

REVIEW–DISCUSSION

AN ANTHOLOGY OF HERODOTEAN SCHOLARSHIP

Rosaria Vignolo Munson, ed., *Herodotus: Volume 1: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. viii + 495. Paperback, \$66.00. ISBN 978-0-19-958757-5.

Rosaria Vignolo Munson, ed., *Herodotus: Volume 2: Herodotus and the World. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. viii + 473. Paperback, \$66.00. ISBN 978-0-19-958759-9.

Amid the explosion of edited collections of articles devoted to Herodotus that has taken place since the early 2000s comes Munson’s two-volume collection—the biggest one yet. At twenty-nine articles, this collection surpasses *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*, which was previously the largest.¹ What distinguishes Munson’s collection from the others is that it consists of only previously-published pieces, which is characteristic of the *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* series in which her volumes appear. Munson has done an outstanding job at selecting some of the best articles written by the top Herodotean scholars working in the last several decades. Her collection will prove useful to scholars in the field, but it will especially appeal to graduate students and advanced undergraduates, for whom it should become a standard, first-stop introduction to the study of Herodotus.

1. Contents of the Collection

It will be helpful to have at hand a list of the articles included in each of Munson’s two volumes, the relevant chapters in which the articles are organized, and the articles’ page numbers and original publication dates:

¹ Along with *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* (Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees (2002)), edited collections devoted to Herodotus and published since 2001 include Luraghi (2001); Derow and Parker (2003); Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004); Giangiulio (2005); Dewald and Marincola (2006); Irwin and Greenwood (2007); *Classical World* 102.4 (2009), with a *Special Section on Herodotus*; Rollinger, Truschnegg, and Bichler (2011); Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012); Foster and Lateiner (2012); Dunsch and Ruffing (2013); Priestley and Zali (2016). Prior to 2001, there were Marg (1982) and Boedeker (1987).

Volume 1: *Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past**Antecedents, sources, credibility, and historiē*

- I 1: Arnaldo Momigliano, 'The place of Herodotus in the history of historiography' (31–45; 1958/1966)
 I 2: Robert L. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his contemporaries' (46–83; 1996)

Herodotus and oral tradition

- I 3: Nino Luraghi, 'The stories before the *Histories*: Folktale and traditional narrative in Herodotus' (87–112; 2005)
 I 4: J. A. S. Evans, 'Oral tradition in Herodotus' (113–23; 1980)
 I 5: Harriet L. Flower, 'Herodotus and the Delphic traditions about Croesus' (124–53; 1991)

Causation, patterning, and the meaning of history

- I 6: Henry R. Immerwahr, 'Aspects of historical causation in Herodotus' (157–93; 1956)
 I 7: Donald Lateiner, 'Herodotean historiographical patterning: "The Constitutional Debate"' (194–211; 1984)
 I 8: Matthew R. Christ, 'Herodotean kings and historical inquiry' (212–50; 1994)

Narratology

- I 9: Irene J. F. de Jong, 'Narratological aspects of the *Histories* of Herodotus' (253–91; 1999)

The uses of history

- I 10: Hermann Strasburger, 'Herodotus and Periclean Athens' (295–320; 1955)
 I 11: Charles W. Fornara, 'Herodotus' perspective' (321–33; 1971)
 I 12: Philip A. Stadter, 'Herodotus and Athenian *archē*' (334–56; 1992)

Look at his end

- I 13: Deborah Boedeker, 'Protesilaus and the end of Herodotus' *Histories*' (359–78; 1988)
 I 14: Carolyn Dewald, 'Wanton kings, pickled heroes, and gnomic founding fathers: Strategies of meaning at the end of Herodotus' *Histories*' (379–401; 1997)

Volume 2: *Herodotus and the World**Phusis and historiē*

- II 1: James S. Romm, 'The boundaries of Earth' (21–43; 1992)
 II 2: Aldo Corcella, 'Herodotus and analogy' (44–77; 1984)
 II 3: Catherine Darbo-Peschanski, 'Herodotus and *historia*' (78–105; 2007)

The Homeric wanderer

- II 4: John Marincola, 'Herodotus and Odysseus' (109–32; 2007)

Women in Herodotus

- II 5: Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 'Exit Atossa: Images of women in Greek historiography on Persia' (135–50; 1983) (with an addendum by Amélie Kuhrt)
 II 6: Carolyn Dewald, 'Women and culture in Herodotus' *Histories*' (151–79; 1981)

World religions and the divine

- II 7: John Gould, 'Herodotus and religion' (183–97; 1994)
 II 8: Walter Burkert, 'Herodotus and the names of the gods: Polytheism as a historical problem' (198–209; 1985)

Herodotus' barbaroi

- II 9: Michele Rosellini and Suzanne Saïd, 'Women's customs among the "savages" in Herodotus' (213–44; 1978)
- II 10: François Hartog, 'Imaginary Scythians: Space and nomadism' (245–66; 1979)
- II 11: James Redfield, 'Herodotus the tourist' (267–91; 1985)
- II 12: Ian S. Moyer, 'Herodotus and the Egyptian mirage: The genealogies of the Theban priests' (292–320; 2002)
- II 13: Rosaria Vignolo Munson, 'Who are Herodotus' Persians?' (321–35; 2009)

Us and them

- II 14: Rosalind Thomas, 'Ethnicity, genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus' (339–59; 2001)
- II 15: Christopher Pelling, 'East is East and West is West—Or are they? National stereotypes in Herodotus' (360–79; 1997)

2. Summary of the Collection

I now offer a chapter-by-chapter summary of the contents of both volumes in Munson's collection. Since all the articles in the collection have been previously published, I will in general not critique the merits of the individual articles' arguments (even when I am not persuaded by some of them). Instead, I will consider what the articles tell the reader about Herodotus; how well chosen the articles are to elucidate the themes of the chapters in which they are placed; and how well the articles fit together with each other in the specific chapters or volumes. One thing that will become clear is that within the chapters Munson has carefully chosen and arranged the articles so that they engage in dialogue with one another.

