

HERODOTUS—THE MOST HOMERIC HISTORIAN?

HISTOS

The Online Journal of Ancient Historiography

FOUNDING EDITOR: J. L. MOLES (1949–2015)

Histos Supplements

Supervisory Editor: John Marincola

1. Antony Erich Raubitschek, *Autobiography*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Donald Lateiner (2014).
2. A. J. Woodman, *Lost Histories: Selected Fragments of Roman Historical Writers* (2015).
3. Felix Jacoby, *On the Development of Greek Historiography and the Plan for a New Collection of the Fragments of the Greek Historians*. Translated by Mortimer Chambers and Stefan Schorn (2015).
4. Anthony Ellis, ed., *God in History: Reading and Rewriting Herodotean Theology from Plutarch to the Renaissance* (2015).
5. Richard Fernando Buxton, ed., *Aspects of Leadership in Xenophon* (2016).
6. Emily Baragwanath and Edith Foster, edd., *Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography* (2017).
7. John Moles, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Brutus* (2017).
8. Alexander Meeus, ed., *History and Narrative in Hellenistic Historiography* (2018).
9. Geoffrey Greatrex, ed., *Work on Procopius outside the English-Speaking World: A Survey* (2019).
10. Paul Christesen, *A New Reading of the Damonon Stele* (2019).
11. Christy Constantakopoulou and Maria Fragoulaki, edd. *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (2020).
12. Rachel Bruzzone, ed., *Polemos and his Children: War, its Repercussions, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature* (2021).
13. Bruno Currie, *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (2021).
14. Ivan Matijašić, ed., *Herodotus—The Most Homeric Historian?* (2022)

HERODOTUS—THE MOST
HOMERIC HISTORIAN?



Edited by
IVAN MATIJAŠIĆ

HISTOS SUPPLEMENT 14

2022

Oxford • Edmonton • Tallahassee

Published by

HISTOS

ISSN (Online): 2046-5963 (Print): 2046-5955

www.histos.org

Published online 22 February 2022

© 2022 THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
About the Contributors	ix
1. Introduction: How Homeric Was Herodotus? Ancient and Modern Readers <i>Ivan Matijašić</i>	1
2. Homeric and Herodotean Intertextuality: What's the Point? <i>Christopher Pelling</i>	39
3. Homeric Allusions in Herodotus' <i>Histories</i> <i>Jan Haywood</i>	59
4. Herodotus, Homer, and the Character of the Gods <i>Thomas Harrison</i>	91
5. Bloody Death in Greek Historiography and Homer: Discursive Presences and Meaningful Absences in Herodotus' Battle Narratives <i>Maria Fragoulaki</i>	107
6. Die Another Day: Sarpedon, Aristodemos, and Homeric Intertextuality in Herodotus <i>Elton T. E. Barker</i>	161
7. Truth, Fiction, and Authority in Herodotus' Book 8 <i>Giulia Donelli</i>	211
8. The Homericness of Herodotus' Language (with a Case-Study on <i>-έειν</i> Aorist Infinitives in the <i>Histories</i>) <i>Olga Tribulato</i>	241
9. Poet and Historian: The Impact of Homer in Herodotus' <i>Histories</i> <i>Christopher Tuplin</i>	287

PREFACE

This book explores the relationship between Herodotus and Homer and the reason why Herodotus was considered Homeric in antiquity. It stems from a conference at the School of History, Classics and Archaeology of Newcastle University which took place in March 2019, where most of the chapters that make up the book were presented. The conference was funded by the Research Committee of the School of History, Classics and Archaeology at Newcastle, and by the Institute of Classical Studies in London. I wish to express my gratitude to both institutions for their generous support, to the speakers for accepting my invitation to Newcastle, to the other numerous participants for a successful and fruitful discussion during the event, and to the chairs of each session: Federico Santangelo, Rowland Smith, Christopher Tuplin, and Jaap Wisse.

I also wish to thank the *Histos* editors, Rhiannon Ash and Timothy Rood, for accepting this edited book for publication in the journal's Supplements, and especially the supervisory editor of the Supplements, John Marincola, for the extremely helpful guidance and valuable assistance in the final stages of the publication process.

Each chapter is autonomous and includes a self-standing bibliography, but all have benefitted from discussion during the conference and from subsequent exchanges of emails and texts. The Covid-19 pandemic has certainly made our work more challenging, especially because of limited access to libraries, but we hope that our efforts have produced something that will benefit Herodotean and Homeric scholars. If the book manages to stimulate further thoughts or provoke some constructive reaction, it will have accomplished its principal objective.

I. M.

Siena, October 2021

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ELTON BARKER is Professor of Greek Literature and Culture at The Open University. His research interests focus primarily on poetic rivalry in Homer and representations of space and place in Herodotus. He is author of *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy* (2009), as well as two co-authored books on Homer with Joel Christensen: *A Beginner's Guide to Homer* (2013), and *Homer's Thebes* (2020). His work on spatial analysis led to the edited volume *New Worlds out of Old Texts* (2016) and to the establishment of the Pelagios Network, which is developing digital tools and methods for scholarly research into historical places (see the Pelagios special issue of the *International Journal of Humanities and Arts Computing*, 2021).

GIULIA DONELLI holds an MA and a PhD in Classics from King's College London, where she currently teaches. Previously, she was a Teaching Associate in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Bristol, where she remains an Honorary Research Associate. Her main research interests are Greek lyric poetry, Herodotean historiography, and the early developments of Greek prose.

MARIA FRAGOULAKI is Lecturer in Ancient Greek History at Cardiff University. Her main research interests are ancient Greek historiography, especially Thucydides and Herodotus, kinship and international relations in antiquity, memory and performance studies. She is author of *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative* (2013), and co-editor (with Christy Constantakopoulou) of *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (2020). She is currently working on a monograph on Thucydides and Homer and co-editing (with Neville Morley) a volume on *Doing Things with Thucydides: Politics, Education, Performance*.

