Like these three scholars, I perform close readings in which I pay attention to the way that the text both articulates norms and ideals and presents conflicting narratives, revealing gaps between ideals and lived experience. I thus reconsider established ancient norms based on lived experiences expressed in texts. Just because we have legal sources that indicate norms and laws does not mean that this was the experience on the ground.

[20] Blok 2017; Cohen 1992; Kennedy 2014.
[21] Kennedy 2014, 113.

Overview of Chapters

In the body chapters of my dissertation, I offer close readings of Herodotus' *Histories* and Apollodoros' *Against Neaira.* The genres of these texts affect the type of conclusions that can be drawn from them. Herodotus is a historiographer who is famously interested in a storytelling approach rather than a straight facts point of view. Both fellow ancient writers, such as Thucydides and Plutarch, as well as modern scholars have argued about the extent of truth in Herodotus' *Histories*. I argue that the portrayal of identities in Herodotus provides us with a cultural history, but not necessarily the truth about specific historical individuals. Although the text is written by an elite male, Herodotus, he records stories from a large variety of sources. Furthermore, his interest in marvels has led him to record unique lived experiences that other elite writers may not have included. In this way, he recorded accounts that were potential, or at the very least imagined, lived experiences. My chapter on Neaira, on the other hand, offers a social historical analysis of a historical person's lived experiences as represented by an elite male. While Neaira is but one person, her existence indicated the possible existence of other women like her.

In chapter II, I examine the social construction of ethnic identity in Herodotus' *Histories.* My main research question is "how is membership in an ethnic group determined?" In order to answer this question, I examine the so-called boundaries of ethnic groups and ask, "On what basis do people assign membership to an ethnic group to a person?" This chapter focuses on polyethnic individuals for two main reasons. First, polyethnic people have a double opportunity for belonging to ethnic groups based on their heritage. Since belonging is based on a mutual recognition, their ethnic identity reveals how they are perceived by others. Secondly, individuals

with parents from different ethnic groups complicate the often-asserted divide between Greek Self and foreign Others in Herodotus. Using an intersectional approach, I further highlight the influence of other identities, such as gender, legal, and social status, on the development of ethnic identity. I conclude that individuals with polyethnic descent are allowed flexibility in their identification with either of their parents' ethnic groups. This flexibility is, however, limited by the potential threat to the socio-political hierarchy as a result of their combined ethnic identity and social status. As long as a person does not disrupt socio-political order, they have agency in the construction of their own identity.

In chapter III, I turn my attention to Herodotus' treatment of people with various genders. I argue that he records accounts of men and women with equal interest, just as he is equally interested in the great deeds done by Greeks and foreigners. Both men and women in the *Histories* have agency, self-determination, and intelligence. Both men and women can do great things, leave behind amazing monuments, and commit horrible deeds. Through intersectional analysis of female characters' behavior, I further explore the multiple power hierarchies that result from multiple identities. Some women with power in the *Histories* gained their agency through subjection of individuals with lower social status. Overall, the examples in this chapter demonstrate a greater complexity of female characters in Herodotus' *Histories* than previous studies. Furthermore, in the case of the Amazons, I argue that Herodotus even acknowledges that societies without binary gender distinctions exist. Herodotus thus approaches different genders with the same open-mindedness as he approaches different ethnic identities.

In chapter IV, I present a new perspective on immigrant women in Athens through an examination of the lived experience of Neaira. The inconsistencies in the prosecution speech of the trial against her, Apollodoros *Against Neaira,* called for further analysis. In a discussion of

civic terminology used in classical Athens, I argue that *astos* and *xenos* were cultural terms indicating belonging and not belonging to the in-group in Athens. In my close reading of *Against Neaira,* I argue that the historical Neaira was both a *metoikos* and an *astē*. For example, I observe that Apollodoros fails to exploit the association of foreignness with her presumed status as a metic, suggesting that such a status was not incompatible with being an *astē.* This new understanding of Neaira demonstrates how metic women especially existed in an in-between space in Athenian society. Metics' duties, rights, and privileges were established in law, but their lived experiences were affected by their ethno-cultural belonging and level of assimilation. As approximately one-tenth of Athens' inhabitants in the 5th century BCE were metics, this new understanding of metics' status affects our understanding of the workings of classical Athenian society.[22]

[22] Akrigg 2015.

Chapter II
Herodotus and the Mule: Polyethnic Parentage and Multiple Identities in Ancient Greece

ἦν τέ οἱ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα ἡ Κυνώ
and in his tale Cyno was everything to him
(Hdt.I.122)

> ἦν γὰρ δὴ ὁ Κῦρος οὗτος ἡμίονος· ἐκ γὰρ δυῶν οὐκ ὁμοεθνέων ἐγεγόνεε, μητρὸς ἀμείνονος, πατρὸς δὲ ὑποδεεστέρου· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἦν Μηδὶς καὶ Ἀστυάγεος θυγάτηρ τοῦ Μήδων βασιλέος, ὁ δὲ Πέρσης τε ἦν καὶ ἀρχόμενος ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνοισι καὶ ἔνερθε ἐὼν τοῖσι ἅπασι δεσποίνῃ τῇ ἑωυτοῦ συνοίκεε.
>
> For Cyrus was that mule: since he had been born from two parents from different ethnic groups, a nobler mother, but an inferior father: for she was a Mede and the daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes, but he was Persian and ruled by them and, while lower in all respects, married to his own ruler. (Herodotus, *Histories* I.91)[23]

Thus, Herodotus reveals the meaning of the Delphic oracle that told Croesus to flee when a mule became king of the Medes. As is often the case, the oracle used language that could be interpreted in multiple ways. The image of the mule was a metaphor for king Cyrus, whose parents did not have the same ethnic identity, one belonging to an ethnic group of higher social status than the other. Recent scholarship in ethnic and migration studies has highlighted the lack of attention paid to questions concerning the "lived experiences, identifications and social outcomes of the multiethnic and multiracial descendants of intermarriages."[24] Unlike children from parents with the same ethnicity, these individuals might not be ascribed a singular ethnic

[23] This translation and all subsequent ones are my own.
[24] Törngren et al. 2019, 2-3.

identity at birth. When read with an eye to identity formation, Cyrus and other children of parents from different ethnic groups pose a challenge. Modern scholarship suggests that they may follow an "either-or" type of classification process and identify with one of their parents' ethnic groups, but can also, depending on the available identity options in society, identify with "neither-nor" or "both-and."[25] In this chapter, I argue that characters with parents from different ethnic groups in Herodotus' *Histories* problematize conventional categorization and provide striking evidence for ancient Greek understandings of ethnic identity formation, and its intersection with other categories of identity, such as legal and social status. As "in-betweens" they provide unique insight into the ways that identity is negotiated when status is contested. Furthermore, focus on these individuals rather than ethnic groups provides a window onto identity formation that has not hitherto been exploited.

In this chapter, I argue that an individual's ethnic identity is socially constructed in Herodotus' *Histories.* Due to the nature of my source, I discuss ethnic identity as Herodotus presents it and as understood by the Greeks.[26] I position my research in response to three strains of scholarship on ethnicity, ethnography, and Herodotus. First, Herodotus' portrayal of ethnic groups has been used to gain information about the Greek construction of ethnic groups' cultural characteristics, such as the Persians' deliberation of important matters while both drunk and sober or the Egyptians' weaving practice of pushing the woof downwards.[27] This information, however, does not explain how membership in an ethnic group is determined for the Greeks. As my research focuses on the development of individual ethnic identity, this chapter is not concerned with the cultural character of ethnic groups. Instead, I follow Barth in examining the

[25] Törngren et al. 2019, 4.
[26] Comparison of Herodotus' portrayal with portrayal in texts from other ethnic groups would be a fruitful direction for future research.
[27] Hdt. I.133; Hdt. II.35.

boundaries of ethnic groups. Second, in scholarship focused on understanding Herodotus' conception of ethnicity, there has been a tendency to prioritize a singular feature of ethnic groups as the determinant of ethnicity for the Greeks. I contend, however, that ethnic groups vary in which features they use to establish or assert their ethnicity in Herodotus' *Histories.* This study therefore uses multiple features of the ethnic group as a heuristic rather than a strict definition. Third, scholars have generally focused on the presentation of the Greeks as a Self in opposition to ethnic Others, but children with parents from different ethnic groups complicate this binary opposition between Self and Other. Furthermore, I use an intersectional approach to understand the influence of other identities, such as gender, legal, and social status, on the development of ethnic identity.

In this chapter, I argue that ethnic identity and social status are constructed, changeable, and influence one another according to the Greeks. I focus on four *logoi*: the birth and upbringing of Cyrus (I.55; I.91; I.107-122), the tales of Skyles and Anacharsis (IV.76-80), the account of the Atheno-Pelasgian children on Lemnos (VI.138), and the story about Scythian youths born from free Scythian women and enslaved men (IV.1-4). Each of my examples demonstrates that individuals with parents with different ethnic identities have an opportunity to belong to both of their parents' ethnic groups and are afforded the flexibility to perform customs and traditions from both ethnic groups. Furthermore, the individuals whose parents have distinct social statuses were able to live with either social status. If the intersection of ethnic identity and social status made the individual a threat to the established political order, however, both the individual's agency over their identity and their life were in danger.

Cultural Characteristics and Ethnic Boundaries

Herodotus' *Histories* has been a fruitful source for the study of ethnic groups in the ancient world. Some scholars have used Herodotus' ethnographical accounts to understand the ethnic groups described, both internally as e.g., "Herodotus' Persians," and externally as providing factual information about the culture of the "real" historical group.[28] In fact, there has been a long scholarly debate concerning the veracity and reliability of Herodotus' *Histories.*[29] For the purposes of this study, however, the actual cultural characteristics of specific ethnic groups are not relevant, since *what* customs or behaviors members of an ethnic group perform are not explanations for *how* they became members of the group. Therefore, since I do not aim to understand *what* customs or behaviors the historical members of ethnic groups performed, I am not concerned with the veracity of the claims in Herodotus' *Histories*. Instead, I approach Herodotus' writings as a cultural history, depicting societal ideals and possible lived experiences in the accounts of marvels and stories from various sources. As there have been various anthropological approaches to studying ethnic groups, I provide a brief overview and establish my own approach in this section. Primordialists are of the opinion that ethnic groups have always existed and that they connect people through an ineffable ethnic tie that is established at birth. Since ethnic groups are, however, subject to change, I adhere to the instrumentalist approach which considers ethnic groups to be socially constructed. In particular, I follow Barth, whose focus is on the dynamics of creating ethnic groups and maintaining their boundaries of ethnic

[28] E.g., Munson 2009; Bichler 2001; Bakker et. al. 2002 also includes several chapters focused on the history and ethnography of certain ethnic groups: 415-496. On Herodotus as part of a discourse with native sources, see Moyer 2002.

[29] For debate on sources and accuracy, see Fehling 1989; cf. Pritchett 1993; Fowler 1996. A useful overview is Hornblower 2002. Most recent work on Herodotus' sources is an edited volume: Dunsch and Ruffing 2013.

groups. Barth understands ethnic identity as the belonging to and identification with an ethnic group as determined through self-ascription and ascription by members of that ethnic group.[30]

Many introductions to the study of ethnicity start by stating that ethnicity is a new term that appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in the 1970s, with its earliest attestation in 1953.[31] Ethnic groups, however, have existed for a long time. The emergence of the term ethnicity marks a change in the academic study of ethnic groups. Classical anthropologists analyzed "tribes" or "primitive societies" as distinct cultural units without outside influence. Yet in the 1960s anthropologists became aware how this ethnographic practice was "a product and beneficiary of colonial expansion," while it also perpetuated the colonialist treatment of the groups they studied.[32] By viewing the groups as objects of study, the anthropologists positioned themselves as being superior to the ethnic groups they studied. For instance, while anthropologists made money from their research, the members of the ethnic group were often paid minimally, if at all.[33] The global changes post Second World War not only engendered critiques of this colonialist approach, but increased contact between societies also stimulated interest in inter-group dynamics. While initially serving to replace the problematic ideology associated with "a race" or "a tribe," the terms "ethnic group" and "ethnicity" also grew in popularity due to this shift in thinking in social anthropology.[34] Similarly, early uses of "ethnic" had a negative, alienating connotation as it marked the group or person as Other. While this

[30] Barth 1969.
[31] Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 4.
[32] Davies 2008, 11. See also 10-17 on the development and importance of reflexivity in ethnography research.
[33] Lewis 1973.
[34] The coexistence of the terms ethnicity and race, nowadays, resulted from the fact that ethnicity developed to describe social phenomena and classify groups, whereas race relates to the organization of human diversity. See Jones 1997, 51-55 for a more detailed account of the emergence of "ethnicity" as a scientific term.

connotation is still present if someone describes an individual as ethnic, as a non-White racial marker, it is now commonly understood that most, if not all, people belong to at least one ethnic group, have an ethnic identity, and can thus be considered ethnic.

As mentioned above, the anthropological approaches to ethnicity are generally divided into two, namely the primordialist and instrumentalist approaches. The concept of primordialism was first introduced by the sociologist Edward Shils, who examined the bonds that hold together society and observed attachments between members of kinship groups even in the absence of social interaction. Shils considered these attachments to result from "a certain ineffable significance [that] is attributed to the tie of blood," and named them primordial.[35] Clifford Geertz, another germinal primordialist, developed Shils' concept and recognized primordial attachments beyond kinship groups. According to Geertz, these attachments are determined by the so-called 'givens' at birth, including biological kinship, as well as other aspects of life, such as membership in a religious community, language and dialect, or customary social practices.[36] Primordialists see ethnic identity as based on these primordial ties and therefore hereditary and unchangeable. While Geertz and Shils considered the strength of ethnic identity ineffable, other primordialists argue that "primordial ties" underlie ethnic identity and make it more powerful and more natural than other social identities.[37] This primordialist view of the ethnic group as perennial, immutable, and culture-bearing was prevalent for a long time. Yet this approach supported the aforementioned colonialist practice of studying "primitive societies" and failed to explain certain aspects of ethnicity, such as "ethnic change and dissolution, as well as the effects of immigration and intermarriage in the modern world."[38]

[35] Shils 1957, 13.
[36] Geertz 1963, 109.
[37] Jones 1997, 66; Isaacs 1974; Connor 1978.
[38] Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 32.

The instrumentalist approach to ethnicity developed in response to primordialism and offered solutions to some of its problems. Instrumentalists view ethnic identity as a dynamic group identity that can be leveraged for social, economic, and political benefit. Abner Cohen, a key figure in instrumentalism, approached ethnicity from an interest in social structures. He saw the separation into ethnic groups not as the result of an inherited attachment to an unchanging group, but as involving "a dynamic rearrangement of relations and of customs."[39] Customs and other cultural markers, such as language, dress, diet, religion, or customs did not define the ethnic group, but functioned mainly "as mechanisms for political alignment."[40] According to instrumentalists, elites in ethnic groups mobilize people and gain support for their own political goals by appealing to similarities and differences in cultural practices. Contrary to these structural approaches, however, some instrumentalists consider belonging to an ethnic group to be a matter of an individual's rational thought and cost/benefit analysis.[41] This rational choice approach recognizes an individual's agency with respect to their ethnic identity, but it ignores the interpersonal aspect of belonging to an ethnic group. Someone cannot choose to change to a different ethnic group without the members of that ethnic group recognizing that person as one of them.

Frederick Barth's approach to ethnicity, which has often been categorized as instrumentalist, focuses less on socio-structural and strategic dimensions and instead adopts a subjective approach that pays attention to the interpersonal and behavioral aspects.[42] Barth's main issue with primordialist and objective approaches to ethnicity is the inability to explain how ethnic groups are considered stable categories in spite of cultural changes over time or due to

[39] Cohen 1974, 97.
[40] Cohen 1974, 4.
[41] See Hechter 1986; Banton 1994. Cf. Malešević 2002.
[42] Barth 1969, 9-37.

environmental factors. In other words, how is it possible that a person is a part of the same ethnic group as their great-grandparents, but dresses in different clothes, eats different food, or speaks a language their great-grandparents would not understand? Barth thus examines the boundaries of ethnic groups rather than its cultural character. According to Barth, ethnic identity is the result of "ascription and identification by the actors themselves."[43] A person's ethnic identity is determined by the recognition of a person's belonging by a member of the ethnic group and the assertion by that individual that they belong to the ethnic group.[44]

Features of the Ethnic Group

In the previous section I set out that I consider ethnic identity to be socially constructed rather than determined at birth and that I follow Barth's approach of examining the ethnic boundaries of the group rather than their cultural characters. Yet what is it that makes an ethnic group different from other social groups? The following six features of the ethnic group are, however, generally agreed upon.[45] First, the ethnic group is identifiable with a proper name. Second, the ethnic group shares a sense of common ancestry, which can be established through biological kinship relations or through belief in a shared origin. Besides the sense of kinship, an ethnic group also shares historical memories. These memories are often visible in the commemorations of events in the past and widely shared stories about historical figures or heroes. Furthermore, ethnic groups tend to demonstrate one or more elements of common culture. Although some ethnic groups are nomadic, the fifth common feature is an association

[43] Barth 1969, 10.
[44] There is another use of "ascribed" in the study of identity, namely that of ascribed status as opposed to achieved status, see Linton 1936. I do not use this distinction here, since even achieved status or identity, I believe, only is achieved when others ascribe it to you.
[45] Smith 1986, as cited in Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 6-7.

with a specific territory. Finally, the ethnic group, being a social group, has a sense of unity and solidarity. In this section, I argue that ethnic groups maintain their boundaries using any and multiple of these features. In this way, I depart from Jonathan Hall and other scholars who aim to establish which particular feature of ethnicity are definitive for Herodotus.[46] I contend that it is not only possible but also important to keep a flexible definition of ethnicity that includes each of these features.

In 1997, Jonathan Hall's groundbreaking *Ethnic Identity in Greek Ethnicity* introduced the field of Classical Studies to the instrumentalist approach. In the introductory chapters, Hall highlights that it is hard to find "an objective set of criteria which might act as a definition for the ethnic group," since "ethnic identity is *socially constructed and subjectively perceived.*"[47] Similar to Barth, Hall moved away from the cultural character of the ethnic group and focused instead on the 'criteria' of ethnicity that constitute the boundaries of ethnic groups. Hall and Barth differ, however, in their conception of these 'criteria.' According to Barth, ascription by others happens through recognition or dichotomization on the basis of 1) the overt signs and signals in the form of dress, language, etc., and 2) basic value orientations, which are the standards by which the performance of these signs and signals is judged. For Barth, the criteria are thus the externally visible performances of the features of the ethnic group. Most often these signs are common culture as performed through clothing, language, and customs, but one can also display evidence of kinship, shared memories, solidarity, or connection to a homeland through conversation and storytelling.[48] For Barth, an individual's ascription to an ethnic group depends on that person's ability to be recognized by a group member as similar or different. The

[46] Hall 1997 and 2002 prioritizes kinship and descent. Friedman 2006 focuses on territory; Focus on language as determining characteristic: Anson 2009; Figueira 2020.
[47] Hall 1997, 19 emphasis original, citing Romanucci-Ross and De Vos 1995, 350.
[48] Lalioti 2002.

person's characteristics and behaviors are not judged on the basis of their presence or absence but evaluated by group members for the degree to which they align with their own or with those considered relevant to the situation at hand. For instance, a Dutch person walking down the streets of Antwerp cannot be distinguished from a Belgian person (or any other person) based on their outward appearance but could be recognized as Dutch on the basis of their accent and word choice.

Hall, however, differentiates between 'criteria' and 'indicia' of ethnic groups. For him, the 'criteria' are the ethnic groups' definitional set of attributes for membership: "a putative subscription to a myth of common descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory and a sense of shared history."[49] 'Indicia,' on the other hand, are the "[b]iological features, language, religion or cultural traits [that] may appear to be highly visible markers of identification but they do not ultimately define the ethnic group."[50] Hall thus ignores the everyday social aspect of the construction of ethnic groups. He imagines instead that the criteria of ethnicity "are phrased in the form of a yes or no question—normally, 'can you, or can you not, claim descent from x?' It is the value of the response, affirmative or negative, that dictates group membership or exclusion."[51] Although this type of question might be asked in a legal context or when someone's ethnic identity is highly contested, we do not go around asking strangers these questions while we do ascribe them an ethnic identity.[52] Hall's separation of criteria and indicia thus challenges the everyday social aspect of identity construction.

[49] Hall 2002, 9.
[50] Hall 2002, 9.
[51] Hall 1997, 24-25.
[52] Moreover, if this question were asked of us, what would we answer? The second line of the Dutch national anthem *Het Wilhelmus,* as it is sung today, in fact, reads *Ben ik van Duitsen bloed* "I am of German Blood" right before "I will remain loyal to the fatherland until death" *Den vaderland getrouwe blijf ik tot in den dood.* So, while I may claim descent from my Dutch parents, the lineage and myth of

Furthermore, Hall's approach has been criticized for the prioritization of kinship and descent. As Siapkas notes, Hall's discussion of ethnicity is instrumentalist, but "ethnic groups, and ethnicity (as analytical tools) are equated, as a consequence of his definition, with one specific trait."[53] Although Hall recognizes that the biological reality of descent is irrelevant, his insistence on it as *the* defining characteristic makes Hall's definition essentializing.[54] Kostas Vlassopoulos points out two other issues with an essentialist definition. First, the fact that groups recognize common descent does not mean that these groups used to *ipso facto* belong to the same larger ethnic group. For example, the common descent of Egyptians and Argives, as presented in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women,* did not make them part of the same ethnic group.[55] Second, if descent was the determining factor for ethnic identity, what made an ethnic group different from a family?[56] While the main intervention of Hall's work was the introduction of the instrumentalist approach to the field of Classical Studies, his own definition is surprisingly essentializing.[57]

As I see it, there are two reasons for Hall's rigid definition of ethnic identity. First, the primacy of descent in his definition was essential to Hall's main argument that collective identities changed from being ethnic identities to being cultural identities after the Persian Wars.[58] Using the *locus classicus* for Hellenic identity, Herodotus' description at VIII.144, Hall

---

common ancestry ultimately would lead me to be German rather than Dutch. I recognize that I am making a transhistorical comparison here, but do not have any evidence for this behavior in ancient Greece.

[53] Siapkas 2003, 201.

[54] For another argument against Hall's focus on a singular characteristic that demonstrates the importance of inherited language as a part of ethnic definition, see Janko 2018.

[55] Vlassopoulos 2015, 7 + fn. 37.

[56] Vlassopoulos 2015, 7.

[57] Another clarification might be needed here. Despite Hall's explicit assertion that association with territory and shared history are also criteria, he does not explain how they function nor uses them as such in his works. In Hall 2002 especially, he spends pages 11-29 arguing in favor of his prioritization of descent over common culture and does not mention territory or history as criteria.

[58] Hall 2002, 189.

argues that there was a shift in the primary mechanisms of Greek self-definition from aggregative, through the recognition of shared genealogy, to oppositional, through cultural differentiation from others, after the Persian Wars. Yet the description of τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν includes four distinct characteristics:

> αὖτις δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὸν ὅμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα.
>
> Furthermore, there is the Greekness, namely having the same blood and the same language and common shrines and offerings for the Gods and the same way of life.

Hall argues that this definition does not put kinship on the same level as cultural characteristics, but that Herodotus presents them in "ascending order of significance, with cultural consideration ultimately outweighing ethnic notions in definitions of population groups."[59] Following Hall's definition of ethnic identity, the collective identity of being Greek was no longer an ethnic identity after the Persian Wars. I do not see the value, however, in making this distinction, especially since Herodotus uses both kinship and cultural characteristics throughout his *Histories* for ethnic groups of various sizes. Some groups are differentiated on the basis of language, while others speak the same language but practice different customs or come from different homelands.[60] If we accept a broader definition of ethnic identity, we could simply understand Hall's scheme as a shift in the articulation of the Greeks' ethnic identity.[61] Why would the Greeks not collectively be an ethnic group if they are tied through kinship as well as culture?

Second, Hall insists on a clear definition of ethnicity in order to facilitate comparative work through a "common vocabulary in which social scientists and historians of various regions

[59] Hall 2002, 193.
[60] E.g., the Geloni speak both Greek and Scythian, but practice Greek religious customs (IV.108) and the Caunians speak the same language as the Carians, but practice different customs (I.172).
[61] For a more in-depth argument of this position, see Siapkas 2003, 199-204; Sourvinou-Inwood 2005, 24-63.

and periods can communicate."[62] He believes that a more flexible, polythetic definition, in which kinship as well as language, religion, and other cultural characteristics defines ethnicity, is not objective enough. In a criticism of Hall's dismissal of language and religion as criteria on the grounds that they are not objective, Christine Sourvinou-Inwood points out that "[t]he underlying assumption here is that there is a transcultural definition of ethnicity; but if ethnicity is socially constructed, and therefore culturally determined, this is a highly arguable assumption."[63] Any universal definition to ethnicity thus needs to account for the socially constructed nature of ethnicity. While Hall suggests that a strict definition is needed because "it is extraordinarily difficult in a field such as ours to study a phenomenon if you do not know what you're looking for," I contend that using a strict definition of ethnicity would limit our ability to recognize the various articulations of ethnic identity in the ancient world. By excluding language, religion, and customs from the definition, we pre-emptively exclude potential criteria for ascription of ethnic identity. In this study, I thus use all the six characteristics of the ethnic group as the heuristic for recognizing ethnic groups and assertions of ethnic identity.

Beyond Binary Oppositions

In the previous sections, I set out my own theoretical approach to ethnicity and positioned my study with respect to scholarship focused on a) the cultural character and portrayal of particular ethnic groups, and b) a singular characteristic of ethnic groups as the determinant of ethnicity. A third, popular strain of Herodotean scholarship has explored Herodotus' portrayal of barbarians in relation to the Greeks and their self-definition. After providing a brief overview of

[62] Hall 2015, 18.
[63] Sourvinou-Inwood 2005, 27.

this scholarship, I argue that my study complicates the common framework of binary oppositions between Self and Other in two respects. First, the object of my study, children of parents from different ethnic groups, challenges the strict self/other categorization. Second, my intersectional approach moves beyond the model of binary oppositions by looking at the interactions of multiple identities.

Arguably one of the most influential works on ethnography in Herodotus is François Hartog's *Mirror of Herodotus.* In this work, Hartog argues that the ethnographic episodes in the *Histories* function as a mirror for the Greeks. Herodotus describes the barbarian Others in what Hartog calls a "rhetoric of otherness."[64] According to Hartog, Herodotus uses oppositional structures to put his descriptions of Others in familiar terms for his Greek audience. In *Inventing the Barbarian,* Edith Hall argues along a similar vein that Greek tragedy played an important role in the construction of a barbarian Other against whom the Greeks defined their own identities.[65] While Hartog and Hall certainly identify one important mechanism of identity formation, there are multiple mechanisms in play in Herodotus.

I am neither the first nor the only one to contend that Hartog's structuralist approach does not accurately map onto Herodotus' ethnographic passages. Carolyn Dewald, in her review of Hartog's study, argued that Herodotus does not adhere to the "simple and stationary grid that [Hartog] postulates," but that the mirrors function in a more complex, fluid way.[66] Christopher Pelling recognizes the existence and importance of the Greek/barbarian categories, but argues that Herodotus never clearly established them and rather begins his *Histories* "by pressing on the boundaries and blurring them."[67] Rosalind Thomas similarly calls our attention to the risk of

[64] Hartog 1988. For another binary approach to the ancient Greek world, see Cartledge 1993.
[65] Hall 1989.
[66] Dewald 1990, 221.
[67] Pelling 1997, 56.

creating oversimplified images of Greeks and barbarians when we understand portrayals of Others as a reflection of the Self. Based on her discussion of how Herodotus presents the Greekness of the Macedonians, Spartans, Athenians, and Ionians, she argues that Herodotus in fact "seems willing to collapse the strict divisions between Greek and non-Greeks."[68] My study argues, in a manner similar to Pelling and Thomas, that Herodotus portrays a more complex construction of Greeks and barbarians. Individuals with parents from distinct ethnic groups challenge Hartog's oversimplified model with their very existence that blurs the lines of ethnic Self and Other. Furthermore, as I show in my analysis below, they are allowed more flexibility and are able to live as "both-and" or "in-between."[69] The oppositional model, however, suggests that these people would have to be "either-or" and define their ethnic identity as opposed to another.

In the last decade, both Eric Gruen and Kostas Vlassopoulos have made contributions that aim to shift our thinking away from the oppositional model for understanding ethnic interactions. Gruen in *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* shifts our focus from contrast to connection and argues "that Greeks, Romans, and Jews [..] had far more mixed, nuanced, and complex opinions about other people."[70] Vlassopoulos' approach is similar, but he does not reject the idea of contrast as strongly as Gruen. Instead, Vlassopoulos recognizes the complicated context in which conflict and polarity coexist with interaction and exchange.[71] He argues that polarity and exchange are therefore also not to be viewed in a binary, but that we should rather work to understand how the "full range of Greek-Barbarian interactions" functioned.[72] This

[68] Thomas 2001, 228.
[69] The idea of "in-between" can also be found as applied to groups in the concept of hybridity, see Skinner 2020, McWilliams 2013; Reger 2014.
[70] Gruen 2011, 3.
[71] Vlassopoulos 2013.
[72] Vlassopoulos 2013, 7.

study aligns with Vlassopoulos in that, while it challenges the rigid binary of Self and Other, it does not deny the role of polarity in self-definition or the ascription of ethnic identity.

In order to achieve this broader understanding that Vlassopoulos promotes, I consider other vectors of identity in addition to ethnic identity. Interactions between people from different ethnic groups do not just involve navigating ethnic differences and similarities, but also those that are related to identities such as gender, legal, and social status. Depending on the persons' combination of identities, ethnic identity may indeed not be the most salient in their interaction.[73] Since ethnic identity is socially and dynamically constructed, not only the ethnic characteristics, such as language, kinship, and religion, but also the influence of other identities ought to be considered. The intersectional approach I take in this chapter involves "asking the other question," an often-cited method that Mari Matsuda uses "to understand the interconnection of all forms of subordination."[74] In my analysis I thus ask, "what role does gender play in this?" and "what role does social status play in this?" In this way, my study departs from the oppositional model and considers the broader context of the dichotomization and recognition involved in ascription of ethnic identity.

Cyrus (I.55; I.91; I.107-I.122)

Perhaps the best-known person with parents of different ethnicities in Herodotus is the Persian king Cyrus. In I.55, the oracle of Delphi responds to Croesus' question whether he should attack the Persians as follows:

[73] For importance of ethnicity in Greek identity, see Gruen 2013.
[74] Matsuda 1991, 1189. For my understanding and application of intersectionality in the dissertation as a whole, see the Introduction, pages 3-7.

> ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν ἡμίονος βασιλεὺς Μήδοισι γένηται,
> καὶ τότε, Λυδὲ ποδαβρέ, πολυψήφιδα παρ᾽ Ἕρμον
> φεύγειν μηδὲ μένειν μηδ᾽ αἰδεῖσθαι κακός εἶναι.
>
> But whenever a mule becomes king of the Medes, just then, tender-footed Lydian, flee along the pebbly Hermus and do not remain nor be ashamed to be a coward.

Thinking that such an animal could never be a ruler, Croesus dismissed it. As often is the case with oracles, the message was misunderstood, because the mule was a metaphor.[75] As Herodotus has the priestess at Delphi explain, "in fact, Cyrus was this mule: for he had been born from two people who were not of the same ethnic group" (ἦν γὰρ δὴ ὁ Κῦρος οὗτος ἡμίονος· ἐκ γὰρ δυῶν οὐκ ὁμοεθνέων ἐγεγόνεε, I.91). The oracle thus ascribed Cyrus a polyethnic identity on the basis of descent, since he was born from a Median mother and Persian father. Yet Cyrus is ascribed both Median and Persian ethnic identities at different points in book I. Cyrus' ethnic identity is initially constructed as Persian by the Median king, Astyages, to avoid a political threat. The intersection of his Persian ethnic identity with his high social status derived from his descent from the Median royal family, however, resulted in a new political threat to Astyages. In response, Astyages tried to kill Cyrus but he was rescued by an enslaved shepherd and was raised as an enslaved Median boy for the first 10 years of his life. In this section, I argue that the example of Cyrus shows how membership in an ethnic group is socially constructed and can change, especially when it comes into conflict with other vectors of identity such as social status.

[75] For an overview of scholarship on oracular responses more broadly, see Pistone 2017, especially 28-45. Pistone notes that studies on oracular responses in Herodotus have traditionally focused on their (in)authenticity, see: Crahay 1955, Fontenrose 1978, while more recent approaches, such as Maurizio 1997 and Murray 2001, focus on oracles as a part of storytelling in Hdt.

Creating Ethnic Identity and Social Status

The first construction of Cyrus' ethnic identity and social status occurred prior to his birth as the result of a prophetic dream. The king of the Medes, Astyages, had a dream in which his daughter, Mandane, "urinated so much that she filled the city and flooded all of Asia." According to Herodotus, Astyages became afraid after the dream interpreters of the Magi gave a detailed explanation of his dream. Herodotus does not present us with the Magi's explanation, but it has commonly been understood as predicting that Mandane's child would gain control over the city and Asia in place of Astyages. Most of this modern interpretation is, however, interpolation from Astyages' second prophetic dream, in which "a vine grew out of his daughter's genitalia, which took hold of all of Asia," that the Magi interpreted to mean that his grandchild would "rule instead of him." As Christopher Pelling has argued, the first vision had a confusing multivalence, such as Herodotean prophesies often have.[76] The flood of urine could be interpreted in a urinary/genital assimilation as a positive sign to heirless Astyages that his daughter's offspring would be a great ruler over all of Asia. In a more negative light, however, urine had a connotation of pollution and may have suggested "contempt or hostility for the city and land, and perhaps by extension its current king."[77] After he heard from the dream interpreters, Astyages acted out of fear and "did not give her as wife to any one of those Medes who were as worthy as himself" (Μήδων μὲν τῶν ἑωυτοῦ ἀξίων οὐδενὶ διδοῖ γυναῖκα, I.107). With a double mention of fear, "fearing the vision" (δεδοικὼς τὴν ὄψιν, I.107) and "having learned all in exact detail from them, he became scared" (ἐφοβήθη παρ᾽ αὐτῶν αὐτὰ ἕκαστα μαθών, I.107), Herodotus portrays Astyages as responding to a negative interpretation of his dream.

[76] Pelling 1996.
[77] Pelling 1996, 72.

Astyages' response offers insight to the connection between ethnic identity and social status. As Astyages understood the vision to predict some type of destruction, his decision to no longer marry his daughter to a Mede of equal status suggests that the father plays a role in the character and ethnic identity of his child. Indeed, Herodotus reports that Astyages "gave her to a Persian named Cambyses, whom he found to be of a good family, but of a quiet demeanor, considering him to be lesser by far than an average Median man" (ὁ δὲ Πέρσῃ διδοῖ τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Καμβύσης, τὸν εὕρισκε οἰκίης μὲν ἐόντα ἀγαθῆς τρόπου δὲ ἡσυχίου, πολλῷ ἔνερθε ἄγων αὐτὸν μέσου ἀνδρὸς Μήδου, I.107). Not only Cambyses' quiet nature is seen as a trait that could be passed down. Herodotus puts particular emphasis on ethnic status when he has Astyages choose anyone but a Median of royal status for his daughter and again when he introduces Cambyses as "a Persian" before any other attributes or his name. Cambyses came from a good house and, according to sources external to Herodotus, was even a royal.[78] For an audience familiar with Cambyses, their ethnic identities would have been the main differentiating attribute between the royal Cambyses and Median men of royal status. This preference for, and thus higher social status ascription to, those of the same ethnic groups is not surprising. Yet the ethnicity-based comparison "lesser than a middling Mede" suggests that Astyages ascribed to Cambyses a lower status not only due to being from a different ethnic group, but significantly lower on the basis of specifically his Persian ethnic identity. Astyages thus attributed value to ethnic identity beyond the general preference for members of one's own social group.

Whereas in I.107 Herodotus indicates the position of Cambyses in comparison with the men who might have married Mandane, the earlier description at I.91 highlights the differences

[78] Herodotus does not depict Cambyses as a royal but, supported by the Cyrus Cylinder ll. 20-21 (see Finkel 2013) and by later sources, such as Xen. Cyr. I.ii.1, it is generally accepted that Cambyses I was the Persian king.

between Mandane and Cambyses. The explanations given in this description offer some insight into the value attributed to ethnic identity in the ascription of social status. As Croesus recounts the story of the misunderstood oracle, he offers a more detailed description of Cyrus' parents:

> μητρὸς ἀμείνονος, πατρὸς δὲ ὑποδεεστέρου· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἦν Μηδὶς καὶ Ἀστυάγεος θυγάτηρ τοῦ Μήδων βασιλέος, ὁ δὲ Πέρσης τε ἦν καὶ ἀρχόμενος ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνοισι καὶ ἔνερθε ἐὼν τοῖσι ἅπασι δεσποίνῃ τῇ ἑωυτοῦ συνοίκεε.
>
> A nobler mother, but an inferior father: for she was Median and the daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes, but he was Persian and ruled by them and, while lower in all respects, married to his own ruler. (I.91)

In this description, Cyrus' parents are directly compared in terms of ethnic identity and social status, and here too the two identities are linked.[79] In the explanation for their disparate social statuses, both Mandane and Cambyses are primarily indicated by their ethnic identity. In addition to the fact that people tend to ascribe a higher status to members of their own ethnic group, two dynamics appear to be at play in Herodotus' account. First, Mandane's status was considered to be higher on account of her ethnic identity. When Herodotus offers the explanation that Cambyses was "ruled by *them*," he recognizes the power structure resulting from the political situation, namely that the Median royal family ruled the Persians as well as the Medes. Second, as the daughter of Astyages, Mandane did not just have a higher social status on account of her ethnic identity, but also due to her descent from the king. Cambyses was, on the other hand, simply "from a good house" according to Herodotus. It is due to these two dynamics then that Cambyses was considered not simply of lower social status than Mandane's potential suitors, but even lower than an average Mede.

[79] The fact that Cyrus' mother was of higher social status than his father makes the comparison with a mule particularly apt, since mules are the offspring of female horses and male donkeys, and horses are generally valued more than donkeys.

Astyages' response to the enigmatic dream thus used his knowledge of the intersections of ethnic identity and social status to create a politically advantageous situation for himself. Yet, unsurprisingly in Herodotus, it turns out that Astyages misinterpreted the dream. The second dream, in which he saw vines come out of Mandane's genitals and seize all of Asia, clarified the meaning of the first: the grandchild will rule Asia. If Mandane had married a Mede and thus produced a Median heir to the throne, Astyages might have been proud to know that he had such a successful successor. Due to his own actions, however, Mandane was married to Persian Cambyses and his grandson's future power becomes a potential threat. If the child were to grow up in Persia and with a Persian father, the likelihood is large that his loyalties would lie with the Persians. Cyrus' polyethnic identity is thus framed negatively as it results in mixed loyalties. This threat then led to the interpretation of the Magi "that the daughter's offspring would rule *instead* of him" (ὅτι μέλλοι ὁ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ γόνος βασιλεύσειν ἀντὶ ἐκείνου, I.108). This is, as Pelling also argues, "a suggestion of violence and usurpation rather than natural inheritance."[80] In an attempt to use the intersection of ethnic identity and social status to his own advantage, Astyages thus created a threat against his own reign.

Cyrus, who was yet to be born, but would be considered both Persian and Median through descent, thus became a problem for Astyages. Whereas Astyages attempted to combat the previous prophecy by making Cyrus of lower social status, he now decides to kill the child. The man ordered to do so cannot make himself commit murder and thus orders an enslaved herdsman to do it instead. This enslaved herdsman and his wife, however, decide to keep the baby and raise him as their own. The threat to Astyages' reign remains.

[80] Pelling 1996, 73.