The first chapter of Volume 1 (*Antecedents, sources, credibility, and historiē*) sets the stage for Herodotus, focusing on the historiographical background, context, and reception of the *Histories*. This chapter's two articles, Momigliano (I 1) and Fowler (I 2), fit together extremely well. Momigliano famously claims: 'There was no Herodotus before Herodotus' (33). For Momigliano, Herodotus can truly be considered the 'father of history' (as Cicero had it) because he pioneered the use of oral traditions to write history; later Greek and Roman historians followed the lead of Thucydides, however, in concentrating on contemporary history over the more distant past that concerned Herodotus. In response to Momigliano, Fowler asks: 'Was there then a Herodotos before Herodotos?' (56). To map out Herodotus' own unique authorial voice, Fowler looks at different ways in which we can detect Herodotus' first-person engagement with the material in his text. What most distinguished Herodotus from his historiographic contemporaries, argues Fowler, was that 'he discovered the *problem* of sources' (81), that sources could be unreliable and contradictory. In addition, Fowler helpfully introduces readers to the controversial views of Detlev Fehling (1971, and its English translation (1989)) regarding the supposed

fictitious nature of Herodotus' source citations; many other articles in Munson's collection also grapple with Fehling's reading of Herodotus (on which, see Munson's discussion: (vol. 1) 17–18).

Building on Momigliano's observations about Herodotus and oral traditions, the three articles included in the second chapter (*Herodotus and oral tradition*) explore further the oral nature of Herodotus' sources. Luraghi (I 3) 93 n. 18 refers to Evans (I 4, or at least his later expansion of this article in Evans (1990/1991)) and to Flower (I 5). Both Evans (I 4) and Flower (I 5) take the findings of anthropologists (especially Jan Vansina) who have studied oral traditions in Africa and apply them to the study of the oral stories with which Herodotus worked: Evans concludes that professional 'remembrancers' of oral tradition analogous to those in pre-colonial Africa existed in ancient Greece, while Flower traces much of Herodotus' information about the Lydian king Croesus to oral traditions that attached to Croesus' lavish dedications at Delphi. After surveying the work of Vansina, of Murray (2001), and of Aly (1921), Luraghi (I 3) considers how Herodotus fit into his work oral stories that were already encoded with the moral and political concerns of their original tellers.

The three articles in the third chapter (*Causation, patterning, and the meaning of history*) uncover patterns of thought used by Herodotus to make sense of the past and of the world as a whole. Immerwahr (I 6) looks at the historical causes that Herodotus posits for events, especially the rise and fall of eastern empires (Lydian and Persian). Lateiner's (I 7) article begins with a reference to Immerwahr, mentioning the interest in Herodotean patterning that Immerwahr shows in his later monograph (Immerwahr (1966)). According to Lateiner, the anti-monarchical, pro-democratic stance taken by the Persian Otanes in the Constitutional Debate (3.80–2) reflects the way that Herodotus himself saw history working: kings and tyrants will ultimately end in failure, while democratic states like Athens will prosper. For Christ (I 8), Herodotean kings are negative analogues to Herodotus himself as measurers, explorers, and investigators; Herodotus furthers his authorial self-presentation by drawing an implicit contrast between his own search for truth and the self-serving aims and coercive methods employed by kings in their researches.

In the fourth chapter (*Narratology*) there is only one article (de Jong (I 9)), but it covers a lot of ground (as we shall see below). After introducing readers to narratology, de Jong provides narratological analyses of the *Histories*. She analyzes Herodotus' voice as narrator (in a complementary way to Fowler (I 2)); his use of anachrony with his frequent shifts in narrative time through analepses (flashbacks) and prolepses (flashforwards); and his use of foreshadowing and suspense.

The three articles in the fifth chapter (*The uses of history*) consider the *Histories* as a window into what Herodotus thought about contemporary events and what he wished to communicate to readers about those events. Arguing against

earlier scholarly readings (e.g., Pohlenz (1937) 165–77) that connected Herodotus' aim to memorialize the victory of the Greeks in the Persian Wars with his supposed fondness for Periclean Athens, Strasburger (I 10) detects a much more negative view on Herodotus' part of both Athenian imperialism and the policies of Pericles. 'If Immerwahr is the father of patterning,' says Munson (vol. 1) 26, 'Fornara is the father of our political reading of the *Histories*.' According to Fornara (I 11), Herodotus intended for his late fifth-century readers to view the last three books of the *Histories* through the filter of their contemporary knowledge of the growth of the Athenian empire and of the beginnings of the Peloponnesian War. Stadter (I 12) is even more direct: Herodotus intended readers to view imperialist Persians as analogues to imperialist Athenians, both of which groups crossed continental boundaries in acts of aggression, exacted tribute, and enslaved subject peoples.