THOMAS HARRISON is Professor of Ancient History at the University of St Andrews. His research focuses primarily on the archaic and classical Greek world, with particular interest in Herodotus' *Histories*, Greek religious ideas, and the interface between the Greeks and foreign peoples. His publications include *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (2000), *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century* (2000) and *Writing Ancient Persia* (2011). He is currently working on a study of Greek religious belief.

JAN HAYWOOD is Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Leicester. He is the co-author of a book on cross-cultural receptions of the Trojan War tradition with Naoise Mac Sweeney (*Homer's Iliad and the Trojan War: Dialogues on Tradition*, 2018), and he has a co-edited with Zosia Archibald a volume in honour of the ancient historian J. K. Davies (*The Power of Individual and Community in Ancient Athens and Beyond*, 2019). He has also published several articles and book chapters in the field of ancient Greek historiography, and is now working on a book concerning the sources of information that informed Herodotus' *Histories*, and a separate article on human and divine agents in the *Histories*. He is also the co-founder of the Herodotus Helpline with Thomas Harrison, a free, online seminar series set up in April 2020, which is open to anyone interested in Herodotus and his world.

IVAN MATIJAŠIĆ is post-doctoral researcher in Ancient History at the University of Siena. He holds a PhD in Classics and Ancient History from the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. He has held research and teaching positions in Venice, Münster, and Newcastle. His research interests focus on Greek historiography, epigraphy, ancient geography, and the history of classical scholarship in the twentieth century. He is the author of two books: *Shaping the Canons of Ancient Greek Historiography* (2018) and *Timachidas of Rhodes* (2020).

CHRISTOPHER PELLING is Emeritus Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford University. Among his books are *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (2000), *Plutarch and History* (2002), *Herodotus and the Question Why* (2019), and commentaries on Plutarch's *Antony* (1988) and *Caesar* (2011), on Herodotus Book 6 (coedited with Simon Hornblower, 2017), and Thucydides Books 6 and 7 (2 vols, 2022). He is now working on a further Plutarch commentary, this time on Alexander.

OLGA TRIBULATO is Professor of Greek language and literature at Ca' Foscari University of Venice. She is the author of *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds: Their Diachronic Development within the Greek Compound System* (2015) and she has edited, among other volumes, *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily* (2012). Her research interests focus on the Greek dialects and literary languages, epigraphy, ancient bilingualism, Atticist lexicography, and Greek theories of language correctness. She is currently the PI of the ERC project *Purism in Antiquity: Theories of Language in Greek Atticist Lexica and Their Legacy (PURA)*.

CHRISTOPHER J. TUPLIN is Gladstone Professor of Greek at the University of Liverpool. He is the author of *The Failings of Empire* (1993), *Achaemenid Studies* (1997), and some 140 research essays on Greek and Achaemenid Persian history; editor of *Pontus and the Outside World* (2004), *Xenophon and his World* (2004), and *Persian Responses: Cultural Interaction (with)in the Achaemenid Empire* (2007); and co-editor of *Science and Mathematics in Ancient Greek Culture* (2002), *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (2012), and *Aršāma and his World: The Bodleian Letters in Context* (2020). His current major project is a commentary on Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

I

INTRODUCTION:
HOW HOMERIC WAS HERODOTUS?
ANCIENT AND MODERN READERS*

Ivan Matijašić

Er [Herodotus] schreibt nicht, wie man sich das gelegentlich vorgestellt hat, wie ein naives Naturkind, sein Stil ist das Produkt mühevoller Kunstübung.

G. Kaibel, *Stil und Text der Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία des Aristoteles* (Berlin, 1893) 66

Herodotus is an unaccountable phenomenon in the history of literature. ... It is easy to regard Herodotus as an entertaining old fellow gifted with unlimited incredulity and a knack for telling amusing, sometimes improper, stories in an Ionic brogue. But he was more than this.

J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1952) 5

‘Gardons-nous de retirer à notre science sa part de poésie’. Entendons bien Marc Bloch. Il ne dit pas: l’histoire est un art, l’histoire est littérature. Il dit bien: l’histoire est une science, mais une science dont une des caractéristiques, qui peut faire sa faiblesse mais aussi sa vertu, est d’être poétique, parce qu’elle ne peut être réduite à des abstractions, à des lois, à des structures.

J. Le Goff, ‘Préface’, in M. Bloch, *Apologie pour l’histoire ou Métier d’historien* (Paris, 1993) 14

An eminent classicist recently stated: ‘it was a truism of ancient criticism, as it is of modern, that Herodotus was the historian most like Homer’.¹ This is undisputable, and perhaps it needs no further

* Several friends read and commented on earlier drafts of the present contribution: Stefania De Vido, Jan Haywood, Christopher Pelling, Christopher Tuplin, Federico Santangelo. I wish to thank them warmly for their help. After the Newcastle conference in March 2019, I was invited in November 2019 to present a paper at a meeting of the international network *Historiai: Geschichtsschreibung und Vergangenheitsvorstellungen* in Trento: my sincere gratitude to the organisers, Maurizio Giangliulo and Elena Franchi, for the invitation and the opportunity to discuss my thoughts on Herodotus and Homer. Finally, the two anonymous readers for *Histos* provided very useful criticism that allowed me to improve my text. Herodotus’ Greek text relies on N. G. Wilson’s OCT edition (2015), Homer’s on M. L. West’s Teubner edition (*Iliad*: 2000 and 2006; *Odyssey*: 2017). Translations are my own, unless otherwise reported.

¹ Marincola (2018) 3.

qualification. However, the fact that Herodotus was the most Homeric among ancient historians—*ὀμηρικώτατος*, to use pseudo-Longinus' adjective²—has wide-ranging implications that have been only partially explored. George L. Huxley lamented in 1989 the absence of a full treatment in English of Homer's influence on Herodotus.³ If we exclude works devoted to specific aspects of this influence, this assertion is still true.⁴ This volume seeks to address this gap.