The political consequences of the ascription of a Persian ethnic identity to Cyrus are especially clear after the discovery that Cyrus was still alive. Astyages' reaction to his recognition of Cyrus is similar to his reaction to the visions in his dreams, a reaction of fear: "struck by these things, he was speechless for some time" (ἐκπλαγεὶς δὲ τούτοισι ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄφθογγος ἦν, I.116). As with the dreams, he consulted the Magi. His fear is further evident in his request, "consider it very well and advise me what actions will be the safest for my house and for you" (συμβουλεύσατέ μοι εὖ περισκεψάμενοι, τὰ μέλλει ἀσφαλέστατα εἶναι οἴκῳ τε τῷ ἐμῷ καὶ ὑμῖν, I.120), after the Magi had already given him an interpretation. The Magi share Astyages' fear and assert that "if the kingdom is alienated to that child, who survived and is Persian, then we, as Medes, will be enslaved and become of no account at the hands of the Persians, since we are foreign" (ἢν μὲν γὰρ ἀλλοτριῶται ἐς τὸν παῖδα τοῦτον περιοῦσα ἐόντα Πέρσην, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐόντες Μῆδοι δουλούμεθά τε καὶ λόγου οὐδενὸς γινόμεθα πρὸς Περσέων, ἐόντες ξεῖνοι·, I.120). The political status quo is threatened at the intersection of social status and ethnic identity. The Magi fear that the Medes would become subjects and that the Persians would "other" them in the way that they "other" the Persians. Due to Cyrus' Persian ethnic identity, his rulership would change the established hierarchy between the Persians and the Medes. If a foreign king reigns, not only Astyages has to fear for his own power, but all of the Medes face a potential demotion.

Social Status: Ascription and Performance

Until Cyrus was ten years old, no one had discovered that he was the biological grandson of the king. He was raised as the son of a cowherd and his wife, named Mitradates and Cyno, who were enslaved to the Medes. Cyrus' social status, and most likely his ethnicity, were ascribed on the basis of putative descent. At I.112, when we learn that the cowherd's wife raised

him, Herodotus notes that she did so "having given him some other name and not Cyrus" (οὔνομα ἄλλο κού τι καὶ οὐ Κῦρον θεμένη). We never learn this name, but Herodotus generally describes Cyrus in relation to his adoptive father. As the narrator, Herodotus refers to Cyrus as "the one who was by name the child of the cowherd" (τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τοῦ βουκόλου ἐπίκλησιν παῖδα, I.114). While he indicates to the audience with ἐπίκλησιν "by name" that the boy was not the biological son of the cowherd, there is no indication that any of the people who knew Cyrus were aware of this.

The putative descent from Mitradates led to the ascription of a low social status to Cyrus. When Artembares, a Medıan nobleman, goes to Astyages to complain that Cyrus whipped his son while they were playing, both Artembares and Astyages use descent as a criterion. Most direct is the phrasing with which Herodotus has Artembares addresses Astyages: "O king, by your enslaved person, the child of a cowherd, we have been treated poorly in this way," ('ὦ βασιλεῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ σοῦ δούλου, βουκόλου δὲ παιδὸς ὧδε περιυβρίσμεθα, I.114). Herodotus here emphasizes that Cyrus, at this time, was considered the son of the cowherd and enslaved. In response to Artembares' outrage, Astyages questions Cyrus and asserts his social status through comparison: "Did you, the child of such sort of man, dare to treat the child of this man who is first-rate in my judgment with such injury?" (σὺ δὴ ἐὼν τοῦδε τοιούτου ἐόντος παῖς ἐτόλμησας τὸν τοῦδε παῖδα ἐόντος πρώτου παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ ἀεικείῃ τοιῇδε περισπεῖν; (I.115)). Although the demonstrative pronoun of quality τοιοῦτος does not specify whether the quality is positive or negative, it indicates an intensity in the quality. The comparison is made between Mitradates and Artembares includes the qualification that Artembares is "first-rate," showing that Astyages is using τοιούτος to put down Mitradates. From these descriptions it is clear that Cyrus is considered to have a low social status due to his putative descent from the enslaved cowherd.

The extent to which Cyrus was perceived to have low social status can be seen in the phrasing of Artembares' complaint. When Artembares goes to Astyages to complain about the whipping of his son by Cyrus, Herodotus describes it as "at the same time bringing his child, he said that he had suffered incongruous matters" (καὶ ἅμα ἀγόμενος τὸν παῖδα ἀνάρσια πρήγματα ἔφη πεπονθέναι, I.114). The use of ἀνάρσια is remarkable, since this word is used in Herodotus only a few times. In III.10, Herodotus uses the word to describe the reign of Amasis, "during which no big, strange thing befell him" (ἐν τοῖσι οὐδέν οἱ μέγα ἀνάρσιον πρῆγμα συνηνείχθη). This absence is contrasted to an event, described as "an extraordinary occurrence (φάσμα … μέγιστον), that occurred during Psammenitus' reign: it rained for the first and only time. Another instance is when in IX.110, Xerxes' wife, Amestris, wanted to avenge herself on his brother's wife, with whom she suspected Xerxes had had an affair. When she requested that the wife be handed over to him, "Xerxes considered it wicked and unfitting (ἀνάρσιον) to hand over his brother's wife, and also that she was innocent in this matter."[81] Herodotus thus uses the adjective ἀνάρσιος/α/ον to indicate an act or event that is not just upsetting or bad, but something contrary to what ought to be or perhaps even contrary to nature. Combined with Astyages' response that makes a direct comparison between Artembares and Mitradates, the use of "incongruous" in Artembares' complaint shows that the offense was not just that Cyrus whipped his son, but that it was someone of lower status than his son whipped him. The intensity of the term further emphasizes just how important the distinction in social status was in Cyrus' account.

The social stratification of this society is not just visible in the ascription of low social status to Cyrus, but also in the fact that Cyrus actively performs behaviors indicating this status. When Cyrus answers Astyages' question whether it was he who hurt the son of Artembares,

[81] IX.110: ὁ δὲ δεινόν τε καὶ ἀνάρσιον ἐποιέετο τοῦτο μὲν ἀδελφεοῦ γυναῖκα παραδοῦναι, τοῦτο δὲ ἀναιτίην ἐοῦσαν τοῦ πρήγματος τούτου.

Herodotus reports him as saying "Oh master, I did these things to him rightly" ('ὦ δέσποτα, ἐγὼ ταῦτα τοῦτον ἐποίησα σὺν δίκῃ', I.115). He addresses Astyages with the vocative form of the word for "master" (δέσποτα), which is the form of address used by enslaved people for their masters, as well as by subjects for non-Greek kings.[82] Artembares, on the other hand, uses the vocative form of the word for "king" (βασιλεῦ) when he addresses Astyages. According to Dickey, δέσποτα "express[es] a greater degree of deference than does βασιλεῦ when used to the same addressee."[83] The proximity of the two salutations thus further emphasizes the contrast between Cyrus and Mitradates on the one hand and Artembares and his son on the other. Cyrus was thus not only seen as inferior, but also demonstrated speech patterns characteristic of this social status.

When Astyages recognizes that ten-year-old Cyrus is his own grandson, he realizes this because "both the character of his face seemed to be similar to his own and his answer was rather characteristic of a free person, and the time since the exposure seemed to line up with the age of the child" (καὶ οἱ ὅ τε χαρακτὴρ τοῦ προσώπου προσφέρεσθαι ἐδόκεε ἐς ἑωυτὸν καὶ ἡ ὑπόκρισις ἐλευθερωτέρη εἶναι, ὅ τε χρόνος τῆς ἐκθέσιος τῇ ἡλικίῃ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐδόκεε συμβαίνειν, I.116). Astyages' familial relationship to Cyrus was necessary for his recognition, since Cyrus' physical similarity to Astyages is biologically passed down and it appears unlikely that people outside the family knew about the birth and assumed death of a royal baby. Yet Herodotus' emphasis on Cyrus' outspoken behavior demonstrates Herodotus' belief in the inborn nature of social status. While Cyrus used the forms of address that marked him as being of lower status, Herodotus suggests that something in Cyrus' answer marked him as a free person rather than an enslaved person. This free aspect of his speech by itself, however, would not have been recognized as a

[82] Dickey 1996, 95.
[83] Dickey 1996, 97.

sign that Cyrus was not born as an enslaved person. Since he was previously ascribed low social status on the basis of putative descent, and since he performed behaviors characteristic of such a status, it is more likely that he would be seen as a misbehaving enslaved boy with an audacious answer. Although Astyages did not ascribe Cyrus any other identity than an enslaved son of a cowherd before he knew that Cyrus was his grandson, Herodotus portrays Cyrus as having exhibited behaviors of a free person.

Despite Cyrus' performance of behaviors that indicate lower social status and the ascription of this status to him on the basis of descent, Cyrus was also seen as, and behaved as, someone of royal status. The most direct ascription ultimately caused the revelation that he was the grandson of Astyages. As mentioned above, Cyrus was brought to king Astyages after he whipped the son of Artembares as they played in the street. They "played king" in a manner similar to which children might "play house" and Cyrus had been chosen to be king by the other children his age. When Cyrus explains his actions to Astyages, he describes the incident as follows: "The children of the town, of whom he was one, while playing established me as king of themselves; for they considered me to be the most suited for this" (οἱ γάρ με ἐκ τῆς κώμης παῖδες, τῶν καὶ ὅδε ἦν, παίζοντες σφέων αὐτῶν ἐστήσαντο βασιλέα· ἐδόκεον γὰρ σφι εἶναι ἐς τοῦτο ἐπιτηδεότατος, I.115). Some of the children were likely enslaved like Cyrus, while others, such as the son of Artembares, were of higher status. Although we do not know the basis for their choice, the fact that all of these children saw Cyrus as most suited indicates an ascription of high status to Cyrus.

Not only children, but also adults recognize Cyrus as capable of rule. Herodotus explains that after Cyrus was chosen by the other children, "he appointed some of them to build houses, others to be spear-bearers, a certain one of them to be the eye of the king, and another one he

gave the honor to bear messages, thus assigning work to each."[84] Cyrus' make-believe corresponds accurately with a king's duties. When Astyages consults with the Magi at I.120, he lists nearly the same offices as mentioned previously, adding porters, but omitting house builders and the "eye of the king." While the latter of these two omissions was an office in the Persian court that is attested, namely the office of inspector, the housebuilders may have been an addition of the children.[85] Nevertheless, Herodotus never has Astyages refer back to the account as play or make-believe. Instead, he acknowledges that Cyrus "having done all these things, accomplished as much as true kings" (ὁ δὲ πάντα ὅσα περ οἱ ἀληθέι λόγῳ βασιλέες ἐτελέωσε ποιήσας, I.120), and that "having assigned [the different tasks and offices] he ruled" (διατάξας ἦρχε, I.120). Astyages thus also recognizes that Cyrus has the competencies to rule, despite his previous attempt to prevent this by marrying his daughter Mandane to the Persian Cambyses.

Polyethnic Potential

Besides ascription by others on the basis of outward performance, Herodotus also depicts Cyrus' self-ascription. When Cyrus arrived at Mandane and Cambyses' home, they "receive him and as they discovered who he was, they welcomed him greatly since they were sure that he had died immediately at that time, and they inquired in what way he survived."[86] In Cyrus' response Herodotus includes a rare description of Cyrus' own perception:

> ὁ δέ σφι ἔλεγε, φὰς πρὸ τοῦ μὲν οὐκ εἰδέναι ἀλλ᾽ ἡμαρτηκέναι πλεῖστον, κατ᾽ ὁδὸν δὲ πυθέσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ πάθην. ἐπίστασθαι μὲν γὰρ ὡς βουκόλου τοῦ Ἀστυάγεος εἴη παῖς, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς κεῖθεν ὁδοῦ τὸν πάντα λόγον τῶν πομπῶν πυθέσθαι. τραφῆναι δὲ ἔλεγε

[84] I.114: ὃ δὲ αὐτῶν διέταξε τοὺς μὲν οἰκίας οἰκοδομέειν, τοὺς δὲ δορυφόρους εἶναι, τὸν δέ κου τινὰ αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸν βασιλέος εἶναι, τῷ δὲ τινὶ τὰς ἀγγελίας φέρειν ἐδίδου γέρας, ὡς ἑκάστῳ ἔργον προστάσσων.
[85] How and Wells, 124 references Aesch. *Pers*. 980, and "Pseudartabas" in Ar. *Ach*. 92.
[86] I.122: καὶ δεξάμενοι ὡς ἐπύθοντο, μεγάλως ἀσπάζοντο οἷα δὴ ἐπιστάμενοι αὐτίκα τότε τελευτῆσαι, ἱστόρεόν τε ὅτεῳ τρόπῳ περιγένοιτο.

> ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ βουκόλου γυναικός, ἤιέ τε ταύτην αἰνέων διὰ παντός, ἦν τέ οἱ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα ἡ Κυνώ.
>
> He told them, saying that before this he did not know but had been very mistaken, but along the way he learned all that had happened to him: for he felt sure that he was the child of the cowherd of Astyages, but learned from the journey from there the whole story from the attendants. He said that he was reared by the cowherd's wife, and he went on praising her continuously, and in his tale Cyno was everything to him. (I.122)

The first two sentences, although they seem repetitive, present two different effects of Cyrus' attendants talking with him on the journey. In the first sentence, Cyrus explains that the attendants provided him with knowledge that he did not have. He was unaware of what had happened to him. In the second sentence, however, Cyrus explains what he believes to be true, namely that he is the son of the cowherd. Cyrus already knew part of his story and the attendant provided supplementary information. Cyrus' own perception of himself and his lived experience did not necessarily change. Cyrus had for the past ten years seen himself as the son of the cowherd and most probably ascribed to himself the same identity as others ascribed him. He was an enslaved boy. As he meets his birthparents, he may not have immediately seen them as parents. Although he knows the whole story (τὸν πάντα λόγον), his (foster) mother Cyno, literally and poetically, made up every part of his story (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα ἡ Κυνώ).

Cyrus' attachment to Cyno calls attention to the role of parents in Cyrus' life. Cyrus' ability to pass as Median, to perform his Median identity, depended on his upbringing. Yet his birthparents responded to Cyrus' stories about Cyno with a different attitude:

> οἱ δὲ τοκέες παραλαβόντες τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο, ἵνα θειοτέρως δοκέῃ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι περιεῖναί σφι ὁ παῖς, κατέβαλον φάτιν ὡς ἐκκείμενον Κῦρον κύων ἐξέθρεψε.
>
> His birthparents took up that name and, so that the child would seem to the Persians to have survived more divinely, spread the rumor that a female dog nurtured the exposed Cyrus. (I.122)

The spreading of the rumor, however, did not just make Cyrus' survival seem more divinely determined. The assertion that Cyno was a dog is an erasure of Cyrus' past. Without his foster

parents, Cyrus has no association with people of lower status or any human influence at all. Considering the audience of this rumor, the Persians, it may have further functioned to disconnect Cyrus from his upbringing in a different ethnic group and allow him to become and be seen as Persian henceforth. Any non-Persian behaviors did not have to be indications of a different ethnic identity but could rather be cast as the result of an animalistic upbringing. Both Cyno and Mitradates, as well as Mandane and Cambyses, thus played important roles in the creation of Cyrus' ethnic and social status identities.

The difference between Cyrus' two sets of parents is also emphasized by the terms Herodotus uses for them. For Mandane and Cambyses, Herodotus uses primarily forms and derivatives of τίκτω and γείνομαι, such as "begetters" γεινάμενοι and "birthparents" τοκέες. For instance, the Magi advise Astyages to send Cyrus back to "the Persians and his begetters" (ἐς Πέρσας τε καὶ τοὺς γειναμένους, I.120). Mitradates and Cyno, however, cannot be identified by those terms, but are his parents, nonetheless. After Astyages recognizes Cyrus he asks Mitradates who gave the child to him. Herodotus reports his answer as "He said that he (Cyrus) had come into existence from himself and that the one who gave birth to him (Cyrus) was still with him" (ὁ δὲ ἐξ ἑωυτοῦ τε ἔφη γεγονέναι καὶ τὴν τεκοῦσαν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἔτι παρ᾽ ἑωυτῷ, I.116). Although Astyages calls Mitradates out on his lying, he does not deny that Mitradates and Cyno were parents to Cyrus. This is clear when Astyages, as he sends Cyrus off to Persia, states that "having arrived there you will find a father and a mother unlike Mitradates the cowherd and his wife." (ἐλθὼν δὲ ἐκεῖ πατέρα τε καὶ μητέρα εὑρήσεις οὐ κατὰ Μιτραδάτην τε τὸν βουκόλον καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, I.121). Herodotus thus creates a stark dichotomy between these two sets of parents, the ones which Cyrus considered parents and the ones who begot him; Cyrus is caught somewhere in the middle.

Cyrus, as the child of a Mede and a Persian, a royal princess and a man deemed to be of low social status, was able to be both. Ten-year-old Cyrus was perceived as and considered himself to be the son of Mitradates and Cyno. Yet he was also seen by his peers and Astyages as royal and capable of rule. A similar duality exists with regards to Cyrus' ethnic identity. Although we are not explicitly told about his foster parents' ethnic identities, Cyrus is unlikely to have identified with the Persian ethnic identity due to his childhood in Media. Yet Astyages and the Magi consistently ascribed him a Persian ethnic identity. Since the intersection of Cyrus' individual social status and ethnic identities became a political threat, he lost agency in establishing his identity himself. Perhaps the oracle of Delphi spoke truth in more than one way when she answered Croesus' question. Cyrus was not just a mule by descent, but he also lived a life in which he inhabited multiple social statuses and ethnic identities.

Skyles and Anacharsis (IV.76-80)

In the fourth book, Herodotus introduces his audience to the Scythians in depth. Continuing his focus on the interaction of peoples and the sharing of customs, clothing, and other ethnic characteristics, Herodotus remarks at IV.76 that the Scythians "very much avoid using foreign customs, those of all the others, but especially the Greek ones."[87] Herodotus illustrates this statement with the stories of Anacharsis and Skyles. Both men were killed as a consequence of performing Greek religious rites, but their experiences were not identical. In this section, I argue that the contrast between the stories of Skyles and Anacharsis demonstrates that individuals with polyethnic descent have a unique opportunity to identify with and belong to two

[87] IV.76: ξεινικοῖσι δὲ νομαίοισι καὶ οὗτοι φεύγουσι αἰνῶς χρᾶσθαι, μήτε τεῶν ἄλλων, Ἑλληνικοῖσι δὲ καὶ ἥκιστα.

ethnic groups. Furthermore, I argue that Skyles' story demonstrates that this flexibility and potential is limited by political considerations. When the intersection of an individual's social status and ethnic identities becomes a political threat, the individual loses agency in establishing their identity.

Foreign Relatives and Relative Foreignness.

Herodotus starts with the story of Anacharsis and depicts him primarily as a Scythian traveler: "having seen much of the earth and having shown much wisdom throughout, he came back to the accustomed places of the Scythians." From Herodotus' narrative there is no reason to believe that Anacharsis was polyethnic or even performed foreign customs prior to this event. On his way back, Anacharsis encountered celebrations of the feast of the Mother Goddess. He vowed to make offerings upon a safe return home and, "as he arrived in Scythia, (…) Anacharsis completed the whole feast for the goddess, bearing a drum and decked out with statues."[88] Yet a fellow Scythian saw him and told the king, who "when he saw Anacharsis doing these things, shot at him and killed him." (ὡς εἶδε τὸν Ἀνάχαρσιν ποιεῦντα ταῦτα τοξεύσας αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινε, IV.76). Anacharsis was thus killed for the performance of a foreign religious rite and offers a straightforward example of the Scythians' intolerance towards foreign customs.

The story of Skyles is the second account that Herodotus presents in order to support his statement about the Scythian aversion to foreign customs. Unlike Anacharsis, Skyles was not simply a Scythian who adopted foreign customs. As Herodotus says at IV.78,

[88] IV.76: ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Σκυθικήν (…) Ἀνάχαρσις τὴν ὀρτὴν ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τῇ θεῷ, τύμπανον τε ἔχων καὶ ἐκδησάμενος ἀγάλματα.

> Ἀριαπείθεϊ γὰρ τῷ Σκυθέων βασιλέι γίνεται μετ᾽ ἄλλων παίδων Σκύλης· ἐξ Ἰστριηνῆς δὲ γυναικὸς οὗτος γίνεται καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐγχωρίης· τὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὕτη γλῶσσάν τε Ἑλλάδα καὶ γράμματα ἐδίδαξε.
>
> Skyles was one of the children born to Ariapithes, the king of Scythia, but he was born from an Istrian woman who was not at all from this land, and his mother herself taught him spoken and written Greek.

As the son of a Scythian and a Greek, Skyles had access to the cultures of both ethnic groups. Herodotus explicitly notes that Skyles was not just brought up immersed in Scythian culture but actively learned Greek cultural practices as well. His mother taught him both her language and, as we subsequently learn (see below), her practices. Indeed, his childhood education is depicted as the source of, if not cause of, his tendency towards Greek customs:

> βασιλεύων δὲ Σκυθέων ὁ Σκύλης διαίτῃ οὐδαμῶς ἠρέσκετο Σκυψικῇ, ἀλλὰ πολλὸν πρὸς τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μᾶλλον τετραμμένος ἦν ἀπὸ παιδεύσιος τῆς ἐπεπαίδευτο.
>
> While reigning the Scythians, Skyles was in no way pleased with the Scythian way of life, but had been much more turned towards the Greek ways from the upbringing he had received. (IV.78)

While Herodotus uses the middle voice for Skyles' disliking of the Scythian ways, his "turn towards" the Greek ways is indicated in the passive voice and pluperfect tense; Skyles' inclination is less a choice and more of a consequence of his mother's teaching. The effect of teaching cultural practices is thus that Skyles is not just able to perform Greek customs, but also appears to prefer them. His Greek ethnic identity, while made possible due to descent, is socially constructed.

Although Skyles, according to Herodotus, prefers the Greek way of life over Scythian customs, he was not considered any less Scythian by the Scythians. As an individual with parents from two distinct ethnic groups, Skyles could have easily been charged with divided loyalties and distrusted. In fact, Herodotus emphasizes that Skyles hides his trips to the city of the Borysthenites and takes preventative measures, namely that "he left behind the army in the

suburb" (τὴν μὲν στρατιὴν καταλίπεσκε ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ, IV.78) and that "they were guarding the gates, lest some Scythian see him wearing this outfit" (τὰς δὲ πύλας ἐφύλασσον, μή τίς μιν Σκυθέων ἴδοι ἔχοντα ταύτην τὴν στολήν, IV.78). Yet his parentage did not limit his ability to become king. Skyles inherited the kingdom from his father and also one of his father's wives, "who was named Opoie: she herself was an *astē,* from whom Ariapithes had a child named Orikos" (τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Ὀποίη· ἦν δὲ αὕτη ἡ Ὀποίη ἀστή, ἐξ ἧς ἦν Ὄρικος Ἀριαπείθεϊ παῖς, IV.78). Herodotus' mention of Orikos, Skyles' half-brother from a Scythian mother, shows that Ariapithes had at least one son with mono-ethnic parentage. Contrary to Skyles, Orikos would have posed little risk of disloyalty with respect to his ethnic affiliation. While it is possible that Skyles was simply the heir to the throne due to birth order, Herodotus' mention of Orikos reinforces the idea that Skyles' parentage did not affect his ability to reign. The Scythians viewed Skyles as Scythian.

Just as Cyrus was able to be both Median and Persian, Skyles' parentage gave him a double opportunity for ethnic belonging. Skyles was not just able to perform Greek customs and speak the Greek language, but practiced Greek customs regularly. While he was king of the Scythians, Skyles spent significant amounts of time with the Borysthenites, a Greek ethnic group that resided in a city nearby. While he was there, he would wear Greek clothing and "do all other things in the Greek way and make offerings to the gods according to the customs of the Greeks."[89] According to Herodotus, Skyles "would do these things often and he built a house in Borysthenes and to it he took a woman from the area as his wife."[90] These were thus not rare occurrences, but rather an integrated part of Skyles' life. Skyles' ability to go to this city and live

[89] IV.78: καὶ τά τε ἄλλα ἐχρᾶτο διαίτῃ Ἑλληνικῇ καὶ θεοῖσι ἱρὰ ἐποίεε κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Ἑλλήνων.
[90] IV.78: ταῦτα ποιέεσκε πολλάκις καὶ οἰκία τε ἐδείματο ἐν Βορυσθένεϊ καὶ γυναῖκα ἔγημε ἐς αὐτὰ ἐπιχωρίην.

as a fellow Greek among the Borysthenites further indicates that the Borysthenites tolerated Skyles' presence in their city. His later initiation into the cult of Dionysus even suggests that the Borysthenites were welcoming and accepted Skyles as one of their own. As a person with polyethnic parentage, Skyles had agency over his ethnic identity and was able to belong to both the Scythians and the Borysthenites.

Matters Concerning Religion and Politics

As an individual, Skyles had agency over his ethnic identity and performance. Seemingly paradoxically, Skyles lost this agency due to his membership in the Scythian ethnic group. Herodotus tells us that Skyles was persecuted and killed and that "it happened for this reason: he desired to be initiated in the mysteries of Bacchic Dionysus."[91] Religious practices are isolated as of particular importance:

> Σκύθαι δὲ τοῦ βακχεύειν πέρι Ἕλλησι ὀνειδίζουσι· οὐ γὰρ φασὶ οἰκὸς εἶναι θεὸν ἐξευρίσκειν τοῦτον ὅστις μαίνεσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐτελέσθη τῷ Βακχείῳ ὁ Σκύλης, διεπρήστευσε τῶν τις Βορυσθενειτέων πρὸς τοὺς Σκύθας λέγων 'ἡμῖν γὰρ καταγελᾶτε, ὦ Σκύθαι, ὅτι βακχεύομεν καὶ ἡμέας ὁ θεὸς λαμβάνει· νῦν οὗτος ὁ δαίμων καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον βασιλέα λελάβηκε, καὶ βακχεύει τε καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαίνεται. εἰ δέ μοι ἀπιστέετε, ἕπεσθε, καὶ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ δέξω.' εἵποντο τῶν Σκύθεων οἱ προεστεῶτες, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀναγαγὼν ὁ Βορυσθενεΐτης λάθρῃ ἐπὶ πύργον κατεῖσε. ἐπείτε δὲ παρήιε σὺν τῷ θιάσῳ ὁ Σκύλης καὶ εἶδόν μιν βακχεύοντα οἱ Σκύθαι, κάρτα συμφορὴν μεγάλην ἐποιήσαντο, ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐσήμαινον πάσῃ τῇ στρατιῇ τὰ ἴδοιεν.
>
> The Scythians reprehend the Greeks for their celebration of the Bacchic mysteries: for they say that it is not fitting to seek out a god who leads people to be mad. When Skyles was initiated to Bacchus, one of the Borysthenites sneered at the Scythians, saying "you laugh at us, O Scythians, because we celebrate the mysteries of Bacchus and our god takes hold of us: now this divine power has also taken hold of your king, and he revels and is maddened by the god. If you don't believe me, follow, and I will show you." The leaders of the Scythians followed, and having led them secretly up a tower the Borysthinite made them take a seat. When Skyles passed by with his religious band and

[91] IV.79: ἐγίνετο ἀπὸ προφάσιος τοιῆσδε. ἐπεθύμησε Διονύσῳ Βακχείῳ τελεσθῆναι.

> the Scythians saw him reveling, they considered it a very big misfortune, and having left they explained to the whole army what they had seen. (IV.79)

There were stark religious differences between the Greeks and the Scythians that led to open mockery and distinctions between the two ethnic groups. This mockery emphasizes the significance of religion as a demarcating cultural feature of their ethnic groups. The Borysthenite notes that the Scythians laugh at them for their religion; he is aware how controversial it would be for their king to be initiated in the mysteries. Once the Scythian army that had accompanied him to the city learned about Skyles' religious revelry, they took Skyles' brother Octamasadēs as their king, rebelled against Skyles, and killed Skyles after his failed attempt at taking refuge in Thrace. Although the Scythians had accepted Skyles' polyethnic parentage and that he had learned Greek customs and the Greek language from his mother, his religious conversion was of greater significance.

The significance of Skyles' initiation was demonstrated to him in the form of an omen. When he was about to be initiated, a lightning bolt struck the large house he had built, which was surrounded with white marble sphinxes and griffins, and burned it down completely (IV.79). While such a sign from Zeus and the loss of such a magnificent house is indubitably a bad sign, the significance of this particular omen is not explained by Herodotus. Hartog, who pays particular attention to spatial relations in this episode, suggests that the destruction of the enclosed space surrounding the home (περιβολή) symbolizes the destruction of Skyles' separation between his Greek side (the town) and his Scythian side (the home with foreign decorations).[92] Although I agree with this reading, it does not provide an answer to the question of what symbolic meaning Skyles was supposed to take from the omen. I suggest that the white marble sphinxes and griffons symbolize Skyles' polyethnic identity. The sphinx is a legendary

[92] Hartog 1988, 73-74.

creature made up of the body of a lion, the wings of a bird, and the head of a woman; the griffin also had the body of a lion, but the head and wings of an eagle. What previously seemed to be a puzzling descriptive remark from Herodotus can thus be understood as an integral part of the omen.[93] The destruction of these hybrid creatures thus foretold the destruction of Skyles on the eve of his initiation. If he were to go through with it, he could no longer live as a polyethnic person.

Although Skyles had been afforded the flexibility to live a polyethnic life, his initiation into the Dionysiac mystery cult changed the Scythians' ascription of Skyles' ethnic identity to that of a monolithic ethnic identity. The religious differences between the Greeks and the Scythians that make religion a salient criterion of ethnic identity for the Scythians are concerned with the type of religious activities and the level of commitment. First, the Scythian mockery of the Greeks focused on the orgiastic and *enthousiastic* nature of the Bacchic mystery cult.[94] Herodotus repeatedly mentions the way that Dionysus as a god "who drives people mad" (ὅστις μαίνεσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους) and that they "revel" (βακχεύω) (IV.79). These aspects of the Dionysiac cult in which the Scythians see their king participating are the physical manifestations of the problem at hand: Dionysus is a god who takes hold of a person and inhabits or possesses them. Skyles' participation in Bacchic rituals thus compromised the Scythians' ability to trust his

[93] For instance, Braund 2019 suggests that the sphinxes and griffins are symbols of Dionysus and that Dionysus himself sent the thunderbolt to destroy Skyles' second, Greek life. According to Braund, Dionysus was displeased since Skyles had rejected Dionysus in his Scythian life, but that seems to pre-empt the event after initiation.

[94] Although Herodotus does not use words related to ἐνθουσιασμός, the term succinctly conveys the Scythians' view.

leadership. How could they trust a king who has gone mad or is possessed by some god and thus out of his mind?[95]

Second, initiation into the Dionysian cult signals a large level of commitment. Even if Dionysus did not possess Skyles at that time, his loyalties were likely to have changed. As Hartog argues, "initiation makes a lasting, irreversible change of status; it is meaningful only in the context of a separation established between a "before" and an "after."[96] Skyles, by being initiated into the Bacchic cult, thus changed a fundamental part of his own identity. Conflict arose afterwards "because Skyles afterwards drove out to his own accustomed places" and attempted to return to his usual Scythian life including, presumably, his royal position.[97] While Skyles' ability to speak Greek and perform Greek customs were acquired skills, they had been legitimized by virtue of his descent. More importantly, they did not impede his ability to rule. The initiation into a mystery cult brought about a finalizing change, since Skyles was now committed to a new bond with (some of) the Borysthenites through the practice of Bacchic rituals. The Scythians could not trust Skyles to prioritize the Scythians' best interest; they no longer considered him to be one of them. Although Skyles may still have identified with both the Greek and Scythian ethnic identity, he was no longer ascribed a Scythian identity by the Scythians.

[95] Herodotus includes several stories related to kings and madness: At II.173, king Amasis argues for the importance of leisure time lest he go mad. In III.30-38, Cambyses' madness is described at length and related to his evil acts.
[96] Hartog 1988, 72.
[97] IV.80: ὡς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξήλαυνε ὁ Σκύλης ἐς ἤθεα τὰ ἑωυτοῦ.

Children on Lemnos (VI.138)

I have argued above that upbringing played an important role in constructing ethnic identity and social status. Cyrus was raised by Cyno and Mitradates and spent the first ten years of his childhood as an enslaved boy. According to Herodotus, Skyles' mother not only taught him to speak Greek and live life in a Greek way, but also to prefer it over Scythian culture. In this section, I discuss the story of the Atheno-Pelasgian children on Lemnos. I argue that this example further demonstrates the important role of upbringing in the social construction of ethnic identity. Moreover, I argue that the social status associated with the children's ethnic identity threatened the Pelasgians and resulted in their decision to kill them.

At VI.138, Herodotus tells us how there came to be Atheno-Pelasgian children living on Lemnos:

> πεντηκοντέρους κτησάμενοι ἐλόχησαν Ἀρτέμιδι ἐν Βραυρῶνι ἀγούσας ὁρτὴν τὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἁρπάσαντες τουτέων πολλὰς οἴχοντο ἀποπλέοντες, καί σφεας ἐς Λῆμνον ἀγαγόντες παλλακὰς εἶχον. ὡς δὲ τέκνων αὗται αἱ γυναῖκες ὑπεπλήσθησαν, γλῶσσάν τε τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τρόπους τοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἐδίδασκον τοὺς παῖδας.
>
> [The Pelasgians] took fifty-oared ships and ambushed those Athenian women who were celebrating the festival for Artemis at Brauron, then having snatched many of them they went away, sailing, and they kept those they took to Lemnos as concubines. As these women became mothers of many children, they taught their children the Attic language and the Athenian ways of life.

In this passage, Herodotus highlights the influence of the children's upbringing. They were children from parents with different ethnic identities, since the men who abducted their Athenian mothers were Pelasgians. On Lemnos the children were surrounded by the language and customs of their fathers, but their mothers also taught them their own language and Athenian cultural behaviors. As the criteria for ascription of ethnic identity, the children's ability to speak the Greek language with an Attic accent and to perform culturally significant behaviors determined

their ability to identify as Athenian, if they wished. Thanks to their mothers' teaching, these children thus had a flexibility to identify with both or ether of their parents' ethnic identities.

As the story goes on, however, it becomes clear that the Atheno-Pelasgian children primarily identified themselves with their mothers' Athenian ethnic identity:

> οἳ δὲ οὔτε συμμίσγεσθαι τοῖσι ἐκ τῶν Πελασγίδων γυναικῶν παισὶ ἤθελον, εἴ τε τύπτοιτό τις αὐτῶν τινός, ἐβοήθεόν τε πάντες καὶ ἐτιμώρεον ἀλλήλοισι.
>
> But they did not want to mingle with the children from the Pelasgian women, and if any of them were ever hit by someone, they all helped and avenged one another. (VI.138)

Herodotus depicts the separation among the children as connected to their shared polyethnic parentage and related bicultural upbringing. Although the children all had Pelasgian fathers, it was their mothers' ethnic identity that became a dividing line. An additional characteristic of ethnic groups that is in play here is the sense of solidarity. The way that the Atheno-Pelasgian children stood up for one another demonstrates loyalty and unity amongst group members. The Atheno-Pelasgian children thus formed a distinct ethnic group.

The boundaries of the children's ethnic groups are not just visible in their positive behavior towards group members, but also in the negative behavior towards non-group members. Herodotus emphasizes the active hostility from the Atheno-Pelasgian children towards the children from Pelasgian mothers, saying "what is more, the children held it as a right to rule the other children and they prevailed by far" (καὶ δὴ καὶ ἄρχειν τε τῶν παίδων οἱ παῖδες ἐδικαίευν καὶ πολλῷ ἐπεκράτεον, VI.138). This hostility was not just a threat to the children, but also had consequences for the other members of society:

> μαθόντες δὲ ταῦτα οἱ Πελασγοὶ ἑωυτοῖσι λόγους ἐδίδοσαν· καί σφι βουλευομένοισι δεινόν τι ἐσέδυνε, εἰ δὴ διαγινώσκοιεν σφίσι τε βοηθέειν οἱ παῖδες πρὸς τῶν κουριδιέων γυναικῶν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τούτων αὐτίκα ἄρχειν πειρῴατο, τί δὴ ἀνδρωθέντες δῆθεν ποιήσουσι;

> The Pelasgians, having learned these things, deliberated amongst themselves, and in their counseling something fearful sank in for them: if the children are determined to lend aid to one another against the children of their wedded wives and already tried to rule them, what then will they do when they have really grown up? (VI.138)

Herodotus highlights the distress of the Pelasgians as he describes their realization of how the boys may act in the future. The actions of the children are, as in Cyrus' story, not dismissed for being the interactions of children but seen as representing a miniature version of (future) society. Furthermore, like the Medians and Persians, the different ethnic groups of children are connected to social status distinctions. In the Pelasgians' deliberations, they compare the children from Athenian mothers to the children of the wedded women (τῶν κουριδιέων γυναικῶν τοὺς παῖδας, VI.138). Since the Athenian children's mothers were kept as concubines (παλλακὰς εἶχον), their social status would have been lower than that of wedded wives. The Atheno-Pelasgian children's belief that they ought to rule and their attempt to do so thus threatens not only the Pelasgian children, but also the Pelasgians' power in their society.

The interactions between the Atheno-Pelasgian children's social status and ethnicity are further apparent from the Pelasgians' decision:

> ἐνθαῦτα ἔδοξέ σφι κτείνειν τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀττικέων γυναικῶν. ποιεῦσι δὴ ταῦτα, προσαπολλύουσι δὲ σφέων καὶ τὰς μητέρας.
>
> Thereupon it seemed right to them to kill the children of the Attic women. They did these things and murdered in addition to them also their mothers. (VI.138)

Just like Astyages, the Pelasgians feared usurpation by the younger generation. The Pelasgians' extreme choice to murder their own children demonstrates the intensity of the threat that the children formed against them. It is, however, the additional murder of their mothers that reveals the Pelasgians' view of the intersection between ethnic identity and social status. In the earlier passages Herodotus already implied that the children's behavior was connected to their Athenian upbringing; without their mothers, these children would not have known Athenian customs or the

Greek language. The fact that the removal of the threat against the Pelasgians necessitated the murder of the mothers thus indicates that the Pelasgians saw the imperious behavior of the children as explicitly connected to their Athenian ethnic identity.

When the Men are Away... (IV.1-IV.4)

For my final example, I turn to a case in which the difference between the parents is primarily a difference in social status. In IV.1-4, Herodotus tells us about the children whom Scythian wives begat with their enslaved men. As in previous examples, the children of parents from different backgrounds have an initial double possibility to align with either of their parents' identities. Until the Scythian men returned from the Median war, the youths were able to navigate their lives as free Scythian men (and presumably women). The youths' change in status from free Scythians to enslaved people occurred when the youths fled in response to the Scythian men's use of a horsewhip against them in battle. This story has conventionally been explained as a typical tale supporting the Greek belief in natural slavery.[98] Yet, as individuals with a double social status identity on the basis of descent, why would one social status have been more "natural" for them than another? In this section, I argue that the youths' response and their ultimate change in social status is the result of what modern psychologists would call "stereotype threat."[99] This example thus depicts the social construction of social status through the dynamics of ascription and self-ascription.

[98] Hunt 1998, 51-52. Although I believe it best to discuss "slavery" as "enslavement" to highlight that this was done to people by other people, the term "natural slavery" captures the assumption around enslavement from people who believe in it.
[99] Steele and Aronson 1995, Steele 1997.

In book IV, the story begins with Herodotus describing the Scythians' reign over Asia and consequent Median War. During this war, which took 28 years, all men old enough to fight would have been away at the front. Consequently, there would have been no new generation of Scythians, were it not that the Scythian women "turned to their enslaved men" (ἐφοίτεον παρὰ τοὺς δούλους, IV.1). The youths in Scythia were mainly the offspring of this union between free Scythian women and enslaved men. When Herodotus explains that the Scythians blind their enslaved people, he depicts the Scythians as primarily enslaving the people they captured: "the Scythians blind each man whom they take" (ἅπαντα τὸν ἂν λάβωσι οἱ Σκύθαι ἐκτυφλοῦσι, IV.2). Although people also enslave captives from their own ethnic group, it is most likely that the captives were from different ethnicities than the Scythians.[100] The young men in Scythia who were born during this war were thus born from parents with different ethnic identities and social statuses.