Volume 1 ends on a high note: the sixth and final chapter (*Look at his end*) features two articles on the end of Herodotus' work that fit together perfectly. Boedeker (I 13) focuses on the penultimate episode of the *Histories* (9.116–20), the Athenians' siege of Sestos and crucifixion of the Persian governor Artayktes. She sees this episode as linking not only the East–West conflicts of the Persian and Trojan Wars (Artayktes plundered the temple of the hero Protesilaos, the first Greek to land in Asia and die at Troy; Protesilaos gets his revenge when Artayktes is crucified at the very place where Xerxes crossed into Europe), but also the Athenians and the Persians as ruthless imperialists, the former of whom now cross into Asia by besieging Sestos and inflict a Persian-like punishment on Artayktes. Dewald (I 14) focuses on the very last episode of the *Histories* (9.122): Cyrus' (ultimately unsuccessful) advice that the Persians reside in their rugged homeland and so avoid the enervating effects of the 'soft' lands they wish to conquer (9.122). She argues that Herodotus may have meant for this final episode to have an ambiguous message for Greek readers: was it really weakness on the part of the imperialistic Persians that led to their defeat by the Greeks, and if so, are the imperialistic Athenians on a path to weakness and defeat as well? With their emphases on contemporary resonances in the ending of the *Histories*, Boedeker and Dewald recall the articles of Strasburger, Fornara, and Stadter in the previous chapter.

Shifting mainly to Herodotean ethnography and, to a lesser extent, geography, Volume 2 begins with a chapter (*Phusis and historiē*) that considers the ways that Herodotus applies 'inquiry' (*historiē*) to the world of 'nature' (*phusis*). For Romm (II 1), Herodotus transforms the conceptual boundaries of the Ionian world map by basing them not on the words of poets like Homer (or even of prose predecessors like Hecataeus), who imagined a circular earth bounded on its edges by the River Ocean, but instead on travelers' reports, which effectively bounded the earth by uninhabited regions precisely because there were supposedly no people in those regions to offer any information about them.

Just as Herodotus takes the ‘laws’ (*nomoi*) governing the natural world as fixed and regular, says Corcella (II 2), so too he takes the ‘customs’ (*nomoi*) observed by each different people as fixed and regular (although, unlike natural laws, such customs can change over time); what most deserves explanation for Herodotus is when a natural feature (like the Nile) breaks from these laws or, on the contrary, when the customs of two different peoples (e.g., Greeks and Egyptians) actually match each other. While Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) agrees with Corcella that Herodotus feels the need to explain transgressions against the natural order (including peoples’ *nomoi*, such as when the Persians move away from their custom of truth-telling to one of deceit), she sees this Herodotean order as maintained by divine justice, which dispenses judgment against and retribution for such transgressions. She believes, moreover, that Herodotus holds all the *logoi* (stories/accounts) he reports up for judgment by his readers, who will ultimately decide what sort of truth value the *logoi* contain.

In the second chapter (*The Homeric wanderer*) Marincola (II 4) also addresses Herodotus’ relationship with truth. He argues that contemporary readers would have known not to accept at face value everything Herodotus reports about Egypt in Book 2 of the *Histories*, since in that book Herodotus casts himself as an Odysseus-like figure, traveling far and telling tall-tales about his travels. Accordingly, Marincola urges scholars not to dismiss out of hand all of Detlev Fehling’s arguments about the fictitious nature of the *Histories*; at least in parts of his work, says Marincola, Herodotus and his readers may have been playing with truth in a way now lost to us.

The two articles in the third chapter (*Women in Herodotus*) turn to the roles that Herodotus gives to women in his narrative. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (II 5) demonstrates that we can trust little of what ancient Greek authors say about the influence queens and princesses exercised in Achaemenid Persian society; such authors viewed these women through the lens of the purported decadence and effeminacy of the Persian Empire. Although not immune from this prejudice, Herodotus is unusual in preserving traces of what appear to be genuine Persian traditions, which reveal that through marriage alliances female Persian elites were put into the sometimes difficult position of tying together both the royal and satrapal families of Persia. Amélie Kuhrt provides an ‘Addendum’, in which she surveys scholarship on Achaemenid women done since Sancisi-Weerdenburg’s ground-breaking study. While looking at Herodotean women in general, Dewald (II 6) concludes that Herodotus is, again, unusual among Greek authors in giving a more balanced and nuanced depiction of women. In the *Histories* women serve several different functions in their respective societies: some become priestesses, but most work to ensure that either their own family structure or their society’s customs stay intact. Other than the general theme of Herodotean ethnography (in which women feature prominently), there does not seem to be an obvious connection between this third chapter

on women in the *Histories* and the previous chapter on the Odyssean Herodotus; the connection that Munson (vol. 2) 7 herself makes—women play a very prominent role in Homer's *Odyssey*—seems forced.

Herodotus' presentation of religion is the topic of the two articles in the fourth chapter (*World religions and the divine*). Munson's decision to place a chapter on religion exactly here in Volume 2 was apparently dictated by Dewald's (II 6) ending her discussion of women in Herodotus with priestesses. Gould (II 7) makes two main points. One, against such scholars as Lateiner (1989), who take Herodotus' reticence to talk about divine matters as proof that they cannot be verified by historiographic methods, Gould shows not only that Herodotus' reticence simply reflects a general Greek acknowledgment that humans cannot fully understand the workings of the gods, but also that Herodotus often suggests a divine explanation for historical events (such as the outcomes of battles). Two, rather than considering the *ideology* behind Greek or non-Greek religions, Herodotus is concerned almost completely with issues of *ritual*, including sacrifice and the proper names of the gods. Regarding divine names, Burkert (II 8) shows that through an impressive combination of inquiry and reasoned judgment Herodotus comes to the conclusion that almost all such names came to Greeks by way of Egypt through the intermediacy of the Pelasgians (2.50–3). As Herodotus learned from the priestesses at Dodona, Pelasgians had formerly just worshipped undifferentiated 'gods' (*theoi*); once they learned the divine names from the Egyptians (as Herodotus surmises), the Pelasgians passed on to Greeks these names of the gods, for whom Homer and Hesiod eventually established genealogies and personalities. Burkert grounds Herodotus' attention here to correct naming in the linguistic theories of the pre-Socratics (Sophists especially) and contrasts these theories with the later ones of the Stoics.