Given the variety of issues that come up when dealing with two heavyweights in Greek literature such as Homer and Herodotus, combined with the ever-growing scholarship on both authors, the present volume makes no claim to offer an exhaustive and comprehensive treatment of Homeric influences on Herodotus, nor to attempt to cover the vast ground of Herodotus' engagement with his poetic predecessors. Instead, the present book attempts to answer a specific question: why was Herodotus considered the most Homeric historian? From intertextuality and why it matters to explicit references to Homer in Herodotus, from the thorough analysis of single words to the Homericness of Herodotus' language, the chapters that make up this volume combine various approaches and exploit different theories and methods, but start from common premises and aim at the same goal: to offer new thoughts on the relationship between Herodotus and Homer. There is obviously no single answer to the question posed in this book, but a variety of answers and possibilities.

Before setting out to present my own introduction, it is important to lay out what this book is *not* about. Occasional references to the sophists, the Hippocratic corpus, tragedy, comedy, and archaic Greek poets other than Homer occur throughout the book, but no single chapter is dedicated specifically to these sources, which obviously influenced Herodotus to a great

² [Longin.] *Subl.* 13.3. As it is well known, the author of the treatise *On the Sublime* is here employing a rhetorical question and in the following sentence he states that Stesichorus, Archilochus, and, above all, Plato were also considered Homeric. At *Subl.* 14.1, it is Thucydides who is recalled alongside Homer, Plato, and Demosthenes as an example of sublimity (*ὕψηλοῦς*) and grandeur (*μεγαλοφροσύνη*) in historiography (*ἐν ἱστορίᾳ*).

³ Huxley (1989) 1. Cf. also Marincola (2006) 24: 'A full treatment of Herodotus' engagement with his poetic predecessors remains a desideratum'.

⁴ See §3 for a more detailed discussion of previous scholarship. I recall that the recent publication of *The Cambridge Guide to Homer* (Pache (2020)) does not include a chapter on Herodotus, while *The Herodotus Encyclopaedia* (Baron (2021)) includes a brief but suitable entry on Homer by Sheila Murnaghan.

extent and assist us in clarifying some of the features of his *Histories*.⁵ However, the focus of this book is on Herodotus' relation to Homer, and Homer—as Dio Chrysostom reminds us—‘comes first, in the middle, and last, and he gives of himself to every boy, adult, and old man as much as each can take’.⁶ In other words, he was a fundamental presence not only in ancient literature, but also in classical education and culture.

This introduction will first discuss the evidence for Herodotus' recitations, the relationship with Homeric rhapsodes in the fifth century BCE, and the place of the *Histories* between orality and literacy (§1). Secondly, it will discuss Herodotus' explicit references to Homer, the Homeric poems, and the traditions pertaining to the Trojan War (§2). An overview on Herodotean scholarship will follow, with particular emphasis on intertextuality (§3), which will in turn be followed by some examples of Homeric intertexts in the *Histories* (§4). A summary of the book's contents rounds off this introduction (§5).

1. Herodotus the Rhapsode? Recitations, Audiences, and Ancient Literacy

In ancient literary criticism, Herodotus was often associated with Homer. From Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who called Herodotus ‘an eager admirer of Homer’ (Ὁμήρου ζηλωτῆς γενόμενος) and referred to his prose as ‘poetic’,⁷ to Hermogenes of Tarsus, from Pseudo-Longinus' rhetorical question ‘Was Herodotus alone the most Homeric of all?’⁸ to Hellenistic-age inscriptions,⁹

⁵ See Thomas (2000); various contributions in Luraghi (2001); Raaflaub (2002); Chiasson (2012); Griffin (2014).

⁶ Dio Chrys. 18.8: Ὁμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος, παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἀφ' αὐτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν.

⁷ D.H. *Pomp.* 3.11 and 3.21; cf. D.H. *Thuc.* 23, *Dem.* 41, and *Comp.* 3.

⁸ The main texts I refer to are: Hermog. *Id.* 2.10.30, 52, 2.12.18–20, and the already mentioned [Longin.] *Subl.* 13.2–3.

⁹ The Salmacis inscription (or ‘Pride of Halicarnassus’) refers to Herodotus as ‘the prose Homer of history’ (Ἡρόδοτον τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὁμηρον, line 43): see *SEG* 48.1330; *SGO* 01/12/02 (cf. Priestley (2014) 187–91, 195, 216–17; Santini (2016)); while another late-Hellenistic inscription in elegiac couplets found on Rhodes, but originally from Halicarnassus and probably praising Halicarnassus' literary past, mentions Herodotus' sweet tongue (*IG* XII 1.145; *SEG* 36.975; *SGO* 01/12/01, line 5), just as Cicero (*Hort.* fr. 29 Straume-Zimmermann), Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.73), and Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 18.10) did in

Herodotus' place alongside Homer was so pervasive that ancient critics did not feel the need to provide more details on this relationship.¹⁰ The ancient biographical tradition on Herodotus refers to public readings of his *Histories* in various civic contexts, including Olympia. According to Lucian of Samosata, Herodotus presented himself as a competitor at Olympia and recited, perhaps even sang, his *Histories*—ἄδων τὰς ἱστορίας, says Lucian—bewitching the audience so much so that his books were named after the Muses.¹¹ Even though there is no evidence that Herodotus himself named his books after the Muses (in fact, it is usually assumed that the book-division of the *Histories* should be ascribed to the Hellenistic grammarians),¹² the reading at the Olympic Games gives a Panhellenic flavour to the story.¹³ That a historian would recite portions of his work at a public gathering is not utterly implausible: numerous Hellenistic-age inscriptions show historians delivering lectures and readings (ἀκροάσεις).¹⁴ The only problem with Herodotus is that all the evidence we have on his recitations comes from authors who lived many centuries after the alleged recitations. But the characteristics of oral deliveries (parataxis, deixis, anaphora, ring-

later times. I discussed these two latter passages and their significance for ancient Greek historiography in Matijašić (2018) 18–23, 146 n. 115.

¹⁰ For Homer and Herodotus in ancient literary criticism: Priestley (2014) 187–219, Matijašić (2019) 88–90, and Tribulato, below, pp. 242–8.