Herodotus' focus in these chapters is on the conflict between the younger generation and the men returning from war after 28 years. I argue that the return of the Scythian men threatened the social status of the youths, who up until this time had been raised as free Scythians. Herodotus describes the cause of the conflict saying, "since they learned of their birth, they opposed those men returning from the Medes" (οἳ ἐπείτε ἔμαθον τὴν σφετέρην γένεσιν, ἠντιοῦντο αὐτοῖσι κατιοῦσι ἐκ τῶν Μήδων, IV.3). As children were generally brought up by their mothers, it is most probable that the new information acquired about their birth is who their fathers were. Having thus been raised as free Scythians, the new knowledge that they were descended from enslaved men must have changed their view of themselves. Aware of the double possibilities given at birth for their ethnic identity and social status, they attempted to prevent the

[100] For examples of Greeks enslaving Greeks, see Forsdyke 2021, 100.

return of the Scythian men who had been at war. After all, the returning Scythians, as free mono-ethnic Scythian men, they would likely displace the polyethnic youths. In fact, Herodotus describes the actions of the youths, saying "afterwards they opposed the Scythians who were trying *to invade* and fought them" (μετά γε πειρωμένοισι *ἐσβάλλειν* τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι ἀντικατιζόμενοι ἐμάχοντο, IV.3). He thus depicts the returning men as not simply returning to their original positions in Scythian society, but instead invading the space of the youths.

The youths had been raised as free Scythians and were ascribed the free Scythian identity by themselves and others throughout their childhood. On the battlefield they proved to be an equal match to the returning free Scythian men. From the beginning of the account, Herodotus indicates that the conflict was not an easy one for the returning Scythians. Before the audience knows who comprises the opposing force, Herodotus depicts the encounter as "no less trouble than the Median [trouble]" (οὐκ ἐλάσσων πόνος τοῦ Μηδικοῦ, IV.1). Positioning the story from the returning Scythians' point of view, Herodotus explains "for they found that no small army opposed them" (εὗρον γὰρ ἀντιουμένην σφίσι στρατιὴν οὐκ ὀλίγην, IV.1). Herodotus' use of στρατιήν also depicts the youths as a legitimate force and not just a random group of people. Furthermore, since military service was strongly associated with citizenship in Greek civic ideology, this depiction indicates that Herodotus ascribed to the Scythian youths the status of free citizens.[101] In IV.3, Herodotus continues this portrayal of the youth, saying that "fighting happened often and the Scythians were not able to make any more headway in the fight" (γινομένης δὲ μάχης πολλάκις καί οὐ δυναμένων οὐδὲν πλέον ἔχειν τῶν Σκυθέων τῇ μάχῃ). The younger generation, born from parents with distinct ethnic identities and social statuses, were thus the returning Scythians' equals.

[101] Hunt 1998.

The youth are considered equally capable as free Scythians until one of the Scythian men considers their parentage:

> ‘οἷα ποιεῦμεν, ἄνδρες Σκύθαι, δούλοισι τοῖσι ἡμετέροισι μαχόμενοι. αὐτοί τε <γὰρ> κτεινόμενοι ἐλάσσονες γινόμεθα καὶ ἐκείνους κτείνοντες ἐλασσόνων τὸ λοιπὸν ἄρξομεν. νῦν ὦν μοι δοκέει αἰχμὰς μὲν καὶ τόξα μετεῖναι, λαβόντα δὲ ἕκαστον τοῦ ἵππου τὴν μάστιγα ἰέναι ἅσσον αὐτῶν. μέχρι μὲν γὰρ ὥρων ἡμέας ὅπλα ἔχοντας, οἳ δὲ ἐνόμιζον ὅμοιοί τε καί ἐξ ὁμοίων ἡμῖν εἶναι· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἴδωνται μάστιγας ἀντὶ ὅπλων ἔχοντας, μαθόντες ὡς εἰσὶ ἡμέτεροι δοῦλοι καὶ συγγνόντες τοῦτο οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι.’
>
> “What are we doing, Scythian men, fighting our own slaves! For we become fewer in number as we are killed and as we kill them, we will have fewer to rule in the future. Now then it seems best to me to let go of our spears and bows, and to approach them having each taken up a horse whip. For as long as they saw us having weapons, they considered themselves to be our equals and born from equals, but when they see us having whips instead of weapons, they will understand that they are our enslaved people and knowing this they will not endure.” (IV.3)

The returning Scythian men shift their ascription of social status to the youth in this passage. Herodotus does not explain on what criterion the Scythians based their new ascription, but it seems most likely that the Scythians ascribed them the same status as their fathers. Since in Greek society, like in other societies that depend on enslavement, status usually passed to children matrilineally, the returning men violated societal norms in their quest to regain power.[102]

As for the timing of their ascription, they may not have immediately realized that these youths can only be the sons of their enslaved people and thus did not initially ascribe this status to them. Alternatively, they may have realized that the youths had a double potential due to their descent. In that case, they were willing to recognize the youth as equals until this threatened their own position in society. Regardless of the scenario, the ascription of enslaved status to the youths did

[102] Forsdyke 2021, see below on page 60.

not become important until the moment that the free Scythian men could not defeat the youths in combat.

The solution of the Scythian men to the stalemate in battle was to change from fighting the youths with weapons to using a horse whip. The use of a horse whip in place of weapons is both a physical manifestation of the free Scythian men's shifts in ascription and a way to communicate this shift to the youths. Herodotus described the response of the youths to the whip in similar wording as the revelation of Cyrus' identity to Astyages. The youths "were terrified by what happened" (οἳ δὲ ἐκπλαγέντες τῷ γινομένῳ, IV.4), just as Astyages was "terrified by these things" (ἐκπλαγεὶς δὲ τούτοισι, I.116), namely the observations that made him realize that the enslaved boy was Cyrus. The Scythian youths thus realized that they were ascribed enslaved social status by the Scythian men and "they forgot about the fight and fled" (τῆς μάχης τε ἐπελάθοντο καὶ ἔφευγον, IV.4).

This account has often been interpreted as representing the ancient Greek attitude towards enslavement. How and Wells, for instance, say that the story is written "to illustrate the proper way of controlling slaves."[103] In addition to such 'practical' advice, Herodotus promotes a particular ideology in this passage. Van Groningen even goes as far as to say that "the story itself (3-4) conforms completely to the Greek views concerning the essential difference between the nature of the freeborn and the enslaved person."[104] By using the horse whip and treating the youths as enslaved people, they intend to bring out some inherently slavish part of the youths' nature. The Scythian men suppose that, upon seeing it, the youths would suddenly understand (μαθόντες, IV.3) and agree (συγγνόντες, IV.3) that they are enslaved people. The fact that the

[103] How and Wells 1912, ad loc.
[104] Van Groningen 1950, ad loc. "*Het verhaal zelf (3-40 sluit zich geheel aan bij de Griekse inzichten omtrent het wezenlijke verschil tussen den aard van den vrijgeborene en den slaaf."*

Scythian youth indeed stopped fighting and fled contributes to this reading of the passage as promote the ideology of natural slavery.[105]

Although Herodotus often portrays Greek culture in the stories of the Scythians, the outcome of the Scythian men's plan is surprising and not without complications. Even if we were to believe in natural slavery—and I do not— there is no reason that the youths' true nature would be that of an enslaved person and not of a free person. Up until this time, the youths had been ascribing free status to themselves and had been actively fighting the returning men to retain their free status. This self-ascription as free Scythians on the basis of their mothers' status as free was on solid ground, especially considering that Herodotus' audience would expect status to pass to children matrilineally.[106] Why then do the Scythian youths accept the externally ascribed status of enslaved people? Why did they respond to the Scythian men's enslavement of them by submitting when they were their equal in battle? I suggest that the modern concept of stereotype threat explains their response and illuminates the social construction of social status.

Stereotype threat is the phenomenon that member of an identity-based social group performs according to stereotypes about their group if they are reminded of their identity. In the original studies on stereotype threat, Claude Steele investigated the question of intellectual underperformance of Black students and of women in math, science, and engineering.[107] The difference in performance was attributed not to the nature or nurture of these students, but to the situation in which they found themselves. While the mere existence of salient stereotypes may cause the underperformance of an individual, Murphy and Taylor argue that situational cues "can launch the stereotype threat process and interfere with the performance, aspirations, and

[105] See also Evans 1982, 66; Finley 1998, 118; Cartledge 1993, 157. Cf. Hunt 1998, 51-52.
[106] Forsdyke 2021, especially 65-68.
[107] Steele and Aronson 1995, Steele 1997.

cognitive processes of stigmatized individuals."[108] For stigmatized social groups, relevant situational cues are often tied to concerns that the individual may have, i.e., concerns about one's belonging or about discrimination and devaluation. For women in STEM, this may involve the low number of other women in their classes or a casual comment that the exam tests one's natural ability in math. These situational cues "imply some contingency between the cue and one's outcomes" and make people aware of their group membership and thus susceptible to stereotype threat.[109]

In our case of the Scythian youths, stereotype threat explains their response to the use of a horsewhip. There was a stereotype about the character of enslaved people that is salient in the context of the battle. According to Peter Hunt, enslaved people in the Greek world were "typed as cowardly, weak, obsequious, and irresolute."[110] Although people need not believe in the stereotype in order to suffer from stereotype threat, they do have to ascribe themselves the relevant identity and the youths did that, at least in part.[111] The cue of the horsewhip, as an object that enslavers use to whip enslaved people, was thus a meaningful situational cue that connected to the youths' double social status identity. Furthermore, the violent nature of this situational cue was important, since cues are more likely to be meaningful "when situational cues direct or restrict one's behavior along the lines of social identity." [112] When the Scythian men changed to using a horsewhip, they thus not only asserted their ascription of the youths as enslaved people, but also provided a situational cue that sparked stereotype threat. While their opponents were using weapons, the youths performed well in their fight against the Scythian men returning from

[108] Murphy and Taylor 2012, 22-23.
[109] Murphy and Taylor 2012, 23.
[110] Hunt 1998, 51.
[111] Steele et. al. 2002, 389-91.
[112] Murphy and Taylor 2011, 23.

war. Yet their self-ascription as partially enslaved and partially free resulted in their subconscious fulfillment of the stereotype and ultimately determined their social status.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have used modern theoretical concepts, such as intersectionality and stereotype threat, to provide insight into the development of ethnic identity and social status. Herodotean scholarship had hitherto focused on the Greek construction of ethnic groups' characteristics and how these constructions functioned to reflect a Greek Self in opposition to a barbarian Other. These approaches, however, ignored the negotiation of identity that occurs at the boundaries of the ethnic group and elided individuals' lived experiences. My examination thus shifted the focus from the group to the individual and centered individuals with polyethnic parentage or with parents from different social strata in order to better analyze the dynamics involved in determining ethnic identity and social status.

In Herodotus' *Histories,* individuals with parents from different ethnic groups offer us more than the clever solution to a misunderstood oracular message. The four case studies in this chapter provide a unique look at the formation of identity in Classical Greece. The cases of Cyrus and the Scythian youths demonstrate that social status was established on the basis of putative descent, which allows a double opportunity for children born to parents with different social statuses. Individuals with polyethnic descent had a similar opportunity to belong to both or either of their parents' ethnic groups. Both Skyles and the Atheno-Pelasgian children were able to identify with and perform customs associated with their fathers' and their mothers' ethnic identities. This flexibility ended, however, when these individuals became a threat to the sociopolitical hierarchy as a result of their ethnic identity and social status. Although they could

perform the customs, speak the language, and claim descent from a group member, the individual was no longer able to identify with both ethnic identities. The lesson seems to be that only so long as a person is not disruptive to the socio-political order can they retain their agency in the construction of their own identity.

Chapter III
From Fish to Amazons: Gender in Herodotus' *Histories*

ἡ γὰρ Ἄτοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος
for Atossa held all the power
(Hdt.VII.3)

> οἱ δὲ ἰχθύες οἱ ἀγελαῖοι ἐν μὲν τοῖσι ποταμοῖσι οὐ μάλα γίνονται, τρεφόμενοι δὲ ἐν τῇσι λίμνῃσι τοιάδε ποιεῦσι. ἐπεάν σφεας ἐσίῃ οἶστρος κυΐσκεσθαι, ἀγεληδὸν ἐκπλέουσι ἐς θάλασσαν· ἡγέονται δὲ οἱ ἔρσενες ἀπορραίνοντες τοῦ θοροῦ, αἱ δὲ ἑπόμεναι ἀνακάπτουσι καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ κυΐσκονται. ἐπεὰν δὲ πλήρεες γένωνται ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ἀναπλώουσι ὀπίσω ἐς ἤθεα τὰ ἑωυτῶν ἕκαστοι, ἡγέονται μέντοι γε οὐκέτι οἱ αὐτοί, ἀλλὰ τῶν θηλέων γίνεται ἡ ἡγεμονία· ἡγεύμεναι δὲ ἀγεληδὸν ποιεῦσι οἷόν περ ἐποίευν οἱ ἔρσενες· τῶν γὰρ ᾠῶν ἀπορραίνουσι κατ᾽ ὀλίγους τῶν κέγχρων, οἱ δὲ ἔρσενες καταπίνουσι ἑπόμενοι.
>
> The fish who live in shoals are never born in rivers but being raised in lakes, they act in the following way. When the desire to procreate comes upon them, they swim out to sea in schools; the males shed their semen as they lead and the females follow, swallow it, and conceive from it. When they have become pregnant in the sea, they all swim back to their own haunts. The same ones no longer lead, however, but the leadership belongs to the females; they lead the school, doing the same sort of thing that the males did: for they shed their eggs little by little like small grains, and the males follow and swallow it. (Herodotus, *Histories* II.93)

After describing Egyptian cuisine involving fish, Herodotus presents this puzzling story about the behavior of shoaling fish. Narrative excursions are not surprising for Herodotus and the scientific inaccuracy of this account has been noted in detail.[113] Read alongside Herodotus' treatment of gender in his ethnographic accounts, however, it highlights Herodotus' remarkably balanced attitude to gender relations. In this anecdote, he presents similarity in the behavior of

[113] Aristotle *Generation of Animals* III.756b; Glanville 1926; Coonen 1953.

male and female fish. Despite the biological difference, namely that male fish have semen and female fish have eggs, each group leads and follows during half of their journey and they both swallow the particles that the other group expels. This story is emblematic of Herodotus' treatment of men and women.

In this chapter, I argue that Herodotus does not present gender-based bias in his *Histories.* Just as he aims to record the great deeds done by both Greeks and foreigners, he also records actions taken by men and women with equal interest and attention. Women in the *Histories* are smart and capable, offer advice, and have self-determinacy and agency in their own lives. Nevertheless, I argue that Herodotus' representations of gender interact with other social identities in ways which are not always a positive endorsement of female power. He sometimes elides gender distinctions altogether and recognizes that people of any gender can act in positive and negative ways. Although they do challenge conventional Greek gender norms, Herodotus' representations of women are complex, sometimes reinforcing and at other times undermining conventional Greek gender norms. Finally, I argue that Herodotus, in the case of the Amazons, even acknowledges that societies without binary gender distinctions exist. While most scholars view Herodotus' account of the Amazons as reflecting the standard reversal of gender that was typical of representations of the Amazons in Greek mythology, I will suggest that Herodotus views them as a society without gender distinctions at all. In sum, Herodotus sets out to record great deeds done by all, regardless of ethnic identity, gender, legal, or social status, and shows a remarkable open-mindedness regarding gender.

Previous Scholarship

Since the 1960s and 70s, scholars have recognized the importance of women in Herodotus' *Histories*. In this chapter, I use close reading in order to complicate four particular trends in current scholarship: a) the focus on legal and political power, b) the attempt to systematize portrayals of women into neat categories, c) the exclusionary feminist focus on so-called "strong" women, and d) the binary approach to gender in Herodotus.

Alexandre Tourraix, in one of the earliest works on women in Herodotus, analyzes the connection between women and power.[114] He highlights how Herodotus depicts women throughout his *Histories* and argues that they fulfill "two complementary and fundamental functions, assuring simultaneously the transmission and the permanence of Power."[115] The capitalization of power by Tourraix highlights his focus on political power, such as when men become kings by marrying the daughter of a king, or when women bear an heir to the throne.[116] Not only does this understanding of women's roles reduce them to their reproductive capacities, but it also overlooks types of power other than political power, such as social power or the power to make decisions in one's own life. For instance, in my analyses of Kandaules' wife (I.8-12) and Atossa (III.134), I highlight the agency they gain over their own lives. Concerning Cyno (I.111-112) and Sesostris' wife (II.107), I pay particular attention to the position of power they hold within their own families. Women do not merely affect legal and political power in Herodotus' *Histories*, but they themselves are also powerful in a myriad of ways.

---

[114] Tourraix 1976; Wolff 1964 preceded Tourraix and focused in particular on the narrative unity Herodotus creates by bookmarking his work with the episodes of Kandaules' wife (I.8-12) and Masistes' wife (IX.108-113).

[115] Tourraix 1976, 369: *elle remplit donc deux fonctions complémentaires et fondamentales, assurant tout à la [fois] la transmission et la pérennité du Pouvoir.*

[116] e.g., Pisistratus marrying the daughter of Megacles (I.60) or the succession of Cyrus thanks to his royal mother Mandane (I.107-8).

Since Tourraix, many scholars have discussed the varying portrayals and roles of women in Herodotus. Although these scholars do examine female agency beyond reproductive roles, their tendency to create systematic categories along simple dichotomies (e.g., active/passive) reduces the complexity of Herodotus' portraits of women. While many now examine individual episodes, both Dewald and Rossellini and Saïd attempt to use a structured approach.[117] Rossellini and Saïd, for instance, analyze Herodotus' portrayal of foreign peoples and argue that Herodotus' "uses of women," i.e., their roles in society, connect to other foreign customs, such as those concerning diet and sacrifice, in a systematic manner. Dewald, in her study of women in Herodotus, offers a result that is similarly systematic. She not only enumerates the 375 mentions of women but classifies them according to their levels and kinds of agency. Dewald separates active women from passive women and distinguishes between public and private displays of agency. Although this offers a useful catalog for anyone interested in women in Herodotus, it ignores the fascinating complexity of Herodotus' female characters and simplifies his approach to societal gender roles. My frustration with this binarity is not unique; Clara Bosak-Schroeder shifts focus from women's "active" or "passive" roles by examining the effects women have upon the world rather than their intentions.[118] In this chapter, I use an intersectional approach that disrupts the tendency to categorize individuals into distinct boxes. Through a close analysis of several episodes, I complicate the understanding of women who act and do not act. For example, I argue that some women both do and do not act; e.g., Cheops' daughter is both non-agentive in that her father makes her do sex work and active in the way that she uses her clients to build her own memorial.

[117] Dewald 1981; Rosellini and Saïd 1978. For treatment of individual episodes, see McNeal 1988; Munson 1988; Cairns 1996; Hazewindus 2004; Larson 2006; Dominick 2007; Wesselmann 2007; Anhalt 2008.
[118] Bosak-Schroeder 2020, 68-69.

As discussed in my Introduction, my intersectional approach involves examining the multiple identities of an individual at the same time, including the complex ways in which they overlap. In addition to the disruption of structural categorization, this approach leads us to assess and be mindful of multiple power hierarchies that result from social identities. As the scholarship on women in Herodotus took off, especially in the 1980s during the rise of second wave feminism, several studies focused on powerful, active women in Herodotus. Of course, the recognition of such female capabilities is valuable, but the celebration of "strong" women has led to a disregard of their other social identities. Consequently, without examining women as full, complex characters, we are not able to recognize how women navigate power hierarchies based on ethnicity or social status. Just as men are capable of doing great or horrific deeds, so too are women. I highlight this capacity in particular in my analyses of Kandaules' wife, of Atossa, and of the Scythian women. I argue that both men and women use their high social statuses to their advantage. They do not simply outsmart men, but also instrumentalize men of low social status. Female power does not necessarily mean fair treatment of subordinate people.

Another type of schematization is present in nearly every study of gender in Herodotus, namely the gender binary. It is perhaps most explicit in Deborah Boedeker's study of Persian gender relations in Herodotus' *Histories*.[119] Boedeker examines how the Persian narratives in Herodotus are affected by individuals' interactions with the "opposite" sex. Although she recognizes that "Herodotus' narrative, then, tacitly presents [violent] actions as available to representatives of either sex and of any nation," Boedeker ultimately concludes that "men and women in Herodotus are figured as *essentially* different."[120] My study, however, demonstrates

[119] Boedeker 2011.
[120] Boedeker 2011, 229, 232 (emphasis hers).

that Herodotus regularly presents men and women as similar.[121] Furthermore, Herodotus recognizes that different groups not only have different gender *roles* but also different gender *systems*. By focusing explicitly on male/female interactions, Boedeker assumes a binary gender system for the Persians. It is important to note, however, that these assumptions are based on Greek textual sources. Although we lack textual primary sources that discuss gender from the Persians and Scythians at this time, there are indications from archaeological research that the Persians, as well as the Scythians, recognized more than two genders.[122] I thus argue that approaching gender in Herodotus' *Histories* ought to be done without preconceived notions of binary gender systems, as well as previous understandings of "Greek cultural customs" or "ancient gender roles."

Cultural Relativity of Gender Roles

The topics of Herodotus' ethnographic episodes, in which he comments on the customs of ethnic groups, are varied; Herodotus demonstrates particular interest in religious matters, clothing and coiffure, and marital and sexual behaviors. Regardless of the topic, Herodotus highlights gender as a factor in determining the appropriateness of an individual's behavior within the same ethnic group. For instance, at I.82, Herodotus describes the Argives' resolution to alter their outward appearance until they recovered Thyrea. The customs differed for people of different genders, namely "that before [the recapture of Thyrea] no one of the Argives should grow hair and that the women should not adorn themselves in gold" (μὴ πρότερον θρέψειν κόμην

[121] I refer here to gender roles. Although Herodotus makes mention of genitals, he does not compare them in order to comment on the supposed biological difference between men and women.
[122] Cifarelli 2018.

Ἀργείων μηδένα, μηδὲ τὰς γυναῖκάς σφι χρυσοφορήσειν, I.82).[123] Customs are applied differently to members of the same ethnic group based on their gender. Furthermore, it is also clear that that gender roles differ from ethnic group to ethnic group. Each time that Herodotus discusses gendered behavior, he marks a cultural difference. After all, the very fact that Herodotus comments on a gendered behavior marks it as of interest and thus as different from the (Greek) customs his audience would expect. Comments upon the clothing of Libyan women (IV.189) or marriage practices among the Persians (3.31) or the Bacchiadae (5.92b) thus demonstrate that Herodotus recognizes the cultural relativity of gender roles, just as he does with the customs of various ethnic groups.[124]

The cultural relativity of gender roles can have consequences for ethnic groups. In her work on ethnicity and gender, Katherine Lomas emphasizes that gender is "important not just in the ways in which ethnic identity is configured within a community, but also in the ways in which ethnic identity is perceived by outsiders."[125] A remarkable example of this influence can be found in Herodotus' description of Egyptian customs at II.35. After stating that the Egyptians do all things backwards from other people, he lists a series of customs, including gendered ones:

> τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ἔμπαλιν τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ἀνθρώποισι ἐστήσαντο ἤθεά τε καὶ νόμους· ἐν τοῖσι αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἀγοράζουσι καὶ καπηλεύουσι, οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες κατ᾽ οἴκους ἐόντες ὑφαίνουσι· ὑφαίνουσι δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἄνω τὴν κρόκην ὠθέοντες, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ κάτω. τὰ ἄχθεα οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλέων φορέουσι, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων. οὐρέουσι αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ὀρθαί, οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες κατήμενοι. εὐμαρείῃ χρέωνται ἐν τοῖσι οἴκοισι, ἐσθίουσι δὲ ἔξω ἐν τῇσι ὁδοῖσι ἐπιλέγοντες ὡς τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὰ ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ ἐστὶ ποιέειν χρεόν, τὰ δὲ μὴ αἰσχρὰ ἀναφανδόν. ἰρᾶται γυνὴ μὲν οὐδεμία οὔτε ἔρσενος

[123] I.82: "Now the Argives shaved their heads from this time, while they previously had the custom to let their hair grow, and they made a custom and curse, that no one of the Argives should grow hair and that the women should not adorn themselves in gold, until they recovered Thyrea." Ἀργεῖοι μέν νυν ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου κατακειράμενοι τὰς κεφαλάς, πρότερον ἐπάναγκες κομῶντες, ἐποιήσαντο νόμον τε καὶ κατάρην μὴ πρότερον θρέψειν κόμην Ἀργείων μηδένα, μηδὲ τὰς γυναῖκάς σφι χρυσοφορήσειν, πρὶν Θυρέας ἀνασώσωνται.
[124] See Chapter II.
[125] Lomas 2014, 484.

> θεοῦ οὔτε θηλέης, ἄνδρες δὲ πάντων τε καὶ πασέων. τρέφειν τοὺς τοκέας τοῖσι μὲν παισὶ οὐδεμία ἀνάγκη μὴ βουλομένοισι, τῇσι δὲ θυγατράσι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη καὶ μὴ βουλομένῃσι.
>
> They establish many laws and customs completely backwards from other humans: Among them the women go to market and practice trade, but the men remain at home and weave; and others weave pushing the weft upwards, but the Egyptians push it down. The men bear burdens on their heads, but the women upon their shoulders. The women on the one hand urinate standing up and the men sitting down. They relieve themselves in their houses, but eat outside in the streets, explaining that the shameful necessities ought to be done in hiding, but the non-shameful ones in plain sight. A woman can be a priestess for no god, either male or female, but men can be a priest for all male and female gods. It is in no way necessary for sons to care for their parents, if they are unwilling, but for the daughters it is completely necessary, even if they are unwilling. (II.35)

When Herodotus describes the practices concerning urinating and bearing burdens, his statements even construct direct opposition between people of different genders. Not only do Egyptian men perform customs that Greek men do not perform, but the things they do are what Greek women would do. The antonyms in the statement about carrying, as well as the comment on urination, indicate their oppositional nature. As the second clause supplies the alternative way in which people of the other gender perform the same action, Herodotus presents the customs for people of one gender as exclusive to people of that gender. Due to the double antithesis, the first between the Egyptians and other people and the second between men and women, the Egyptian men thus come across as Greek women. Consequentially, the stereotypes applied to Greek women could now also be applied to Egyptian men; Egyptian men may have been viewed by the Greeks as less capable than Greek men.

Customary Approaches to Antithetical Customs

Although Egyptologists have pointed out the historical inaccuracy of many customs that Herodotus described, we do not have to reject this passage as a source of information and insight into the cultural landscape of both Greeks and Egyptians at the time. Lloyd points out in his

commentary that Herodotus "provides a classic case of over-schematization," but he does not present complete lies.[126] For most of these Egyptian customs, Herodotus at least reports events he could have witnessed; Egyptian men were accustomed to weave and did indeed sit down to urinate.[127] The "rule" that Herodotus presents for these customs, however, can often not be confirmed, since there is evidence to the contrary. For instance, Egyptian men were not alone in sedentary urination. Greek men did the same. While the gender roles may not have been as strict as portrayed, Herodotus appears to explain customs about which he was told and/or which he observed.

Due to a conflation of Francois Hartog's work with Edith Hall's, this passage has often been interpreted as constructed to create an image of the Egyptians as backwards.[128] Hall wrote about the representation of foreigners in theatre as constructing a self-identity for the Greeks. Above, I recognized that the image of backwards Egyptians is indeed a result of the antithetical structures in II.35. Yet I question whether this was Herodotus' intent. I agree with James Redfield, who argues that Herodotus was not an anthropologist and did not approach other ethnic groups in order to understand their internal system: "he is not concerned with the functional, structural, or stylistic coherence of the cultures he describes."[129] Instead, as Hartog argued in *The Mirror of Herodotus,* Herodotus used antithetical structures as a way to communicate ethnic differences to his Greek audience. By presenting Egyptian customs in terms of Greek customs, Herodotus was able to communicate more clearly to his audience. This understanding of the

[126] As mentioned in Chapter II, there has been a long scholarly debate concerning the veracity and reliability of Herodotus' *Histories*: see Fehling 1989; cf. Pritchett 1993; Fowler 1996. A useful overview is Hornblower 2002. Most recent work on Herodotus' sources is an edited volume: Dunsch and Ruffing 2013.
[127] See Asheri et. al. ad. loc. for details with regards to this particular custom.
[128] Hartog 1988; Hall 1989.
[129] Redfield 1985, 97.

dynamics of Self and Other differs from Hall's insight that tragedians affirm the Greeks' own values by presenting Others on stage. Following Hartog, Herodotus' schematization thus is his attempt to make cultural differences that he observed understandable to his audience.

Returning to II.35, I will now discuss what the list of customs evinces about ancient gender. The antitheses discussed above depend on the presence of a binary gender system for both the Greeks and the Egyptians. Although a surface reading suggests that the Greeks and Egyptians were complete opposites, the construction of antitheses mandates the presence of a commonality. To build on Hartog's image of a mirror, the self that is looking in the mirror and the inverse reflection looking back share the presence of the mirror. The mirror represents the axis of symmetry between the Greeks and Egyptians. Both societies must divide their people into two groups, men and women, on the basis of their genitalia in order for the antithetical gender roles to become coherent. If their genders were not assigned on the same basis or there were more Egyptian genders, we would not be able to talk about men and women for both the Egyptians and the Greeks and compare them in an antithetical construction. The mirror of Herodotus, in the case of II.35, is not only how he constructs difference, but also how he recognizes shared systems that can be used to draw a contrast and explain Egyptian customs to a Greek audience.

Socio-Economic Inequality: Babylonian Customs (I.196-199)

My intersectional approach is congruent with Herodotus' own recognition of social identity dynamics and social justice. Herodotus is concerned with social equality between people of different ethnic groups, genders, legal, and social statuses. Near the end of Book I, Herodotus talks about Babylonian customs and his judgment of them reveals a concern with the treatment

of women and equal opportunity among them.[130] In I.196 Herodotus calls one of the Babylonian marriage customs superior, presenting it as both "the wisest" (ὁ μὲν σοφώτατος) and "the best custom they had" (ὁ μέν νυν κάλλιστος νόμος οὗτός σφι ἦν).[131] After recounting the custom itself, he also describes the custom that has taken its place and a third custom that he considers the worst Babylonian custom. Herodotus' judgment of these customs is not cast in comparative terms relative to any customs of other ethnic groups; I argue that Herodotus focuses on the way that these customs affect the lives of women of different appearances and socio-economic statuses.

As for the Babylonian marriage custom that Herodotus judges to be the best, Herodotus relates that girls, when they reached marriageable age, were brought together into one place. Although Herodotus does not specify who gathers the women, the lack of choice on the part of the women is clear. Once gathered, the women were subject to the male gaze of a crowd of men standing around them (πέριξ δὲ αὐτὰς ἵστατο ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν, I.196). The women are further objectified when the crier makes literal value judgement when he sells the women to the men by arranging them from most beautiful to the least desirable. He sells the most beautiful woman to the man with the most money and in descending order sells off the others. Finally, the crier would offer the "misshapen and incapacitated" women to "whoever would be willing to take the least amount of money to marry her" (ὅστις θέλοι ἐλάχιστον χρυσίον λαβὼν συνοικέειν αὐτῇ, I.196). Herodotus thus portrays a custom that assigns value to the appearances and bodily capabilities of women as the best Babylonian marriage custom.

[130] It is very unlikely that the Babylonian customs existed as Herodotus reports them: Asheri et al. 210-11; McNeal 1988. My focus here is on Herodotus' portrayal of the benefits and drawbacks of the customs.
[131] For Herodotus' use of the superlative see Bloomer 1993.

Although this practice seems discriminatory, the crux of the matter is the source of the money for the dowries given with the less desirable women: "the money came from the beautiful maidens and thus those who were fair of form provided for the marriage of the misshapen and incapacitated ones" (τὸ δὲ ἂν χρυσίον ἐγίνετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων καὶ οὕτω αἱ εὔμορφοι τὰς ἀμόρφους καὶ ἐμπήρους ἐξεδίδοσαν, I.196). Even though the Babylonian men judge the women, Herodotus' focus in telling this story is not on the objectification of women, but on the way the custom creates social equality among women who differ by nature. First, Herodotus explains that the custom stipulates that fathers cannot give their daughters away in marriage to anyone they wish. This ensures the critical participation of all girls in the auction. Second, the future husbands who receive money for their promise of marriage need to have a guarantor to ensure that the promise is fulfilled.[132] Finally, Herodotus notes that "if they could not agree, a law was laid down that they should return the money" (εἰ δὲ μὴ συμφεροίατο, ἀποφέρειν τὸ χρυσίον ἔκειτο νόμος, I.196). The use of a plural verb suggests that the woman plays an active part in the ultimate decision to marry.[133] Despite the absence of an explicit subject for this verb, in context, the money referred to is the money given to the husband for marrying the woman. If that did not ultimately happen, the money had to be returned, thus preventing the possibility of men agreeing to marry girls only to keep the money. Herodotus thus recognizes and praises a custom that ultimately results in socio-economic equity amongst women and allows for a small amount of agency for the women over their marriage.

Further evidence for Herodotus' focus on equality can be found at the end of I.196 as he

[132] For more on surety in Herodotus and Babylon, see McNeal 1988.
[133] Not mentioned in any commentaries except for Sheets 1993, 72. It is also remarkable that Wenghofer when arguing that neither father nor daughter had any influence on the marriage, leaves this sentence out of his block quote, Wenghofer 2014, 517.

notes that this best custom was replaced by another. Although Herodotus does not tell us *how* the custom changed, Herodotus describes the socio-economic conditions after the conquest of Babylon: "for since having been conquered they were in distress and ruined, each person of the land lacks a livelihood and makes his female children practice sex work" (ἐπείτε γὰρ ἁλόντες ἐκακώθησαν καὶ οἰκοφθορήθησαν, πᾶς τις τοῦ δήμου βίου σπανίζων καταπορνεύει τὰ θήλεα τέκνα, I.196). Due to economic changes, the women now must earn money for their families, and possibly even for their own dowries, through sex work.[134] I argue that the original "best" Babylonian custom, to auction off women, would not work in these new socio-economic circumstances. If everyone is poor, women might not be able to receive large enough dowries for men to consent to marry them. I thus argue that Herodotus held the first auction custom of the Babylonians to be the best but understood how customs depended on socio-economic conditions. Although Herodotus prefers the previous custom, he recognizes in this explanation that the change of custom was necessary to maintain the best possible situation for the women.[135]

A few chapters later in I.199, Herodotus describes "the foulest custom of the Babylonians" (ὁ δὲ δὴ αἴσχιστος τῶν νόμων ἐστὶ τοῖσι Βαβυλωνίοισι ὅδε). From Herodotus' treatment of this custom, we can see that he is concerned with the treatment of women and equal opportunity among them. Herodotus says that among the Babylonians "each woman of the land needs to sit in the temple of Aphrodite and have sex with a strange man once in her life" (δεῖ

[134] After Herodotus' treatment of a Lydian custom of sex work for dowry collection in I.93 we learn in I.94 that "the Lydians and the Greeks use nearly all the same customs except for that they make their children practice sex work" (Λυδοὶ δὲ νόμοισι μὲν παραπλησίοισι χρέωνται καὶ Ἕλληνες, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι τὰ θήλεα τέκνα καταπορνεύουσι). This practice was thus foreign for Herodotus' Greek audience.
[135]This episode includes a line that explains the purpose of the custom change, saying "so that they would not harm the women nor be taken to another city" (ἵνα μὴ ἀδικοῖεν αὐτὰς μηδ᾽ εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν ἄγωνται, I.196). Stein, however, marked this line as out place, according to OCT by Hude, and even deleted it, according to OCT by Wilson. If this line was indeed spurious and inserted by an ancient commentator, this individual also recognized that Herodotus commented on the change with an interest in the well-being of women.

πᾶσαν γυναῖκα ἐπιχωρίην ἱζομένην ἐς ἱρὸν Ἀφροδίτης ἅπαξ ἐν τῇ ζόῃ μιχθῆναι ἀνδρὶ ξείνῳ, I.199). Although the text specifies that every woman (πᾶσαν γυναῖκα) is obligated to perform the ritual sex work, Herodotus remarks that "many women who do not think they should mingle with the rest of them, such as those who were overly proud of their wealth" (πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἀξιούμεναι ἀναμίσγεσθαι τῇσι ἄλλῃσι, οἷα πλούτῳ ὑπερφρονέουσαι) separate themselves from the others by going to the temple in covered carriages (ἐν καμάρῃσι) and were accompanied by many attendants (θεραπηίη … πολλή). The economic disparity between the different groups of women thus affects their experience of the ritual and reflects their economic inequality.

Like the best custom of the Babylonians, this worst custom involves monetary exchanges for women. While in the best custom the crier was able to sell the most beautiful girls to the highest bidder and offer the less desirable ones to the man who would accept her for the least amount, the woman had to accept any amount of money offered to her in this case. Herodotus explains the religious significance of this practice, saying "the amount of money is such as it is, for she would not reject it, since that is not right: for this money is sacred. So, she follows the man who throws down [his money] first and rejects no one as unworthy."[136] The best Babylonian custom allows women some agency in approving the match, but in this worst Babylonian custom the women lack the ability to refuse. The price for the women is also not regulated to be in proportion to their appearance or qualities. As no amount of money can be refused, men could possibly have sex with a beautiful woman for very little money. Meanwhile, the less beautiful women would be left to wait. The conclusion of the account especially emphasizes the unattractive women's duration of stay in the temple: "Those who are both possessing a certain

[136] I.199: ὸ δὲ ἀργύριον μέγαθος ἐστὶ ὅσον ἂν, οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἀπώσηται, οὐ γάρ οἱ θέμις ἐστί· γίνεται γὰρ ἱρὸν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον. τῷ δὲ πρώτῳ ἐμβαλόντι ἔπεται οὐδὲ ἀποδοκιμᾷ οὐδένα.

amount of beauty and stature are released quickly, but those of them that are ugly remain for a lot of time, since they do not have the ability to fulfill the custom: as some of them remain for three and even four years."[137] Herodotus' judgment of this Babylonian custom thus demonstrates a dislike of socio-economic inequality and general poor treatment of women.

In the next sections I will treat several episodes from Herodotus' *Histories* that depict women as fully agentive individuals. As in his judgment of the Babylonian customs, Herodotus portrays women as not inherently less than men. In fact, most stories depict women of various ethnic groups and with a variety of legal and social statuses as they navigate a world that privileges men. They use their ingenuity, the established social norms, and their social superiors and inferiors to achieve their own goals. Finally, I turn to the Amazons who similarly take an active role in shaping their future, but also—I suggest—operate outside the Greeks' binary gender system altogether.

Kandaules' Wife (I.8-12)

At first, the story of Kandaules' wife at the beginning of Herodotus' *Histories* appears to be a typical account of a misogynist king and a "clever, vengeful queen."[138] Against all societal norms, King Kandaules shows off his unsuspecting wife, as she undresses, to Gyges, his favorite bodyguard. His wife, however, notices and uses Gyges to avenge her honor. Yet close reading of the text reveals a more complicated image. Although Kandaules treats his wife as an object, he also recognizes her ability to act. Furthermore, his wife does not act solely in revenge, but

[137] I.199: ὅσσαι μέν νυν εἴδεός τε ἐπαμμέναι εἰσὶ καὶ μεγάθεος, ταχὺ ἀπαλλάσσονται, ὅσαι δὲ ἄμορφοι αὐτέων εἰσί, χρόνον πολλὸν προσμένουσι οὐ δυνάμεναι τὸν νόμον ἐκπλῆσαι· καὶ γὰρ τριέτεα καὶ τετραέτεα μετεξέτεραι χρόνον μένουσι.
[138] Flory 1987, 23-46.

specifically seeks a solution to the problematic position in which she was placed. The example of Kandaules' wife demonstrates that, according to Herodotus, women had the capacity for self-determination and agency over their own lives. When examined with an eye to social status as well as gender, however, we see how this female power comes at the expense of those with a lower social status.