The fifth chapter (*Herodotus' barbaroi*) of Volume 2 is the single longest chapter in either volume, containing five articles total, all of which discuss Herodotus' ethnographic treatment of foreign peoples. If we temporarily suspend the previous chapter on religion, then we can see that Dewald's (II 6) article at the end of the third chapter would have fit very well before the first article of the fifth chapter, Rosellini and Saïd (II 9): Dewald talks about women in Herodotus, while Rosellini and Saïd talk about non-Greek women in Herodotean ethnography. As Munson (vol. 2) 11 points out, the first three articles in the current chapter—by Rosellini and Saïd, Hartog, and Redfield, respectively—use the structuralist theories of the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss to support their arguments that Herodotus understands (certain) non-Greek cultures as in many ways polar opposites of the Greek norm. Focusing on women's customs (including marriage, sexuality, and diet) among the 'savage' cultures in the *Histories*, Rosellini and Saïd show that even for near bestial cultures at the edges of the earth Herodotus' structuralist system can be contradictory and untidy,

which reflects a tension in his ethnographic thought between symmetry and verisimilitude. Hartog's (II 10) structuralist reading concentrates on a single people, the Scythians. On the one hand, the nomadic Scythians are by their very nature the opposites of *polis*-dwelling Greeks; on the other hand, the Scythians use their nomadism as a military tactic that turns on its head conventional methods of fighting: they cannot be conquered (as by Darius in his failed invasion of Scythia in Book 4) because they possess no space to conquer. Redfield (II 11) notes that Herodotus envisions peoples as either 'hard' (poor and rugged) or 'soft' (wealthy and luxurious) and that the latter never conquers the former in the *Histories*; these categories are fluid, however, with the 'hard' Persians first conquering the 'soft' Lydians and Egyptians, but then, as a now 'soft' people, failing to conquer the 'hard' Scythians and Greeks. The last two articles in this chapter move away from the systems Herodotus himself imposes on his ethnography and on to the active role his foreign sources played in constructing that ethnography ahead of time. Although scholars (such as Fehling (1989) 77–85) have impugned Herodotus' veracity for the story that priests in Egyptian Thebes could show visitors statues representing high priests from 345 consecutive generations (2.143), Moyer (II 12) argues that such a story is plausible when seen in the light of the ideological stress that Persian rule placed on the Egyptians, who had a vested interest in expanding the history of Egypt as far as possible into the past in order to undermine the legitimacy of the comparatively recent Persian conquest. In her own article Munson (II 13) uncovers self-interested, aristocratic, non-Greek oral sources behind Herodotus' account of Persia: the historically inaccurate tale that Cyrus the Great's mother was a Mede may have come from distinguished families of Median descent living in Asia Minor, while the dispirited voices of Persian elites echo through Herodotus' narrative, revealing their unhappiness with the ethical direction Achaemenid kings have taken the Persian people.

Volume 2 closes with a sixth chapter (*Us and them*) on what Herodotus thinks about the ethnic character and identity not of foreign peoples but of Greeks themselves. According to Thomas (II 14), Herodotus marshals Greek mythical genealogies and Greek customs to arrive at conclusions regarding ethnicity that must have surprised or even appalled contemporary readers: the autochthonous Athenians were originally non-Greek; due to their descent from Perseus' mother Danaë, Spartan kings were ultimately Egyptian; and the Ionians had no unified ethnic heritage, but were an amalgam of several different peoples. The last article in the collection is particularly well-chosen for this position: reflecting its orally-delivered origin, Pelling's (II 15) article has a conversational tone that is pleasingly Herodotean, and Pelling not only engages in an extensive dialogue with Hartog's ideas on the construction of a foreign 'Other', but also ends his discussion with the last chapter of the *Histories* (thereby recalling Boedeker's and Dewald's articles at the end of Volume 1). Pelling sees in the *Histories* both challenges to and reassertions of the Greek 'us'

and barbarian ‘them’ dichotomy; in the final chapters of Book 9, for example, we find Persian-like, imperialistic, crucifying Athenians (9.116–20) and Persians (9.122), who by their rejection of Cyrus’ advice did become predictably ‘soft’ in some ways, and yet were still praised by Herodotus for the toughness they displayed in their fighting against the Spartans at Plataea (9.62–3).

3. Analysis of the Collection

For her collection, Munson herself indicates neither who the target audience is nor what criteria she used to select the articles she includes. According to the introductory blurb on the *Oxford Readings* series as a whole, ‘[t]he series provides students and scholars with a representative selection of the best and most influential articles on a particular author, work, or subject’ (i). In her ‘Preface’ (which is the same for both volumes) Munson (v) merely says that she has aimed at compiling ‘a collection of “must read” scholarship on Herodotus’.