¹¹ *Herod.* 1: ἐνίσταται οὖν Ὀλύμπια τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ ὁ Ἡρόδοτος τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο ἤκειν οἱ νομίσας τὸν καιρὸν, οὗ μάλιστα ἐγλίχετο, πλήθουσαν τηρήσας τὴν πανήγυριν, ἀπανταχόθεν ἦδη τῶν ἀρίστων συνειλεγμένων, παρελθὼν ἐς τὸν ὀπισθόδομον οὐ θεατὴν, ἀλλ' ἀγωνιστὴν Ὀλυμπίων παρείχεν ἑαυτὸν ἄδων τὰς ἱστορίας καὶ κηλῶν τοὺς παρόντας, ἄχρι τοῦ καὶ Μούσας κληθῆναι τὰς βίβλους αὐτοῦ, ἐννέα καὶ αὐτὰς οὔσας. ('The great Olympian games were at hand, and Herodotus thought this was the occasion he was waiting for. He waited for a packed audience to assemble, one containing the most eminent men from all Greece; he appeared in the temple chamber, presenting himself as a competitor for an Olympic honour, not as a spectator; then he recited his *Histories* and so bewitched his audience that his books were called after the Muses, for they too were nine in number'). Cf. the elegiac distich in *Anth. Pal.* 9.160. Lucian's passage led the iconoclastic philologist Bertrand Hemmerdinger to argue that 'la prose d'Hérodote était chantée': Hemmerdinger (1981) 170. More on this in Tribulato, below, pp. 254–5 and n. 44. On Hemmerdinger's work on the text of Herodotus: Matijašić (2020).

¹² Cf. Highbie (2010).

¹³ Lucian is not the only testimony on Herodotus' performances: another such reference is detectable in Marcellinus' biography of Thucydides (*Vit. Thuc.* 54; cf. Piccirilli (1985) 158–61). Phot. *Bibl.* 60, 19b40 and *Suda*, s.v. Θουκυδίδης (Θ 414 Adler) seem to rely on the same biographical tradition.

¹⁴ See Momigliano (1978), Chaniotis (1988) 365–72, and (2009) 259–62.

composition, and similar devices)¹⁵ are still detectable in Herodotus' narrative, and there is no reason to exclude Herodotus' readings of his historical inquiries. Indeed, his *Histories* were possibly performed by comic actors in the great theatre in Alexandria in the third century BCE, if we retain the reading of the manuscripts 'Ἡροδότου in a passage of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*.¹⁶

In Lucian's passage quoted above, he curiously uses the verb *αἰίδω*, 'to sing': *ᾄδων τὰς ἱστορίας* was evidently meant to refer to rhapsodic performances of epic poetry. The *Iliad* famously starts with the poet asking the Muse to 'sing' the wrath of Achilles (*μῆνιν αἰεide θεά Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος*, *Il.* 1.1).¹⁷ *αἰίδω* is always used in Homeric epics and other archaic poetry to indicate singing, and is often related to the activity of the bard (*ἄοιδός αἰείδε*).¹⁸ The text performed *par excellence* at gatherings such as the one described by Lucian was obviously Homer. Plato offers some instructive guidance on rhapsodes and rhapsodic performances in the fifth century BCE.¹⁹ At the beginning of the *Ion*, Socrates commends Ion for his success at the festival of Asclepius at Epidaurus and recalls that rhapsodes such as Ion are 'necessarily familiar with many excellent poets, and especially Homer, the best and most divine of all poets' (Pl. *Ion* 530b: *ἅμα δὲ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι ἔν τε ἄλλοις ποιηταῖς διατρέβειν πολλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ δὴ καὶ μάλιστα ἐν Ὀμήρῳ, τῷ ἀρίστῳ καὶ θειοτάτῳ τῶν ποιητῶν*).²⁰ How rhapsodies work is recounted in the same Platonic dialogue (535b–e). When Socrates asks about Ion's feelings when reciting, he suggests several episodes that rhapsodes might perform: Odysseus revealing himself to the suitors in the opening lines of *Od.* 22; Achilles charging at Hector at *Il.* 22.312–16; or some part of the

¹⁵ Immerwahr (1966) 7–8, 46–58; briefly: Fowler (2006) 226.

¹⁶ Athen. 14.620d; see Matijašić (2019) for further details on this passage.

¹⁷ In most of the Homeric hymns, *αἰίδω* occurs in the first hexameter as an exhortation to the Muses using the opening of the *Iliad* as a model. In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the first verb is *ἐνέπω* 'to tell' (*ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε*), which features also in the first lines of the Homeric hymns to Aphrodite and Pan. *ἐνέπω* is also used in the *Iliad* when the poet addresses the Muses at *Il.* 2.761 (cf. *Il.* 8.412), and in the opening verses of Hesiod's *Works and Days* (*Op.* 1–2): *Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσαι, | δεῦτε Δι' ἐννέπετε, σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι* ('Muses, from Pieria, glorifying in songs, come here, tell in hymns of your father Zeus', transl. G. W. Most).

¹⁸ Cf. *Od.* 1.325, 338–9; 8.83–93, 367; 22.345–6. For further references to the uses of *αἰίδω* in archaic Greek epic poetry: Philipp (1955).

¹⁹ Cf. González (2013) ch. 9.2.

²⁰ Plato famously expels Homer from his ideal city in *Resp.* 378d2–e3.

gloomy story of Andromache or Hecuba or Priam (535b). Perhaps we can imagine a similar scenario with Herodotus' recitation at Olympia: he could have easily selected dramatic scenes from the *Histories* that would arouse the audience's imagination.

Herodotus lived in an age that saw a surge in the use of written record. It has been supposed that the last decades of the fifth century and the early fourth century BCE represented a transitional period in Athens from a predominantly oral culture to a society that relied heavily on writing, and especially on books.²¹ In fact, most of the evidence for the use of written texts in Athens is later than 430 BCE.²² Herodotus probably spent the 440s in Athens and experienced the intellectual and political excitement of the Periclean age, perhaps living through the early years of the Peloponnesian War.²³ Hence, we can assume that he benefitted from the growing use of written records and books, even though we can credibly view him as someone who grew up in a world where orality was still predominant and knowledge was transmitted mainly through spoken words, not through written books.