Objectification

In the first part of Herodotus' story, Kandaules' wife is objectified by her husband and Gyges in several ways. First, Kandaules' erotic desire for his own wife leads to a foregrounding of her physical beauty while no consideration is given to any other aspects of the woman. In I.8, the focus on her body is first noted when Kandaules "again and again heaps lots of praise on the appearance of his wife" (ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων). When Kandaules thinks that Gyges does not believe his claim about his wife's appearance (εἶδος), he devises a plan to show her naked to Gyges and thus make him believe. Herodotus' parenthetical statement "for it happens that for humans their ears are less trustworthy than their eyes" (ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν, I.8), in combination with a repeated use of εἶδος, leaves no doubt that Kandaules' lust is focused on the physical appearance of his wife. Kandaules is, however, not just a husband enamored with his wife, but his desire is transgressive. Kandaules urged Gyges to sneak a peek at her naked body in order to see how she was "the most beautiful of all women" (πασέων καλλίστην). Yet if it were simply about her beauty, this beauty would be evident to any onlooker. Kandaules' insistence on perceiving the wife without clothes marks her as a sexual object and thus makes Kandaules' plan transgressive.

A second, more literal, type of objectification can be found in Gyges' response to Kandaules' plan. Gyges recognizes the shame for a woman to be seen naked by someone who is not her husband and considers it significant enough for him to refuse his master's orders. Although he shudders at the thought of seeing the wife naked, because "at the same time by stripping off her tunic she also strips off her honor" (ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή), he still refers to women as "objects of property" when he explains a rule of conduct for men as "one should examine what things are one's own" (σκοπέειν τινὰ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ). The objectification is in this case achieved in the change from talking about a woman using feminine singular nouns to including her among a man's possessions. Contrary to Kandaules' objectification of his wife, which Herodotus marked as unconventional and transgressive by commenting upon it, Gyges' objectification of women as objects of property is condoned. Furthermore, even if Gyges had not expressed his detestation of the plan, Kandaules' attempts to conceal his wife's exposure from herself indicates his awareness of the transgressive nature of his plan. Women may belong to their husbands according to ancient Greek norms, but exhibition of them, whether verbally or physically, was clearly unacceptable and worthy of remark.

Agency and Ability

Gyges recognizes the shame for a woman to be seen naked by someone who is not her husband and considers it significant enough for him to refuse his master's orders. As Kandaules tries to convince Gyges, he also recognizes his wife's agentive potential

> θάρσεε, Γύγη, καὶ μὴ φοβεῦ μήτε ἐμέ, ὡς σέο πειρώμενος, λέγω λόγον τόνδε, μήτε γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμήν, μή τί τοι ἐξ αὐτῆς γένηται βλάβος. ἀρχήν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι οὕτω ὥστε μηδὲ μαθεῖν μιν ὀφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ σεῦ.

> Be brave, Gyges: don't be afraid, neither of me, that I give this command to put you to the test, nor of my wife, that any harm will come from her upon you. For to begin with, I will contrive in such a way that she would not notice that she had been seen by you.

Marked by the Greek μήτε… μήτε… "neither… nor…," Kandaules recognizes two people of whom Gyges could be afraid: himself and his wife. The neither-nor construction does not place emphasis on one of the options; it is just as likely that Gyges is afraid of Kandaules as of his wife.[139] Specifically, Kandaules suggests that Gyges might be fearing βλάβη "harm" from his wife, whereas he imagines that Gyges would fear that Kandaules was tempting him as a test. Kandaules does not simply dismiss Gyges' fear of his wife but legitimizes it by explaining what his plan is to make sure that Gyges comes to no harm. This recognition of Gyges's potential fear of his wife, at the same time, recognizes his wife's agency. Gyges apparently had reason to be afraid of Kandaules' wife; she was capable of hurting him.

Despite his recognition of her ability to harm Gyges, Kandaules underestimates his wife's mental capabilities. Although he assures Gyges that his plan will prevent his wife from noticing the intruder, as the story unfolds in I.10, his wife does perceive what is happening. Indeed, she both "beheld him exiting" (ἐπορᾷ μιν ἐξιόντα) and "comprehended what her husband had done" (μαθοῦσα δὲ τὸ ποιηθὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς). Thus, it continues this story's theme of "seeing is believing/knowing."[140] The verb used to describe the physical beholding of Gyges exiting is ἐφοράω "oversee, observe," whose prefix emphasizes the higher position, whether physical or metaphorical, of the subject.[141] The narrative thus asserts her control through sight. The second phrase emphasizes and specifies this ability, i.e.: "comprehended what her husband had done" (μαθοῦσα δὲ τὸ ποιηθὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς). Through the physical perception of Gyges, Kandaules'

[139] cf. Denniston and Dover 1950. s.v. τε I.4. Denniston marks τε as connective and corresponsive, equivalent, or similar in character.
[140] Anhalt 2008.
[141] LSJ s.vv. ἐφοράω; ἐπί G. I.2.e-f, and G. III.1-2.

wife immediately mentally perceives, as the verb μανθάνω indicates, that her husband had brought this about, demonstrating her cognitive abilities.[142]

Kandaules' wife not only has perceptual abilities beyond her husband's expectations, but also displays remarkable self-control in her response. Although she was not able to prevent the male gaze, she did prevent the transgressors from knowing that she had discovered the transgression. Kandaules' wife demonstrated self-control as, "although being ashamed, she neither cried out nor showed that she knew, having it in her mind to punish Kandaules" (οὔτε ἀνέβωσε αἰσχυνθεῖσα οὔτε ἔδοξε μαθεῖν, ἐν νοῷ ἔχουσα τίσεσθαι τὸν Κανδαύλεα). Herodotus' inclusion of this phrase suggests that Kandaules' wife is reacting in an unexpected manner. Normative impulses upon discovery of such a social transgression would have signaled her knowledge either directly, such as by shouting or confronting Kandaules, or indirectly, in facial expressions or reluctance to interact with her husband. After all, as Herodotus explains, for the Lydians "it brings a man also great shame to be seen naked" (καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνὸν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει). Yet she "indicated nothing and kept silent" (οὐδὲν δηλώσασα ἡσυχίην εἶχε I.9). In exerting control over her body, Kandaules' wife regains the ownership and agency over her body that Kandaules had taken when he showed her to Gyges. She is no longer a mere victim of Kandaules' plan, but the agent in her own plan to exact retribution from Kandaules.

Kandaules' wife's decision also demonstrates her ability to leverage societal norms to gain agency over her own life-choices. She was put in a socially unacceptable situation. She had now been seen naked by two men, only one of whom was her husband. As Gyges remarked above as an ancient rule, a man was supposed to view only his own wife (πάλαι δὲ τὰ καλὰ ἀνθρώποισι ἐξεύρηται, ἐκ τῶν μανθάνειν δεῖ· ἐν τοῖσι ἓν τόδε ἐστί, σκοπέειν τινὰ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ,

[142] LSJ s.v. μανθάνω III-IV.

I.8). To resolve the issue, Kandaules' wife called Gyges to her the next day and said the following to him:

> νῦν τοι δυῶν ὁδῶν παρεουσέων, Γύγη, δίδωμι αἵρεσιν, ὁκοτέρην βούλεαι τραπέσθαι. ἢ γὰρ Κανδαύλεα ἀποκτείνας ἐμέ τε καὶ τὴν βασιληίην ἔχε τὴν Λυδῶν, ἢ αὐτόν σε αὐτίκα οὕτω ἀποθνήσκειν δεῖ, ὡς ἂν μὴ πάντα πειθόμενος Κανδαύλῃ τοῦ λοιποῦ ἴδῃς τὰ μή σε δεῖ. ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι κεῖνόν γε τὸν ταῦτα βουλεύσαντα δεῖ ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἢ σὲ τὸν ἐμὲ γυμνὴν θεησάμενον καὶ ποιήσαντα οὐ νομιζόμενα.
>
> Now, I give you, Gyges, the choice of the two roads that are present, which of the two you want to take. For either you kill Kandaules and have both me and the kingship of the Lydians, or you must yourself immediately be killed, so that you will not obey Kandaules in the future and see all those things that it is not permissible for you to see. But either that one who planned these things should be killed, or you who saw me naked and did not act according to the norms. (Hdt. I.11)

In this address, Kandaules' wife is clear and direct as she reveals her knowledge of Gyges' actions. Both the description that Gyges saw her naked and the remark that Kandaules is "the contriver" (βουλεύσαντα) confirms once more that Kandaules' wife was fully aware of the situation. Her understanding of the broader societal meaning and consequences is apparent in her solution; whether Kandaules or Gyges survives to be her husband, with the other man dead only her husband will have seen her naked. Kandaules' wife demonstrates intelligence both with regards to her perception of what happened and the societal consequences of it.

Kandaules' wife's awareness of the societal norms was instrumental in resolving the problematic situation. Although Dewald argues that women in Herodotus have "full partnership with men in establishing and maintaining social order," [143] I argue that she neither established nor freely chose to uphold these standards. Rather, Kandaules' wife works within the societal norms that she finds to achieve her agency. She not only recognized her predicament but decided to give Gyges a choice. If, however, she had simply wanted to resolve the fact that she had been

[143] Dewald 1981, 94.

seen naked by two men, she could have ordered Kandaules to kill Gyges. As it is, however, she appears to have chosen to be Kandaules' wife no longer. Her understanding of societal norms thus provided her with the opportunity to gain agency over her own life. At no point does she say that she agrees with these norms or express approval of them. She simply finds herself impacted by them and works within the system to her own advantage.

Hierarchies of Status and Gender: Kandaules' wife (I.8-12), Atossa (III.134) and Scythian Women (IV.1)

Kandaules' wife is a smart woman with some agency in her own life, but her agency is only achieved, or at the very least facilitated, by her position of power over Gyges. Both Atossa, as she convinces her husband king Darius to march on Greece (III.134), and the Scythian women at the beginning of Book IV, whose children I discussed in Chapter II on pages 55-61, also take control of their own lives at the expense of lower-status individuals. I discuss these three passages for two reasons. First, it is an important aspect of intersectional approaches to recognize an individual's positionality with respect to multiple different identities. For my work this includes highlighting that female agency and power does not necessarily create a more equitable environment for everyone. Second, concerning Herodotus' portrayal of women, these stories demonstrate that Herodotus depicts women as whole, complex characters who are capable of the same actions, both good and bad, as men.

Recognizing Kandaules' wife as an agentive woman is not unproblematic. Although she clearly outwits Kandaules and, in contrast to him, plans successfully, we cannot directly compare her relationship to Kandaules with her interactions with Gyges. The power imbalance between Kandaules and his wife was on the basis of gender; they were both of high social status, as is

seen when Gyges addresses Kandaules as ruler, δέσποτα, in parallel with his reference to Kandaules' wife as a female ruler, δέσποιναν (I.8).[144] The power imbalance between Kandaules' wife and Gyges, on the other hand, is on the basis of legal and social status. As a servant, Gyges is of lower legal and social status and thus is under added pressure to act as Kandaules' wife asks. Herodotus indicates, with reference to Gyges, "for even before then he was used to coming, when the queen called him" (ἐώθεε γὰρ καὶ πρόσθε, ὅκως ἡ βασίλεια καλέοι, φοιτᾶν, I.11).[145] For a more complete picture of Kandaules' wife, we thus have to examine her legal and social status alongside her gender identity.

Kandaules' wife uses her power to dominate and compel a person of lower legal and social status to commit an atrocious deed. When Gyges discusses the choice that he has to make between his own death and killing the king, he too recognizes that it is not truly a choice and describes it as binding him with necessity (μιν ἀναγκαίῃ ἐνδέειν, I.11). He expresses that he feels forced to kill his master by using a form of the Greek for "necessity" thrice: twice as a noun, ἀνάγκη, and once as the verb ἀναγκάζω (I.11). With respect to Gyges, Kandaules' wife thus does not demonstrate a *remarkable* amount of power; her position of authority over Gyges does not occur contrary to societal expectations. As her agency over her marriage is facilitated by her social status in relation to Gyges, we cannot simply take Kandaules' wife as a great example of female power. The situation is more complex. Just as Kandaules was able to devise the shameful exhibition of his wife to their servant, so she was able to commit a violent deed through Gyges. Although some have argued that Kandaules' wife is the least important character in this story,

[144] Hazewindus 2004, 53 also comments upon Gyges' awareness that he is subordinate to both Kandaules and his wife.

[145] Note here the verb φοιτᾶν, which can have sexual connotations, as in my example of Scythian women on page 86. This could suggest a sexual relationship is at play. Is Kandaules' wife cuckolding Kandaules with their servant Gyges?

due to her lack of a name, this closer examination of social status demonstrates that Gyges is the lowest on the hierarchy throughout this account.[146]

In the first section of book IV, when Herodotus describes the role of the Scythians during their war with the Medes, we encounter another group of women who instrumentalize men of lower social status. Herodotus highlights the effects of the war on the Scythian women at home and the choices that they made. The Scythian men were absent from Scythia as they ruled "upper Asia" for about 28 years. During this time, although we do not know exactly how long they waited in abstinence prior, "the Scythian women had sex with their enslaved men, because their husbands had been away from them for a long time" (αἱ γὰρ τῶν Σκυθέων γυναῖκες, ὥς σφι οἱ ἄνδρες ἀπῆσαν χρόνον πολλόν, ἐφοίτεον παρὰ τοὺς δούλους, IV.1). Although we cannot know the exact reason for this intercourse, the result of a new generation of offspring suggests that the women acted to ensure the survival of the Scythian ethnic group. This presumed motive is further supported by indicators in IV.3 that the offspring, despite being born from enslaved men and Scythian women, were raised as free Scythian youths.[147] The Scythian women are thus portrayed as agentive women who made a unilateral decision that advanced their community; they thus appear to act as a mini-*polis.* Although this political action is remarkable, it also ought to be remarked upon that they benefited from their higher social status and instrumentalized the enslaved men for their own purposes.

In her 1981 analysis of this account, Dewald too argues that the Scythian women acted in an attempt "to [guarantee] the survival of their culture by continuing to produce children." Furthermore, she states that "the motives of the women are not immoral," arguing that the

[146] e.g., Hazewindus 2004, 53; Scholars have countered similar arguments and demonstrated that the namelessness of women was not necessarily an indicator of their worth or status: see Larson 2006 and Schaps 1977 with regard to Athenian oratory.
[147] See Chapter II, pg. 55-61.

enslaved men "after all, are domesticated and blind."[148] According to Herodotus, all people who are enslaved by the Scythians were blinded.[149] It is remarkable to me that Dewald rejects the idea of immorality in connection with the enslaved men's legal and social statuses and vision impairment.[150] Certainly, relationships between enslavers and enslaved people are recorded in history.[151] If the Scythian women, however, had sexual intercourse with the enslaved men *en masse*, as Herodotus' narrative suggests, I doubt that each of these couples established a consensual relationship. Why does Dewald assess this act as not immoral? First, there is no certainty whether this is Dewald's own opinion or whether she understood the ancients to have considered this not immoral. Second, the Scythian women were understood to be motivated by the common good of preserving their society. Perhaps this motivation, or simply the fact that it is thus not motivated by sexual desire, could make it seem moral. Finally, Dewald's comment may simply reflect the logic of a previous era of scholarship. Dewald's judgment, like as my own, reflects contemporary standards and it is questionable whether we should judge the ancients in this manner. If we must judge, however, we cannot say for certain that the power differential between the Scythian women and the enslaved men was moral.

Another tale that offers insight into the intersectional identity of women with agency is the story about Atossa in III.133-134. She, like Kandaules' wife and the Scythian women, demonstrably exercises remarkable power and agency, but little has been said with regards to how she achieved it. We first meet her in III.32 as the daughter of Cyrus the Great, and both

[148] Dewald 1981, 99.
[149] IV.2: τοὺς δὲ δούλους οἱ Σκύθαι πάντας τυφλοῦσι τοῦ γάλακτος εἵνεκεν τοῦ πίνουσι ποιεῦντες ὧδε.
[150] One interpretation of IV.2 in light of IV.1,3-4 suggests that the story about their blindness and their tasks with regards milk production explains metaphorically how the enslaved men did not know that they had sexual intercourse with the "crème de la crème" of the society.
[151] For a recent book on sexuality and enslavement in the Americas, for instance, see Berry and Harris 2018.

sister and wife to Cambyses. Herodotus goes on to narrate the usurpation of the throne and queen by a fake Smerdis after the death of Cambyses and the final new marriage of Atossa to king Darius. Herodotus portrays Atossa as a powerful woman throughout his *Histories.* For instance, in VII.3, Herodotus notes that Atossa's son Xerxes would have become king, regardless of the advisor to the king's opinion, since "Atossa held all the power" (ἡ γὰρ Ἄτοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος). Finally, in the passage in question at III.133, Atossa is confronted with a medical problem and finds a way to receive treatment. In this section, I argue that Herodotus not only ascribes power to Atossa verbally, but also depicts her as a woman with agency and socio-political influence. Yet from close reading it becomes clear that Atossa benefits from her high legal and social statuses and actively disregards the interests of fellow women in favor of achieving her own goals.

One day during her marriage to king Darius, Atossa discovered a lump in her breast. Atossa, however, "hid it, was ashamed, and said nothing" (ἣ δὲ κρύπτουσα καὶ αἰσχυνομένη ἔφραζε οὐδενί, III.1133). As we have seen with Kandaules' wife, it was shameful for women to show their body to strangers; a woman's breasts are commonly seen as private and are often sexualized.[152] Although she was initially limited by these societal standards, when the growth burst and the infection spread Atossa took action:

> ἐπείτε δὲ ἐν κακῷ ἦν, μετεπέμψατο τὸν Δημοκήδεα καί οἱ ἐπέδεξε. ὁ δὲ φὰς ὑγιέα ποιήσειν ἐξορκοῖ μιν ἢ μέν οἱ ἀντυπουργήσειν ἐκείνην τοῦτο τὸ ἂν αὐτῆς δεηθῇ· δεήσεσθαι δὲ οὐδενὸς τῶν ὅσα ἐς αἰσχύνην ἐστὶ φέροντα.
>
> When she was in a bad state, she sent for Democedes and showed it to him. Saying that he would make her healthy, he made her swear an oath that she would give him in return whatever he might ask of her, saying that he would ask for nothing that would lead to shame. (III.133)

[152] For a discussion of the body and sex appeal, see Robson 2013.

In this passage, Atossa sent for Democedes, the Greek doctor who was attached to Darius' court. In return for healing, Democedes asks that Atossa give him whatever he wants, as long as it is not shameful. Dominick argues that Atossa's shame forced her to agree to "Democedes' bargain" and that Atossa "only serves as a means to [Democedes's] end" (435). Although Democedes certainly benefitted from his deal with Atossa, I argue that Atossa acted from her own volition and motivated by a pursuit of health. First, Herodotus does not depict Atossa as desperate or led by shame. She specifically sent for Democedes (μετεπέμψατο) and showed him her breast. This indicates Atossa's confidence in Democedes' ability to heal her, as well as her trust in him to not cause her any future shame. Second, Atossa (re)gains control over her own body through this decision. While the disease was present against her will, Democedes was there on her invitation with the intent to remove the disease. Moreover, she defies the societal standards of bodily propriety as she invites a man who is not her husband to see (and presumably touch) her body.[153] Atossa defies societal norms and makes her own choice about her own body.

Atossa not only had agency in her own life, but also held sway in the Persian court. She upholds her own end of the bargain and "instructed by Democedes, delivered this speech to Darius in their bedchamber" (διδαχθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Δημοκήδεος ἡ Ἄτοσσα προσέφερε ἐν τῇ κοίτῃ Δαρείῳ λόγον τοιόνδε) (III.134). Although Atossa received instructions from Democedes, this was simply necessary for the transfer of information. Atossa takes the initiative to achieve her own goals. In her speech, Atossa persuades Darius to invade Greece and bring Democedes along. After all, Democedes was held at the Persian court against his will and wanted to escape. Atossa

[153] As her *kyrios* a husband would usually be in charge of doctor's appointments for his wife. The Hippocratic Oath states that doctors are not to commit any acts of mischief or corruption, such as sexual intercourse, with women, nor any member of a *kyrios'* household. Hp. *Jusj*. 18-21: Ἐς οἰκίας δὲ ὁκόσας ἂν ἐσίω, ἐσελεύσομαι ἐπ' ὠφελείῃ καμνόντων, ἐκτὸς ἐὼν πάσης ἀδικίης ἑκουσίης καὶ φθορίης, τῆς τε ἄλλης καὶ ἀφροδισίων ἔργων ἐπί τε γυναικείων σωμάτων καὶ ἀνδρῴων, ἐλευθέρων τε καὶ δούλων. See also Miles 2005, 85-87, 139-140.

was successful in persuading her husband, as Darius' response, "Since you think that we should make an attempt upon Greece first," (ἐπεὶ τοίνυν τοι δοκέει τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡμέας πρῶτα ἀποπειρᾶσθαι), affirms.

Scholars have commented upon the gendered aspect of Atossa's speech.[154] Dominick argues that her first attempt at persuasion, in which she tells Darius to act "so that the Persians should know that they are ruled by a man" (ἵνα καὶ Πέρσαι ἐκμάθωσι ὅτι ὑπ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἄρχονται, III.134), reminds the reader of the higher social status of men.[155] I agree that her statement affirms traditional gender norms, but I argue that Atossa purposefully plays into Darius' gendered interest in being viewed as manly through waging war. Furthermore, as Dominick points out, Atossa makes a very domestic-oriented and gendered request for enslaved women from Greece, which convinces Darius to march on Greece instead of Scythia.[156] Like Kandaules' wife, she works within the system and uses her understanding of its societal norms to achieve her own ends.

The focus on the gendered nature of Atossa's requests, however, have led scholars to overlook other aspects of her identity. Of course, the representation of a powerful woman who achieves her goals in her own ways is important. Yet an intersectional approach brings nuance to this tale and problematizes the character of Atossa. In Hdt III.134, Atossa convinces Darius when she tells him: "I tell you, march against Greece. For I have learned of Laconian, Argive, Attic, and Corinthian enslaved women and desire to have them for myself." (σὺ δέ μοι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατεύεσθαι. ἐπιθυμέω γὰρ λόγῳ πυνθανομένη Λακαίνας τέ μοι γενέσθαι θεραπαίνας καὶ Ἀργείας καὶ Ἀττικὰς καὶ Κορινθίας.) This passage depicts Atossa as holding a particular kind

[154] Boedeker 2011; Dominick 2007.
[155] Dominick 2007, 434.
[156] Dominick 2007, 434.

of power. First, she addresses her husband with στρατεύεσθαι, an infinitival imperative. This construction, according to Rutger J. Allen, is not, like the imperative mood, a personal appeal from the speaker to the addressee, but rather "refers to the appropriate action which has to be carried out as an element of a procedure."[157] The use of this verbal construction thus demonstrates that Atossa is not just directing her husband but inserting herself on matters of state. Second, Atossa's power is gendered, since it is based on her desire as a woman for handmaidens. Although she achieved agency over her own life, she was willing to do so by enslaving Greek women and depriving them of their agency. Altogether, Atossa's power is thus distinctly the power of an elite woman, of a queen. Like Kandaules' wife, Atossa has agency in her life through outsmarting her husband and instrumentalizing subordinate people. At the same time, Herodotus portrays Atossa as reversing the Greek norms of enslavement; instead of non-Greeks, now Greeks are enslaved. For Herodotus' audience, who were mainly Greek, this would have been a concern. Herodotus thus does not shy away from portraying women as powerful, even when they might be threatening to his audience.

Wise Advisers: Cyno (I.111-112), Sesostris' wife (II.107), and Gorgo (V.51; VII.239)

In several small stories, Herodotus reports agentive capabilities of women. From queens and the daughter of the pharaoh to the wife of a cowherd, women are presented as intelligent and capable agents in their own lives. One common figure in the *Histories* is the wise adviser. According to Richmond Lattimore, this important character appears in many guises but has two main kinds: the tragic warner and the practical adviser.[158] Lattimore includes a few women in his list, such as

[157] Allan 2010, 206.
[158] Lattimore 1939, 24-25.

Polycrates' daughter (III.124), Gorgo (V.51; VII.239), and Queen Artemisia (VIII.68;VIII.102), but overlooks several other female characters who offer advice to men.[159] In this section, I discuss Cyno (I.111-112) and Sesostris' wife (II.107) alongside Gorgo (V.51; VII.239) as wise advisers. I thus demonstrate that Herodotus recognizes female agency and power in women of various legal and social statuses.

Cyno (I.111-112)

As I discussed in Chapter II, Cyno played an important role in the upbringing of king Cyrus. As his grandfather, king Astyages, had a dream that was interpreted to mean that his daughter's child would overthrow him, Astyages set out to kill his grandson, Cyrus. Initially he orders his guard Harpagus to expose the child, but when he cannot bring himself to carry out the command, Harpagus in turn delegates the task to an enslaved cowherd, Mitradates. Upon his arrival home with the child, his wife Cyno is startled and asks him why he has been summoned by Harpagus.[160] Both Cyno's direct questioning and Mitradates' willingness to answer indicates that Cyno is an equal partner, capable of understanding and solving their quandary. Having heard her husband's story, Cyno asks him not to expose the child. Mitradates explains, however, that he feels forced by Harpagus' warning that he will send spies to see whether the baby was exposed. Cyno then presents a plan that satisfies the criterion that a baby must be left exposed, that prevents them from committing murder, and has personal benefits. Cyno decides to adopt baby Cyrus and leave their own still-born baby exposed in its place.

Although Cyno had just gone through the trauma of childbirth and the loss of her child, she

[159] Lattimore 1939, 25-28.
[160] I.111: οἷα ἐξ ἀέλπτου ἰδοῦσα ἡ γυνὴ εἴρετο προτέρη ὅ τι μιν οὕτω προθύμως Ἅρπαγος μετεπέμψατο.

was able to take charge. Like Atossa's, Cyno's language is direct and assertive as she orders her husband with imperatives to "do the following" (σὺ δὲ ὧδε ποίησον) and "expose it" (πρόθες), that is, her own still-born baby. She recognizes her own power in having given birth (τέτοκα 2) and at the same time how her husband benefits from not "disobeying the masters" (ἀδικέων τοὺς δεσπότας). Finally, she also identifies their collective responsibility for the consequences of their actions and thus avoids "planning reprehensibly" (ἡμῖν κακῶς βεβουλευμένα ἔσται) to expose the royal child. Cyno takes initiative, directs her husband, and requests with a hortatory subjunctive (τρέφωμεν) that they raise the royal child together.

Herodotus does not merely represent her ability through reporting her plan, but also through her husband's recognition: "and the cowherd thought that the woman had spoken about the present circumstances exceedingly well, and he immediately did the following things" (κάρτα τε ἔδοξε τῷ βουκόλῳ πρὸς τὰ παρεόντα εὖ λέγειν ἡ γυνή, καὶ αὐτίκα ἐποίεε ταῦτα). Her husband recognizes Cyno's ability to speak well (εὖ λέγειν), thus praising her intellectual abilities. Furthermore, the adverb κάρτα emphasizes the strength of the impact of her words on her husband, while the adverb αὐτίκα indicates the cowherd's immediate execution of her plan. The speed of his implementation, without rebuttal or alterations to the proposed plan, shows Mitradates' full confidence in his wife. Despite the challenging situation, Cyno was able to think creatively and influence not only her family's future, but also the future of a royal child.

Sesostris' Wife (II.107)

While the enslaved cowherd's wife planned to save a child, an account in Book II tells of the wife of the Egyptian king's plan that instead involves sacrificing her children. The Egyptian king Sesostris was attacked by his own brother, who invited him to dinner and encircled the home

with flames. Herodotus reports Sesostris' reaction in II.107, saying that he "immediately asked his wife's advice" (αὐτίκα συμβουλεύεσθαι τῇ γυναικί). Whereas the cowherd's wife offered her plan on her own accord, Sesostris explicitly asked for his wife's opinion. Just as αὐτίκα in I.113 indicates the cowherd's trust in his wife, here it shows the connection between husband and wife; in their plight Sesostris turned to his wife rather than depending entirely on his own intellect and bravery. The verb συμβουλεύεσθαι with the prefix συμ- highlights their collaboration to escape their sudden predicament. The wife's advice is unexpected; she suggested that they should lay their children out over the fire as a bridge. Sesostris took her advice and did what she suggested (ταῦτα ποιῆσαι τὸν Σέσωστριν). This episode thus illustrates one man's impulse to depend on his wife, as well as her ability to find a way to escape a frightening situation. Furthermore, Herodotus recognizes the horrific nature of this deed as he comments, "and two of their children burned alive in this way, but the remaining ones were saved together with the father."[161] Not only was this woman able to think of a solution, but she was willing to sacrifice a third of her own children to save the others. Just as Herodotus recounts memorable tales of men and misfortune, such as the account of Arion escaping death by singing, so he narrates this woman's solution to an unavoidable disaster.

Gorgo (V.51, VII.239)

Finally, I present two accounts of Gorgo. The first account of demonstrates a woman's ability to advise men regardless of age. At V.51, Gorgo is only eight or nine years of age yet advises her father, king Cleomenes I of Sparta, when Aristagoras came to make a request. She

[161] II.107: καὶ δύο μὲν τῶν παίδων κατακαῆναι τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἀποσωθῆναι ἅμα τῷ πατρί.

just happened to be present in the room as Aristagoras kept offering more and more money, and she "spoke out 'Father, the stranger will corrupt you, unless you go away from him.'"[162] It appears Gorgo had some type of insight into Aristagoras' intentions, perhaps it was intuition, and recognized the urgency to speak out of turn. The king's response further suggests that her input was valued, since "Cleomenes was pleased, in fact, with the council of the child and went into a different room."[163] Even only at such a young age, Gorgo thus demonstrated insight and incentive in her valuable input.

The second account of Gorgo demonstrates not just a woman's ability to advise men but emphasizes that women can be smarter than men. At VII.239, Demaratus had sent a hidden message to the Lacedaimonians to warn them of Xerxes' intent to march upon the Greeks. The Lacedaimonians thought they had just received an empty tablet and "were not able to put two and two together" (οὐκ εἶχον συμβαλέσθαι οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι). The daughter of Cleomenes and wife of Leonidas, Gorgo, understood what was happening, "having thought of it herself" (ἐπιφρασθεῖσα αὐτή). Gorgo told the Lacedaimonians to scrape off the wax and thus led them to reveal a message carved in the wood underneath. Gorgo could look beyond first impressions and understand the mechanics of a wax tablet, and thus outsmarted the leading Lacedaimonians who were in control of the military operations of Lacedaimon. Furthermore, the way she conveyed her understanding to the Lacedaimonians shows that, despite her inability to officially partake in politics, she was able to direct men. Although it must be recognized that her relationship to prominent men gave Gorgo the opportunity to influence these men, Herodotus indicates her direct manner as she instructed (ὑπέθετο) and ordered them (κελεύουσα), as well as their

[162] V.51: ηὐδάξατο 'πάτερ, διαφθερέει σε ὁ ξεῖνος, ἢν μὴ ἀποστὰς ἴῃς.'
[163] V.51: ὅ τε δὴ Κλεομένης ἡσθεὶς τοῦ παιδίου τῇ παραινέσι ἤιε ἐς ἕτερον οἴκημα.

acceptance of her directives when they obeyed (πειθόμενοι). Gorgo was thus not simply a practical advisor, but an independently intelligent, influential individual.

Monumental Memories: Cheops' daughter (II.126); the Nitocrises (I.187; II.100)

Herodotus tells us of women in connection to buildings, constructions which function not just as physical and visible memorials, but as the locus of female agency and competence. The daughter of Cheops in II.126, and the two Nitocrises, the one of Babylon (I.187) and the one from Egypt (II.100), demonstrate intellectual abilities. They are able to outsmart men, like Gorgo and Kandaules' wife, and create lasting memorials for themselves.

Cheops' Daughter (II.126)

At II.126, Herodotus reports, in a manner reminiscent of the foulest Babylonian custom, a narrative that involves father-sanctioned sex work during economic distress. Herodotus judges Cheops' character, saying that "Cheops had arrived at such wickedness" (ἐς τοῦτο δὲ ἐλθεῖν Χέοπα κακότητος) and put his own daughter in a brothel, since he was in need of money.[164] As with Kandaules' wife, Cheops' daughter had no choice in her initial objectification, but was intelligent and used the situation to her own advantage:

> τὴν δὲ τά τε ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ταχθέντα πρήσσεσθαι, ἰδίῃ δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν διανοηθῆναι μνημήιον καταλιπέσθαι, καὶ τοῦ ἐσιόντος πρὸς αὐτὴν ἑκάστου δέεσθαι ὅκως ἂν αὐτῇ ἕνα λίθον ἐν τοῖσι ἔργοισι δωρέοιτο.
>
> She exacted payment for the things ordered by her father, but she also had it in her mind to leave behind a memorial pertaining to herself and required that each one coming to her would gift her one stone for the work.

[164] II.126: ὥστε χρημάτων δεόμενον τὴν θυγατέρα τὴν ἑωυτοῦ κατίσαντα ἐπ᾽ οἰκήματος προστάξαι πρήσσεσθαι ἀργύριον.

Cheops' daughter thus obeys her father but uses her mental abilities to serve herself (ἰδίῃ) and create a monument. Like Kandaules' wife and Atossa, she works within the confines placed upon her. She goes beyond the passive role her father expects of her and takes agency over her own remembrance; the men who use the daughter for sex are used by her in turn.

Herodotus ends the story of Cheops' daughter by telling us the result of her plans. She succeeded and a pyramid was built; the pyramid and its size were still known. Herodotus is specific in the measurements he reports (each side is 150 feet (τῆς ἐστὶ τὸ κῶλον ἕκαστον ὅλου καὶ ἡμίσεος πλέθρου)) and thus allows the audience to recognize the extreme scale of the operation, since we know that every stone represents a man who slept with the daughter.[165] The pyramid is not just a marvel built through the daughter's intelligent planning, but also a physical reflection of Cheops' evil and his daughter's perseverance. Herodotus' judgment of Cheops shows his sympathy for Cheops' daughter, but he does not pity her. Rather, he once again acknowledges the wrongful treatment of women while also foregrounding their intelligence and agency.

Nitocris of Babylon (I.187)

The accounts of the Nitocrises are especially concerned with tombs. In these stories Herodotus explicitly demonstrates the intellectual abilities of the women. When he introduces Nitocris of Babylon, stating that "she was more intelligent than the previous female ruler" (αὕτη δὲ συνετωτέρη γενομένη τῆς πρότερον ἀρξάσης), he begins from a focus on intellect, but also asserts women's ability to rule. He gives two examples of her excellence, namely that "she left

[165] Alex Tarbet discusses the humor in this use of Cheops' own plan to outsmart him in his forthcoming dissertation.

behind monuments" (μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο) and "protected [the land] as much as possible" (προεφυλάξατο ὅσα ἐδύνατο μάλιστα). Such monuments counted among the *thaumasia* that Herodotus intends to commemorate, according to the opening of *The Histories.* As a further example of her character, Herodotus tells in I.187 of her ability to understand and anticipate the actions of others:

> ἡ δ᾽ αὐτὴ αὕτη βασίλεια καὶ ἀπάτην τοιήνδε τινὰ ἐμηχανήσατο· ὕπερ τῶν μάλιστα λεωφόρων πυλέων τοῦ ἄστεος τάφον ἑωυτῇ κατεσκευάσατο μετέωρον ἐπιπολῆς αὐτέων τῶν πυλέων, ἐνεκόλαψε δὲ ἐς τὸν τάφον γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε. 'τῶν τις ἐμεῦ ὕστερον γινομένων Βαβυλῶνος βασιλέων ἢν σπανίσῃ χρημάτων, ἀνοίξας τὸν τάφον λαβέτω ὁκόσα βούλεται χρήματα· μὴ μέντοι γε μὴ σπανίσας γε ἄλλως ἀνοίξῃ· οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον·'
>
> This very same queen also designed a trick of the following kind: over the gates of the most frequented thoroughfare of the city she constructed a tomb for herself off the ground above the very gates, and she carved writing on the tomb, which read: 'if any of the future kings of Babylon would be in need of money, let him open the tomb and take as much money as he wants: however, let him not open it unless he is indeed in need: for it will not be better.'

The note of trickery (ἀπάτη) along with the verb ἐμηχανήσατο, which is used for any work requiring a skill or art, explicitly indicates Nitocris' intellectual ability.[166] The inscription clearly warns the future kings that they cannot open the tomb this unless they are truly in need: "for it will not be better." She understood that if there was a circumstance in which the king was in such need of money that he would desecrate a grave, the offense would be close to irrelevant, or at least forgivable. But Nitocris foresaw their greed and did not leave money in the tomb, only her body and the following writing: "'If you had not been so insatiable for money and offensively greedy for gain, you would not have opened the coffins of the dead" ('εἰ μὴ ἄπληστός τε ἔας χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδής, οὐκ ἂν νεκρῶν θήκας ἀνέῳγες.) The "trick" aspect of the tomb she built was thus based on her recognition and disapproval of greed, showing moral superiority over

[166] cf. LSJ s.v. μηχανάομαι A.1.

men, as well as an understanding of societal values. Herodotus marks this story as indicative of her character, stating "such a woman, it is said, was this queen" (αὕτη μέν νυν ἡ βασίλεια τοιαύτη τις λέγεται γενέσθαι). Herodotus thus portrays Nitocris as just as capable as men. By noting "it is said," he even highlights that his desire to memorialize women's deeds was supported and shared by the stories of others. Herodotus was not the only one who understood women as complex individuals.

Nitocris of Egypt (II.100)

Nitocris of Egypt had a similar inclination to trickery, although she had more definite targets in mind than Nitocris of Babylon. Herodotus reports that she had a brother, who was king and was killed by his subjects. The Egyptians then gave her the sovereignty, but she took revenge and "put many Egyptians to death by means of a trick" (τούτῳ τιμωρέουσαν πολλοὺς Αἰγυπτίων διαφθεῖραι δόλῳ, II.100). Whether the Egyptians gave the sovereignty to Nitocris in recognition of her ability, or simply to appease her after killing her brother, the idea of a ruling woman was evidently not inconceivable to them. Nitocris' revenge was completed through a δόλος, a trick often involved with catching or trapping, indicating her superiority over her targets in intelligence or ability.[167]

Herodotus narrates the trick as follows:

> ποιησαμένην γάρ μιν οἴκημα περίμηκες ὑπόγαιον καινοῦν τῷ λόγῳ, νόῳ δὲ ἄλλα μηχανᾶσθαι· καλέσασαν δέ μιν Αἰγυπτίων τοὺς μάλιστα μεταιτίους τοῦ φόνου ἤδεε πολλοὺς ἱστιᾶν, δαινυμένοισι δὲ ἐπεῖναι τὸν ποταμὸν δι᾽ αὐλῶνος κρυπτοῦ μεγάλου.
>
> For having made them a very large underground chamber she intended to inaugurate it according to the story, but in her mind she was devising other things: having invited to her home the many Egyptians whom she knew bore the greatest blame for the murder,

[167] cf. LSJ s.v. δόλος.

> she led the river in upon them, when they were feasting, through a large secret channel. (II.100)

Once again Herodotus applies the verb μηχανᾶσθαι to a woman, and specifies the distinction between λόγῳ and νόῳ, between what she says and what she thinks. Her ability to maintain a pretense is reminiscent of Kandaules' wife, as is her summoning of the perpetrators. Nitocris thus understood the need for revenge. She both succeeded in avenging her brother and in turn escaped vengeance for it: "when she had done this, she cast herself into a chamber full of hot ashes, to escape vengeance" (ὡς τοῦτο ἐξέργαστο, ῥίψαι ἐς οἴκημα σποδοῦ πλέον, ὅκως ἀτιμώρητος γένηται). Even though the result of her own actions is the same as the predictable vengeance, by killing herself Nitocris asserts agency over her own life and death.