One criterion for Munson’s selection of articles seems to have been the preference of articles over chapters in monographs. This is a reasonable choice since articles tend to be more self-contained and to offer readers more introduction and guidance than individual monograph chapters. Evans’ 1980 article (I 4) on oral tradition is selected, rather than his later discussion of the topic in Evans (1990/1991); Lateiner’s 1984 article (I 7) on the Constitutional Debate is selected, rather than his later discussion of the topic in Lateiner 1989; Hartog’s 1979 article (II 10) on ‘imaginary Scythians’ is selected, rather than his later discussion of the topic in either his book (Hartog (1980/1991/2001)) or its English translation (Hartog (1988)). There are, however, four chapters from monographs that are included: Fornara (I 11), Romm (II 1), Corcella (II 2), and Darbo-Peschanski (II 3).

Another criterion that Munson uses to select articles for her collection (as she explains: (vol. 1) 3) is the exclusion of English articles that were published in edited collections or journal issues devoted exclusively to Herodotus. There are thus essentially no articles in Munson’s collection from any of the works cited in note 1 of this review. One exception that Munson makes to this criterion is an article of her own, Munson (II 3), which was originally one of several on Herodotus in an issue of the journal *Classical World* (102.4 (2009): 457–70). Non-English articles are a special case, and so she does include Luraghi (I 3), an Italian article originally published in a collection (Giangiulio (2005) 61–90) devoted to Herodotus. Somewhat analogous is the originally German article by Strasburger (I 10), which appears in an edited collection on Herodotus—that of Marg ((1982) 574–608)—but which had previously been published in the journal *Historia* (4 (1955): 1–25).

The Luraghi and Strasburger pieces point to a feature of Munson’s collection that will be attractive to Anglophone readers, and one that is regular for

the *Oxford Readings* series in general: the inclusion of several articles that have been newly translated (from French, German, or Italian) into English. In Volume 1 there are three—Luraghi (I 3), de Jong (I 9), and Strasburger (I 10)—and in Volume 2 there are no less than five—Corcella (II 2), Darbo-Peschanski (II 3), Burkert (II 8), Rosellini and Saïd (II 9), and Hartog (II 10). Although Luraghi and Burkert translated their own articles into English, Jay Kardan translated (or at least edited the English translation, in the case of Burkert) all the other articles; Edith Foster collaborated with Kardan in the translation of Strasburger's article.

Another commendable feature of Munson's collection is the relatively large number of articles that have been newly revised and updated in some way, almost always by the original authors themselves. Thirteen articles (and so nearly half of the twenty-nine total) have been revised and updated by the authors: Fowler (I 2), Luraghi (I 3), de Jong (I 9), Boedeker (I 13), Corcella (II 2), Darbo-Peschanski (II 3), Marincola (II 4), Dewald (II 6), Burkert (II 8), Moyer (II 12), Munson (II 13), Thomas (II 14), and Pelling (II 15). In addition, Thomas provides an 'Addendum' for her article, in which she discusses scholarship done on the topic since the article's original publication, and Amélie Kuhrt provides an even more extensive 'Addendum' for the article (II 5) by the late Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg.

Yet another welcome feature of the collection is Munson's inclusion of an 'Index of Passages from Herodotus' *Histories* section at the back of each volume. In my opinion, no scholarly book in the field of Classics should ever be published without an index of Greek/Latin passages cited. Such an index is certainly not a given for the *Oxford Readings* series: neither Rusten (2009) nor Gray (2010) has one. Each of Munson's 'Index of Passages' is keyed solely to the specific volume (1 or 2) in which it appears and includes only Herodotean passages; unfortunately, non-Herodotean passages (e.g., from Homer or Thucydides) are not included. The detailed 'General Index' is also specific to each volume. By contrast, the 'Bibliography' in each volume is comprehensive and lists all the books referenced in both volumes.

Perhaps the best feature of Munson's collection is the individualized 'Introduction' that she has written for each volume. It is in the 'Introduction' to Volume 1 that Munson explains why her collection spans two volumes (3):

In order to give a fair representation of different approaches, I have divided this *Oxford Readings* into two different volumes, broadly corresponding to the two conspicuously different narrative genres whose combination arguably accounts for the unique essence of the *Histories*: the narrative of events in the past, and the atemporal description of cultures and lands. The main disadvantage of such a partition is that it risks reinforcing the old-fashioned assumption [expressed by Felix Jacoby in his hugely influential 1913 *RE* article on Herodotus] that in Herodotus

historiography and ethnography are independent of one another and concerned with entirely different sets of problems.

Munson begins the ‘Introduction’ to Volume 2 with a brief introduction for readers to Herodotean ethnography (1–4). The beginning of her ‘Introduction’ to Volume 1 (1–13) is lengthier and even more important: Munson’s overview here of Herodotus’ life, travels, and original audience (4–13) is the clearest and most sensible one I have ever read; it should be required reading for all students of Herodotus. The second part of each ‘Introduction’ is entitled ‘Approaches and Contents of Volume I [or II]’. In this part Munson offers valuable discussions of each article (in the order in which they appear in that particular volume), usually devoting at least a paragraph to each article; she orients the articles both in terms of previous scholarship on their topics and in terms of select other articles in her collection. Although it seems to be the standard practice of the *Oxford Readings* series that an editor’s discussion of articles be located in an ‘Introduction’ at the beginning of a volume, I think it would be more useful for readers to have such discussions moved instead to the beginning of the relevant articles themselves.