The double nature of Herodotus' historical work gives it a Janus-like place between orality and literacy.²⁴ One face looks back at epic poetry, and especially Homer, the other glances forward to Thucydides and the political use of writing in democratic Athens.²⁵ For Herodotus' audience in the late fifth century BCE, we can assume two main categories: listeners to performances of the *Histories*, and readers of Herodotus' *Histories*. These two categories are not that far apart from each other as it may seem. In fact, if we accept the idea that silent reading in antiquity was almost non-existent,²⁶ we can also accept the fact that most of Herodotus' audience enjoyed listening to recitations of the *Histories*. Hence, those who had access to written

²¹ Cavallo (2019) 17: 'Questo passaggio a una "cultura del libro e della scrittura" si colloca, in concomitanza con una più ampia diffusione dell'alfabeto, tra la seconda metà del V secolo a.C. e l'inizio del IV'.

²² See Harris (1989) 92–3.

²³ Cf. Thomas (2000) *passim*; Moles (2002); Raaflaub (2002) 152–4; Fowler (2003). Fornara (1971) famously looked at Herodotus' narrative of the Persian Wars in the light of the Peloponnesian War. For a recent re-evaluation of Fornara's contribution to Herodotean scholarship: Harrison–Irwin (2018).

²⁴ See Thomas (1992) 103–4 and 123–6; (2000) 249–69; Slings (2002).

²⁵ On Herodotus' relation to Thucydides: Hornblower (1991–2010) II.38–61; Rengakos (2006a) and (2006b); Foster–Lateiner (2012).

²⁶ See the classic work of Svenbro (1988).

copies of the *Histories* could read them aloud to others—after all, a reading, whether public or private, for a hundred people or just a few friends, is always a kind of performance.

2. Homer, the Homeric Poems, and the Trojan War in Herodotus' *Histories*

By the late fifth century BCE, Homer's poems were certainly well known through oral performances not only to the Athenians, but also to most Greek communities around the Mediterranean, in a truly Panhellenic scenario.²⁷ Herodotus' audience could certainly appreciate the manifest and hidden references to poetry in the *Histories*, of which Homer had the lion's share. His authority led to the ascription of many poems of the epic cycle to him, albeit not without debate. Herodotus himself includes references to the *Cypria* (2.117), the *Epigoni* (4.32),²⁸ and the 'Ὀμηρεία ἔπεα being recited at Sicyon and banned by tyrant Cleisthenes.²⁹ In fact, the expression 'Ὀμηρεία ἔπεα does not refer to our Homeric epics, but designates the Theban epics, at the time probably still considered Homeric.³⁰

Other passages in the *Histories* refer explicitly to Homer, namely 2.23 (the invention of the Ocean), 2.53 (the name of the gods),³¹ 2.112–19 (Helen's Egyptian stay including several Homeric quotations: *Il.* 6.289–92, *Od.* 4.227–30, and *Od.* 4.351–2),³² and 4.29. The latter passage is instructive for the use

²⁷ On the reception of Homer in antiquity: Lamberton (1997); Graziosi (2002); Kim (2020). On rhapsodes in the classical age: González (2013) chs. 9–11 and (2020).

²⁸ On the *Cypria* and *Epigoni* see Currie (2015) and Cingano (2015) respectively.

²⁹ Hdt. 5.67.1: ταῦτα δέ, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐμιμέετο ὁ Κλεισθένης οὗτος τὸν ἐωυτοῦ μητροπάτορα Κλεισθένα τὸν Σικυῶνος τύραννον. Κλεισθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολέμησας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψωδοὺς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὀμηρείων ἐπέων εἶνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέεται ('I believe that, in doing so, Cleisthenes was imitating his maternal grandfather Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon. After the war with Argos, he banned rhapsodes from performing the Homeric poems in Sicyon because they were full of praise for Argos and the Argives').

³⁰ This was first pointed out by Cingano (1985); cf. Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015a) 11–12 and Cingano (2015) 247.

³¹ The passage is discussed by Harrison, below, Ch. 4, and Donelli, below, pp. 223–4. Cf. also Sammons (2012), esp. 60–3.

³² See Farinelli (1995); Grethlein (2010) 151–8; Sammons (2012); Currie (2020) and (2021); Haywood, below, pp. 62–72, and Tuplin, below, pp. 292–4. The quotations of the *Odyssey* verses at Hdt. 2.116 have been considered examples of interpolations by some scholars, but it is also possible that these references represent Herodotus' afterthoughts on the same issue

of the *Odyssey* in the *Histories*. Discussing the coldness of the vast geographical area known as Scythia, Herodotus relies on Hippocratic theories on climate and zoology to claim that in cold weather animals grow small horns or do not grow them at all. The Homeric testimony is employed to support this view (Hdt. 4.29, quoting Hom. *Od.* 4.85):

μαρτυρέει δέ μοι τῆ γνώμη³³ καὶ Ὀμήρου ἔπος ἐν Ὀδυσσηίῃ ἔχον ᾧδε·
 ‘καὶ Λιβύην, ἵνα τ’ ἄρνες ἄφαρ κεραοὶ τελέθουσι’.

A verse from Homer in the *Odyssey* supports my opinion: ‘And Libya, where horns grow quickly on the foreheads of lambs’.

Herodotus’ argument is based on the polarity between two geographic extremes: Scythia to the north and Libya to the south. But it also relies on evidence from analogy: Scythia has a very cold climate, and cattle grow no horns there; on the other hand, animals have big horns in Libya where it is usually extremely hot. The general rule is that cattle horns are influenced by the climate.³⁴ More data would have shown Herodotus that this is not the case, but he did the best he could with the limited knowledge at his disposal. The Homeric testimony is embedded in Herodotus’ reasoning and is functional to the argument. We can spot the same method in Thucydides when he argues for the recent uses of the name *Hellenes* (Ἕλληνες) to designate all the Greeks, quoting as proof Homer (τεκμηριοὶ δὲ μάλιστα Ὀμηρος), who in fact employed Ἕλληνες only for the warriors captained by Achilles from Phthiotis, while regularly labelling the Greeks collectively as Danaans, Argives, or Achaeans (Thuc. 1.3.3). To convey Homer’s evidentiary value, Herodotus uses the verb μαρτυρέω (4.29), while Thucydides employs τεκμηριόω/τεκμαίρομαι (Thuc. 1.3.3): these are similar terms that relate to the ‘language of proof’ and display both authors’ engagement with late-fifth century BCE developments in scientific discourse and rhetorical argumentation in judicial contexts.³⁵

that had not been properly incorporated in the text: see Powell (1935) and Wilson (2015) I.vii–viii and I.191–2. Currie (2021) 10–13 argues against a possible interpolation.