Beyond the Gender Binary: Amazons (IV.110-117)

From ancient texts to *Wonder Woman*, the Amazons are commonly portrayed as masculine, fighting women. Although the (re)presentation of female strength is important, a close reading of the portrayal of the Amazons in Herodotus' *Histories* suggests that they may not have been the warrior women we have come to expect. In this section, I argue that Herodotus presents the Amazons as members of a society with an alternative, non-binary gender system. First, I offer a quick overview of previous scholarship on the Amazons, their historicity. and their gender. Turning to the Amazonian episode in the *Histories*, I demonstrate how the Scythians impose their own binary gender system on the Amazons. The Scythians attempt to make sense of these individuals in respect to their own understanding of the world. I argue, however, that Herodotus does not impose a system upon the Amazons and depicts the Amazons as having a

non-gendered self-conception.[168] In this way, I demonstrate that with regard to gender also, Herodotus approaches the world with a mind open to different cultural systems.

Approaching the Amazons

As early as Homer, who called them "peers of men" (ἀντιάνειραι), and as recently as their scantily clad representations in the *Wonder Woman* movies, the Amazons have lived in our imagination as female warriors.[169] The main debate about them has concerned whether they existed or were simply a figment of the Greek imagination.[170] Both scenarios have implications for our understanding of ancient gender. If the Amazons or an Amazon-like people were fact rather than fiction, the existence of warrior women would provide an ancient precedent for female participation in the realm of war. As a part of the Greek, and especially Athenian, imagination, however, the stories about the Amazons would function to demonstrate the barbarian opposite to ideal gender roles. Recent scholarship no longer treats this as an either-or question but affirms both the existence of warrior women in the ancient world and the important role of Amazonian myths in the establishment/perseverance of ancient Greek gender roles.[171]

In *Postcolonial Amazons,* Walter Penrose argued for the existence of ancient warrior women, who served as the basis for the "Greek phenomenon of the Amazons."[172] By connecting archaeological evidence with a reading of texts rooted in postcolonial theory, Penrose decentered the Athenian perspective on the Amazons and their gender presentation in order to focus on

[168] Matsuno and Budge 2017 and Monro 2019 offer succinct and useful overviews of scholarship inn NBGQ (Non-Binary GenderQueer) Studies.
[169] For more on the epithet ἀντιάνειραι and its translation of ἀντι- as "peer," see Hazewindus 2004, 181-183; Mayor 2014, 22-25.
[170] Penrose 2016, especially 1-22, 67-117; Mayor 2014, who deals explicitly with this question of historicity; cf. Blok, who instead concerns herself with the cultural history of the myth of the Amazons.
[171] Penrose 2016.
[172] Penrose 2016, 2.

gender roles in other societies. In my work I too question the status quo regarding ancient gender roles. In particular, I build on Penrose' recognition of the Athenian gender system as binary:

> "Whereas the Athenians conceived of masculine behavior and masculinity in women, their assessments were produced and reiterated in a society where strong binary oppositions were drawn between men and women. This does not appear to have been the case within some non-Greek and even some mixed Greek/barbarian societies."[173]

I agree with Penrose that not only gender roles, but also gender systems were culturally relative in the ancient world. The binary gender system was especially key to the traditional understanding of the Amazons. Their non-adherence to gender norms was not expressed as an absence of femininity, but rather as a presence of masculinity. For example, due to associations of men and war, the Amazons are cast as masculine women rather than non-women. Although Penrose's work in uncovering the evidence for female masculinity and warrior women is of great importance to our understanding of the ancient world, his analysis still relies upon the imposition of a binary system on ancient peoples, whose gender systems are unfamiliar to us. In my analysis of Herodotus IV.110-117, I examine the imposition of the gender binary upon the Amazons and suggest that Herodotus allowed for a non-binary interpretation of the Amazonian society.

Much has been said about the historicity of the Amazons. Unlike Penrose, however, I am only examining the portrayal of the Amazons in Herodotus' *Histories.* Herodotus treats the Amazons as a real, historical people rather than mythological figures. Herodotus sets up his story as an ethnographic account of the origins of the Sauromatians. By saying "about the Sauromatae it is told" and "the story goes," he frames his story as a report of knowledge gathered elsewhere. Additionally, the context that Herodotus provides indicates that Herodotus and the Greeks thought of the Amazons as real people from a mythical past. As Hazewindus points out, the

[173] Penrose 2016, 13.

Greeks' interaction with the Amazons took place "at *the* battle of Thermodon," indicating that the Greek audience of Herodotus would have been familiar with this story. Furthermore, the only other mention of the Amazons in the *Histories* occurs at IX.27, when the Athenians remind the Tegeans of the Athenians' victory at this mythical battle. While it might be impossible to verify the historicity of his account, Herodotus understood the Amazons to be real, historical people. I thus approach the text from the perspective of a cultural rather than a social historian. I do not argue for the reality of one Amazonian people, but rather suggest that Herodotus' text is reflective of historical beliefs regarding what was possible. In this section, I thus argue that Herodotus' portrayal of the Amazons indicates that he had the notion that not every culture had the same gender binary as his own.[174]

The Amazons and Gender Systems

As I discussed above, the Amazons have been understood in reference to the Athenian binary gender system. Scholars have also held that Herodotus' account of the Amazons presents the Amazons as a society with a reversal of patriarchal gender roles.[175] Approaching Herodotus' description of the Amazons in comparison with his description of the Egyptians, however, the lack of antithetical statements regarding the Amazons stands out. Instead of portraying the Amazons as "others" in stark opposition to the Greeks, and thus with a shared gender system, Herodotus depicts the Amazons as foreign and strange by describing the reaction of the Scythians upon seeing them:

[174] There are several cross-cultural examples of non-binary people and non-binary gender systems, see Matsuno and Budge 117.
[175] Rosellini and Saïd 1978; Hazewindus 2004.

> οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι οὐκ εἶχον συμβαλέσθαι τὸ πρῆγμα· οὔτε γὰρ φωνὴν οὔτε ἐσθῆτα οὔτε τὸ ἔθνος ἐγίνωσκον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν θώματι ἦσαν ὁκόθεν ἔλθοιεν, ἐδόκεον δ᾽ αὐτὰς εἶναι ἄνδρας τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίην ἔχοντας, μάχην τε δὴ πρὸς αὐτὰς ἐποιεῦντο
>
> The Scythians were not able to comprehend the matter; for they recognized neither their sound nor their clothing nor their group, but they were in awe as to whence they had come, and they considered them to be men being in the first age of life, and so they waged war with them.

From observation, the Scythians were unable to categorize the Amazons. They determined neither their ethnic identity, nor their gender. Herodotus lists various aspects of the Amazons that brought confusion to the Scythians. I noted in Chapter II, pages 22-26, that clothing and language are criteria of ethnic identity, but can also indicate gender.[176] Their clothing did not match the Scythians' expectations for men or women, nor did it indicate an ethnic group to the Scythians. Furthermore, Herodotus notes that the Scythians did not recognize the Amazons' *ethnos* and wondered whence they came. Although this last phrase could theoretically also indicate their surprise at the Amazons' sudden appearance in their area, Herodotus uses multiple identity factors to depicts the Scythians' inability to determine to which ethnic group the Amazons belonged. When one does not know a person's ethnic group, they must also be unaware of what gender system this ethnic group uses. The Scythians were thus unfamiliar with the Amazonian gender system.

The Scythians' confusion at the Amazons' *phōnē* not only hindered the Scythians' gender assignment to the Amazons but could also be indicative of bodily androgyny. *Phōnē* is often translated as "language" and can indeed be interpreted as a misunderstanding of the Amazons'

[176] Judith Butler has famously argued that gender is not essential or biological but is constituted by one's own performance of it. Key to her theory, however, is that this identity is performed in dialogue with societal norms. Although clothing is gendered in most binary societies, we cannot say anything definitive about whether the Amazons presented themselves as androgynous, knowing that other societies had binary gender, or if they simply wore the clothes they wore. I hesitate to suggest that the Amazons performed their gender within the same semiotic realm as the Scythians. In this case, however, the Amazons, like us all, perform their gender, but do not do so subversively; Butler 1990.

language as an indicator of their ethnic group. At the same time, if we consider the use of *phōnē* as opposed to *glōssa, phōnē* could indicate the physical sound made rather than the language spoken.[177] Although there are various reasons for physical sounds to be different, there is a biological reason that could further explain the Scythians' confusion at the Amazons. There are physical differences between humans' sounds in tone and volume due to hormonal changes in puberty are commonly understood as a gendered characteristic. Although the differences are not absolute, individuals with more testosterone, who are generally ascribed the male gender in binary gender systems, have a relatively lower tone of voice. Additionally, How and Wells suggest that the Scythians' interpretation of the Amazons as "men in the first age of life" indicates young men without beard growth, perhaps pre-pubescents. Due to the lack of hormonal changes, the vocal register of pre-pubescent youths can be ascribed to both men and women in a binary system. The Amazons have a *phōnē* and body like pre-pubescent boys. The confusion at the Amazons' *phōnē* could thus indicate their bodily androgyny.

Without knowledge of the ethnic group, the Scythians must have assigned the Amazons a gender based on the Scythian gender system rather than the Amazonian one. Within the narrative, Herodotus does not set out the Scythian gender system for his audience. As the Scythians were unable to recognize several identity factors, the only indicator of their gender to the Scythians was the Amazons' behavior. From the beginning of his account, Herodotus portrays the Amazons as a bellicose people. He begins by establishing that the Scythian name for the Amazons means "man-killers" and describing a battle with the Greeks.[178] The Greeks had won the battle and captured the Amazons alive, but when they got out to sea the Amazons killed

[177] LSJ s.vv. φωνή and γλῶσσα.
[178] IV.110: τὰς δὲ Ἀμαζόνας καλέουσι Σκύθαι Οἰόρπατα, δύναται δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἀνδροκτόνοι.

the Greeks. After the Amazons landed in the country of the Scythians, "they found their way to the inhabited country, snatched the first group of horses they happened upon, and riding upon them plundered the Scythians" (ὁδοιπόρεον ἐς τὴν οἰκεομένην. ἐντυχοῦσαι δὲ πρώτῳ ἱπποφορβίῳ τοῦτο διήρπασαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων ἱππαζόμεναι ἐληίζοντο τὰ τῶν Σκυθέων IV.110). The Scythians thus encounter the Amazons as invaders of their territory. These acts of horse-riding, plundering, and general attack occur in close temporal proximity to the Scythians' gender assignment of male to the Amazons. Herodotus also positions these two elements side by side, when he asserts that the Scythians "considered them to be men in the first age of life, and they waged war with them" (ἐδόκεον δ᾽ αὐτὰς εἶναι ἄνδρας τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίην ἔχοντας, μάχην τε δὴ πρὸς αὐτὰς ἐποιεῦντο, IV.111). Herodotus' lack of comment on this correlation between bellicose behavior and the gender assignment indicates that the ascription seemed logical to Herodotus; it was unnecessary to spell it out to his audience. Herodotus thus portrays the Scythian gender system as similar to the Greeks' gender system, in which the Amazons' bellicose activities were understood as indicators of a male gender identity.

The binarity of the Scythians' gender system and the non-binarity of the Amazons become evident when the Scythians reassess their gender assignment to the Amazons. As a result of their battle, the Scythians end up with the bodies of the Amazons. In binary gender systems, a person's body is commonly used to assign gender. In "western" societies, a doctor examines the newborn baby and through observation of the shape of their genitals determines whether to declare "it's a boy!" or "it's a girl!". This assignment is referred to as one's sex assigned at birth.[179] Although the Scythians first ascribed the Amazons a male gender identity, they revised their interpretation after they saw the Amazons' bodies "and thus perceived them to be women"

[179] Matsuno and Budge 2017, 117.

(καὶ οὕτω ἔγνωσαν ἐούσας γυναῖκας IV.111). Herodotus describes the Scythians' ascriptions of gender to the Amazons with two different verbs. First, Herodotus uses ἐδόκεον, "thought" or "considered," when the Scythians assigned a male gender identity to the Amazons. In this second instance of gender assignment, however, Herodotus used ἔγνωσαν, "perceived" or "knew from observation." Herodotus thus depicts an increased level of certainty on behalf of the Scythians. By describing the Scythians' understanding of the Amazons as women as validated by the observation of their bodies, Herodotus depicts the Scythians as using a binary gender system. While the Amazons were initially understood as men, the conception of the Amazons as women is a case of gender assigned at death.

Herodotus' Perspective

In the previous sections, I have set out both the traditional understanding of the Amazons and the Scythians' understanding as portrayed in Hdt. IV.110-117. Furthermore, I demonstrated Herodotus' recognition of gender roles and gender systems as culturally relative phenomena. In his account, Herodotus portrays the Amazons as enigmatic and androgynous to the Scythians, which I argue is due to the Scythians' binary gender system. In this section, I argue that Herodotus' portrayal of the Amazons allows for the presence of an indigenous non-binary gender system. Despite his use of the feminine grammatical gender for the Amazons, Herodotus does not call them *gunaikes* until they have agreed to become the Scythians' wives. Furthermore, in Herodotus' direct speech attributed to the Amazons, he does not have the Amazons use gendered language to refer to themselves at all. Finally, in their description of their differences from the Scythian women, the Amazons do not identify themselves as gendered individuals. Although Herodotus uses adjectives and participles in the feminine gender for the Amazons, I argue that

this is a consequence of the gendered nature of the Greek language and functions to mark the Amazons as non-masculine. I thus demonstrate that Herodotus recognizes that the binary gender system that led to our understanding of the Amazons as warrior women is non-native to the Amazons. Through his language choices, Herodotus allows for an alternative, non-binary gender system for the Amazons.

After the Scythians' inability to identify the gender of the Amazons and their "discovery" that they were women, the Scythians cease their fighting and instead pursue the Amazons as wives and mothers of their future children (IV.111). Herodotus depicts this endeavor as a plot of the Scythian elders, who sent young men to set up camp nearby and befriend the Amazons. The Amazons, contrary to Greek gender roles for women, participate as equals in the encounter and arrange for the matching of the young Scythian men to the Amazons.[180] It is only because of these marriages that Herodotus uses the word *gunē*, which in addition to "woman" can mean "wife." At IV.114, Herodotus says, "After they combined their camps they lived in the same place, each man taking as wife the one with whom he first had intercourse" (μετὰ δὲ συμμίξαντες τὰ στρατόπεδα οἴκεον ὁμοῦ, γυναῖκα ἔχων ἕκαστος ταύτην τῇ τὸ πρῶτον συνεμίχθη). In the absence of a gender-neutral word such as spouse, the Greek designation for the Amazons' new relation to the Scythian men is *gunē.*[181] Rather than a gender ascription, *gunē* indicates the Amazons' societal role.

After the Amazons agree to be the Scythians' *gunaikes*, the Scythians discuss their future living situation with the Amazons. The Scythians propose that the Amazons come with them and

[180] Hazewindus 2004, 200-201.
[181] Scholarship in NBGQ studies emphasizes the difficulty of an absence of space in society for people outside the binary, including the absence of adequate language; Matsuno and Budge 2017, 118; Bradford et. al. 2019, 165.

live amongst the Scythians alongside their existing families.[182] The Amazons argue against this plan, saying:

> ‘ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἂν δυναίμεθα οἰκέειν μετὰ τῶν ὑμετερέων γυναικῶν· οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ νόμαια ἡμῖν τε κἀκείνῃσι ἐστί. ἡμεῖς μὲν τοξεύομέν τε καὶ ἀκοντίζομεν καὶ ἱππαζόμεθα, ἔργα δὲ γυναικήια οὐκ ἐμάθομεν· αἱ δὲ ὑμέτεραι γυναῖκες τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν ἡμεῖς κατελέξαμεν ποιεῦσι, ἔργα δὲ γυναικήια ἐργάζονται μένουσαι ἐν τῇσι ἁμάξῃσι, οὔτ᾽ ἐπὶ θήρην ἰοῦσαι οὔτε ἄλλῃ οὐδαμῇ. οὐκ ἂν ὦν δυναίμεθα ἐκείνῃσι συμφέρεσθαι. ἀλλ᾽ εἰ βούλεσθε γυναῖκας ἔχειν ἡμέας καὶ δοκέειν εἶναι δίκαιοι, ἐλθόντες παρὰ τοὺς τοκέας ἀπολάχετε τῶν κτημάτων τὸ μέρος, καὶ ἔπειτα ἐλθόντες οἰκέωμεν ἐπὶ ἡμέων αὐτῶν.’
>
> We cannot possibly live together with your women: for we and they do not have the same customs. We shoot the bow, fight with spears, and ride horses, but we did not learn the womanly works: and your women do nothing of the things we talk about, but practice womanly work, remaining in the wagons, not going out to hunt or for any other reason. We thus cannot possibly associate with them, but if you want to have us as your wives and appear to be just, go to your parents and obtain a portion of your possessions, and then let us go and live by ourselves.

In this reply, the Amazons describe differences between Scythian women and themselves. Some scholars have argued that the comparison between the Scythian women and the Amazons implies a self-identification of the Amazons as women. I argue, however, that this passage supports a non-gendered self-conception of the Amazons. The Amazons clearly distinguish themselves from the Scythian women in this passage. The Amazons do not say that they are unlikely to get along or simply do not want to live with Scythian women, but rather bluntly state that it is not possible (οὐκ ἂν δυναίμεθα) for them to live together. The reasons given by the Amazons are directly concerned with gender roles and the Amazons acknowledge the Scythians’ binary gender system. They are aware that in accepting the role of wives to these Scythian youths, they would be expected to act as Scythian wives would if they lived in Scythia. Unlike the Scythians,

[182] IV.114.2: “When they lived together with one another, the men said the following to the Amazons: “We have parents and we have possessions; Now then let us not for any more time live this life but let us go to the larger group of people to spend our life. We will have you as wives and no others.” ἐπεὶ δὲ συνῆκαν ἀλλήλων, ἔλεξαν πρὸς τὰς Ἀμαζόνας τάδε οἱ ἄνδρες. ‘ἡμῖν εἰσὶ μὲν τοκέες, εἰσὶ δὲ κτήσιες· νῦν ὦν μηκέτι πλεῦνα χρόνον ζόην τοιήνδε ἔχωμεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὸ πλῆθος διαιτώμεθα. γυναῖκας δὲ ἕξομεν ὑμέας καὶ οὐδαμὰς ἄλλας.

"they did not learn womanly works" (ἔργα δὲ γυναικήια οὐκ ἐμάθομεν). The Amazons, however, did not argue that they do masculine work, nor that in their culture the feminine work is different. For an argument concerning gender roles, the Amazons' self-presentation is remarkably genderless.

A second argument for the non-gendered self-conception of the Amazons lies in Herodotus' use of verbs in this direct speech. Although the Scythian men had already ascribed the Amazons a female gender identity, Herodotus does not indicate that the Amazons are feminine in their direct speech. The differences between the Scythian women and themselves are expressed by the Amazons using distinct verbal structures. For the Scythian women, the Amazons use two participles, μένουσαι and ἰοῦσαι, to describe how they remain in the wagons and do not go out. For their own actions, however, Herodotus has the Amazons only use finite verbs, such as we shoot the bow" (τοξεύομέν) "we fight with spears" (ἀκοντίζομεν) and "we ride horses" (ἱππαζόμεθα), but *not a single participle.* This absence of participles, which seem to pervade the Greek language, is remarkable. As participles, being verbal adjectives, are gendered, the absence of them from this speech suggest a lack of self-perception as female. Additionally, the Amazons use no feminine gendered adjectives to describe themselves. Finally, scholars have assumed, and Hazewindus argued, that the use of ὑμέτεραι γυναῖκες in contrast to ἡμεῖς implies a self-identification of the Amazons as women. The distinction between "your women" and "we," however, is not a direct antithesis and does not have to imply "we as women." In fact, "we as non-women" or "we as non-men" is an equally plausible interpretation of the Greek. As it is, Herodotus does not have the Amazons indicate their gender, but rather has a distinct absence of self-gendering of the Amazons in this speech. These absences of gendering, I have demonstrated, indicate that Herodotus understood the Amazons as existing outside of binary gender systems.

Sauromatians and other Amazonian Afterlives

Herodotus reports that the Amazons' marriage led to a merging of groups with the Scythians to create a new ethnic group, the Sauromatians (IV.116-117). The Sauromatians appear to have adopted the Scythian concept of binary gender but have no to little difference in gender roles for their people. Like their Amazonian ancestors, everyone rides out hunting, goes to war, and dresses the same way. Herodotus thus presents ethnic groups and their gender systems as culturally dependent and changeable. Furthermore, the existence of a non-binary society would explain the Scythians' confusion and perhaps even how the Amazons could procreate in a society without men. If there were individuals with various genitalia present in the society, but they did not identify with different genders, then it would be less of a mystery how the Amazons procreated. Furthermore, the purported etymology of ἀμαζόνες as ἀ-μαζῶν "without breasts" aligns with a more androgynous bodily figure.[183] In fact, the Greek word ἀμαζόνες does not specify a grammatical gender, since the third declension has the same form for both masculine and feminine gender, and supports Herodotus' portrayal of the Amazons as coming from a non-binary society.[184]

Previous scholarly interpretations of this passage in Herodotus were clearly affected by the imposition of our own cultural concepts upon the ancients. An understanding of the Amazons as "biologically female" and an example of female masculinity can have important implications,

[183] The desire to have no visual chest is common among transgender individuals, such as transmen, non-binary individuals, and other transmasculine identifying folk. Although this etymology has led to ancient imaginings of Amazons cutting off their breast(s) and suggestions that this was to advance their skills in archery. The removal of breasts through surgery is an invasive procedure, but a similar visual result can be achieved by binding the chest.
[184] Mayor 2014, 22; Blok 1995, 156-159.

such as the suggestion that one's genitalia does not determine one's ability, for modern societies with binary gender systems. Yet we have no clear indication that the Amazons saw themselves as women prior to their acceptance of that role when they married Scythian men. Despite the lack of primary sources to offer us the Amazonian point of view, a close reading of Herodotus demonstrates that he depicts the Amazons as coming from a non-binary society. If we want to take notice of lived experiences from the ancient world, it is imperative for us to be aware of how our own horizon of experience informs our reading of ancient texts and aim to understand them within their socio-cultural context.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined Herodotus' treatment of gender in his *Histories.* Early approaches to gender in Herodotus especially highlighted how women transfer and legitimize men's political power, such as when they bear heirs, but this ignores private and social power. When scholars moved to examine agency of individual women in Herodotus' *Histories*, however, they attempted to systematically sort women into binary categories, such as active/passive, public/private, and Greek/foreign. Yet female characters exist beyond the binary categories of active/passive and show both moments of both agency and objectification. Through an intersectional approach, I revealed more complexity in Herodotus' treatment of gender and explored the multiple power hierarchies that result from social identities. For example, Kandaules' wife, Atossa, and the Scythian women all achieved their goals due to their power over individuals of lower legal and social status. In this way, I demonstrate, contra to feminist scholars' praise of "strong" women, that female agency was often facilitated by other social identities and does not equate to a positive or ethical portrayal of power.

The examples in this chapter demonstrate a larger complexity of female characters in Herodotus' *Histories* than previous studies. I argued that Herodotus demonstrates a remarkable open-mindedness regarding gender, an interest in the fair treatment of women, including a recognition of women's capabilities, and an awareness of different gender systems. In his account of Babylonian customs (I.196-199), Herodotus shows an interest in the treatment of women and in particular a concern with equal opportunity among them. He portrays Cheops' daughter, Nitocris of Egypt, and Nitocris of Babylon as clever women who even leave lasting memorials for themselves. Furthermore, the examples of female wise advisers, such as Gorgo and Cyno, demonstrate a recognition of women's capabilities by other characters within the *Histories.* Finally, Herodotus' language in the account of the Amazons suggests that Herodotus did not just recognize a broad variety of gender roles, but also accepted that gender systems, like cultural customs, differ from ethnic group to ethnic group.

Chapter IV
A Life of One's Own: The Story of Neaira

αὐτὴν αὑτῆς κυρίαν
[she was] her own guardian
(Dem. 59.46)

In the city of Athens, sometime between 343 and 340 BCE, a woman was brought to trial. In her fifties she was caught in the crossfires of a political feud between her partner and the prosecutors.[185] While she had been settled in the city for about thirty years, her turbulent childhood and adolescence was now made public for the purpose of revenge.[186] Her name is Neaira, and she is best known to modern scholars as the immigrant sex worker who lived in marriage with an Athenian citizen. But how did she receive that reputation? To what extent is our perception based on factual evidence? What aspects of her life might have been overlooked or disregarded? How may she have identified herself?

In this chapter I offer a new perspective on the lived experience of immigrant women in Athens through an investigation of the historical Neaira. In order to answer the questions above, I examine the prosecution speech of the trial, Apollodoros *Against Neaira*, as well as Athenian civic ideology in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE.[187] I provide an initial overview of ancient

[185] Estimates of time are made based on the date of events in the narrative and Neaira's likely age at that time. Her birth date is based on Lysias' date of birth, since Neaira had him as a client when she was a young girl. See Kapparis 1999, 44-45; Carey 1992, 2-3.
[186] According to the narrative, Stephanos entered Neaira's life after the battle of Leuktra in 371 (59.37-38).
[187] Apollodorus' *Against Neaira* is also known as Pseudo-Demosthenes *Against Neaira*: see my discussion below on pages 115-116.

sources of information about Neaira and review scholarship on *Against Neaira* that has shaped our current understanding of her life. While most scholarship has demonstrated the efficacy of Apollodoros' argument for an ancient audience, I suggest that the modern reader can perceive inconsistencies in his argument that call for further analysis of *Against Neaira.* Next, I will discuss the terminology used in civic ideology in classical Athens. Contrary to orthodox scholarship, I argue that *astos* and *xenos* were cultural terms indicating belonging and not belonging to the ingroup in Athens, showing that a *metoikos* could be considered either an *astos* or a *xenos* depending on their level of cultural assimilation. Finally, in a close reading of *Against Neaira,* I analyze Apollodoros' assertions, the evidence he provides, and the inconsistencies and incongruities in his narrative. After demonstrating how Apollodoros fails to prove his claim that Neaira was a *xenē* and how he attempted to mitigate his lack of evidence, I argue that the historical Neaira was both a *metoikos* and an *astē*.

Sources and Scholarship

The main source for Neaira's life is a speech, generally known as Pseudo-Demosthenes 59, *Against Neaira.* In this speech, which was delivered between 343 and 340, Neaira is charged with being an outsider (*xenē*) who is living in marriage with an Athenian man (*astos*) named Stephanos. After an introduction by Theomnestos, the official prosecutor, Apollodoros takes over and presents the law that forbids the marriage between *astoi* and *xenoi* (59.16). In order to convince the jurors of her foreignness, Apollodoros first describes Neaira's life from her childhood onward and focuses especially on her past as an enslaved person and sex worker (59.16-48). In the second half of the narrative, Apollodoros continues this endeavor but switches his focus from Neaira to her alleged daughter Phano to prove also that Stephanos and Neaira

were living in marriage (59.49-84). This lengthy narrative, while clearly biased due to the speech's goals, is our main source of evidence for the historical Neaira. *Against Neaira* is thus at the center of this chapter.

Despite its transmission as Demosthenes' fifty-ninth speech, *Against Neaira* is now attributed to Apollodoros, a fourth-century orator excluded from the 'Canon of the Ten Attic Orators,' who delivered the speech.[188] Callimachus, the third-century Alexandrian librarian, misattributed the speech to Demosthenes, and the transmission of the speech is owed to this error.[189] Five additional speeches of Apollodoros, Dem. 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, and 53, are extant due to the same misattribution.[190] Reconsideration of this attribution happened on the basis of style, structure, and vocabulary; Apollodoros' speeches are often considered to be disorganized, lengthy, and to provide weak arguments. Many scholars regard Apollodoros' style as inferior to the orators of the canon, yet Callimachus, since he ascribed the speeches to Demosthenes, must have perceived a certain level of quality.[191]

While early scholarly focus was on Apollodoros' divergence from the norm, Jeremy Trevett argues in his monograph on Apollodoros that the structure of *Against Neaira* makes sense in light of its context and goals.[192] Apollodoros' interweaving of proofs in the narrative of the speech functions to cover over his lack of evidence. The speech has an initial introduction (*prooimion)* by Theomnestos (59.1-15), after which Apollodoros remarks on the legal grounds for prosecution (59.16-17) and then proceeds to the narrative section (*diegesis*) of his speech.[193]

---

[188] Roisman et al. 2015, 6-7.
[189] For an extensive overview of the authorship debate, see Kapparis 1999, 48-56.
[190] Carey 1992, 17; Kapparis 1999, 50; Trevett 1992, 62-70.
[191] Roisman et al. 2015, 35.
[192] Trevett 1992, 77.
[193] Trevett considers the speech by Theomnestos a preliminary speech (*prodiegesis)* and the rest of the speech a secondary speech on Theomnestos' behalf (*synegoria).* I favor Carey's understanding of the speech as comprised of four parts with two speakers, rather than Trevett's two speeches, since neither

The narrative is lengthy, a feature of Apollodoros' style, and can be separated into two sections. Each section aims to demonstrate a different sub-point of Apollodoros' claim: first, that Neaira was a foreigner (59.18-48), and second, that Stephanos gave evidence of Neaira's foreignness (59.49-87). From 59.88-117 Apollodoros offers a *peroration,* where one would expect proofs based on the traditional structure of Greek forensic speeches.[194] While he does use several types of natural/artless proofs (*atechnoi pisteis*), such as witness testimonies, laws, and other documents, in *Against Neaira,* these are interwoven in the *diegesis* and *peroration* rather than presented in a clear third part.[195] Only at the very end, from 59.118-125, does Apollodoros present argumentation in his defense against Stephanos' potential counterarguments. Trevett argues that the absence of the *pisteis* section might indicate how little proof Apollodoros had available.[196] The lengthy narrative of *Against Neaira* is thus not a flaw, but rather Apollodoros' most effective tool of persuasion.[197] Furthermore, it is thanks to this 'poor' composition that we have this amount of evidence for the historical Neaira.

While *Against Neaira* is the most informative of our extant sources, even if this account were not passed down to us, Neaira would still be associated with sex work. Several ancient writers make reference to (a) Neaira. In the late fourth century BCE Timocles and Philemon each wrote a comedy titled *Neaira* in which the titular character was a courtesan.[198] Athenaeus lists

---

Theomnestos' nor Apollodoros' part would include all traditional parts of a speech. Rather, Theomnestos' introduction appears to fulfill a strategical function in that he voices matters that would be considered hubristic or otherwise inappropriate for Apollodoros to present.

[194] Trevett 1992, 104-5. The traditional structure of a Greek forensic speech being introduction (*proioimion*), narrative (*diegesis*), proof (*pisteis*), and peroration. I agree with Trevett in his determination that this section is a peroration, since the arguments are used to spur on and convince the jurors of the severity of her crime rather than prove Neaira's guilt.

[195] Carey 1992, 12; Trevett 1992, 91-92.

[196] Trevett 1992, 92.

[197] Trevett 1992, 92.

[198] Timocles fr. 25-26 KA, Philemon fr.49 KA; cf. Kapparis 1999, 44.

her alongside other courtesans, some of whom also appear in *Against Neaira*, and mentions her in reference to her relationships with Stephanos and Phrynion, for which he cites *Against Neaira* as his source.[199] Moreover Horace, Virgil, and Tibullus all use a character named Neaira in their poetry.[200] Finally, in his *Oratio ad Graecos,* the Christian Tatian criticizes statues of women in the Portico of Pompey, which depict 8 poets, including Sappho and Corinna, 5 mothers, 6 unknown women, and 4 *hetairai,* including Neaira.[201] Tatian complains that these statues are objects of art devoted to unworthy women and questions why he should look up at Neaira "for she was a *hetaira*" (Ἑταίρα γὰρ ἦν.)[202] Archaeologists have debated whether these statues represented the individual sex workers or rather, as Jane Evans argues, represent comedic and tragic characters.[203] Similarly, in a series of articles B.L. Ullman and J.P. Postgate avidly discussed whether Neaira, as well as Glycera, might have become a type-name for *hetairai* and used as such by the aforementioned Roman poets.[204] Ullman concludes that the development of Neaira as a type-name reflects truths about the historical Neaira, since "the notoriety of Neaera was the chief reason for the later use as a type-name and even as a common noun."[205] I suggest that the type-name does not reflect truths about the historical Neaira, but rather about her reputation. Regardless, it is clear from these references that Neaira's reputation as a *hetaira* prevailed for several centuries.

Neaira's sex work is a probable reason for the long absence of *Against Neaira* from modern scholarship. As topics including sex, adultery, and sex work were considered

[199] Ath. *Deipnosophistai* XIII 587f, 594a
[200] Hor. *Carm.* III 14, *Epod.* 15; Verg. *Ecl.* III; Tib. *Eleg.* III 1-6.
[201] Tatianus, *Ad Gr.* 33-34
[202] Tatianus, *Ad Gr.* 34
[203] Evans 2009; Sande 2014; Kuttner 1999; Fuchs 1982; Thorsen 2012, 706. Thorsen also questions whether the distinction between theatrical and historical figures is productive.
[204] Ullman 1912a; Postgate 1912; Ullman 1912b; Postgate 1914; Ullman 1915.
[205] Ullman 1915, 29.

inappropriate for schools, it was not until 1992 that a commentary on the text was published.[206] Yet, in the preface to the latest commentary, Deborah Kamen describes the speech as "an ideal text for undergraduates" for both its readable prose *and* the content, as the speech offers a "spicy mix of sex, law, and politics."[207] Alongside the increased attention in the classroom, scholars have used the speech as a fertile ground to examine oratorical techniques, as well as the social, legal, and economic aspects of sex work, citizenship, and gender. As one of the most extensive and representative sources concerning sex work and immigrant women in classical Athens, the narrative in *Against Neaira* has contributed to a more detailed and complex understanding of classical Athenian society.

The information presented in *Against Neaira,* however, cannot be taken at face value. Although the broad strokes of his claims about Neaira are generally accepted, we ought to keep the objective of Apollodoros' speech in mind. Since orators aim to persuade a jury, it can be assumed that Apollodoros tailored his argument, in structure, tone, and word choice; he is likely to have left out redeeming qualities and counterarguments while exaggerating her 'reproachable' characteristics.[208] Furthermore, the introductory remarks reveal that a long-standing political and legal conflict between Apollodoros and Stephanos motivated the prosecution.[209] Considering this political motive and the nature of forensic speeches, we cannot take the account of Neaira's life as fact. Yet, by being aware of Apollodoros' perspective and the goals for his speech, we can examine Apollodoros' argument and rhetorical techniques to gain understanding of others' view

[206] Carey 1992; Patteson 1978. While Patteson's commentary was significantly earlier, as a dissertation it was not widely available.
[207] Kamen 2018, preface.
[208] Kapparis 1999, 2-3; on the revision of speeches, see Worthington 1991.
[209] For discussions of the orators' motivation, see Kapparis 1999, 30-31; Carey 1992, 4-8; Glazebrook 2006, 164; Trevett 1992, 146-7; Macurdy 1942. For the relationship between the legal system and politics, see Carey 1994.

of Neaira and her place in society. Furthermore, by recognizing his biases we can go beyond this layer of persuasion to get closer to the lived experience of the historical Neaira

Over the past thirty years, this lengthy narrative that has engendered much critique and provides us with unique information became itself the focus of scholarship. Building on Trevett's argument that the extensive narrative is essential to the speech, scholars have focused on *how* the *diegesis* fills the gaps left by the absence of evidence. Dimos Spatharas examines the role of storytelling in Apollodoros' attempt to persuade the jurors.[210] He argues that, through simplification of the narrative, the assimilation of Phano to Neaira, and incorporation of contemporary societal anxieties, Apollodoros creates an advantageous framework.[211] Besides influencing the jurors, the performance of the narrative, Konstantinos Kapparis argues, would have diverted the jurors' focus away from the lack of evidence.[212] Kapparis examines in particular the use of direct and indirect speech, *amplificatio,* and citations of 5th century literature, which made the narrative into "one of the best known tales from classical Athens."[213]

In addition to these general rhetorical strategies, scholars have analyzed tactics related to Neaira's identities, e.g. her gender or profession.[214] Alison Glazebrook, for instance, analyzes how Apollodoros portrays Neaira as a sex worker and argues that his strategies involve the gendered use of demonstratives, naming, and stereotyping commonly used against women in Athenian law courts.[215] Jess Miner too focused on sex work, and argues that Apollodoros uses

[210] Spatharas 2011.
[211] Spatharas 2011, 100-101.
[212] Kapparis 2019, 291. On the role of performance in forensic oratory, see Hall 1995, Todd 1990, Volonaki 2019, Papaioannou, Serafim, and Da Vela 2017.
[213] Kapparis 2019, 291.
[214] Miner 2003; Glazebrook 2005; Gilhuly 2008.
[215] Glazebrook 2005, 173.

terms for sex workers, *hetaira, pallakē,* and *pornē* with attention to their distinctions.[216] Apollodoros uses *hetaira* only when describing her early career and builds up to an invective use of *pornē* at the end of the speech, thus producing the most forceful attack against Neaira.[217] In addition to these analyses of language, Kate Gilhuly and Cynthia Patterson have examined how the portrayal of Neaira as a *hetaira* reflected on the people around her. Gilhuly argues that the narrative about Neaira portrays Stephanos as having transgressed social standards for male Athenians, since his 'traffic in women' mixes up short-term exchanges with long-term exchanges, as he takes a *hetaira* (short-term) for a wife (long-term).[218] While Gilhuly's argument shifts the focus from Neaira to Stephanos, Patterson moves away completely from the "deeply ingrained modern habit" of focusing on individuals.[219] She argues that Apollodoros uses the ideology of the *oikos* to portray Neaira (and Phano) as not merely establishing illegitimate families but threatening an institution that is at the core of public Athenian identity.