It is hard to fault Munson’s choice of the specific articles included in her collection. On the one hand, some of the most frequently cited articles in modern Herodotean research now reside together, articles such as Fowler (I 2), Christ (I 8), and Redfield (II 11). These articles, as well as classic ones like Momigliano (I 1) and Strasburger (I 10), have been dusted off and given new life and a new 2013 date. On the other hand, articles by the best Herodotean scholars of the last two generations are found here, scholars such as Immerwahr, Fornara, Gould, Lateiner, Dewald, Pelling, Munson, Marincola, Thomas, and Luraghi. Dewald is the only scholar who has two articles included, one in Volume 1 (I 14) and one in Volume 2 (II 6). I applaud this decision most heartily: no modern scholar has made more significant contributions to Herodotean studies than Dewald. (One hopes that a collection of all of Dewald’s articles on Herodotus will appear someday.)

Munson’s decision to automatically exclude articles from English edited collections on Herodotus, however, leads to some missed opportunities for her collection. In the second chapter of Volume 1 (*Herodotus and oral tradition*) the obvious article missing is Oswyn Murray’s seminal ‘Herodotus and Oral History’ (2001). Murray’s article first appeared in Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Kuhrt (1987: 93–115) and then was reprinted in Luraghi’s 2001 collection on Herodotus (16–44). Within this second chapter Luraghi (I 3) 89–97 at least discusses Murray’s (2001) article at length. An article that would have fit very well in the fifth chapter of Volume 1 (*The uses of history*) among Strasburger (I 10), Fornara (I 11), and Stadter (I 12)—but that originally appeared in journal issues devoted to Herodotus—is Raaflaub (1987), who similarly argues that Herodo-

tus expects his contemporary readers to use the past as he relates it in the *Histories* to think about the present. Stadter (I 12) 335 quotes Raaflaub (1987) and refers to the Strasburger–Fornara–Raaflaub sequence twice (336 n. 7, 356 n. 67). Juxtaposing in one volume all four of these complementary treatments—Strasburger (1955), Fornara (1971), Raaflaub (1987), Stadter (1992)—would have made even richer the dialogue between these scholars regarding Herodotus’ engagement with contemporary events.

There are also some missing chapters that could have been included in Munson’s collection, as well as some additional articles that could have been included in these hypothetical chapters. In many cases Munson appears to have selected articles that are wide-ranging enough to make up for most of the missing chapters. For example, her collection does not have a separate chapter on Herodotus’ reception, whether in antiquity or in modern times.² While Momigliano (I 1) does touch upon the reception of the *Histories*, perhaps an article like Murray (1972) could have been added to this first chapter of Volume 1 to provide more coverage on Herodotus’ reception.³ De Jong’s (II 9) article in particular can be seen to take the place of several missing chapters. First, de Jong joins several scholars in Munson’s collection (Fowler (I 2), Christ (I 8), Darbo-Peschanski (II 3), Marincola (II 4)) in examining Herodotus’ authorial persona. This may help explain why Munson does not include a separate chapter on Herodotus’ self-presentation; such a chapter could have featured either of Dewald’s treatments of the subject, Dewald (1987) or (2002).⁴ De Jong (263 n. 29, 264) does mention the former of Dewald’s articles, but not the latter. Second, de Jong compares Herodotus’ authorial voice to those of Homer and of Hippocratic writers, respectively. By so doing, de Jong’s article takes the place of a separate chapter on Herodotus’ relationship to Homer; both Romm’s (II 1) and Marincola’s (II 4) articles also consider this relationship. One of the gaps in the coverage of Munson’s volumes, however, is greater attention paid to Herodotus’ relationship to different Greek poetic genres; a chapter on this relationship could have included Pelling (2006), Marincola (2006), or Boedeker (2000). Third, De Jong’s article (along with Burkert’s (II 8)) takes the place of a separate chapter on the similarities between Herodotean modes of expression and those of the Hippocratics, a subject taken up in most detail by Thomas (2000); earlier articles on this subject by Thomas (1997) or by Lateiner (1986) could also have been chosen for such a potential chapter.

Although the discussions of the individual articles found in the ‘Introduction’ to each volume are for the most part quite instructive, there is one instance where Munson does not give first-time readers of Herodotus, at any

² By contrast, the final chapter of Rusten’s (2009) collection features three articles on Thucydides’ ancient and modern reception.

³ On Herodotus’ reception, see now Priestley (2014); Priestley and Zali (2016).

⁴ On Herodotus’ self-presentation, see further Branscome (2013).

rate, enough information about a specific article and its place in the history of scholarship on Herodotus. The article in question is that of Strasburger (I 10), which was ahead of its time in the darker reading of the *Histories* that it took. Nevertheless, the article (first published in 1955) still expresses an opinion that was commonly held at the time and even later, namely, that Herodotus was the more old-fashioned, Archaic-Period-like thinker and Thucydides the more enlightened, Classical-Period-like thinker. As late as 1987, Stewart Flory could title his own monograph *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*.⁵ More recently, scholars have tended rather to stress Herodotus' mastery of contemporary, late fifth-century scientific modes of thought and argument (Raaflaub (2002); Thomas (2006)). Munson has not prepared readers for the old scholarly opinion, whether in her discussion of Strasburger's article ((vol. 1) 24–5) or in her selection of the other articles in her collection. For readers new to the study of Herodotus, it may therefore be jarring when they encounter Strasburger's references to Herodotus' archaic nature (296, 299, 312).

Given the nearly 800 pages of text in the articles alone, Munson's collection is in general remarkably free of errors. There are some typographical errors, to be sure, especially in the Greek.⁶ Not surprisingly, perhaps, the articles that contain the most errors—the most error-ridden article is Rosellini and Saïd (II 9)—are those that have been newly translated into English and have therefore received the least amount of editing in their current form; since there are fewer translated articles in Volume 1 than in Volume 2, there are correspondingly fewer errors in the former volume than in the latter.