³³ A discussion of Herodotus’ *gnōmē* and his methodological approaches in Donelli, below, Ch. 7.

³⁴ Cf. Hartog (1980); Corcella (1984); Thomas (2000) 53–8.

³⁵ Aristotle gives a clear definition of the ‘language of proof’ in the *Rhetoric*: Arist. *Rh.* 1355b26–39, 1357b3–25, 1375a22–5. Cf. Kennedy (1963) 41–3; Grimaldi (1980); Darbo-Peschanski (1987); Ginzburg (1994); Butti de Lima (1996) 127–50; Thomas (2000) 168–200.

Finally, it is remarkable that in the relatively small number of instances where Herodotus quotes verses from *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—the above quoted 4.29 and 2.116³⁶—they do not differ from the Homeric text transmitted in our manuscript tradition. We might suppose that Herodotus knew his Homer by heart, but it is more likely that he had at his disposal some kind of fixed text of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, perhaps the much-debated Athenian texts commissioned by Pisistratus and used as the official text for performances at public festivals.³⁷

References to both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* feature in the ethnographic sections of Herodotus' *Histories* (Books 1–4). The second part of the *Histories* (Books 5–9) include only references to the *Iliad*. This is clearly not a coincidence: the martial character of the *Iliad* could be used to greater profit in the Books that dealt specifically with the war between Greeks and Persians. There are many instances of this trend,³⁸ and one illustration will here suffice.

In Book 7—which generally abounds with Homeric intertexts³⁹—Herodotus stages a dialogue between the Greek envoys, headed by the Spartans and the Athenians, and Gelon, the powerful tyrant of Syracuse (Hdt. 7.157–62). The Spartan envoy Syagros is attempting to obtain Gelon's support against the Persian, and the tyrant agrees to provide a large army and provisions for the whole Greek army on one condition: that he be named the commander of the whole army. Syagros is offended by this proposal and exclaims: ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων πυθόμενος Σπαρτιήτας τὴν ἡγεμονίην ἀπαραιρηῆσθαι ὑπὸ Γέλωνός τε καὶ Συρηκοσίων (Hdt. 7.159: 'Surely, he would groan aloud, Agamemnon, the son of Pelops, if he heard that the Spartiates had been robbed of their leadership by Gelon and the Syracusans'). This exclamation recalls *Il.* 7.125: ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε γέρον ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς ('Surely, he would groan aloud, Peleus, the aged horseman'). The expression ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων was no rhetorical commonplace or a phrase from ordinary speech: it is an almost complete hexameter and a clear and distinctive quotation of a Homeric

³⁶ But see above, n. 32 for a possible interpolation of two set of verses from the *Odyssey*.

³⁷ The so-called Pisistratean recension of Homeric epic is as well-known as it is debated: even though the story is recounted by many ancient sources, nothing of such an endeavour is reported by Herodotus. Cf. Graziosi (2002) 220–8 and Fowler (2006) 224–5 with further bibliographic references.

³⁸ For Homeric intertext in Books 5–9 of Herodotus see Fragoulaki, Barker, Donelli, and Tuplin in this volume.

³⁹ See Erbse (1992) 127–9; Boedeker (2003); Pelling (2006); Carey (2016); Vannicelli ap. Nicolai–Vannicelli (2019) 212–24.

verse, as noted already by Eustathius of Thessalonica in his Homeric commentary and by numerous scholars in recent years.⁴⁰

But this embedded quotation of the *Iliad* in Hdt. 7.159 does not exhaust the Homeric resonances of the episode. Gelon's reply to the Spartan Syagros includes another proposal: to leave the army to the Spartans and obtain the command of the fleet. This time it was the Athenian envoy who stood up against Gelon. He recalls that Athens has the largest fleet in the Greeks' army, that they rule because of their autochthony and because an unnamed ancestor was among the leaders of the Greek armies at Troy: τῶν καὶ Ὀμηρος ὁ ἐποποιὸς ἄνδρα ἄριστον ἔφησε ἐς Ἴλιον ἀπικέσθαι τάξαι τε καὶ διακοσμήσαι στρατόν (Hdt. 7.161.3: 'it was one of our own of those who went to Ilium that the poet Homer said was the best man at ordering and commanding armies'). Gelon and the Syracusans—together with Herodotus' audience—surely knew the name of the Athenians' ancestor who fought at Troy, since the Herodotean phrasing refers to Menestheus, mentioned in the Homeric epics only at *Il.* 2.552–5:

τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευ' υἱὸς Πετῆω Μενεσθεύς.
τῷ δ' οὐ πῶ τις ὁμοίως ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ' ἀνὴρ
κοσμήσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας·
Νέστωρ οἶος ἔριζεν· ὃ γὰρ προγενέστερος ἦεν.

These again had as leader Menestheus, son of Peteos. Like unto him was no other man upon the face of the earth for the marshalling of chariots and of warriors that bear the shield. Only Nestor could vie with him, for he was the elder.

⁴⁰ Eust. *Comm. Hom. Il.* 7.125 (II.422.8–10 van der Valk): ἔτι ἰστέον ὅτι καὶ παρ' Ἡροδότῳ εὐρηται σχῆμα ὅμοιον τῷ Ὀμηρικῷ ἐν τῷ “ἢ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειεν ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων, εἰ πύθοιτο Σπαρτιάτας τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀφαιρεῖσθαι ὑπὸ Συρακουσίων καὶ Γέλωνος” (“Yet one must know that in Herodotus too one finds the same Homeric verses: “Surely, he would groan aloud, Agamemnon, the son of Pelops, if he heard that the Spartiates had been robbed of their leadership by Gelon and the Syracusans”). Cf. Huber (1965) 32; Dover (1997) 106; Grethlein (2006) 488–96, (2010) 160–73; Pelling (2006) 89–92; Saïd (2012) 93–4; Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 497–8. Doubts on the Homeric reference were cast by Boedeker (2002) 101. For further discussion see also Haywood, below, p. 63 n. 24, and Tuplin, below, pp. 337–40.