Recent scholarship has thus consistently demonstrated how Apollodoros' narrative style in *Against Neaira* is likely to have convinced the jurors in 340 BCE. At present, Neaira's residency in Athens as a metic, and therefore a *xenē,* is broadly accepted. Yet various details in the speech have been questioned. Apollodoros' claim about the parentage of Phano and her brothers was initially accepted. Cynthia Patterson, and Kapparis and Hamel after her, however, convincingly argue that they were Stephanos' children from a previous marriage with an *astē*. David Noy agrees but understands Apollodoros' reference to Phano's former name, Strybele, to indicate a fifth child, who *was* the daughter of Neaira and later was called Phano in "Europe's

[216] Miner 2003 generally translates *hetaira* as "courtesan," *pallakē* as "concubine," and *pornē* as "prostitute," thus indicating the orthodox understanding of these terms. For an overview on scholarship about these terms, see Miner 2003, 21-22 fn. 9 and 10.
[217] Miner 2003.
[218] Gilhuly 2008, 37.
[219] Patterson 1994, 199-200.

first recorded case of identity theft."[220] Relying on the conclusion that the children were Stephanos', Rebecca Futo Kennedy recently suggested that Neaira may in fact not have been Stephanos' partner at all, but was merely the nanny, a *pallakē.*[221] Apollodoros' focus on Neaira's past as a sex worker then functioned to establish the likelihood that their relationship was sexual.[222] So while Apollodoros' speech was probably convincing to a listening audience, inconsistencies in his argument, such as those surrounding parentage, are evident to the modern reader and warrant further analysis of *Against Neaira.*

Citizenship Terminology

For many scholars and translators, "as *xenos* is to *astos,* so foreigner is to citizen," appears to have been the common conclusion, understandably, since *xenos* and *astos* are a common oppositional pair.[223] Yet difficulties arise when attempts are made to define these terms outside of the oppositional structure. As for *xenos,* David Whitehead concludes that it carries the general meaning of foreigner but recognizes that *xenos* has "an extremely wide semantic range – with inherent ambiguities."[224] When disconnected from *xenos,* scholars often define *astos* in how it differs from the term *politēs.* For a long time a nuance has been recognized between people with full political rights (*politēs*) and those with only citizen rights (*astos*), but scholars tend to conclude that essentially both mean 'citizen.'[225] Edward Cohen disagreed with this conclusion, as it both shows philological error and the violation of a "universal principle of statutory

[220] Noy 2009, 410.
[221] Kennedy 2014, 137-140.
[222] Kennedy 2014, 139.
[223] Osborne 2002, 94-96; Blok 2017, 163-4; Cohen 2000, 50-53.
[224] Whitehead 1977, 10-11.
[225] Ogden 1996, 69. cf. Cohen 2000, 50 fn.7; Whitehead 1977, 60; Patterson 1981, 151-174; Patterson 1986, 54-55; Patterson 1990, 44-45.

interpretation: legal texts should be construed on the premise that each word has significance, not on the assumption that differentiation of terms is inconsequential."[226] Considering the pre-Classical meaning of *astos* as "insider" in contrast with *xenos* as "outsider," Cohen argues that *astos* is determined territorially, while *politēs* is defined politically.[227] While his call to distinguish between these two terms for citizenship was generally well received, Cohen's focus on residency as the determining factor for an *astos* was not. Robin Osborne, for instance, mainly argues that it would render Periklēs' Citizenship Law (PCL) incomprehensible if descendants of any resident would have access to political citizenship, while Alain Duplouy especially focuses on Cohen's exclusion of Athenian autochthony from the discussion.[228] Presumably, Duplouy considers the Athenian belief that they had always resided in the same place as a contradiction to the idea that descendants of immigrants could be considered *astoi*. Josine Blok, while she agrees with Cohen that before the second half of the fifth century the term *astos* means "belonging to us" when used in contrast to *xenos*, argues that after that date there was "a strong emphasis on descent from citizens playing an unmistakable role."[229]

I agree with Blok that issues of descent were directly related to the determination of *astos,* yet I disagree that it developed a stronger meaning "indicating citizen status in law due to legitimate birth from Athenian parents."[230] The shift that Blok notes in the middle of the fifth century refers to Periklēs' Citizenship Law, which determined that no one can be a citizen unless they descend from citizen parents. The primary texts that render the citizenship law, however, used a variety of terms and phrase to describe the citizens.[231] Of the four references that mention

[226] Cohen 2000, 62.
[227] Cohen 2000, 54.
[228] Osborne 2002, 94; Duplouy 2004, 514.
[229] Blok 2017, 165.
[230] Blok 2017, 172.
[231] Blok 2009.

the law and Periklēs explicitly, two note that one cannot be *Athenaios* unless they descend from *astoi*[232] or *Athenaioi*[233] parents. The Suda Δ 451 says that he who was not from both *astoi* would not be a *politēs.* Ath. Pol. 26.3-4 says that whoever was not born from both *astoi* parents could not "participate in the polis."[234] Furthermore, Aristotle notes in *Pol.* 1278a34-35 that "they only make those *politai* who are from both *astoi*." The relationship between *astos* and descent was thus undeniable, but in none of the texts that Blok associates with the PCL is the determination of being *astos* based on descent.[235]

After the establishment of the Periklean Citizenship Law legal cases arose concerning inheritance and legitimacy, two of which have surviving speeches, namely Isaios 12 and Demosthenes 57.[236] In Isaios 12, the speaker aims to prove Euphilētos' citizenship status after having been rejected by the members of his deme. The argumentation focuses solely on Euphilētos' descent, claiming that he is an *Athenaios* (12.7; 12.12) and a *politēs* (12.12) because his parents were an *astē* (12.7, 9, 10) and an *astos* (12.7). The descent from parents who were both *astoi* was thus the criterion to be a *politēs* and an *Athenaios.* In Demosthenes 57, Euxitheos aims to establish his status as a citizen so that he can be reinstated in the deme of Halimous. He too works to prove that he was a *politēs* (57.46, 47, 51) and an *Athenaios* (57.50), since both his parents were *astoi.* The two occasions on which Euxitheos claims to be *astos* offer further insight into the connection of *astos/astē* status with descent. At 59.46, Euxitheos establishes his *astos* status in the following way:

---

[232] Ael. *VH.* 13.24.
[233] Plut. *Per*. 37.3.
[234] Participation in the polis was a fundamental aspect of *politeia,* see Blok 2009: 158-162.
[235] Blok 2009.
[236] Cohen 2000, 60. Cohen uses these two texts to show the difference between *politai* and *astoi* and their connection to descent, but does not show, as I attempt here, which term is the "cause" and which is the "effect" in relation to descent.

> Οὐκοῦν ὅτι μὲν καὶ τὰ πρὸς μητρός εἰμ᾽ ἀστὸς καὶ τὰ πρὸς πατρός, τὰ μὲν ἐξ ὧν ἄρτι μεμαρτύρηται μεμαθήκατε πάντες, τὰ δ᾽ ἐξ ὧν πρότερον περὶ τοῦ πατρός.
>
> Therefore, that I am *astos* both on my mother's side and on my father's side, you all have learned from those who testified just now and from those who testified before about my father.

In this passage, Euxitheos uses the copulative coordinating conjunctions to show that he was *astos* on the basis of two separate lineages. Euxitheos established this prior to providing his descent from "both *astoi* parents" (ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἀστῶν ὄντα με) as part of the evidence that his is a *politēs.* Similarly, at 57.54, Euxitheos describes that his father presented him to the phratry "knowing that I was born an *astos* from an *astē* betrothed to himself" (ἀστὸν ἐξ ἀστῆς ἐγγυητῆς αὑτῷ γεγενημένον εἰδώς). Here too Euxitheos' status as *astos* is directly connected to his mother being *astē,* although supposedly the status of Euxitheos' father as *astos* had previously been established by the phratry. Considering the timeline this assertion is completely logical, because while you had to be descended from *astoi* parents to be a *politēs*, a boy was not a *politēs* until he was of age.[237] From these two speeches it is clear that the status of *astos/astē* and descent are strongly connected. One had to be descended from parents who were both *astoi* in order to qualify for being *politēs.* Yet being *astos* or *astē* itself could be proven by descent from only one *astos/astē* parent. There is, however, no evidence that descent from an *astos* or *astē* was necessary to be considered *astos* or *astē.*

As part of his larger argument about the definition of *astos,* Cohen argues that *metoikoi* are included among the *astoi* by certain authors. *Metoikoi* are foreigners residing in Athens and as such have been generally understood to be among of the *xenoi.*[238] In Arisophanes' *Acharnians,* however, Dikaiopolis uses a metaphor after describing the absence of *xenoi* at the

[237] see also Blok 2017, 172.
[238] Whitehead 1977, 11.

Lenaia: "But as it is we ourselves are winnowed, for I call the *metoikoi* the bran of the *astoi.*" (507-508).[239] The metics are thus not disposable like husks, the *xenoi* who were of temporary use for protection (οἱ ξύμμαχοι) (506), but the metics were valuable, just as bran is a part of the edible grain.[240] Other authors separate out *metoikoi* from *politai* and *xenoi* in situations that parallel the usual contrast between *xenoi* and *astoi*.[241] Thucydides, for instance, describes the Athenians as having a greater number of people than their enemy, "since troops consisting of *astoi* and the *xenoi* that were present had mobilized," while he earlier described the same group as "the *Athenaioi* themselves, the *metoikoi,* and the *xenoi* that were present" (4.90.1).[242] The group of *astoi* thus consisted of the *Athenaioi* and the *metoikoi.* Seeing as *Athenaios* is an ethnic term for those born in Athens, it makes sense that the *metoikoi* would not be included amongst them, yet Thucydides recognizes them as separate from the *xenoi.* In Demosthenes 23, the same tripartite is present when the question arises for whom a decree was created "is he a *xenos,* or a *metoikos,* or a *politēs*?" (Dem 23.23).[243] Here too, the *metoikoi* are separated from the *xenoi,* while neither *metoikoi* nor *xenoi* could be *politai,* demonstrating that there could be a meaningful distinction made *xenoi* and *metoikoi.* While it is thus often unclear whether an author counts the *metoikoi* among the *xenoi* or the *astoi* in the usual binary opposition, in these occasions the *metoikoi* are clearly not considered part of the *xenoi,* but a category of their own.

[239] ἀλλ᾽ ἐσμὲν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι·
τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω.
[240] There is yet another distinction made here between metics and the remaining *astoi,* who must be the *politai,* since bran is the harder part of the grain that surrounds the germ. The metaphor clearly shows the inclusion of *metoikoi* among the *astoi* and implies a certain inseparability. See also Akrigg 2015, 168; Whitehead 1977, 39.
[241] Cohen 2000, 56-58.
[242] Thuc 4.94.1: ἅτε πανστρατιᾶς ξένων τῶν παρόντων καὶ ἀστῶν γενομένης; Thuc. 4.90.1: Ἀθηναίους πανδημεί, αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ ξένων ὅσοι παρῆσαν
[243] πότερα ξένος ἢ μέτοικος ἢ πολίτης ἐστίν.

Some of the ambiguity about the configuration of *xenoi* as a group is that the term *xenos* is not merely used in contrast with *astos,* but also with *politēs.* For instance, in a comparison between previous and current military practices, Isocrates opposes the *politai* to the *xenoi* saying "Even then when they would man the triremes, they put the *xenoi* and enslaved people aboard, but sent out the *politai* with heavy arms, but now we use the *xenoi* as hoplites, and need the *politai* to row" (Isoc. 8.48).[244] As this passage shows a reversal of previous practice, Isocrates is not merely enumerating different groups of the present military forces but expressing a fundamental contrast between these two groups. This contrast is further emphasized by the purpose clause explaining that this allows the leaders of the Greeks a sense of comfort (ὑπηρέσιον ἔχοντες ἐκβαίνουσιν), while the *xenoi* risk their lives (Isoc. 8.48). In cases like this there is no doubt that *metoikoi* would have been included under *xenoi,* as they are not *politai.* The translation of both *politai* and *astoi* as "citizens," however, has also created flaws in arguments about the inclusion of *metoikoi* among the *xenoi.* For instance, James J. Kennelly cites several passages in which *xenos* is contrasted with *politēs* to support his argument that *metoikoi* belong to the *xenoi.*[245] Of course, as with the Isocrates passage, in a contrast between *xenoi* and *politai* the *metoikoi* belong indisputably to the *xenoi.* While *politēs/xenos* contrasts appear less often than *astos/xenos* contrasts, which perhaps is due to the fact that *xenoi* could, of course, be *politai* in other cities, there exists no other discrete term for a non-*politēs.*[246] In fact, in *Against Eubulides,* which was also discussed above, Euxitheos specifically asks whether the jurors could imagine that "the demesmen would have allowed some *xenos* and *non-politēs* to rule amongst

[244] καὶ τότε μὲν εἰ τριήρεις πληροῖεν, τοὺς μὲν ξένους καὶ τοὺς δούλους ναύτας εἰσεβίβαζον, τοὺς δὲ πολίτας μεθ᾽ ὅπλων ἐξέπεμπον· νῦν δὲ τοῖς μὲν ξένοις ὁπλίταις χρώμεθα, τοὺς δὲ πολίτας ἐλαύνειν ἀναγκάζομεν.
[245] Kennelly 1990, 540-541.
[246] cf. Cohen 2000, 55-56 fn. 46: Kalinka 1913, 136.

themselves, but not have prosecuted him?" (Dem 57.26).[247] This phrasing not only demonstrates that a separate antonym for *politēs* did not exist, as Euxitheos uses a negation of the term, but also shows us that being a *non-politēs* did not necessarily mean one was a *xenos*.[248] The multiple meanings and uses of *xenos* as well as the consistent translation of both *astos* and *politēs* as "citizen," thus have contributed to the prevailing belief that metics are *always* grouped under *xenoi* in contrasts between "citizens" and "foreigners."

The idea that *metoikoi* might be considered *astoi* has been discussed in previous scholarship. Bakewell, in his article on Neaira and other metic spouses, notes the possibility, based on Cohen's interpretation, that "ἀστός is primarily a territorial designation rather than a political one," but refutes the idea on the very basis of Neaira's case.[249] His argument for the incongruency is that Neaira's status as an *astē* could be proven too easily if the term "simply denoted free, long-term local residents," and that it would be foolish for Apollodoros to let his argument depend on this terminology.[250] If Cohen's definition of *astos/astē* was purely based on length of residence, as Bakewell says, Apollodoros would indeed have no case. Yet Cohen did not argue that all *metoikoi* ought to be included among the *astoi*, but rather viewed the group of *astoi* as "including *some* but far from all of the metics."[251]

Prior to Bakewell, Whitehead considered the question in an appendix to the second chapter of *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*.[252] Whitehead too views the *astos/xenos* contrast

[247] ποτ᾽ ἂν τοὺς δημότας ἐκεῖνον τὸν ξένον καὶ μὴ πολίτην ἄρχειν παρ᾽ αὑτοῖς, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἂν κατηγορεῖν;
[248] Technically it could also mean that one could be a *politēs* while being *xenos*, but as *xenos* and *astos* are clearly opposed and *politai* are a subset of *astoi*, I find this highly implausible. The aforementioned idea that some *xenoi* were *politai* in other cities would also not apply, since the speech is clearly concerned with Athenian citizenship.
[249] Bakewell 2008/2009, 102.
[250] Bakewell 2008/2009, 102 fn 30.
[251] Cohen 2000, 61 (emphasis mine).
[252] Whitehead 1977, 60-61.

as an exclusive binary opposition and the inclusion of *metoikoi* as an either-or situation. Despite his recognition of uncertainty and inconsistencies, Whitehead concludes that "evidence upholds probability in the view that *metoikoi* were an opposite, not a component, of *astoi*."[253] This rigidity is especially visible in his interpretation of a claim by Apollodoros about Neaira being someone "whom neither her ancestors passed being *astē* down to, nor the deme made a *politis.*" (59.107).[254] As being an *astē* and being a *politis* are in direct contrast with being *xenē,* it is no surprise that Apollodoros describes Neaira as not having either identity. Yet Apollodoros' specifications of *how* she did not achieve them is peculiar, because it limits the scope of his assertion. Whitehead interprets these specifications to be in binary opposition as depicting "a basic difference," namely that "the *astos* […] is born, not made" and being a *politēs* can be decreed for an individual.[255] This rigid interpretation disregards, however, the fact that the Periklean Citizenship Law made being a *politēs* and an *astos* a package deal, as well as the ability to achieve *politeia* as an *astos* born in Athens. Apollodoros' claim is thus not a complete explanation of every way to achieve a form of "citizenship," but just describes two ways in which Neaira did not achieve them. Consequently, the statement allows for the possibility that Neaira did not have being an *astē* passed down to her but was an *astē* nonetheless.[256]

Sophokles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* is another text that scholars have used for evidence of *metoikoi* being *astoi,* since Oedipus is described as both *astos* (222) and *xenos metoikos* (452).[257] While Whitehead outright dismissed it as "a distortion to say that Oedipus 'is' both *astos* and

[253] Whitehead 1977, 61.
[254] ἣν οὔτε οἱ πρόγονοι ἀστὴν κατέλιπον οὔθ' ὁ δῆμος πολῖτιν ἐποιήσατο. My translation is clunky, but best captures the syntax of the Greek phrase, which is relevant to my argument.
[255] Whitehead 1977, 60.
[256] My argument about Neaira starts on page 132.
[257] Whitehead 1977, 61.

metoikos,"[258] the text actually offers insight into not just receiving "citizenship," but *becoming* an *astos*. Whitehead points out that these lines are discussed out of context, yet does not offer a contextualized analysis himself. In context, however, the descriptions of Oedipous as both *astos* and *xenos metoikos* are coherent. The description of Oedipus as *xenos metoikos* at line 452 is quite straightforward. Teirisias describes Oedipus, as the murderer of Laios, to himself as "a *xenos metoikos* in reputation" (ξένος λόγῳ μέτοικος). Of course, the qualification of "in reputation" points to the fact that Oedipus is *astos* by birth, but it also indicates that how an individual is perceived can determine their identity as *xenos* or *astos.* This aspect of perception recurs at lines 219-223, where Oedipus explains that he is not trying to find the murderer of Laios by himself since he was a *xenos* when it happened. He explains, "but as it is, because I became an *astos* among *astoi* later, I will speak to all you Kadmeians the following words" (222-223).[259] Oedipus thus makes a direct contrast between being a *xenos* in the past and now being an *astos*. Oedipus describes *astos* as something he became, since at this point in the play he does not know that his parentage grants him to status of an *astos.* Furthermore, the phrase "*astos* amongst *astoi*" highlights that Oedipus was recognized by the other *astoi* as part of this group. Being *astos* or *xenos* is thus not completely dependent on the criteria of biological descent or decrees but is also ascribed on the basis of cultural characteristics. Consequently, Oedipus was able to be identify himself and be identified as an *astos* while being a *metoikos.*

The dependence on cultural characteristics to determine an individual's identity as *astos* or *xenos* is especially visible in the speech *Against Eubulides*. As described above, in this speech Euxitheos aims to prove his right to *politeia* by proving his descent from *astoi* parents. In an

[258] Whitehead 1977, 60-61.
[259] νῦν δ᾽ ὕστερος γὰρ ἀστὸς εἰς ἀστοὺς τελῶ,
ὑμῖν προφωνῶ πᾶσι Καδμείοις τάδε·

attempt to depict Euxitheos as ineligible for *politeia,* his demesmen argued that his father was *xenos* because he spoke with a foreign accent (ὡς ἐξένιζε) (57.18). From the sheer number of witnesses that Euxitheos provided, as he too argues (24), it is clear that his father was a *politēs.* He just picked up an accent when he was taken prisoner and enslaved in the Dekelean war (57.18-19). The fact, however, that the identity of a *politēs* and an *astos* could so easily be challenged based on speaking with an accent emphasizes the importance of cultural characteristics in determination of whether someone was an *astos* or a *xenos*. Euxitheos highlights this when he emphasizes the fact that his father's deme and phratry had examined both him and his father throughout their lives (ὅσοισπερ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, ἐξητασμένος φαίνεται καὶ ζῶν ὁ πατὴρ καὶ νῦν ἐγώ) (57.24). Yet they never accused his father of being foreign (57.19-20). The role of observation and recognition of belonging are thus accentuated in the proofs of being an *astos*. The case of Euxitheos' father further demonstrates that cultural characteristics were instrumental in maintaining the boundaries of the *astoi*-group.

What it meant to be an *astos* is thus clearly less defined than what it meant to be a *politēs,* especially after Periklēs' citizenship law. Being *politēs* was restricted to those who were *astos* by birth and could seldom be decreed for people, but no clearly defined boundaries for being an *astos* have emerged from our sources. The laws concerning citizenship clarify being an *astos* as a prerequisite for being a *politēs,* and we thus know that being an *astos* can be passed down through descent, but no law explicitly specifies conditions for being an *astos.* Due to the *astos/xenos* contrast, scholars have gained an understanding of the behaviors associated with being an *astos* as opposed to the criteria for being a *xenos.* While scholars' insistence in grouping *metoikoi* with *xenoi* is justifiable when *xenoi* are discussed in contrast with *politai,* our evidence shows significant contradictions in cases when *xenoi* are contrasted with *astoi.* In several cases

of *astos/xenos* contrasts, the source is not concerned with this question and the evidence is in turn irrelevant or inconclusive. Various authors, however, such as Thucydides and Aeschylus, include *metoikoi* amongst *astoi,* Sophokles in *Oedipus Tyrannos* shows a shift in social status from *xenos* to *astos,* and several speeches concerning citizenship demonstrate the importance of behaviors as indicative of being a *xenos* and recognition as evidence for being an *astos.* Whereas *politeia* was defined in law, the categories *astos* and *xenos* were thus less binary than their use as contrasting terms would suggest and indicated cultural belonging. Therefore, some *metoikoi* who integrated and assimilated into Athenian culture would be considered *astoi.*

Against Neaira

The first half of Apollodoros' narrative in *Against Neaira* aims to prove that Neaira was *xenē.* Scholars generally accept this as evident and some in fact comment on the excessive length of this part of the speech. Several have suggested that he extended this section in order to hide the weakness of his arguments in the second half of the speech. In this section, I argue that Apollodoros' lengthy narrative was neither "an overkill," as Kapparis puts it, nor conclusive. Due to the fact that *astos* and *xenos* were identities determined based on cultural characteristics, Apollodoros had to pull out all the stops to provide evidence that Neaira behaved like a *xenē.* While Apollodoros may have convinced the jurors, his argument does not prove conclusively that Neaira was considered a *xenē.* Apollodoros is inconsistent and contradictory, uses ambiguous verbs, and redefines terminology throughout the speech. Furthermore, his avoidance of terminology concerning metics strongly suggests that the historical Neaira, while a *metoikos,* was in fact considered an *astē.*

Against the Law—Which Law?

Apollodoros' insistence that Neaira was a *xenē* has led to a pervasive misconception that *Against Neaira* was a *graphē xenias*.[260] The *graphē xenias* was a procedure against foreigners who were pretending to be citizens. Our sources lack the exact wording of the legislation for the *graphē xenias,* but two speeches mention a *graphē xenias* and also include a description. In Lysias 13, Aristophanes of Cholleidai was given advice on how to avoid a charge of *xenia,* after the previous sentence narrates that some men thought he was not "purely Athenian" (οὐ καθαρῶς Ἀθηναῖον ὄντα) (13.59). As shown in Periklēs' citizenship law above, *Athenaios* was an ethnic term that specified in particular that one was a *politēs* of Athens rather than a citizen from another city.[261] In Isaios 3 we find our most explicit, albeit very short, description of the type of citizenship at stake in a *graphē xenias.* Nikodemos is described as a man "who, when charged with *xenia* by one of the members of the phratry to which he said he belonged, now participates in the polis on account of four votes" (Is. 3.37).[262] The *graphē xenias* was thus concerned with usurpation of *politeia* by those who had no right to it.

The case against Neaira, however, was based on the laws quoted in sections 16 and 52, not the *graphē xenias.* Kapparis substantiates his argument for this distinction by pointing out that the *graphē xenias* already existed in the 5th century, while the laws in *Against Neaira* were from 4th century legislation. Their difference is further highlighted by the law's excerpt in section 52, because it includes the phrase "as in cases of a prosecution for *xenia*" (καθάπερ τῆς

[260] Kapparis 2005, 78.
[261] Blok 2017, 184.
[262] ὃς αὐτὸς ξενίας φεύγων ὑπὸ ἑνὸς τῶν φρατόρων ὧν φησιν αὑτοῦ εἶναι, παρὰ τέτταρας ψήφους μετέσχε τῆς πόλεως·

ξενίας).[263] The laws concerning marriage (59.16) and giving a foreign woman in marriage as if she was an *astē* (52) were thus laws that were introduced later and served different purposes.[264]

However, Apollodoros' claims, especially at the end of the speech, clearly fit the ideas of a *graphē xenias.* He suggests that the jurors' wives and daughters will be angry because "you deemed her worthy, just as them, of participating in the polis and sacred things" (59.111).[265] Similarly, at 59.113, he claims that, if the men acquit Neaira, they basically give *hetairai* the right "to bear children as they want and to participate in the city's mystic rites and sacred things and honors."[266] In both places, however, Apollodoros carefully avoids claiming that Neaira already had done these things. Both statements are instead shown as potential outcomes if the jury acquits Neaira. Apollodoros' inability to prove that Neaira pretended to be a *politis* must have been one of the reasons for his use of the marriage law instead of the *graphē xenias.*

While Apollodoros' aims were broadly the same, he takes on the extra burden of proof to show that Stephanos and Neaira lived in marriage. For the *graphē xenias,* as it was concerned with *politeia,* Apollodoros would likely have to produce evidence about Neaira's birth. Cultural characteristics often functioned as supporting evidence in cases concerning citizenship, but all known cases of a *graphe xenias* involved the presentation of witnesses to verify descent. It was difficult to prove descent in a society without birth records. As Adele Scafuro demonstrated, witnesses of "descent and participation in a variety of kin and communal events" were integral to proving a citizen's identity in the absence of archival records, especially for women.[267] In *Against Eubulides,* for instance, Euxitheos provides thorough evidence by calling forth witnesses

[263] Kapparis 2005, 78.
[264] Kapparis 2005, 78.
[265] διότι ὁμοίως αὐταῖς ταύτην κατηξιοῦτε μετέχειν τῶν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν
[266] παιδοποιεῖσθαι ὡς ἂν βούλωνται καὶ τελετῶν καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ τιμῶν μετέχειν τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει.
[267] Scafuro 1994, 169. See also Blok 2017 for an extensive overview of female Athenian citizenship.

from his mother's birth family, both from the male and female line, and witnesses to her engagement to his father (57.37-43). In *Against Neaira,* however, Apollodoros offers no such evidence and avoids the topic of descent altogether. As this type of evidence would have been most convincing, there are two potential reasons for its absence. Either Apollodoros had no information about Neaira's natal family, or he did and judged it to be in his best interest to omit it. The marriage law's concern with cultural rather than political citizenship, however, offered Apollodoros an opportunity to prosecute Neaira based solely on cultural evidence.

Sunoikein: **to Live Together in Marriage and…**

Against Neaira thus hinges on a marriage law that forbade the marriage of *xenoi* and *astoi*. Apollodoros cites the law at 59.16:[268]

> Ἐὰν δὲ ξένος ἀστῇ συνοικῇ τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἠτινιοῦν, γραφέσθω πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος οἷς ἔξεστιν. ἐὰν δὲ ἁλῷ, πεπράσθω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἔστω τοῦ ἑλόντος. ἔστω δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἡ ξένη τῷ ἀστῷ συνοικῇ κατὰ ταὐτά, καὶ ὁ συνοικῶν τῇ ξένῃ τῇ ἁλούσῃ ὀφειλέτω χιλίας δραχμάς.
>
> If a "foreign" man lives together with a "citizen" woman by any scheme or device whatsoever, let a willing man from the Athenians, who were allowed, indict him before the Thesmothetai. If he is convicted, let both him and his property be sold, and let the one who convicted him have a share of one-third. But let it be accordingly also if a "foreign" woman lives with a "citizen" man, and let the man living together with the convicted foreign woman pay a thousand drachmas.

In order for Apollodoros to successfully convict Neaira, he had to prove that she was *xenē* and that she was living together with Stephanos. The verb συνοικέω, which is understood as "living together in marriage," is ambiguous, since it is used to describe different types of cohabitation, such as peoples living together in community and not just marriage.[269] Its qualification "in any

[268] This law is considered genuine: see Carey 1992 92; Kapparis 1999, 198; Bakewell 2008/2009, 99.
[269] Kapparis 1999, 203; Carey 1992; LSJ, s.v. "συνοικέω" A.I.1, A.II.

way or by any means whatsoever" further complicates matters by broadening the scope of this law. In a literal reading, it would forbid any type of cohabitation of a foreigner and a citizen, but even Apollodoros suggests that Stephanos would claim Neaira's cohabitation with him was as a *hetaira* (119), which would make no sense if this cohabitation was also forbidden.[270] Συνοικέω was thus a common *pars pro toto* to indicate marriage, but unlikely to have functioned as conclusive proof due to the existence of other, legal cohabitation of foreigners and citizens. Bakewell, in fact, suggests that phrase "in any way or by any means whatsoever" (τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἠτινιοῦν*)* reflects the complicated nature of marriage in ancient Greece.[271] Ancient Athenian marriages involved a series of customs, such as an official betrothal (*enguē*), introduction of the bride to the phratry (*gamēlia*), and marriage feasts (*hestiasis*). Not all of these components were necessary or demonstrable, but their complete absence from *Against Neaira* suggests that Apollodoros uses the broad scope of the law to hide his lack of evidence.

The ambiguity of συνοικέω also allowed room for Apollodoros to define the term himself and shape his argument around that definition. While this was rhetorically beneficial, the inconsistency further reveals his lack of evidence. In the sentence right after the quotation of the law, Apollodoros reiterates its meaning and adds the phrase "nor produce children" (οὐδὲ παιδοποιεῖσθαι) (59.17). He thus reconstructs the law in such a manner that he does not need to provide evidence of their living together in marriage, but of the existence of children. Indeed, Apollodoros mentions several children, but appears to have lost count. While at 59.38-39 Apollodoros reports of "three children with her, Proxenos, Ariston, and a daughter, whom they now call Phano," at the end of the speech Neaira is suddenly reported to have four children: "both Proxenos who has died and Ariston who is currently living, and Antidoridēs the runner,

[270] Patterson 1990, 62 n. 2.
[271] Bakewell 2009, 99; Kapparis 1999, 199.

and Phano."[272] As the difference in the number of children stems from the addition of Antidoridēs, a simple conclusion would be that Antidoridēs was the son of both Stephanos and Neaira. Apollodoros could have claimed that they had produced offspring and thus fit the definition of *sunoikein.* Instead, Apollodoros does not address the discrepancy, and in fact consistently portrays them as being only Neaira's and explicitly not Stephanos' (59.51, 54, 56, 67, 81, 82, 83).

The children did not enter the narrative until the moment when Neaira decided to come to Athens with Stephanos. As discussed above, in recent scholarship the children are commonly understood to be Stephanos'. When Apollodoros addresses a potential counterargument, namely that Stephanos would say "that the children are not hers, but his from another *astē* woman, his kin, whom he will say that he married previously," it suggests why he may have avoided the claim that the children were Stephanos' altogether.[273] Another reason is that Phano, the daughter, had two failed marriages. Apollodoros uses this story not only to prove that Neaira was *xenē,* but also to claim that Stephanos broke the law by giving Phano in marriage as being his own. This law is quoted at 59.52 as follows:

> Ἐὰν δέ τις ἐκδῷ ξένην γυναῖκα ἀνδρὶ Ἀθηναίῳ ὡς ἑαυτῷ προσήκουσαν, ἄτιμος ἔστω, καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ δημοσία ἔστω, καὶ τοῦ ἑλόντος τὸ τρίτον μέρος. γραφέσθων δὲ πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας οἷς ἔξεστι, καθάπερ τῆς ξενίας.
>
> And if anyone gives a xenē woman to an Athenian man as related to himself, let him be *atimos,* and let his property be state-property, and let one-third be for the one who got the conviction. And let anyone for whom it is possible bring this indictment before the Thesmothetai, just as for a charge of xenia.

[272] 59.38-39: παιδία μετ᾽ αὐτῆς τρία, Πρόξενον καὶ Ἀρίστωνα καὶ θυγατέρα, ἣν νυνὶ Φανὼ καλοῦσιν. 59.124: Πρόξενός τε ὁ τελευτήσας καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ νῦν ὢν καὶ Ἀντιδωρίδης ὁ σταδιαδρομῶν καὶ Φανώ.
[273] 59.119-120: οἱ παῖδες οὐκ εἰσὶ ταύτης, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἑτέρας γυναικὸς αὐτῷ ἀστῆς, ἣν φήσει πρότερον γῆμαι συγγενῆ αὐτοῦ.

Using this law, Apollodoros no longer had to prove that Stephanos and Neaira lived in marriage, a claim that Apollodoros clearly struggled to support. As Apollodoros has clear evidence that Stephanos gave Phano away in marriage to her husbands, his case now depends on persuading the jury that Phano is Neaira's daughter and a *xenē.*

Apollodoros thus focuses a large portion of his speech on Phano. We are told that she used to be called Strybele (59.50), perhaps because a name change implies foreign origins. Following Apollodoros' account, Phano initially married Phrastor, but a year into the marriage Phrastor divorced her while she was pregnant with his child when he found out "that she was not the daughter of Stephanos, but of Neaira" (ὅτι Στεφάνου μὲν οὐκ εἴη θυγάτηρ, Νεαίρας δέ) (59.51). After the divorce, however, Phrastor did accept his child from Phano and attempted to register him with his genos and phratry. When they rejected the child based on the belief that Phano was Neaira's daughter, Phrastor sued the genos (59.60) and the outcome of the suit, which would be Apollodoros' strongest evidence, is not reported. If his son was illegitimate, it is unlikely that Phrastor would have gone through these lengths to introduce him. In fact, Kapparis argues that due to the father's assertion and the lack of substantial proof against the boy's legitimacy it is most likely that the genos had to accept Phrastor's son.[274] Phrastor's decision to divorce Neaira may have been based on his perception of the relationship between Neaira and Phano or a rumor, if their relationship seemed like that of a mother and daughter. Moreover, she supposedly did not behave to Phrastor's liking, as she "was disruptive and did not want to obey him."[275] Similarly, a rumor may have led the genos to initially reject Phrastor's son, but Phrastor's recognition of his son shows the lack of concrete and conclusive evidence that Phano was Neaira's daughter and a *xenē.*

[274] Kapparis 1999, 283.
[275] 59.51: αὐτὴν οὔτε κοσμίαν οὖσαν οὔτ᾽ ἐθέλουσαν αὐτοῦ ἀκροᾶσθαι

Apollodoros alleges a similar cause for the failure of her second marriage, the one to Theogenes, who became *archon basileus*.[276] In this case it was the council of the Areopagus who found fault with the marriage, not her husband. They fined Theogenes "because he took that kind of woman and allowed her to perform the unnamed religious rites on behalf of the city."[277] Apollodoros thus does not claim that the council said that Phano was Neaira's daughter, but rather reports a vague statement and attributes the argument about Phano's parentage to Theogenes. The council may in fact not have referenced her parentage at all, since the law that Apollodoros cites at 59.75 also forbids a marriage with a woman "who had had intercourse with another man" (καὶ μὴ ἐπιμεμειγμένην ἑτέρῳ ἀνδρί). Phano would thus not be suitable regardless of her relationship to Neaira, as she had been married to Phrastor and had given birth to their baby. Thus, the council's objection to the *basileus's* marriage to Phano thus does not prove that Phano was Neaira's daughter. Moreover, the fact that Phano was twice successfully given in marriage, a process that included introduction of the bride to the genos and phratry, suggests that it is unlikely that Neaira was Phano's mother.[278]

At the end of the speech, Apollodoros re-defines *sunoikein* again:

> τὸ γὰρ συνοικεῖν τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, ὃς ἂν παιδοποιῆται καὶ εἰσάγῃ εἴς τε τοὺς φράτερας καὶ δημότας τοὺς υἱεῖς, καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἐκδιδῷ ὡς αὑτοῦ οὔσας τοῖς ἀνδράσι.
>
> For that is living together in marriage, to produce children and introduce sons into the phratry and deme, and to give daughters to their husbands as being his. (59.122)

Apollodoros here clearly draws on the law he cited at 59.52 that forbade men to give a foreign woman in marriage as being their own. By adding these duties of a father to introduce his sons to the deme and phratry and to give his daughters away in marriage, Apollodoros made it appear

[276] For more on Theogenes and the *archon basileus*, see Kapparis 1999: 344-348.
[277] 59.81: ὅτι τοιαύτην ἔλαβε γυναῖκα καὶ ταύτην εἴασε ποιῆσαι τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἄρρητα ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως.
[278] Carey 1992, 113. Carey notes a lack of evidence or explanation for how Phrastor discovered "the truth" and explains why it took him a year.

that Stephanos, according to Apollodoros' account, violated the marriage law at 59.16 and this law at 59.52 simultaneously. These acts related to the children are certainly part of married life, just like cohabitation, but they are criteria of parentage, not of marital status. Apollodoros' argument may have been strengthened by his repeated redefinition. As the additional descriptors of συνοικέω are indicative of marriage, the audience likely recognized the behaviors as related to marriage and did not question whether they defined marriage. For the modern reader, however, these inconsistencies reveal that Apollodoros did not have substantial evidence for the supposed marital nature of Neaira's and Stephanos' relationship.

But Surely, She's a *xenē?*

As I have shown above, Apollodoros does not provide concrete evidence, such as witnesses of participation in communal events or family members, to prove that Neaira was *xenē*. As the marriage law in 59.16 relates to cultural citizenship, however, Apollodoros is able to construct an argument supported by evidence from her behavior, characteristics, and interactions with others. Apollodoros narrates Neaira's life story and indeed focuses on these factors, but in his descriptions uses ambiguous vocabulary, contradicts himself, and hedges his claims. Some of these features are marks of Apollodoros' skill as an orator, but simultaneously indicate that the historical Neaira differed greatly from the Neaira that Apollodoros portrays.

Apollodoros begins the narrative by describing Neaira's childhood. Together with six other young girls, she was raised by a freedwoman called Nikaretē. While she lived outside of Athens at this time, Apollodoros does not include her place of residence in his account of her trips to Athens (59.21-25). Only when the witness Philostratos speaks do we learn "that they lived in Corinth," after he affirms that Neaira and her caregiver Nikaretē lodged at his place in

Athens for the initiation into the Mysteries (59.23). The remark thus seems to be simply explanatory for their stay at his home, rather than a key part of the argument. In the six times that Apollodoros mentions Corinth in this narrative, it is not once in relation to her being a *xenē* (59.26, 30, 32, 36, 37). The mention of her early childhood in Corinth clearly implies her foreignness, but Apollodoros did not make it central to his argument.

Apollodoros did not leverage Neaira's hometown of Corinth as evidence that she was *xenē*, but Corinth's reputation as a city filled with sex workers might have worked in his favor.[279] Throughout *Against Neaira*, Apollodoros focuses on depicting Neaira as a *hetaira*. Some scholars argue that Neaira's employment as a *hetaira* would convince the jurors of Neaira's foreignness, since *hetairai* are foreign.[280] Macurdy, however, opposes this argument, saying that Neaira's profession as a sex worker could not legally count against her, since there were also *hetairai* who were *astai*.[281] Most of the aforementioned scholars note this possibility, but they dismiss it by asserting that there was a normative belief that sex workers were foreign. While sex work was not a criterion of foreignness, it could thus function as an indicium. Yet Apollodoros' depiction of Neaira as a *hetaira* also show signs of hesitation and uncertainty on his part.

In *Against Neaira*, Apollodoros argues in a variety of ways that Neaira is a *hetaira*. At 59.19-20, when describing her upbringing, he notes that Nikaretē "reared and educated [her] skillfully" (θρέψαι καὶ παιδεῦσαι ἐμπείρως) and explains why she called the seven young girls 'daughters,' namely "in order to obtain for herself the greatest wages from those wanting to

[279] Kapparis 1999, 241.
[280] Kapparis 1999; Hamel 2003; Patterson 1994.
[281] Macurdy 1942, 267; Ath. 13.46: "For our beautiful Athens has brought forth such a great number of *hetairai*, about which I will tell you as much as I can." (αἱ γὰρ καλαὶ ἡμῶν Ἀθῆναι τοσοῦτον πλῆθος ἤνεγκαν ἑταιρῶν, περὶ ὧν ἐπεξελεύσομαι ὅσον γε δύναμαι) One example is Gnathaina, who was a favorite of the Athenian New Comic poet Diphilus. Timarchus from Aeschines' first speech *Against Timarchus* is another example, although he was male (and thus a *hetairos*); while his profession likely cost him his *politeia*, although he must have been an *astos* from *astoi* parents.

consort with the girls as with free girls" (ἵν᾽ ὡς μεγίστους μισθοὺς πράττοιτο τοὺς βουλομένους πλησιάζειν αὐταῖς ὡς ἐλευθέραις οὔσαις). While τρέφω usually indicates the rearing and bringing up of children, παιδεύω has a more specific meaning of training and educating.[282] Indeed, παιδεύω is often used to describe someone teaching another person a *technē* or in the context of training animals. In combination with the explanatory purpose-clause that indicates monetary gain for Nikaretē, the image quickly shifts from a simple description of Neaira's upbringing and education to a description of Nikaretē grooming girls to be exploited.

As Apollodoros continues, he asserts "Neaira here was Nikaretē's and worked with her body, being rented out to those wanting to associate with her" (ὡς δὲ Νέαιρα αὐτηὶ Νικαρέτης ἦν καὶ ἠργάζετο τῷ σώματι μισθαρνοῦσα τοῖς βουλομένοις αὐτῇ πλησιάζειν). The verbal phrases πλησιάζειν "associate with," both here and at 59.19, and ἠργάζετο τῷ σώματι "worked with her body" suggest, but do not explicitly state, that Neaira practiced sex work. While ἠργάζετο is the common verb for "work," the addition of the dative instrument "with her body" could suggest that she is selling her body for the purpose of sex, just as the phrase "selling your body" does nowadays.[283] Furthermore, while its root meaning as a frequentative verb of πλήσιος is "to come close to," πλησιάζω is often used to indicate sexual intercourse. Yet, while Kennedy is of the opinion that Apollodoros' addition of this verb makes the association of sex work explicit, the verb does not inherently relate to sex.[284] In Dem. 61.3, πλησιάζω is used when Demosthenes describes courting behaviors. Young lovers who were not able to distinguish good from bad would treat every potential lover the same. Since some acted poorly, however, they "were also ill-disposed towards those who deigned to approach with pure intentions" (καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μετὰ

[282] LSJ s.vv. "τρέφω" A.II and "παιδεύω" A.II.
[283] Kennedy 2014, 124.
[284] LSJ s.v. πλησιάζω.