More alarming are some factual errors. The most egregious one involves Croesus' formerly mute son. According to Herodotus, when the Persians were capturing Sardis, this son saved Croesus' life by telling a Persian soldier: 'Man, don't kill Croesus!' (1.85.4). Herodotus continues: 'This [son] uttered this for

⁵ When applied to Herodotus, the term 'archaic smile'—used by art historians for the seemingly wry smile worn by Archaic Greek statues of the *kouros* type—indicates for Flory (1987) 20 that 'Herodotus' stories suggest a deeper meaning hidden behind their surface charm'.

⁶ Errors are underlined; corrections are in brackets. Volume 1: 1 n. 1: the Robert; 9: was a politically; 11: is he is; 11 n. 31: the Herodotus'; 22 n. 71: Branscombe [same error at 411 and vol. 2: 389]; 76: as shown; 113: Evans 1991a [for 1991b]; 115: u purveyed; 194: precedings kings; 244: οἷκε; 285: will consists; 301: socles; 309: Eritreans; 340: τοῦτου; 341: καρταέρξίης; 350: Athens] democratic; 415: Quellengaben [for *Quellenangaben*: same error at 421, 424, 468; vol. 2: 393, 399, 402, 446]; Volume 2: 96 n. 18: ἀνεπιστημονεστέρη; 99: as it he; 105: ἰστορεῖν; 120: IX–XI [for IX–XII]; 131 n. 101: historical; 214 n. 12: Scythians] Amazons; 219: ἔθνος; 221: οἷόν τι; εἶεν; 223: ἐπίκοινα; σπείρουσι; 227: ἐπίκοινον; 229: οἷκίas; 231: γυναίκες; 231 n. 161: One; 232:]like; 234: they] difference; 238: are are; 240: [] especially Strabo's; 264: 440–43 BC; 264 n. 61: was [for 'were']; 282: Ichtnyphagoi; 289: ἰξηγορίη; 322: οἷκίης; 325: ἡσυχίης; 425: O. Murray (printed twice).

the first time, but after this he spoke all the rest of his life.’ In de Jong’s article (I 9) 285–6 we hear that this son ‘saves his father’s life by speaking for the first—and only—time in his life’. Speaking to the Persian soldier was indeed the first time in his life that Croesus’ son had spoken, but it would not end up being the *only* time he spoke. De Jong has it right in her original French article (de Jong (1999)) of which de Jong (I 9) is an English translation: there ((1999) 246) she says that the son saves Croesus’ life ‘by speaking for the first time’ (‘en parlant pour la première fois’). It is unclear who inserted the detail about the ‘only’ time Croesus’ son spoke, whether de Jong herself, as she revised her article for Munson’s collection, or Jay Kardan, the translator of the article into English.

Several more factual errors occur in another article translated from French, that of Darbo-Peschanski (II 3). While discussing Herodotus’ account of the life of Cyrus the Great, Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) 86 refers to ‘the beginning of the λόγος devoted to the Persian king Cyrus I’. The founder of the Persian Empire, Cyrus the Great (ca. 550–530 BCE), son of Cambyses, was Cyrus II; it was Cyrus’ *grandfather* Cyrus, son of Teispes, who would have been Cyrus I.⁷ Darbo-Peschanski has it right in Chapter 4 of her original French monograph (2007), of which Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) represents an English translation: there ((2007) 80) she refers to Cyrus the Great as ‘Cyrus the Elder’ (‘Cyrus l’Ancien’)—as opposed to Cyrus the Younger (son of king Darius II). Again, it is unclear whether Darbo-Peschanski, as she revised this chapter for Munson’s collection, or her translator (Kardan) is responsible for the error about ‘Cyrus I’. One error that was in Darbo-Peschanski’s original French chapter has been faithfully preserved in the English translation. The error involves Herodotus’ citing the effect of the sun on the Nile as the reason this river has a nature opposite to all other rivers; Herodotus says: ‘Thus I have determined that the sun is responsible for these things’ (οὕτω τὸν ἥλιον νενόμικα τούτων αἴτιον εἶναι, 2.25.5). On this passage, Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) 97 (cf. (2007) 97) comments: ‘Placed thus in the attributive position, αἴτιον might well be a neuter substantive ...’ In 2.25.5 (or in some editions 2.26.1, as Darbo-Peschanski has it), the adjective αἴτιον is actually in the *predicative* position, not the attributive position.

Elsewhere in the article (II 3, as well as in the chapter from her 2007 book) Darbo-Peschanski shows a similar inexactness with the distinction between attributive and circumstantial adjectives. When she is discussing Herodotus’ claim that he is going to base his *logos* about Cyrus on those Persians who do not want to glorify Cyrus, but ‘to say the account that exists (i.e., that is true/real)’ (τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, 1.95.1), Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) 87 (cf. (2007)

⁷ Scholars have often identified Cyrus I with the ‘Kuraš the Anzanite (i.e., king of Anshan)’ whose inscribed seal (PFS 93*) was still being used for administrative purposes in the time of Darius I; for bibliography, see Garrison (2011) 378 n. 4.