The Catalogue of Ships was a very powerful tool for self-representation among the Greek *poleis*. Epic poetry was not simply about telling stories of the distant past: it was exploited for present needs too.

That the Trojan War occurred in a distant past of which accurate knowledge was difficult to obtain is very clear to Herodotus, who claims that those events took place ‘less than eight hundred years before my time’ (Hdt. 2.145.4).⁴¹ Some instances in the *Histories* display knowledge of the events of the Trojan War and thus perhaps an implicit reference to Homeric poetry. For example, Hdt. 5.94.2:

ἐπολέμεον γὰρ ἔκ τε Ἀχιλλείου πόλιος ὀρμώμενοι καὶ Σιγείου ἐπὶ χρόνον
 συχρὸν Μυτιληναῖοί τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἳ μὲν ἀπαιτέοντες τὴν χώραν,
 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὔτε συγγινωσκόμενοι ἀποδεικνύντες τε λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον
 Αἰολεῦσι μετεὸν τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρας ἢ οὐ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, ὅσοι
 Ἑλλήνων συνεξεπρήξαντο Μενέλεω τὰς Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὰς.

For there was constant war over a long period of time between the Athenians at Sigeum and the Mytilenaeans at Achilleum. The Mytilenaeans were demanding the place back, and the Athenians, bringing proof to show that the Aeolians had no more part or lot in the land of Ilium than they themselves and all the other Greeks who had aided Menelaus to avenge the rape of Helen, would not consent. (trans. Godley)

This passage clearly displays a familiarity with the content of the *Iliad* and the Homeric epics in general. A similar context is reported by Aristotle: it seems that in the sixth century BCE the Athenians relied on Homer to support their claim for the possession of Salamis in a dispute with the Megarians (*Rh.* 1375b29–30).⁴² The story refers again to a passage in the Catalogue of Ships, namely *Il.* 2.557–8, as the ancient scholia duly annotated.⁴³ Evidently, Homer provided materials for rhetorical argumentation in territorial disputes from the archaic age onwards.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Cf. Pallantza (2005) 126–9; Saïd (2012) 90.

⁴² The use of literary works in territorial disputes is often attested in Classical and Hellenistic inscriptions: cf. Chaniotis (2004).

⁴³ Σ b Hom. *Il.* 2.558; Σ A Hom. *Il.* 3.230.

⁴⁴ Cf. Higbie (1997); Graziosi (2002) 228–32; Pallantza (2005) *passim*; Grethlein (2010) chs. 7–8; Saïd (2012) 93–6.

Another example of such use of Homeric poetry is embedded in the Athenians' debate with the Tegeans for the leadership of the left wing at Plataea.⁴⁵ The Tegeans produce evidence of their privileges in battle from the time of the war against the Heraclidae (Hdt. 9.26). The Athenians respond with their prowess in ancient wars: their support of the Heraclidae and their victory over the Peloponnesians; the recovery and burial of the corpses of the Seven who marched against Thebes (thus involving the events recounted in the Theban epic cycle); their war against the Amazons who descended into Attica; finally, 'during the hard time at Troy we were second to none' (Hdt. 9.27.4: *καὶ ἐν τοῖσι Τρωικοῖσι πόνοισι οὐδαμῶν ἐλειπόμεθα*). The speech continues with a typical Herodotean phrasing: the Athenians dismiss past events (*τὰ παλαιὰ ἔργα*), 'for those who were once worthy may now be least distinguished, and those who lacked courage then might be valiant now', a phrasing that recalls the statement that closes Herodotus' introductory remarks in Book 1.⁴⁶ Ancient history and the stories of the Trojan War thus lose their weight, while recent history and the Persian Wars become fundamental in the self-aggrandising logic of the Athenians: they should have a leading position at Plataea mainly for their role at Marathon, not because of the deeds of Menestheus under the walls of Troy.⁴⁷ The Athenians thus win the debate with the Tegeans by undermining their claim on the relevance of ancient deeds through a clever use of rhetorical strategies.⁴⁸

These examples do not entail a direct reference to Homer, since the story of the Trojan War was widely known through other mythological traditions.⁴⁹ At 7.20.2, Herodotus claims that Xerxes' expedition against Greece was 'by far the largest of those we know of' (*στόλων γὰρ τῶν ἡμεῖς*

⁴⁵ On this episode see Haywood, below, pp. 78–81, and Tuplin, below, p. 340.

⁴⁶ Compare Hdt. 9.27.4 (*καὶ γὰρ ἂν χρηστοὶ τότε ἔόντες ὥστοι νῦν ἂν εἶεν φλαυρότεροι, καὶ τότε ἔόντες φλαῦροι νῦν ἂν εἶεν ἀμείνονες*, 'for those who were once worthy may now be least distinguished, and those who lacked courage then might be valiant now') with Hdt. 1.5.4 (*ὁμοίως μικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄστυα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών. τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ σμικρὰ αὐτῶν γέγονε· τὰ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρὰ*, 'going through in detail equally about small and great cities of men; for most of those which were great in antiquity are small now, and those that were once small were great in my time'). See Corcella (1984) 191–3; Saïd (2012) 95.

⁴⁷ See Hdt. 9.27.5 and above p. 10 for the reference to Menestheus in Hdt. 7.161.3.

⁴⁸ Cf. Grethlein (2010) 173–6.

⁴⁹ On the Trojan War, its historicity and traditions: Graziosi–Haubold (2005) 11–62; Pallantza (2005); Mac Sweeney (2018); Haywood–Mac Sweeney (2018).