σωφροσύνης πλησιάζειν ἀξιοῦντας δυσκόλως διακειμένους). It is unlikely that the verb πλησιάζειν here refers to sexual intercourse, since the passage describes initial interactions between lovers. Similarly, in Dem. 54.6, the speaker recounts an interaction with some very drunken men and expresses his resolve to have nothing to do with that kind of people in the future (καὶ φυλάττεσθαι μὴ πλησιάζειν τοῖς τοιούτοις). In both these passages πλησιάζω does not refer to sexual, but rather social intercourse. While Apollodoros is clearly suggesting that Neaira's childhood activities involved sex work, the verbs he chooses to use are ambiguous and do not declare explicitly that Neaira was a sex worker.

In addition to these descriptions of Neaira's work, Apollodoros highlights behaviors that he holds to be associated with sex workers. When he first uses the term *hetaira* in 59.24, it was to comment on Neaira's behavior, namely that "she drank along and ate along in the company of many, as if being a hetaira" (καὶ συνέπινε καὶ συνεδείπνει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαιρα αὐτὴ ὡς ἂν ἑταίρα οὖσα). While the presence of women at symposia has been understood as indicative of their occupational status as entertainer or hetaira, Joan Burton, Sean Corner, and Clare Kelly Blazeby have each offered analyses of women's commensality that emphasize the sources' biased focus on this "ideal state of Athenian affairs."[285] Kelly Blazeby bemoans the lack of ancient texts related to women's drinking, as she reconsiders the automatic identification of nude women on red-figure pottery as *hetairai*. For instance, some nude women are depicted by themselves, not in the presence of a man, but are still marked as *hetairai.* In addition to considering whether there can be a *hetaira* depicted without a customer, she questions whether the drinking of wine was only the preserve of sex workers at a symposium, as this assumption led to mark any wine-drinking woman as a *hetaira.* Burton and Corner each address the question

[285] Kelly Blazeby 2011, 93.

concerning women and the consumption of wine. Burton, after a survey of women's commensality, concludes that there were occasions, such "luncheons, private parties, wedding banquets, and sacrificial feasts," on which women would have participated and shared food and drink with others.[286] Corner asserts more strongly that respectable women would still be absent from symposia, but agrees that these other occasions could include women and suggests considering the relationships between different types of commensality as a way to examine social groupings in ancient Greek society.[287] An often cited passage from Isaios 3, in which a woman is depicted as a *hetaira,* describes the appropriate behavior for married women, saying "married women do not go to dinner parties (τὰ δεῖπνα) with men, nor do they think it right to eat together with strange men (ἀλλοτρίων*),* and especially with ones they just happened upon (ἐπιτυχόντων)."[288] Burton argues that the last clause is often overlooked and suggests that women might have attended feasts in the company of strangers as long as they were not mere chance comers.[289] Corner, however, disagrees with Burton's reading of ἀλλοτρίων as "strangers," and suggests "non-kinsmen" as ἀλλότριος is often opposed to οἰκεῖος.[290] Following both Burton and Corner, it was clearly worse if women dined with non-kinsmen whom they had not previously met. The specification of *married* women, however, has been commonly overlooked, especially when a parallel is drawn with Neaira.[291] Participation in commensality with non-kinsmen was thus inappropriate for married women and the only women present at a male-centered event such as the symposium were *hetairai* and flute-girls, yet what about all the

[286] Burton 1998, 160.
[287] Corner 2012, 44.
[288] Is. 3.14: οὐδὲ αἱ γαμεταὶ γυναῖκες ἔρχονται μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δεῖπνα, οὐδὲ συνδειπνεῖν ἀξιοῦσι μετὰ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, καὶ ταῦτα μετὰ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων.
[289] Burton 1998, 147.
[290] Corner 2012, 36.
[291] Corner 2012, 36. Corner in fact understands *Against Neaira* as supporting his own reading and conclusion that women were excluded from banqueting with men.

other women? As for Neaira, she accompanied Simus the Thessalian to Athens for the great Panathēnaia and her attendance at and participation in a dinner party should be viewed in this context.

Presence at and participation in meals with men are not defining characteristics of sex work and at most hint towards sex work in the context of *symposia*. As a matter of fact, at 59.24 Apollodoros qualifies this behavior with the phrase "as if a *hetaira*" (ὡς ἂν ἑταίρα οὖσα), and thus insinuates that she is not a hetaira, but merely acted like one.[292] While this highlights Apollodoros' use of behavioral characteristics in his portrayal, it is also remarkable, since Apollodoros would benefit from the assertion that Neaira is a *hetaira*. Allison Glazebrook analyzed Apollodoros' use of the "stereotype of the prostitute" and argues that "the drawn-out description of behaviour attributed to Neaira is intended to convince the audience that she had been a prostitute."[293] She explains the cursory and indirect claims that Neaira was as a hetaira as Apollodoros' attempt to not "alienate jurors unfamiliar with her."[294] Jess Miner, who analyzed the way in which Apollodoros uses different terms for sex workers, understands him to imply that "Neaira was not yet a hetaira, but rather acting "as if" she were."[295] According to Miner, she may not have been considered a hetaira because of her age and social standing.[296] Like Glazebrook, Miner sees the phrase as a part of Apollodoros' rhetorical strategy, allowing for a slow build-up to stronger assertions of her position as a hetaira at the end of his speech. While the phrasing may have benefited Apollodoros rhetorically at 59.24, his frequent use of a ὡς +

[292] Kapparis 1999, p.221: "ἂν after ὡς would imply that Neaira actually was not a courtesan." Kapparis suggests that this discrepancy between the text and the common view that Neaira was a courtesan means that ἂν should be deleted.
[293] Glazebrook 2005, 163.
[294] Glazebrook 2005, 165.
[295] Miner 2003, 22 (emphasis mine).
[296] Miner 2003, 23.

participle construction to describe Neaira "like a *hetaira*" (59.37, 48, 49) actually weakens his claims. Apollodoros had a "proclivity for this construction," as Miner puts it, and consistently prefers this comparison over the stronger assertion that uses only the participial phrase to state "being a *hetaira*." [297] Or, alternatively, Apollodoros could have used a noun in apposition, as at 116 when Apollodoros brings up Sinope: "Sinōpē the hetaira" (Σινώπῃ τῇ ἑταίρᾳ). Yet this comparative phrasing appears only when he makes a claim about Neaira himself. The four times when Apollodoros does use the simple participle with *hetaira*, it is twice in indirect discourse (59.30, 118), once in a purpose clause representing Stephanos' thoughts (according to Apollodoros) (59.39), and once in a general statement without direct reference to Neaira (59.48). He thus consistently hedges his own claims that Neaira is a *hetaira*, indicating that he is uncertain about his claim or at the very least retaining some plausible deniability.

After the witness' accounts of Neaira's trips to Athens with Nikaretē, Apollodoros continues his depiction of her as a sex worker as well as an enslaved person. At 59.26 Apollodoros notes that she had two lovers, Xenocleides the poet and Hipparchus the actor, who "kept her, having rented her" (εἶχον αὐτὴν μεμισθωμένοι), and at 59.29 another pair of lovers, Timanoridas the Corinthian and Eukrates the Leukadian, "bought her outright from her, in accordance with the law of the city, to be their enslaved person" (ὠνοῦνται αὐτὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῆς νόμῳ πόλεως καθάπαξ αὑτῶν δούλην εἶναι). The occupational status of hetaira certainly had consequences for her daily life and may have had the stereotype of 'foreigner' attached, but from Apollodoros' focus on her enslavement it is clear that being a *hetaira* did not unequivocally prove a non-citizen identity.

[297] Miner 2003, 23. The examples she gives are of Stephanos marrying off Phano "as his own" 59.50 and stating that Neaira had to post sureties "as a foreigner" 59.49, but another occurs at 59.41. Apollodoros uses a simple participle with *hetaira* only thrice, twice in indirect discourse and once in a general statement unrelated to Neaira.

Although Neaira's depiction as an enslaved person is initially strongly established and beneficial for Apollodoros' goals, the rest of the speech complicates her legal and social status. After she had previously been sold for 30 minas (59.29), her new owners, Timanoridas the Corinthian and Eukrates the Leucadian, offered her an opportunity to buy her freedom. According to the narrative, the men were each getting married and did not want Neaira to live in Corinth any longer. They offered a discount and set her price at 20 minas, perhaps to speed up her departure or because Neaira negotiated with them. As she could not buy her own freedom, being an enslaved person, Neaira used Phrynion, a former lover, as a third-party buyer.[298] For this fictive sale, she collected money from previous lovers and added it to the money that she saved from her earnings. Phrynion contributed the remaining amount and 'bought' Neaira so that she would be free (ὥστε ἐλευθέραν εἶναι) (59.31). Although Neaira was then free, as the 20 minas for her freedom (ἐπ᾽ἐλευθερίᾳ) (32) had been paid, Phrynion treated her as if he bought her to be his enslaved person. He brought her with him to Athens (ἔχων αὐτὴν). Several participles of attendant circumstance could have been used, namely ἄγων (leading), ἔχων (having), φέρων (carrying), and λαβών (taking), but each has their own connotations. While ἄγων is only used for animate objects, and φέρων merely for inanimate, λαβών and ἔχων can be used for either, but the latter is indicative of possession.[299] This word choice thus suggests that Phrynion considered Neaira enslaved by him. While Phrynion thus initially facilitates Neaira's freedom by acting as a third-person buyer and providing the remaining sum of money, Apollodoros depicts him as Neaira's master immediately after the fictive sale.

Apollodoros continues to depict Neaira as subservient to Phrynion after their arrival in Athens. Phrynion treated her "brutally and rashly" (ἀσελγῶς καὶ προπετῶς), brought her to

[298] For fictive sales, see Kamen 2014.
[299] Smyth 2068.

parties, and "was with her openly" (συνῆν τ᾽ ἐμφανῶς) (59.33). One of these parties was at the temple of Athena Cholias where "many others got together with her as she was drunk, while Phrynion was sleeping, even the servants of Chabrios." (59.33).[300] Both σύνειμι and συγγίγνομαι can mean "to have intercourse with," but they can also describe non-sexual interactions. The verb συγγίγνομαι also means "to come together" or "to have a conversation with," and σύνειμι has the core meaning of "to be with."[301] Apollodoros thus uses ambiguous verbs to suggest rather than declare explicitly that Neaira was engaging in similar behavior as when she was enslaved in Corinth. The witness testimony for the party, however, does not describe the interaction between these men and Neaira, but only reports that the witnesses "noticed that men, amongst whom were servants of Chabrias, got up to go to Neaira in the night" (59.34).[302] The incongruity with the testimony at 34 indicates that one reason for the ambiguity was Apollodoros' lack of knowledge of the events at that party. Neaira was depicted as an enslaved person by suggestions that sexual intercourse occurred and that it was allowed or at least condoned.[303]

Neaira's status is further complicated by the events that followed. Phrynion's treatment of Neaira is the catalyst for her relationship with Stephanos. The *hubris* Neaira endured at the hands of Phrynion made her "afraid of Phrynion because he had wronged her and was angry with her, and she knew that he had a violent and contemptuous character" (59.37).[304] In order to

[300] καὶ ἐκεῖ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ συνεγίγνοντο αὐτῇ μεθυούσῃ καθεύδοντος τοῦ Φρυνίωνος, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι οἱ Χαβρίου.
[301] LSJ s.v. σύνειμι.
[302] καὶ αἰσθάνεσθαι αὐτοὶ ἀνισταμένους τῆς νυκτὸς πρὸς Νέαιραν ἄλλους τε καὶ τῶν διακόνων τινάς, οἳ ἦσαν Χαβρίου οἰκέται.
[303] I question whether this narrative would not have evoked empathy for Neaira, as Apollodoros also depicts it as brutal and rough, even calling it *hubris* at 59.37. For the modern reader it should be clear that these events should not reflect on Neaira, but on the perpetrators of this (sexual) abuse.
[304] φοβουμένη δὲ τὸν Φρυνίωνα διὰ τὸ ἠδικηκέναι μὲν αὐτήν, ἐκεῖνον δὲ ὀργίλως ἔχειν αὐτῇ, σοβαρὸν δὲ καὶ ὀλίγωρον εἰδυῖα αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον ὄντα. Kaparris 1999, ad locum. Kapparis decided on αὐτή instead of the αὐτήν of the manuscript yet considering the context it makes more sense for Neaira to have been wronged by Phrynion. Kapparis notes that ἐκεῖνον δὲ indicates a change of subject, but I think the μέν/δέ

escape Phrynion's abuse, Neaira first flees to Megara by herself and then two years later leaves for Athens with Stephanos. When Phrynion learned that she was at Athens, he attempted to take her away, which suggests that he believed that she was his enslaved person. Stephanos, however, posted sureties with the Polemarch to attest that she was free. Phrynion later returned and made a suit against Stephanos for having taken Neaira (59.45). This suit was settled in arbitration by friends. They decided that "she is a free human and her own guardian" (τὴν μὲν ἄνθρωπον ἐλευθέραν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὴν αὑτῆς κυρίαν), yet also determined that she had to live with Phrynion and Stephanos on alternate days (59.46). Phrynion's attempts to carry her off and the verdict that determined Neaira's living arrangements would suggest that Neaira was not completely free.[305] Although Apollodoros skillfully constructs his story to convince the jurors of Neaira's legal status as an enslaved person, or at least complicate their image of Neaira, Neaira's freedom is clearly and directly asserted when Phrynion buys her freedom, when Stephanos posts sureties with the polemarch, and in the result of this arbitration.

Metic

In the previous three sections, I have shown that Apollodoros offers no conclusive evidence that Neaira was *xenē.* In the absence of evidence of Neaira's descent, Apollodoros strategically used the marriage law to argue that Neaira was culturally a *xenē* and living in marriage with Stephanos. In this argument in *Against Neaira,* Apollodoros uses ambiguous verbs, hedges his claims, and offers conflicting evidence. Furthermore, this narrative focuses

construction connects the two infinitive clauses following διὰ, before shifting to the participle εἰδυῖα in the third clause after δὲ καὶ.

[305] On the extent of the freedom of a freed enslaved person, see: Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005; Forsdyke 2021.

only on Neaira's past, while this court case was concerned with her current status. Despite this, scholars have consistently concluded that Neaira was a *xenē* on the basis that she was a *metoikos.* The orthodox view that all *metoikoi* were *xenoi* lies at the base of this conclusion. Our new understanding of *astos* and *xenos* as cultural terms does not contradict this conclusion, as a *metoikos* could belong to either category depending on their level of cultural assimilation. This cultural conceptualization does offer, however, unexamined possibilities. In this section, I therefore reconsider the implications of Neaira's status as *metoikos.*

Metoikoi are commonly referred to as "resident aliens," but included foreigners, freed enslaved people, and children of mixed or otherwise illegitimate marriages.[306] As someone who grew up abroad and who was previously an enslaved person, Neaira fits into two of the three main subgroups of the metic population. While Apollodoros' story about Neaira's past does not confirm her identity as a *xenē* at the time of the speech, it clearly confirms her status as a metic. Yet, at no point in the speech does Apollodoros call Neaira a *metoikos*.

The absence of the term *metoikos* from *Against Neaira* has been excused in previous scholarship. Whitehead, for instance explains that Apollodoros means *metoikos* when he states *xenē,* since "she is evidently a metic."[307] Yet the other institutions of *metoikia*, such as their obligation to pay a metic tax (*metoikion*), to take an Athenian citizen as a sponsor (*prostates*), and to register with the polemarch (*graphein pros ton polemarchon*), are also absent from the speech. When Neaira settles in Athens with Stephanos, Phrynion did require her to post bonds to the polemarch (κατηγγύησεν αὐτὴν πρὸς τῷ πολεμάρχῳ) to avoid (re)enslavement by Phrynion (59.40). The polemarch only appears in the speech in reference to this event, although some have attributed the later private arbitration between Phrynion and Stephanos to the polemarch as

[306] Kennedy 2014, 2-4; Whitehead 1977, 6-20.
[307] Whitehead 1977, 50.

well.[308] While Apollodoros uses the account that Stephanos posted bonds to highlight the dubious nature of Neaira's freedom, he never emphasizes that this is evidence for her *metoikia*. At 59.49, Apollodoros claims that the bonds were provided "as a *xenē.*" The polemarch, however, had jurisdiction over the *metoikoi,* regardless of whether they were *xenoi* or *astoi.*[309] Furthermore, non-metic *xenoi* were not associated with the polemarch, since they had no rights in the city of Athens at all. As with his claims that Neaira was eating and drinking with men *like a hetaira,* here Apollodoros uses the same construction to connect non-definitional characteristics to an identity.

Another aspect of the institution of *metoikia* was the requirement to take a *prostatēs*.[310] While Stephanos was never directly called a *prostatēs,* Apollodoros does ascribe the following action to Neaira: προΐσταται Στέφανον τουτονὶ αὐτῆς (59.38). This phrase is commonly translated as "took Stephanos as *prostatēs*," yet the verb προίστημι is less specific. The usual phrase for choosing a *prostatēs* is νέμειν προστάτην.[311] The verb προίστημι is more common and can simply mean "to set before" or "to put another before oneself" as a means of protection. [312] While Neaira probably did take Stephanos as her *prostatēs*, his phrasing allows Apollodoros to tell an alternative story. In context, Apollodoros was describing how Neaira switched lovers and how Stephanos made promises to have her as his wife. Neaira is then depicted as having used

[308] Kennedy 2014, 105. Although she notes in error that the polemarch named Neaira her own master, this extrapolative assumption is further evidence for the pervasiveness of the scholarly view of Neaira as a metic.
[309] cf. Dem. 46.22: "now in addition to these things let this law be read, which demands that there be an adjudication of all heiresses, both *astai* and *xenai,* and that for the *politai* the archon will bring cases and be in charge, and that for the *metoikoi* the polemarch will, and that it not be allowed to have either an inheritance or an heiress without legal process" (τὸν τοίνυν νόμον ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀνάγνωθι, ὃς κελεύει ἐπιδικασίαν εἶναι τῶν ἐπικλήρων ἁπασῶν, καὶ ξένων καὶ ἀστῶν, καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν ἄρχοντα εἰσάγειν καὶ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, περὶ δὲ τῶν μετοίκων τὸν πολέμαρχον, καὶ ἀνεπίδικον μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἔχειν μήτε κλῆρον μήτε ἐπίκληρον).
[310] Kennedy 2014, 2.
[311] Suda s.v. νέμειν προστάτην.
[312] LSJ s.v. προίστημι.

Stephanos to protect herself against Phrynion, who was particularly violent and abusive to her. Apollodoros thus actively avoids most of the specific legal terms concerning *metoikia*, while still referencing aspects of the institution to support his depiction of her as a *xenē,* sex worker, and ex-slave.

Considering that Apollodoros lacks concrete evidence to prove that Neaira was *xenē,* his avoidance of metic terminology becomes suspect. If the orthodox view that all *metoikoi* are *xenoi* had been correct, Apollodoros' most effective argument to prove that Neaira was *xenē* would have been to demonstrate her status as a metic. In that case, Apollodoros' avoidance of terminology associated with metics would be counterproductive to his own argument. In light of our new understanding that *metoikoi* could be either *astoi* or *xenoi*, however, Apollodoros' parlance makes sense. Apollodoros avoided portraying Neaira as a metic because asserting metic status would have raised the possibility Neaira was *astē.* In fact, his avoidance of metic terminology strongly suggests that Neaira was both *metoikos* and *astē.*

Due to the ascriptive nature of cultural groups, *metoikoi* would be recognized as *astoi* if they exhibited the cultural behaviors and characteristics that were indicative of *astoi*.[313] Scafuro and Blok have demonstrated that religious practices and communal events were used as evidence for citizenship identity.[314] Indeed, participation in the polis (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως) and religious practices of gifts and respect to the gods (ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια) are explicitly noted in our sources as part of what it meant to be a *politēs.* As the boundaries of cultural groups are maintained through differentiation between the ingroup and outgroup, the criteria of *xenos/xenē* identity are mentioned explicitly in our sources, while the criteria of *astos/astē* identity were more often implied. Yet accounts involving *xenoi* can indicate what types of cultural characteristics were

[313] Barth 1969, 14-15.
[314] Scafuro 1994; Blok 2017.

considered socially relevant for membership. For instance, the ascription of *xenē* identity to Euxitheos' father and mother in *Against Eubulides,* as discussed above, show the importance of language and occupation in membership determination. Neaira's identity as an *astē* thus depended on her cultural assimilation into Athenian society.[315]

At the time of the trial, Neaira had lived in Athens for thirty years. While assimilation is not a direct, inevitable consequence of residence, the sheer length of her residence in Athens makes it highly plausible that Neaira acquired Athenian cultural characteristics and behaviors.[316] In fact, cultural assimilation is often the first type of assimilation to occur when immigrants settle in a new place.[317] Since Neaira immigrated as an individual, rather than as part of a group, it was more important and more likely that Neaira pursued assimilation. Most of the Plataians, who became *politai en masse,* remained a distinct group with strong social ties to one another and monthly meetings at the fresh-cheese-market (Lys. 23.5-7). Social networks, like that of the Plataians, could provide immigrants with "social capital, providing an array of tangible kinds of assistance.[318]" Neaira may have developed such a social network when she lived with Phrynion in Athens, but also became part of Stephanos' household and was thus immersed in Athenian culture.

Further evidence that Neaira assimilated into Athenian society can be found in the fact that she lived in Athens for thirty years without any previous trials or accusations against her. Apollodoros readily admits this fact at the end of his speech:

> πρὶν μὲν γὰρ ταύτην καὶ εἰς ἀγῶνα καταστῆναι καὶ πυθέσθαι πάντας ἥτις ἦν καὶ οἷα ἠσέβηκε, τὰ μὲν ἀδικήματα ταύτης ἦν, ἡ δ᾽ ἀμέλεια τῆς πόλεως· καὶ οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἤδεσαν ὑμῶν, οἱ δὲ πυθόμενοι τῷ μὲν λόγῳ ἠγανάκτουν, τῷ δ᾽ ἔργῳ οὐκ εἶχον ὅ τι χρήσαιντο

[315] On the process of assimilation, see Gordon 1964 and Alba and Nee 2003.
[316] Alba and Nee 2003, 38-39.
[317] Gordon 1964, 77.
[318] Alba and Nee 2003, 44.

> αὐτῇ, οὐδενὸς εἰς ἀγῶνα καθιστάντος οὐδὲ διδόντος περὶ αὐτῆς τὴν ψῆφον. ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἴστε πάντες καὶ ἔχετε ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ κύριοί ἐστε κολάσαι, ὑμέτερον ἤδη τὸ ἀσέβημα γίγνεται τὸ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, ἐὰν μὴ ταύτην κολάσητε.
>
> For before she was indicted, brought to trial, and you all learned who she was and what sort of impious acts she committed, the errors were hers, but the negligence was the city's; and some of you had no knowledge of the matter, but others having learned of it expressed their grievance verbally, but in terms of action did not have a way to deal with her, seeing as no one brought her to trial nor called for a vote concerning her. But since you all know and you have a way available to yourselves and you have the authority to exact punishment, now the impiety towards the gods becomes yours, if you will not punish her. (59.109)

By shifting the responsibility for impiety from Neaira to the jurors, Apollodoros attempts to rouse them into action. Apollodoros suggests that a lack of knowledge explains their previous inaction. The alternative explanation, that there merely was no way to deal with Neaira, is based on Apollodoros' claim that some people did perceive Neaira as *xenē* but does not substantiate it. In a circular manner, Apollodoros offers the absence of trials and votes as evidence that there was no way to deal with Neaira. Yet this absence of trials and votes was the initial inaction that he attempted to explain. In combination with the first explanation that no one took notice of Neaira's character and behaviors, the inaction against Neaira over the previous thirty years indicates that Neaira had in fact assimilated and did not stand out as a *xenē* amongst *astoi*.

After the account of Neaira's arrival in Athens, and she is officially declared "her own guardian," the speech's narrative changes focus from Neaira to Phano. Therefore, our information about Neaira's behaviors and characteristics during her residence in Athens is limited. Only one direct description of Neaira appears in Apollodoros' account on Phano. At 59.55-56, Apollodoros recounts how Phrastor, Phano's former husband who had kicked her out, "fell sick, was very badly indisposed, and became completely incapable."[319] Clearly, Phrastor was very badly off and needed help, but he had no family to help him out since he was childless

[319] 59.55: ἠσθένησε καὶ πάνυ πονηρῶς διετέθη καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπορίαν κατέστη.

and had long been at odds with his family. According to Apollodoros, Neaira and Phano persuaded Phrastor to accept his son while they took care of him during this time. While Apollodoros aims to depict Neaira and Phano as manipulative and suggests that they took advantage of Phrastor's weakened state, his description also suggests that Phano and Neaira were simply helpful, caring women. Apollodoros mentions Neaira as a woman with the same term used for a wife (γυνὴ), and not as a *hetaira,* while he also notes that this was worthy behavior for a woman. The remark "surely you know yourselves how valuable a woman is in illnesses, attending to the suffering person" further emphasizes that women commonly performed these tasks.[320] Care for elders in sickness was an important duty for family members. In Isaeus 2, *On the Estate of Menecles,* the speaker offers the fact that he and his wife took care of Menecles, just as one would take care of their "real" father, to support that he was Menecles' adopted son (Is. 2.18, 2.36). Similarly, in Isocrates' *Aegineticus* the speaker argues that his care for a dying man made him closer in kin than blood relatives (Isoc. 19.33). This second speech also shows us the consequences of not performing these family duties. The man's sister did not take care of her brother, visit him, or even attend his funeral. Yet she attempted to lay claim to the same inheritance as the speaker, but thereby revealed her own negligence:

> εἶτα νῦν αὐτὸν ἀδελφίζειν ἐπιχειρήσουσιν, ὥσπερ οὐχ ὅσῳπερ ἂν οἰκειότερον προσείπωσι τὸν τεθνεῶτα, τοσούτῳ δόξουσαν αὐτὴν μείζω καὶ δεινότερ᾽ ἐξαμαρτεῖν.
>
> And then to think that they will now try to "brother" him, as if by calling the dead man by something much more familiar, she would not then appear to have committed much bigger and worse wrongdoings! (19.30)

This depiction of failure on the part of an actual relative to provide care further emphasizes how significant this duty was for Athenian families. In taking care of Phrastor, who was not a direct

[320] 59.56: ἴστε δήπου καὶ αὐτοί, ὅσου ἀξία ἐστὶ γυνὴ ἐν ταῖς νόσοις, παροῦσα κάμνοντι ἀνθρώπῳ.

part of her family, Neaira thus performed a behavior characteristic of and expected of respectable Athenians.[321]

As a foreigner residing in Athens and as a former enslaved person, Neaira was clearly a *metoikos.* Based on the length of her residency, the behavior recorded from this time, and the fact that no one previously brought a lawsuit against her for being a *xenē,* Neaira appears to have culturally assimilated and been considered *astē.* This conclusion is further supported by the fact that Apollodoros, clearly a skilled orator, offered very little information contemporary to the trial and carefully avoided any terminology that would depict Neaira as a *metoikos.* Throughout *Against Neaira,* Apollodoros uses ambiguous terminology and hedges his assertions. In fact, his description of Neaira at 107 as someone "whom her ancestors did not bequeath to be *astē* nor the deme made *politis*" was not false, but deftly excluded the possibility that I believe to be the truth: Neaira, being a metic for thirty years, had become *astē* through assimilation.[322]

Conclusion: Other Metic Women

Neaira's situation was not unique. Recent scholarship suggests that approximately one-tenth of Athens' inhabitants in the 5th century BCE were metics.[323] Depending on their individual circumstances, some of these metics would "pass" over time and be considered "one of them" or *astos/astē,* while others held on to their previous ethnic identities and remained *xenos/xenē.* To illustrate the broader implications of this indeterminate metic identity, I will turn to Aspasia and Archippē, two well-known metic women.

[321] See also Plat. *Leg.* 361a; Xen. *Mem.* 2.2.13.
[322] ἦν οὔτε οἱ πρόγονοι ἀστὴν κατέλιπον οὔθ᾽ ὁ δῆμος πολῖτιν ἐποιήσατο.
[323] Kennedy 2014, 16-18; On the demographic makeup of the metic population, see Akrigg 2015.

Most surprising in the case of Aspasia, who originated from Miletus, is that her partner, Periklēs, was the one who established the citizenship law of 451 BCE. Several explanations have been offered as to why Periklēs II was a citizen, despite his mother's foreign birth. Scholars from late antiquity considered him to be a citizen by decree (*demopoietos*), and others have accepted Plutarch's account in which a special exception was made for Periklēs II based on the pity the Athenians had for Periklēs I.[324] Carawan, however, suggests that there was not a singular exception made for Periklēs II in 430/429, but that it was instead an amendment to Periklēs' citizenship law that allowed a father without surviving legitimate sons to adopt an illegitimate one (*nothos*) to preserve his lineage.[325] Carawan's argument for another measure circa 411 that extended the rights of *nothoi* further to be considered *politēs* is based on the following passage in Diogenes Laertius' account of Socrates:

> φάσι γὰρ βουληθέντας Ἀθηναίους διὰ τὸ λειπανδρεῖν συναυξῆσαι τὸ πλῆθος, ψηφίσασθαι γαμεῖν μὲν ἀστὴν μίαν, παιδοποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρας.
>
> For they say that the Athenians, since they wanted to work together to increase their population because of the shortage of men, decreed that it was allowed to marry one *astē* and bring forth children also from another. (2.26)

Carawan interprets this passage to mean that "a citizen could now enroll in his phratry any *nothoi* he had already fathered with a second partner (*astē* or not)."[326] This interpretation requires us to dismiss a straightforward reading based on the syntax and grammar of the Greek. The phrasing clearly gaps the noun *astē* in the second clause, as the μὲν…δὲ construction establishes a contrast that is further emphasized by the adjectives "one" (μίαν) and "another" (ἑτέρας). This decree facilitated an increase of citizens while adhering to Pericles' citizenship law by allowing Athenian men to marry one *astē* and have children by another *astē*.

[324] Carawan 2008, 383-384, Plut. *Per.* 37.5.
[325] Carawan 2008, 384.
[326] Carawan 2008, 402.

Carawan's conclusion is premised on two related points, namely that a) it was unlikely that daughters from Athenian families would pursue concubinage and b) that concubines were metics and therefore *xenoi.*[327] While I agree that daughters born from *astoi* parents were highly unlikely to have been concubines and rather pursued marriages, especially as there was evidently a lack of men, our new conception of metics as being either *xenoi* or *astoi* undermines the second point and offers a simpler solution. Neither the amendment in 430/429, which Carawan also based on the prevalence of citizen sons born from foreign-born mothers, nor the suggested measure in 411 were necessary to make Periklēs II a *politēs.* Just like Neaira, Aspasia spent a significant portion of her adult life in Athens and had assimilated culturally. If she had been truly a *xenē,* it is doubtful that the Athenian would have condoned her relationship with Periklēs I or her own public presence in Athenian society as an intellectual and teacher of orators. Periklēs II's citizenship was never a matter of dispute—in fact, there is no contemporary reference to one—since Aspasia was an *astē.*

My second example concerns Apollodoros' own mother, Archippē, who was a known metic. Archippē's two marriages to ex-slave bankers have raised questions about her status.[328] Archippē first married Pasion and together they had two sons, Apollodoros and Pasikles. Pasion became a *politēs* during their marriage, as did their sons, but decrees of citizenship did not extend to wives and Archippē presumably remained a *xenē* based on her metic status.[329] In 370 BCE, Pasion died and arranged in his will for Archippē to marry Phormio, the metic ex-slave who worked for Pasion in his bank.[330] Since Phormio was not yet a *politēs* at the time of Pasion's

[327] Carawan 2008, 401.
[328] Whitehead 1986; Carey 1991; Cohen 1992, 102-106; Cohen 2000, 162-163; Ferruci 2013.
[329] Whitehead 1986, 112.
[330] This is not the only case of a banker giving his wife in marriage to another banker who was formerly enslaved by him. Dem. 36.29 includes the examples of Sōkratēs and Satyros, and Sōklēs and Timodēmos: see Cohen 1992.

death, he was assumed to be *xenos* based on his metic status. While Apollodoros prosecuted Phormio after his mother's death, he remained silent on the matter of status related to her marriage. Therefore, Whitehead argues that "the point we must cling to is that the marriage of Archippē and Phormio was *not in itself illegal.*"[331] By this argument, Archippē must have been *xenē,* as the marriage law forbade marriages between a *xenos* and an *astē.*

The will, however, poses a problem, as it also arranged for Archippē to receive a dowry of two talents as well as a multi-dwelling house worth 100 minas, her enslaved people, jewelry, and all her possessions inside the house.[332] As it was not allowed for *xenoi* to own immovable property, she would thus not have been able to own the real estate that was part of her dowry due her *xenē* status. The legitimacy of her marriage to Phormio and her ability to receive the dowry appear to have been in direct contradiction. Her second marriage would have been against the law if Archippē had received the dowry according to Pasion's will on the basis that she was an *astē.* Yet, as Carey points out, her first marriage would have similarly been unlawful if Archippē was a *xenē* at the time that Pasion became a *politēs.* She would have technically been Pasion's *pallakē* rather than his wife; if she was no longer his wife, it is unclear by what right Pasion gave Archippē in marriage to Phormio.[333]

One solution to this conundrum has been proposed by Whitehead on the basis of Demosthenes 46.23. In this passage, Apollodoros argues that Phormio did not follow the right procedure in his pursuit of Archippē as his wife, since she was an *epikleros*, saying that "if he wished to act correctly, he ought to have claimed the heiress, regardless of whether she belonged

[331] Whitehead 1986, 111. Emphasis not mine.
[332] Dem 45.28: Τάδε διέθετο Πασίων Ἀχαρνεύς· δίδωμι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ γυναῖκα Ἀρχίππην Φορμίωνι, καὶ προῖκα ἐπιδίδωμι Ἀρχίππῃ τάλαντον μὲν τὸ ἐκ Πεπαρήθου, τάλαντον δὲ τὸ αὐτόθεν, συνοικίαν ἑκατὸν μνῶν, θεραπαίνας καὶ χρυσία, καὶ τἄλλ᾽ ὅσα ἐστὶν αὐτῇ ἔνδον, ἅπαντα ταῦτα Ἀρχίππῃ δίδωμι.
[333] Carey 1991, 88-89.

to him by will or as heir-at-law, before the archon, if he did so just as for an *astē,* but before the polemarch, if as for a *xenē*."[334] Apollodoros laid out two options for acceptable procedures that Phormio could have taken. Since it was up to Phormio to decide whether to claim Archippē as an *astē* before the archon or as a *xenē* before the polemarch, Whitehead argues that her status as the wife of a *demopoietos* was indeterminate.[335]

While Whitehead's conclusion could support the theory that metics could be either *astoi* or *xenoi,* the fact that the contradictory events are part of the same will and even the same sentence, makes it implausible that Archippē married as a *xenē* but received her dowry as an *astē.* Our new understanding of metics' ethno-cultural status, however, did not just apply to women. Phormio as a long-time resident of Athens must have been considered an *astos,* just as Archippē was considered an *astē,* and they were thus married according to the laws.

As metic women, Archippē, Aspasia, and Neaira inhabited an in-between space in Athenian society. Due to the institution of *metoikia,* their duties, rights, and privileges were established in law. In a society focused on the preservation and perpetuation of Athenian identity, however, lived experiences were shaped by ethno-cultural belonging. In laws such as Periklēs' citizenship law of 451/0 and the marriage law from 59.16, Athenians used the differentiation between insiders (*astoi*) and outsiders (*xenoi*) to police positions of political and religious power. While cultural characteristics were the basis of this *astos/xenos* dichotomization for both *politai* and *metoikoi,* proof of birth, of participation in the *hiera kai hosia,* or of political office was often available to (male) *politai* to prove that they were *astoi.* Contrarily, cultural assimilation through the performance of culturally acceptable behaviors, display of Athenian values, and separation

[334] 46.23: αὐτόν, εἴπερ ἠβούλετο ὀρθῶς διαπράττεσθαι, λαχεῖν ἔδει τῆς ἐπικλήρου, εἴτε κατὰ δόσιν αὐτῷ προσῆκεν εἴτε κατὰ γένος, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀστῆς, πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα, εἰ δ᾽ ὡς ὑπὲρ ξένης, πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον.
[335] Whitehead 1986, 113-114.

from former ethnic communities were the basis on which *metoikoi* were considered *astoi.* Both the existence of the speech *Against Neaira* and its contents highlight the precarious nature of being *metoikos,* namely its indeterminacy with regard to ethno-cultural identity. Despite Neaira's thirty-year commitment being an upstanding member of Athenian society, it only took one man's defamatory speech to seriously jeopardize her self-made life.

Epilogue

We learn about Neaira's story as "The True Story of a Courtesan's Scandalous Life in Ancient Greece," one of the "Kinky Stories from the Rostrum," or as the story of "The Tragic Life of an Athenian Child Slave Raised in a Brothel." These pithy descriptions are, however, based on the narrative of a single prosecution speech. She must have told a different story about her own life. Neaira was raised by a freedwoman, Nikaretē, who used to call her "daughter" but trained her and her six "sisters" to be sex workers. At her young age, Neaira had no say in the matter and was later sold by Nikaretē as an enslaved person. As she learned how to navigate the world of sex work, however, she acquired the social skills and charisma that allowed her to change the trajectory of her life. Thanks to her wide social network and her financial savviness, she was able to buy her own freedom. A few years later, after escaping an abusive relationship, Neaira met Stephanos and settled down.

If you happened to run into Neaira in the streets of Athens, you would probably not have noticed her. She was similar to other Athenian women in how she looked and acted. She managed the household and took care of her family. She was a stepmother to Stephanos' children. There were three boys, originally, but one of them passed away before his time. What grief and pain it must have caused her! Luckily, the other boys were alive and well, and one of

them was a known long-distance runner. Neaira grew especially close to the girl, Phano, perhaps because she never got to be a real daughter herself. She may not have brought them into the world, but the children considered her their mother, and she thought of them as her own. At the time of the trial, Neaira was in her mid-fifties. Her life was neither scandalous nor tragic, as Apollodoros' story suggested. She would no longer be identified or identify herself as an enslaved person or sex worker. That was her past. She grew up, made acquaintances and friends, was taken advantage of and taken care of, and found her way to Athens and to this life, a life she made for herself.

Chapter V
Conclusion

Although I never thought that I would feel a connection to Jocasta, one scene in Euripides' *Phoenician Women* has recently changed my mind. In this scene (388-425), Jocasta interacts with her son (and grandson) Polyneices and asks him, "What is it like to be deprived of one's fatherland?"[336] Although she must have been familiar with the legal consequences of exile, she clearly does not have knowledge of an exile's circumstances. She continues to question Polyneices, asking "what is the character of exile? what is the hardship for exiled people?"[337] In this interaction, Jocasta explores how Polyneices' life differs from what it would have been had he not been exiled. She inquires after his lived experience. At the same time, Jocasta recognizes the impact that Polyneices' social status, marital status, and social connections might have had on his circumstances. For instance, she asks how he fed himself before he got married, wonders whether his noble birth affected things, and whether his fathers' friends helped him.[338] I am not only interested in Polyneices' answers, but I also understand Jocasta's curiosity. Through close reading I listen to the experiences of ancient people and by asking questions I pay attention to the impact of multiple, intersectional identities and social factors. In these ways, Jocasta's investigation is in parallel to the analysis in my dissertation.