81) says: ‘What is of interest here is the expression λέγειν τὸν ἔοντα λόγον, which contains the accusative of the phrase ὁ λόγος ἔών, usually translated as “the truth” ...’ *Contra* Darbo-Peschanski, the expression τὸν ἔοντα ... λόγον in 1.95.1 represents the accusative of the phrase ὁ ἔων λόγος (with the participle ἔών as an attributive adjective), *not* of ὁ λόγος ἔών (with the participle ἔών as a circumstantial adjective). Darbo-Peschanski is also incorrect to say that the expression τοῦ ... λόγου τοῦδε ἔοντος (a genitive absolute construction found at the beginning of Fragment 1 of the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus) would represent ‘in the genitive, the expression used by Herodotus’; in the Heraclitan fragment, unlike in Herodotus 1.95.1, the participle ἔών is indeed circumstantial. Later, Darbo-Peschanski (II 3) 92 (cf. (2007) 89) again claims that Herodotus uses the expression ὁ λόγος ἔών. Herodotus only uses the phrase ὁ ἔων λόγος, never ὁ λόγος ἔών, and he only uses the former phrase twice, both times in the accusative form τὸν ἔοντα λόγον (1.95.1, 116.5).⁸

Despite these few problems, Munson has assembled a superb collection. The judicious care and thought that went into writing the Introductions to both volumes and into selecting and arranging the articles are evident throughout. For the reader the collection not only presents many of the key contributions to scholarship on Herodotus since the 1950s, but also underlines the impressive breadth and depth of Herodotus’ own historiographical achievement.⁹

Florida State University

DAVID BRANSCOME
dbranscome@fsu.edu

⁸ See Powell (1938) 210 = s.v. λόγος 9. On Herodotus’ use of the expression τὸν ἔοντα λόγον, see further Kahn (2003) 354–5.

⁹ The author apologises for the lateness of this review.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aly, W. (1921) *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen).
- Bakker, E. J., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden).
- Baragwanath, E. and M. de Bakker, edd. (2012) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Boedeker, D., ed. (1987) *Herodotus and the Invention of History*. *Arethusa* 20, nos. 1–2.
- (2000) ‘Herodotus’ Genre(s)’, in M. Depew and D. Obbink, edd., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, Mass.) 97–114.
- Branscome, D. (2013) *Textual Rivals: Self-Presentation in Herodotus’ Histories* (Ann Arbor).
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. (2007) *L’Historia: Commencements grecs* (Paris).
- Derow, P. and R. Parker, edd. (2003) *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford).
- Dewald, C. (1987) ‘Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus’ Histories’, in Boedeker (1987) 147–70.
- (2002) ‘“I Didn’t Give my own Genealogy”: Herodotus and the Authorial Persona’, in Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees (2002) 267–89.
- and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Dunsch, B. and K. Ruffing, edd. (2013) *Herodots Quellen—Die Quellen Herodots* (Wiesbaden).
- Evans, J. S. (1990/1991) *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton).
- Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* (Berlin).
- (1989) *Herodotus and His ‘Sources’: Citation, Invention, and Narrative Art*, trans. J. G. Howie (Leeds).
- Flory, S. (1987) *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit).
- Foster, E. and D. Lateiner, edd. (2012) *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Garrison, M. B. (2011) ‘The Seal of “Kuraš the Anzanite, Son of Šešpeš” (Teispes), PFS 93*: Susa—Anšan—Persepolis’, in J. Álvarez-Mon and M. B. Garrison, edd., *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake, Ind.) 375–405.
- Giangiulio, M., ed. (2005) *Erodoto e il ‘modello erodoteo’. Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia* (Trento).
- Gray, V. J., ed. (2010) *Xenophon* (Oxford).
- Hartog, F. [1980] (1991/2001) *Le Miroir d’Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l’autre²* (Paris).
- (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, trans. J. Lloyd (Berkeley).

- Immerwahr, H. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland).
- Irwin, E. and E. Greenwood, edd. (2007) *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories* (Cambridge).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1999) 'Aspects narratologiques des *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 19: 217–75.
- Kahn, C. H. (2003) *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek* (Indianapolis).
- Karageorghis, V. and I. Taifacos, edd. (2004) *The World of Herodotus* (Nicosia).
- Lateiner, D. (1986) 'The Empirical Element in the Methods of Early Greek Medical Writers and Herodotus: A Shared Epistemological Response', *Antichthon* 20: 1–20.
- (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Luraghi, N., ed. (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Marg, W., ed. (1982) *Herodot: Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*³ (Darmstadt).
- Marincola, J. (2006) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald and Marincola (2006) 13–28
- Murray, O. (1972) 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture', *CQ* 22: 200–13.
- (2001) 'Herodotus and Oral History', in Luraghi (2001) 16–44.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (2006) 'Homer and Herodotus', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, edd., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford) 75–104.
- Pohlenz, M. (1937) *Herodot: Der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig; repr. Stuttgart, 1961).
- Powell, J. E. (1938) *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge; repr. Hildesheim, 1977).
- Priestley, J. (2014) *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories* (Oxford).
- and V. Zali, edd. (2016) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden).
- Raaflaub, K. A. (1987) 'Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History', in Boedeker (1987) 221–48.
- (2002) 'Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees (2002) 149–86.
- Rollinger, R., B. Truschneegg, and R. Bichler, edd. (2011) *Herodot und das Per-sische Weltreich* (Wiesbaden).
- Rusten, J. S., ed. (2009) *Thucydides* (Oxford).
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. and A. Kuhrt, edd. (1987) *The Greek Sources: Achaemenid History II* (Leiden).
- Thomas, R. (1997) 'Ethnography, Proof, and Argument in Herodotus' *Histories*', *PCPS* 43: 128–48.
- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).

—— (2006) 'The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus', in Dewald and Marincola
(2006) 60–75.