[336] Eur.Ph.389: τί τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος;
[337] Eur.Ph.390: τίς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ; τί φυγάσιν τὸ δυσχερές;
[338] Eur.Ph.400: πόθεν δ᾽ ἐβόσκου, πρὶν γάμοις εὑρεῖν βίον; 402: φίλοι δὲ πατρὸς καὶ ξένοι σ᾽ οὐκ ὠφέλουν; 404: οὐδ᾽ ηὐγένειά σ᾽ ἦρεν εἰς ὕψος μέγαν;

In this chapter, I present the major conclusions of this dissertation. I discuss the findings chapter by chapter and conclude that intersectional analysis through close reading offers important insights into ancient Greek lived experiences. After this overview, I set forth several further directions for this research. First, I suggest expansion of my project to different genres of texts. The scene from *Phoenician Women* I discussed above suggests that intersectional analysis of Greek plays can reveal indications of potential lived experience. Furthermore, from Jocasta's responses to Eteocles' answers we can see that his experience was different from what she expected. This scene thus portrays normative and ideal patterns of behaviors and the tensions between them and the reported lived experience. Second, another expansion could occur in terms of vectors of identity. Although I considered a multitude of identities through my intersectional approach, each of my chapters have a primary focus-identity, namely ethnic identity, gender, and legal and social status. Below I discuss the presence of disability in a passage from Herodotus and identify several more axes of identity that could be pursued as the focus identity in an intersectional analysis. Third, I suggest further research into other theories around intersectionality to keep up to date with the fast-growing scholarship. As an example, I briefly discuss how intersectionality can be a basis for coalitions across identity categories. Did individuals from marginalized groups in the ancient world collaborate and form coalitions? Finally, I reiterate the importance of intersectional analysis to recognize diversity in both the ancient and modern human experience.

Chapter Conclusions

In this dissertation, I have examined how lived experiences of ancient people were affected by their identity. Contrary to previous scholarship, I used intersectionality to understand

the complex interactions between different and multiple vectors of identity. In both Herodotus' *Histories* and Apollodoros' *Against Neaira,* there are clear differences between the ideals and norms expressed and the lived experiences reported. In *Against Neaira,* for instance, Neaira did not behave in ways expected of women who were considered insiders (*astos/astē*); she was a formerly enslaved person, a sex worker, and was probably not born in Athens. Several women in Herodotus' *Histories* similarly demonstrate agency and self-determinacy as they navigate their lives, make hard decisions, and even leave behind monuments. At the same time, intersectionality led me to highlight how people marginalized on the basis of one identity are still able to in turn marginalize other people. I thus call attention to the complexity of individuals' lived experiences.

In the second chapter, I provided insight into the social construction of ethnic identity in Herodotus' *Histories*. Contrary to previous scholarship on ethnic identity, my research neither focused on an ethnic group's specific cultural characteristics, e.g., what clothing the Scythians wore or the Egyptians' weaving practice, nor prioritized a singular feature of ethnic groups, such as descent, as the main determinant of ethnic identity. Instead, I addressed the negotiation of identity that occurs in social contexts, asking the question, "On what basis is an ethnic identity ascribed to a person?" In certain stories, my analysis offered a social constructivist explanation for phenomena that had hitherto been used to support essentialist notions of identity. For instance, in the story about Scythian youths born from free Scythian women and enslaved men (IV.1-4), I suggest the modern concept of stereotype threat explains the Scythian youths' response to a whip. The effectiveness of the whip in contrast to the weapons by the Scythian men had previously been using is understood as revealing an essential difference between people born

to enslaved people as opposed to those born to free people. Herodotus does not portray his characters' identities as essentialist.

Although this text about a violent opposition between Greeks and Persians lends itself well to a structural analysis, I did not perpetuate the often-presumed binary opposition between Greeks and foreigners. The presumed binary in previous scholarship ignored the existence of polyethnic individuals, people with parents from different ethnic groups. Although we do not have access to the characters' self-identification, from the accounts of Skyles (IV.76-80) and the Atheno-Pelasgian children on Lemnos (IV.138) we see that polyethnic individuals had flexibility in their identification and performed customs associated with their mothers' as well as their fathers' ethnic groups. Similarly, the account of the birth and upbringing of Cyrus (I.55; I.91; I.107-122) demonstrates how a single person can even change and belong to multiple different ethnic groups and have different legal statuses throughout their life. Ultimately, however, the flexibility afforded polyethnic individuals ended when the intersection of their ethnic identity and legal status caused them to become a threat to the socio-political hierarchy. Herodotus thus does not present a world that is able to be captured in simple binaries but represents the messy reality of individual lived experience in the ancient world.

The third chapter focused on Herodotus' treatment of gender. He records accounts of men and women with equal interest. Contrary to previous scholarship, I call attention to portrayals of female agency and power beyond their ability to transfer and legitimize men's power. Several women outsmart men, offer quick and clever solutions to problems, or leave behind monuments. These portrayals of agency are, however, not necessarily to be praised as demonstrating equality in the ancient world, since some women gain their agency due to their power over individuals with lower social status. Furthermore, Herodotus recognizes the cultural relativity of not only

gender norms, but also gender systems in general. Herodotus thus demonstrates that the available gender categories, such as man, woman, or non-binary differ per ethnic group and that ethnic groups gender behaviors in different ways. What is masculine for one group may be considered feminine for another. As for gender systems, when Herodotus portrays the Amazons, he reports the Scythian interpretation of the Amazons and the Amazons' gender presentation but does not assign them a gender himself. In fact, the direct speech of the Amazons, as written by Herodotus, lack any gendered reference to themselves. As with his approach to ethnic identity, Herodotus demonstrates a remarkable open-mindedness.

In chapter IV, I presented a new understanding of immigrant women in Athens. According to orthodox understandings, immigrants were inherently *xenoi*. I argued, however, that the terms *astos/astē* and *xenos/xenē* are cultural terms that indicate belonging in Athenian community. *Metoikoi* could thus be either *astoi* or *xenoi.* In my close reading of *Against Neaira,* I highlighted both Apollodoros' attempt to leverage Neaira's various social identities, but also the inconsistencies and incongruities in his narrative. In his attempt to depict Neaira as *xenē,* Apollodoros identifies her as a sex worker, former enslaved person, and as someone raised abroad. Although these identities clearly demonstrate that Neaira is a metic, Apollodoros never calls Neaira a *metoikos* in his attempt to prove that she is a *xenē.* This oversight thus strongly suggests that Neaira was both *metoikos* and an *astē.* This new understanding of *Against Neaira* demonstrates how precarious it was to be an immigrant in Athens. Due to the institution of *metoikia*, metics' duties, rights, and privileges were established in law, but their lived experiences were determined by their belonging to the ethnic group. The level of assimilation, in turn, is affected by metics' other identities. While Neaira's livelihood was attacked based on her

former enslavement, history of sex work, and childhood abroad, Aspasia, coming from an elite family in Miletus, was able to navigate public life in Athens more freely.

Further Research

In this dissertation I have demonstrated that an intersectional approach can aid scholars to reach a more complex and consequently complete picture of the ancient Mediterranean world. Future research could fruitfully employ this approach and expand upon my project. In addition to the historiographical text and prosecutorial speech that I analyzed. Many other genres of text could offer insight into individuals' lived experiences. Furthermore, by expanding the genres of text, it might be possible to reveal cultural phenomena that could otherwise seem idiosyncratic to a particular source or genre. As every genre has its own unique way of conveying information, both implicitly and explicitly, it will require an awareness of the genre's particularities.

Above I presented a scene from *Phoenician Women,* which suggests that an intersectional analysis of Greek drama can depict potential lived experience. Jocasta would have been familiar with exile from a legal or logistical perspective, but she was not aware of what it was like to be exiled. Just as I pointed out in *Against Neaira* and Herodotus' *Histories,* in this tragedy tensions can be perceived between normative, ideal behaviors, as indicated by Jocasta's questions, and the lived experiences of Polyneices. Although we cannot take Polyneices' answers as historical fact, Euripides is portraying a potential lived experience. *Phoenician Women* also offers insight into intersectional identities. For instance, Jocasta is quite quick to compare Polyneices' lack of freedom of speech as "the state of an enslaved person."[339] This response of Jocasta reveals the

[339] Eur. Ph. 392: δούλου τόδ' εἶπας, μὴ λέγειν ἅ τις φρονεῖ.

value that individuals of high social status put on free speech, as well on this high status itself. Tragedy is thus one genre of Greek literature that ought to be considered for further research.

A second suggestion for expansion is to broaden the scope of identities to investigate. In addition to age, economic status, occupation, and parenthood, another identity that I believe will be fruitful for intersectional analysis is disability. As a recent edited volume states in its title, disability is a "forgotten other."[340] As with other marginalized groups, it is hard to find evidence for disabled people that concern their own experience. Furthermore, there are several approaches in the field of disability studies, which are in tension with one-another and yet also useful heuristics for understanding lived experience in the ancient world.[341] One example I want to give is from a passage of Herodotus' *Histories* that I have discussed at several points in this dissertation. At the beginning of book IV, we encounter the people who were enslaved by the Scythians. According to IV.2, the Scythians blinded their enslaved people "on account of the milk they drink" (τοῦ γάλακτος εἵνεκεν τοῦ πίνουσι). The effect of the blindness, so commenters have inferred, is that the enslaved people are unable to recognize what is the better part of the milk, the cream on top, and the worse part, the milk at the bottom.[342] This inability due to their blindness could be desirable for the enslavers, since they do not risk the enslaved people drinking the good milk or selling it. According to the social model of disability an impairment is not disabling, but rather the world that is not designed for people with these bodies.[343] For instance, a wheelchair user is disabled by the presence of stairs and absence of a ramp. The blindness might

[340] Adams 2021.
[341] Such as the medical model, human rights model, the social model, and the critical disability studies model, see Berghs et. al. 2016.
[342] Herodotus mentions the better milk on top and the worse milk on the bottom and then states, "this is the reason for the blinding", although he does not directly say it is in order that the enslaved people do not steal the good milk, this is the main logical inference reached by me, as well as How and Wells 1912 and Asheri et. al. 2007.
[343] Shakespeare 2006.

be a disability for the enslaved people privately, but it is beneficial (according to their enslavers) for their daily work. Herodotus emphasizes this point in his concluding phrase: "On account of these things the Scythians blind every man they enslave. For they are not agriculturalists, but nomads."[344] He thus recognizes that the blindness would be disabling if the enslaved people worked the land, but it is not in their present circumstances.

This story of the blinded enslaved people thus illustrates how disability in the ancient world can be seen in different ways. According to the social model of disability, the enslaved people were not disabled in doing their daily work. Yet, according to more holistic models, we can recognize both the disability for other activities and that bodily impairment is disabling in other ways. The enslaved people may, for instance, experience pain in their eye, experience infections after being blinded, have restricted independence, and run the risk of falls and fractures. In terms of intersectionality, there is more work to be done on the different lived experiences of impaired and/or disabled enslaved people in contrast to people with other statuses. Of course, the intersections with the identity axes of gender, age, and ethnic identity would also be of interest.

Finally, further research could address other aspects of the theory of intersectionality, such as the concept of coalition formation across identity categories. Some scholars, such as Anna Carastathis and Elizabeth Cole have built on Crenshaw's idea that "recognizing the ways in which the intersectional experiences of women of color are marginalized in prevailing conceptions of identity politics does not require that we give up attempts to organize as communities of color."[345] Instead, Crenshaw suggests that we can see "race as a coalition

[344] IV.2: τούτων μὲν εἵνεκα ἅπαντα τὸν ἂν λάβωσι οἱ Σκύθαι ἐκτυφλοῦσι. οὐ γὰρ ἀρόται εἰσὶ ἀλλὰ νομάδες.
[345] Crenshaw 1991, 1299.

between men and women of color" or as a "coalition of straight and gay people of color."[346] Carastathis highlight how the conceptualization of "identity categories as coalitions allows us to envision a counterhegemonic interpretation of intersectionality."[347] By viewing identity-based groups as inherently heterogenic, we "[trouble] the ideal of 'natural' affinity groups" and thus avoid essentialist notions of identity.[348] For example, in a group of women there are women with various ethnic identities, with different legal statuses, from various ages etc. A group of women is thus not a monolith, but is heterogenic, and we cannot assume that every woman has the same opinion, experience, or sense of alliance to this group. The essentialist idea that identity groups are created naturally and based on an inherent difference from other groups is thus problematized. If identities are social constructions, so are identity groups. Focusing on the potential coalitions between various marginalized identity groups thus allows for solidarity in a shared struggle against systems of oppression.

Future research could thus focus on coalition formation across identity categories in the ancient world. As in this dissertation, I would approach it through close reading of passages and keep an eye on the idea of coalition. One area of interest is coalitions within occupations, which often included people with various statuses. Historically, multiple women within one household, including enslaved women and the lady of the house, would spin and weave. In addition to enslaved women and free women, even goddesses like Athena and Aphrodite practice weaving in mythology. The practice was thus not exclusive to any particular legal or social status. Yet we are left to wonder (how) did this co-working relationship affect the relationship between these women? Was there a sense of communal purpose?

[346] Crenshaw 1991, 1299.
[347] Carastathis 2013, 961.
[348] Cole 2008, 446.

Another, fictive, example of coalition-building can be found in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata.* In an effort to end the Peloponnesian war, women come together from all over Greece. Not only do we have Lysistrate and Kleonike as Athenian women, but Lampito from Sparta, Ismenia from Boetia, and even a Corinthian join them. After Lysistrata explains the plan—and does some persuading—the women decide to withhold sexual intercourse from men in order to force them to negotiate peace. In the imaginary realm, at least, coalitions between women with different polis affiliations (city-ethnics) and ethnicities (Dorian, Ionian, etc.) are possible. Not only is this effort a coalition of women with various ethnic identities, but also with various occupations and marital statuses. The Corinthian woman, for instance, is a sex worker. Although this woman is effectively asked to sacrifice her earnings for a while, in addition to the lack of sex that all women will experience, she too joins this coalition. Not only does this demonstrate a sense of solidarity amongst women, but the alliance is necessary for their political action to succeed. After all, if only married women refused sex, the men could simply visit sex workers. Only through the cooperation of all women can their plan succeed. This comedy, although fictional, thus gives insight into the coalitions that could be formed, as well as their perceived power.

Diversity Now and Ancient

In this dissertation, I have demonstrated that intersectionality is not only a powerful tool in modern-day activism, but also a productive lens with which to approach diversity in the ancient world. If we look carefully, it is possible to find representations of modern marginalized people in the past as well as people who were marginalized at the time. As a trans, non-binary, queer individual who is writing this conclusion in their second language while living in a foreign

country, I am both excited and cautious about the possibilities in future scholarship. As Malatino puts it in their explanation of trans care via 'hirstories:'[349]

> "In order to communicate *about* these lives, you engage in forms of speculation, projection, invention, and translation that inevitably fail to render subjecthood faithfully. The piecemeal, the partial, the imperfect is all you have. Each claim you make is overdetermined and only ever *possibly* resonant with the vicissitudes of their lived experience."[350]

It is with this caveat that I present my work, as well as with the belief that this imperfect approximation of ancient lived experience is nevertheless an important intervention in a historiography that is focused on the dominant, normative, ideological narratives.

[349] hir is a neopronoun used by trans individuals, 'hirstory' thus plays on the feminist adaption of history as 'herstory.'
[350] Malatino 2020, 57, emphasis theirs.

Bibliography

Adams, Ellen, ed. *Disability Studies and the Classical Body: The Forgotten Other*. Routledge Studies in Ancient Disabilities. Abingdon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2021.

Akrigg, Ben. "Metics in Athens." In *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Claire Taylor and Kostas Vlassopoulos. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Alba, Richard D., and Victor Nee. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Allan, Rutger J. "The Infinitivus pro Imperativo in Ancient Greek. The Imperatival Infinitive as an Expression of Proper Procedural Action." *Mnemosyne* 63, no. 2 (2010): 203–28.

Anhalt, Emily Katz. "Seeing Is Believing: Four Women on Display in Herodotus' Histories." *New England Classical Journal* 35, no. 4 (2008): 269–80.

Anson, Edward M. "Greek Ethnicity and the Greek Language." *Glotta* 85 (2009): 5–30.

Asheri, David, Alan B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Edited by Alfonso Moreno and Oswyn Murray. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bakker, Egbert J., Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees, eds. *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Brill, 2002.

Banton, Michael. "Modelling Ethnic and National Relations." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17, no. 1 (1994): 1–19.

Barth, Fredrik, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Bergen; Oslo; London: Universitetsforlaget; George Allen and Unwin, 1969.

Berger, Michele Tracy, and Kathleen Guidroz, eds. *The Intersectional Approach: Transforming the Academy through Race, Class, and Gender*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Berghs, Maria, Karl Atkin, Hilary Graham, Chris Hatton, and Carol Thomas. "Implications for Public Health Research of Models and Theories of Disability: A Scoping Study and Evidence Synthesis." *Public Health Research* 4, no. 8 (2016): 1–166.

Berry, Diana Ramey, and Leslie M. Harris, eds. *Sexuality and Slavery: Reclaiming Intimate Histories in the Americas*. University of Georgia Press, 2018.

Bichler, Reinhold. *Herodots Welt: Der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der Fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001.

Blok, Josine. *Citizenship in Classical Athens*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.

———. “Perikles’ Citizenship Law: A New Perspective.” *Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 58, no. 2 (2009): 141–70.

———. *The Early Amazons: Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth*. Religion in the Graeco-Roman World 120. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

———. “Women in Herodotus’ Histories.” In *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Bakker, De Jong, Van Wees, 225–42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Bloomer, W. Martin. “The Superlative ‘Nomoi’ of Herodotus’s ‘Histories.’” *Classical Antiquity* 12, no. 1 (1993): 30–50.

Boedeker, Deborah. “Persian Gender Relations as Historical Motives in Herodotus.” In *Herodot und das persische Weltreich = Herodotus and the Persian Empire*, edited by Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschnegg, and Reinhold Bichler, 211–35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.

Bosak-Schroeder, Clara. *Other Natures: Environmental Encounters with Ancient Greek Ethnography*, 2020.

Bradford, Nova J., G. Nic Rider, Jory M. Catalpa, Quinlyn J. Morrow, Dianne R. Berg, Katherine G. Spencer, and Jenifer K. McGuire. “Creating Gender: A Thematic Analysis of Genderqueer Narratives.” *International Journal of Transgenderism* 20, no. 2–3 (2019): 155–68.

Braund, David. “Historiography and Theatre: The Tragedy of Scythian King Skyles.” In *Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture Around the Black Sea*, edited by David Braund, Edith Hall, and Rosie Wyles, 433–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Brauw, Michael de. “‘Listen to the Laws Themselves:’ Citations of Laws and Portrayal of Character in Attic Oratory.” *The Classical Journal* 97, no. 2 (2001): 161–76.

Burton, Joan. “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World.” *Greece & Rome* 45, no. 2 (1998): 143–65.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Thinking Gender. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Cairns, Douglas L. “‘Off with her AIΔΩΣ’: Herodotus 1.8.3-4.” *The Classical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1996): 78–83.

Carastathis, Anna. “Identity Categories as Potential Coalitions.” *Signs* 38, no. 4 (2013): 941–65.

———. *Intersectionality: Origins, Contestations, Horizons*. University of Nebraska Press, 2016.

Carawan, Edwin. “Pericles the Younger and the Citizenship Law.” *The Classical Journal* 103, no. 4 (2008): 383–406.

Carey, Christopher. *Apollodoros Against Neaira: (Demosthenes) 59*. Oxford University Press, 1992.

———. “Apollodoros’ Mother: The Wives of Enfranchised Aliens in Athens.” *The Classical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1991): 84–89.

———. “Legal Space in Classical Athens.” *Greece & Rome* 41, no. 2 (1994): 172–86.

———. “Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law.” *The Classical Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (1995): 407–17.

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

Cifarelli, Megan. “Discovering Others: Can we find Non-Binary Individuals in the Archaeological Record?” Presented at the ASOR Annual Meeting, Denver CO, November 2018.

Cohen, Abner. *Two-Dimensional Man: An Essay on the Anthropology of Power and Symbolism in Complex Society*. London: Routledge., 1974.

Cohen, David. “Sexuality, Violence, and the Athenian Law of ‘Hubris.’” *Greece & Rome* 38, no. 2 (1991): 171–88.

Cohen, Edward E. *Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective*. Princeton University Press, 1992.

———. “Free and Unfree Sexual Work: An Economic Analysis of Athenian Prostitution.” In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, edited by Christopher Faraone and Laura K. McClure, 95–124. University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

———. “Mothers and Daughters in a Family Business.” In *Athenian Prostitution: The Business of Sex*, 131–53. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton University Press, 2000.

———. “The Local Residents of Attika.” In *The Athenian Nation*, 49–78. Princeton University Press, 2000.

Cole, Elizabeth R. “Coalitions as a Model for Intersectionality: From Practice to Theory.” *Sex Roles* 59, no. 5 (September 1, 2008): 443–53.

Connor, Walker. “A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group, is a ….” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1, no. 4 (October 1, 1978): 377–400.

Coonen, L. P. “Herodotus on Biology.” *The Scientific Monthly* 76, no. 2 (1953): 63–70.

Corner, Sean. “Did ‘Respectable’ Women Attend Symposia?” *Greece & Rome* 59, no. 1 (2012): 34–45.

Crahay, Ronald. *La Littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote*. Liège, 1955.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989, no. 1 (1989): 139–67.

———. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (July 1991): 1241–99.

Davidson, James. “Fish, Sex and Revolution in Athens.” *The Classical Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (1993): 53–66.

Davies, Charlotte Aull. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. Routledge, 2008.

Deborah, Kamen. “Sale for the Purpose of Freedom: Slave-Prostitutes and Manumission in Ancient Greece.” *The Classical Journal* 109, no. 3 (2014): 281–307.

Denniston, John Dewar, and Kenneth James Dover. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Dewald, Carolyn. Review of *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History, François Hartog*, by François Hartog and Janet Lloyd. *Classical Philology* 85, no. 3 (1990): 217–24.

———. “Women and Culture in Herodotus ‘Histories.’” *Women’s Studies–an Interdisciplinary Journal* 8, no. 1–2 (1981): 93–127.

Dickey, Eleanor. *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendonn Press, 1996.

Dominick, Yancy Hughes. “Acting Other: Atossa and Instability in Herodotus.” *The Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (2007): 432–44.

Dunsch, Boris, and Kai Ruffing, eds. *Herodots Quellen - Die Quellen Herodots.* Classica et Orientalia 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013.

Duplouy, Alain. “Edward E. Cohen, The Athenian Nation.” *L’Antiquité Classique*, 2004 : 513–14.

Evans, J. A. S., ed. “Persian Expansion into Europe.” In *Herodotus*, 65–78. Boston, MA: Twayne, 1982.

Evans, Jane. “Prostitutes in the Portico of Pompey?: A Reconsideration.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, 139 (2009): 123-145.

Fehling, Detlev. *Herodotus and His Sources: Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*. Translated by J.G. Howie. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1989.

Ferrucci, Stefano. “Archippe, la moglie del banchiere.” *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 55, no. 1 (2013): 11–28.

Figueira, Thomas. “Language as a Marker of Ethnicity in Herodotus and Contemporaries.” In *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, edited by Thomas Figueira and Carmen Soares, 43–60. London: Routledge, 2020.

Finkel, Irving, ed. *The Cyrus Cylinder: The Great Persian Edict from Babylon*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2013.

Finley, M. I. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. Expanded ed. Princeton, NJ, 1998.

Flory, Stewart. *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Fontenrose, J.E. *Didyma: Apollo’s Oracle, Cult, and Companions.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Forsdyke, Sara. *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greece*. Key Themes in Ancient History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Fowler, Robert L. “Herodotos and His Contemporaries.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996): 62–87.

Foxhall, Lin. “Household, Gender and Property in Classical Athens.” *The Classical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (1989): 22–44.

Friedman, Rachel. “Location and Dislocation in Herodotus.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, 165–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Fuchs, Michaela. “Eine Musengruppe aus dem Pompeius-Theater.” *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung= Bullettino dell’Istituto Archeologico Germanico, sezione Romana*, 1982, 69–80.

Garrison, Elise P. “Attitudes toward Suicide in Ancient Greece.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 121 (1991): 1–34.

———. *Groaning Tears: Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy*. Mnemosyne, Supplements, Vol. 147. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995.

Geertz, Clifford. “The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States.” In *Old Societies and New States*, edited by Clifford Geertz, 108–13. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Gilhuly, Kate. *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Glanville, S.R.K. “A Note on Herodotus II, 93.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 12, no. 1/2 (1926): 75–76.

Glazebrook, Allison. “The Bad Girls of Athens: The Image and Function of Hetairai in Judicial Oratory.” In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, edited by Christopher Faraone and Laura K. McClure. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

———. “The Making of a Prostitute: Apollodoros’s Portrait of Neaira.” *Arethusa* 38, no. 2 (2005): 161–87.

Glazebrook, Allison, and Madeleine M. Henry. *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE-200 CE*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011.

Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Gould, John. “Law, Custom and Myth - Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100, (1980): 38–59.

Groningen, B. A. van (Bernhard Abraham). *Herodotus’ Historiën: Commentaar op Boek IV-VI. Herodotus’ Historiën*. Vol. 4. 5 vols. Grieksche en latijnsche schrijvers met aanteekeningen, 49, etc. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950.

Gruen, Erich. “Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe.” *Phoenix* 67, no. 1/2 (2013): 1-22.

Gruen, Erich S. “Introduction.” In *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*, 1–6. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.

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

Hall, Jonathan M. “Ancient Greek Ethnicities: Towards a Reassessment.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58, no. 2 (2015): 15–29.

———. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

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

Halperin, David M. “How to Do the History of Male Homosexuality.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 6, no. 1 (2000): 87–123.

Hamel, Debra. *Trying Neaira: The True Story of a Courtesan’s Scandalous Life in Ancient Greece*. Yale University Press, 2003.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. “The Theoric Fund and the Graphe Paranomon against Apollodorus,” 1976, 12.

Harris, Edward M. “C. Carey: Apollodoros, Against Neaira [Demosthenes] 59.” *The Classical Review* 44, no. 1 (1994): 21–23.

Hartog, François. *The mirror of Herodotus: the representation of the other in the writing of history*. The New historicism: studies in cultural poetics 5. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Hazewindus, Minke W. *When Women Interfere: Studies in the Role of Women in Herodotus’ Histories*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 12. Amsterdam: Gieben, 2004.

Hechter, Michael. “A Rational Choice Approach to Race and Ethnic Relations.” In *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, edited by John Rex and David Mason, 268–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Hornblower, Simon. “Herodotus and his Sources of Information.” In *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees, 373–86. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

How, Walter Wybergh, and Joseph Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus: In Two Volumes: With Introduction and Appendixes*. Clarendon Press, 1912.

Hunt, Peter. *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hunter, Virginia. “Gossip and the Politics of Reputation in Classical Athens.” *Phoenix* 44, no. 4 (1990): 299–325.

Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Ethnicity*. Oxford Readers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Isaacs, Harold R. “Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe.” *Ethnicity*, 1974.

Janko, Richard. “The Greek Dialects in the Palatial and Post-Palatial Late Bronze Age.” In *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edited by Georgios K. Giannakis, Emilio Crespo, and Panagiotis Filos, 49:107–29. Trends in Classics. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Johnstone, Steven. “Apology for the Manuscript of Demosthenes 59.67.” *American Journal of Philology* 123, no. 2 (2002): 229–56.

Jones, Siân. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Kamen, Deborah. *Pseudo-Demosthenes: Against Neaira*. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Dickinson College Commentaries, 2018.

———. "Sale for the Purpose of Freedom: Slave-Prostitutes and Manumission in Ancient Greece." *The Classical Journal* 109, no. 3 (2014): 281–307.

Kapparis, K. A. *Apollodoros "Against Neaira" [D. 59]*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

———. *Athenian Law and Society*, London; New York: Routledge, 2019.

———. "Critical Notes on Ps.-Dem. 59 Against Neaira." *Hermes: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* 123, no. 1 (1995): 19–27.

———. "Humiliating the Adulterer: The Law and the Practice in Classical Athens." *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3e sér., 43 (1996) : 63–77.

———."Immigration and Citizenship Procedures in Athenian Law," 2005, 71-113.

Kartzow, Marianne Bjelland. *Destabilizing the Margins: An Intersectional Approach to Early Christian Memory*. Eugene, Or.: Pickwick Publications, 2012.

Kelly Blazeby, Clare. "Woman + Wine = Prostitute in Classical Athens?" In *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE-200 CE*, edited by Allison Glazebrook and Madeleine M. Henry, 86–105. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011.

Kennedy, Rebecca Futo. *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City*. London; New York: Routledge, 2014.

Kennelly, James J. "Archaisms in the Troizen Decree." *The Classical Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (1990): 539–41.

Kostas, Vlassopoulos. "Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens." *The Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2007): 33–52.

Kurke, Leslie. "Inventing the Hetaira: Sex, Politics, and Discursive Conflict in Archaic Greece." *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (April 1, 1997): 106–54.

Kuttner, Ann L. "Culture and History at Pompey's Museum." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999): 343–73.

Lalioti, Vassiliki. "Social Memory and Ethnic Identity: Ancient Greek Drama Performances as Commemorative Ceremonies." *History and Anthropology* 13, no. 2 (2002): 113–37.

Larson, Stephanie. "Kandaules' Wife, Masistes' Wife: Herodotus' Narrative Strategy in Suppressing Names of Women: (Hdt. 1.8-12 and 9.108-13)." *The Classical Journal* 101, no. 3 (2006): 225–44.

Lattimore, Richmond. "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus." *Classical Philology* 34, no. 1 (1939): 24–35.

Lewis, Diane. "Anthropology and Colonialism." *Current Anthropology* 14, no. 5 (1973): 581–602.

Linton, Ralph. *The Study of Man: An Introduction*, 1936.

Lomas, Kathryn. "Ethnicity and Gender." In *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Jeremy McInerney, 483–96. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014.

Luft, Rachel E. "Intersectionality and the Risk of Flattening Difference." *Intersectional Approach*, 2010, 145.

Macurdy, Grace H. "Apollodorus and the Speech against Neaera (Pseudo-Dem. LIX)." *The American Journal of Philology* 63, no. 3 (1942): 257–71.

Malešević, Siniša. "Rational Choice Theory and the Sociology of Ethnic Relations: A Critique." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25, no. 2 (January 1, 2002): 193–212.

Matsuda, Mari J. "Beside My Sister, Facing the Enemy: Legal Theory out of Coalition." *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (1991): 1183–92.

Matsuno, Emmie, and Stephanie L. Budge. "Non-Binary/Genderqueer Identities: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Current Sexual Health Reports* 9, no. 3 (2017): 116–20.

Maurizio, L. "Delphic Oracles as Oral Performances: Authenticity and Historical Evidence." *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 2 (1997): 308–34.

Mayor, Adrienne. *The Amazons: Lives and Legends of Warrior Women across the Ancient World*. Princeton University Press, 2014.

McNeal, Richard A. "The Brides of Babylon, Herodotus 1,196 + Supposed Babylonian Marriage Custom in the 'Histories.'" *Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 37, no. 1 (1988): 54–71.

McWilliams, Susan. "Hybridity in Herodotus." *Political Research Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (2013): 745–55.

Miles, Steven H. *The Hippocratic Oath and the Ethics of Medicine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Miner, Jess. "Courtesan, Concubine, Whore: Apollodorus' Deliberate Use of Terms for Prostitutes." *The American Journal of Philology* 124, no. 1 (2003): 19–37.

Monro, Surya. "Non-Binary and Genderqueer: An Overview of the Field." *The International Journal of Transgenderism* 20, no. 2–3 (January 21, 2019): 126–31.

Moyer, Ian S. "Herodotus and an Egyptian Mirage: The Genealogies of the Theban Priests." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122 (2002): 70–90.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. "Artemisia in Herodotus." *Classical Antiquity* 7, no. 1 (1988): 91–106.

———. "Who are Herodotus' Persians?" *Classical World: A Quarterly Journal on Antiquity* 102, no. 4 (2009): 457–70.

Murphy, Mary C., and Valerie Jones Taylor. "The Role of Situational Cues in Signaling and Maintaining Stereotype Threat." In *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application*, edited by Michael Inzlicht and Toni Schmader. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Murray, O. “Herodotus and Oral History.” In *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by Nino Luraghi, 16–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Noy, David. “Neaera’s Daughter: A Case of Athenian Identity Theft?” *The Classical Quarterly* 59, no. 2 (2009): 398–410.

Ogden, Daniel. *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Osborne, Robin. “Law in Action in Classical Athens.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985): 40–58.

———. “Review: Edward E. Cohen, The Athenian Nation” *Classical Philology* 97, no. 1 (2002): 93–98.

Papaioannou, Sophia, Andreas Serafim, and Beatrice da Vela. *The Theatre of Justice*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Patterson, Cynthia. “Hai Attikai: The Other Athenians.” *Helios* 13, no. 2 (1986): 49–67.

———. *Pericles’ Citizenship Law of 451-50 B.C.* Arno Press, 1981.

———. “The Case Against Neaira and the Public Ideology of the Athenian Family.” In *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, edited by Alan L. Boegehold and Adele C. Scafuro. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

———. “Those Athenian Bastards.” *Classical Antiquity.* 9, no. 1 (1990): 40–73.

Patterson, Cynthia B., and Edward E. Cohen. “Review of Athenian Prostitution: The Business of Sex.” *The Classical Outlook* 92, no. 3 (2017): 113–14.

Patteson, Alice Jean. “Commentary on (Demosthenes) LIX: ‘Against Neaera.’” Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1978.

Pelling, Christopher. “East is East and West is West—or are they? National Stereotypes in Herodotus.” *Histos* I (1997): 51–66.

———. “The Urine and the Vine: Astyages’ Dreams at Herodotus 1.107-8.” *The Classical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1996): 68–77.

Penrose, Jr., Walter Duvall. *Postcolonial Amazons: Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Pistone, Amy Nicole. “When the Gods Speak: Oracular Communication and Concepts of Language in Sophocles.” Dissertation, 2017.

Postgate, J. P. “Albius and Tibullus.” *The American Journal of Philology* 33, no. 4 (1912): 450–55.

———. “Neaera as a Common Name.” *The Classical Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (1914): 121–22.

Pritchett, William Kendrick. *The Liar School of Herodotus*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1993.

Redfield, James. “Herodotus the Tourist.” *Classical Philology* 80, no. 2 (1985): 97–118.

Reger, Gary. “Ethnic Identities, Borderlands, and Hybridity.” In *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Jeremy McInerney, 112–26. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014.

Riess, Werner, and Garrett G. Fagan. *The Topography of Violence in the Greco-Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016.

Robson, James. "Beauty and Sex Appeal in Aristophanes." *EuGeStA: Journal on Gender Studies in Antiquity* 3 (2013): 43–66.

Roisman, Joseph, Ian Worthington, Robin Waterfield, Joseph Roisman, Ian Worthington, and Robin Waterfield. *Lives of the Attic Orators: Texts from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius, and the Suda*. First edition. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Romanucci-Ross, Lola, and George A. De Vos. *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict, and Accommodation*. Rowman Altamira, 1995.

Rosellini, Michèle, and Suzanne Saïd. "Usages de femmes et autres nomoi chez les ' sauvages ' d'Hérodote : Essai de lecture structurale."." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di lettere e filosofia* 8, no. 3 (1978) : 949–1005.

Roy, J. "An Alternative Sexual Morality for Classical Athenians." *Greece & Rome* 44, no. 1 (1997): 11–22.

Sande, Siri. "The Female Portrait Gallery in Pompey's Theatre Complex in Rome: Appearance and Impact." *Acta Ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia* 27 (2014): 41–70.

Scafuro, Adele C. "Witnessing and False Witnessing: Proving Citizenship and Kin Identity in Fourth-Century Athens." In *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, edited by Alan L Boegehold and Adele C. Scafuro, 156–98. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Schaps, David. "The Woman least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names." *The Classical Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (1977) : 323–30.

Sebillotte Cuchet, Violaine. "Familles et société à Athènes à l'époque classique : un éclairage par les études de genre." *Pallas*, 2017, 71–90.

Shakespeare, Tom. "The Social Model of Disability." In *The Disability Studies Reader*, edited by Lennard J. Davis, 197–204. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Sheets, George A. *Herodotus Book I*. Bryn Mawr commentaries. Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Dept. of Greek, Bryn Mawr College, 1993.

Shils, Edward. "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties: Some Particular Observations on the Relationships of Sociological Research and Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 8, no. 2 (1957): 130–45.

Siapkas, Johannes. *Heterological Ethnicity: Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece*. Boreas: Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations / Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis 27. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2003.

Sjöberg, Birgitta L. "More than Just Gender: The Classical Oikos as a Site of Intersectionality." In *Families in the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Ray Laurence, 48–59. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.

Skinner, Joseph E. "Writing Culture: Historiography, Hybridity, and the Shaping of Collective Memory." *Histos* Supplement 11 (2020): 189–234.

Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and Others: Myth, Ritual, Ethnicity: Martin P. Nilsson Lecture on Greek Religion*, Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen. 80;19 =Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae. Stockholm: Paul Aaström, 2005.

Spatharas, Dimos. "Kinky Stories from the Rostrum: Storytelling in Apollodorus' Against Neaira." *Ancient Narrative* 9 (2011): 99+.

Steele, Claude M. "A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance." *American Psychologist* 52, no. 6 (1997): 613–29.

Steele, Claude M., and Joshua Aronson. "Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69, no. 5 (1995): 797–811.

Steele, Claude M., Steven J. Spencer, and Joshua Aronson. "Contending with Group Image: The Psychology of Stereotype and Social Identity Threat." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 34 (2002): 379–440.

Taylor, Claire. "Women's Social Networks and Female Friendship in the Ancient Greek City." *Gender & History* 23, no. 3 (2011): 703–20.

Thomas, Rosalind. "Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by Irad Malkin, 213–33. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 5. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Thorsen, Thea Selliaas. "Sappho, Corinna and Colleagues in Ancient Rome. Tatian's Catalogue of Statues (*Oratio ad Graecos* 33-4) Reconsidered." *Mnemosyne* 65, no. 4/5 (2012): 695–715.

Todd, Stephen. "The Use and Abuse of the Attic Orators." *Greece & Rome* 37, no. 2 (1990): 159–78.

Törngren, Sayaka Osanami, Nahikari Irastorza, and Dan Rodríguez-García. "Understanding Multiethnic and Multiracial Experiences Globally: Towards a Conceptual Framework of Mixedness." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47, no. 4 (2019): 763-781.

Tourraix, Alexandre. "La femme et le pouvoir chez Hérodote." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 2, no. 1 (1976) : 369–86.

Trevett, Jeremy. "Apollodoros the Son of Pasion." University of Oxford, 1990.

———. *Apollodoros, the Son of Pasion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Ullman, B. L. "Rejoinder to Mr. Postgate." *The American Journal of Philology* 33, no. 4 (1912): 456–60.

———. "Some Type-Names in the Odes of Horace." *The Classical Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1915): 27–30.

Vlassopoulos, Kostas. "Ethnicity and Greek History: Re-Examining Our Assumptions." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58, no. 2 (2015): 1–13.

———. "Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens." *The Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2007): 33–52.

———. “Greek Slavery: From Domination to Property and Back Again.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 131 (2011): 115–30.

———. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Volonaki, Eleni. “Narrative in Forensic Oratory: Persuasion and Performance.” *The Ancient Art of Persuasion across Genres and Topics*, October 4, 2019, 55–72.

Wenghofer, Richard. “Sexual Promiscuity of Non-Greeks in Herodotus’ Histories.” *Classical World* 107, no. 4 (2014): 515–34.

Wesselmann, Katharina. “Xerxes Und Frau Des Masistes.” In *Literatur und Religion 2: Wege zu einer Mythisch-Rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen*, edited by Katharina Wesselmann, Anton Bierl, and Rebecca Lämmle, 1–39. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Whitehead, David. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1977.

———. “Two Notes on Greek Suicide.” *The Classical Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1993): 501–2.

———. “Women and Naturalisation in Fourth-Century Athens: The Case of Archippe.” *The Classical Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (1986): 109–14.

Wolff, Erwin. “Das Weib Des Masistes.” *Hermes* 92, no. 1 (1964): 51–58.

Worthington, Ian. “Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches and the Problem of Historical Reliability.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991): 55–74.

Zelnick-Abramovitz, Rachel. *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*. Brill, 2017.