ἴδμεν πολλῶ δὴ μέγιστος οὗτος ἐγένετο)⁵⁰ and includes a list of famous and less famous military expeditions: Darius' attack on Scythia, the Scythians' subjugation of northern Asia, 'the army which the stories tell us the Atreides led to Ilium' (κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα τὸν Ἀτρειδέων ἐς Ἴλιον), the Mysians and Teucrians who crossed the Bosphorus, conquered Thrace and reached the Adriatic coast as far south as the river Peneus. Since the reference to the expedition of the Atreides (i.e., Agamemnon and Menelaus) is very brief, we might infer that Herodotus' audience was well aware of the stories concerning the Trojan War, but much less so of other great conflicts among barbarians.

The events of the Trojan War were also used by the Persians to impress the Greeks. In the narrative of the Persian army's march towards Greece, Herodotus briefly recalls Xerxes' visit to the site of Troy (7.43):

ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν ποταμὸν [sc. Σκάμανδρον] ὡς ἀπύκετο Ξέρξης, ἐς τὸ Πριάμου Πέργαμον ἀνέβη ἕμερον ἔχων θεήσασθαι· θεησάμενος δὲ καὶ πυθόμενος ἐκείνων ἕκαστα τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἔθυσε βούς χιλίας, χοὰς δὲ οἱ Μάγοι τοῖσι ἥρωσι ἐχέαντο.

When he arrived at the river [Scamander], Xerxes ascended Priam's acropolis, since he desired to see it. When he saw it and asked about it, he offered a thousand cattle in sacrifice to Athena of Ilium, and the Magi offered libations to the heroes.

It has been recognised that Xerxes' visit to Troy represented a piece of carefully staged Persian propaganda: the aim was to present the Persian king as the avenger of Priam and 'the champion of Troy in the eyes of a Greek audience'.⁵¹ Even if little is known about this episode apart from Herodotus' concise account, its historicity need not to be questioned, and Xerxes' own involvement displays a strategy to take possession of the epic tradition for his own political purposes.⁵²

⁵⁰ In the same vein, Herodotus claims that Pausanias' victory at Plataea was 'the most splendid of all those we know' (νίκην ἀναιρέεται καλλίστην ἀπασέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν Πανσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδew, Hdt. 9.64), thus reasserting the superiority of his account of the Persian Wars in relation to the Homeric epics. Cf. Marincola (2006) 16.

⁵¹ Haubold (2007) 55. Cf. Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 353–4.

⁵² There is another general reference to the ancient myths surrounding the Trojan War in the context of Xerxes' invasion, namely Hdt. 7.191, on which see Pallantza (2005) 142–52 and Haubold (2007) 56–7.

These explicit references in Herodotus' *Histories* to Homeric poetry and the traditions of the Trojan War have two distinct functions: (1) they show a familiarity with the Homeric tradition and a knowledge of a Homeric text not dissimilar from our own; (2) they display Herodotus' need to distance his own inquiries from the epic tradition. Epic poets relied traditionally on the Muses as a source of inspiration, knowledge, and authority, as shown in the opening lines of the *Iliad* and in several Homeric hymns. At the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2 the poet goes a step further and, together with an invocation to the Muses, he also expresses a pose of outright ignorance (*Il.* 2.484–6):

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι—
 ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστε τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,
 ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν.

Tell me now, Muses who have your homes on Olympus—for you are goddesses, and are present, and know everything, while we hear only rumour, and know nothing.

Herodotus, on the other hand, relies on his own authority (*τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν* or *ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*);⁵³ on observation (*ὄψις*)⁵⁴ and evidence (*σήματα*); on oral testimonies; on arguments from analogy. He even sometimes conveys ignorance on certain matters that are beyond his capacity in inquiry.⁵⁵ Herodotus' knowledge of the past and his ability to recount the events in detail are thus unrelated to any external literary authority, which is yet another way of distancing himself from the archaic epic tradition.

3. Intertextuality and Herodotean scholarship

The explicit references to Homer, the epic tradition, and the Trojan War we have so far explored do not exhaust the relationships that can be

⁵³ These expressions occur 36 times throughout the *Histories* at significant sections of the narrative: e.g. Hdt. 1.6, 1.14, 1.94, *passim*.

⁵⁴ Statements of autopsy occur at Hdt. 2.12.1, 29.1, 131.3, 143.3, 148.1; 3.12.4; 5.59; 6.47.1. Cf. Schepens (1980).

⁵⁵ An illuminating example is Hdt. 4.16.1–2. For further examples see Lateiner (1989) 69–72.

established between Herodotus and Homer. On the contrary, many other meaningful connections can be established through the lens of intertextuality. The chapters by Pelling, Fragoulaki, Barker, Donelli, and Tuplin in the present volume undertake to show how intertextuality operates, what it tells us about Herodotus and Homer, and why it is useful to explore the intended audience of both historian and poet. By the terms ‘intertextuality’ and ‘intertext’ I mean the verbal echoes, metrical soundings, similarities of subject matter, parallels in narrative structures and so on, that an author employs to evoke another passage or series of passage from a previous author, without however involving explicit references.⁵⁶ These are not simply allusions to previous texts: intertexts can be used to recall a predecessor, but can also be employed to create new meanings. Intertextuality between Homer and Herodotus raises many problems, such as the status of the *Histories* and the veracity of its content.⁵⁷ But it also helps to better evaluate and contextualise Herodotus’ work. Exploring intertextuality means going beyond the mere assumption, already noted by ancient literary critics, that Herodotus was the most Homeric of prose authors.

Intertextuality has been profitably employed in classical studies, and specifically in Herodotean scholarship, in the past few decades. But there have also been many valuable works on the relationship between Herodotus and Homer that go back to the mid-nineteenth century. Heinrich Stein offered many useful remarks on Homeric allusions in Herodotus’ prose scattered throughout his multi-volume commentary on the Halicarnassian historian.⁵⁸ His work remains valuable for the analysis of specific passages,

⁵⁶ Cf. Morrison (2020) 17–22 for a similar use of intertextuality: he relies on the seminal work of Gian Biagio Conte (1985) where a distinction is made between the use of a text as a *modello-codice* (a representative of a certain genre) and as *modello-esemplare* (the use of a specific passage in later texts).

⁵⁷ There is a debate about the difference between intertextuality within poetic works and intertextuality in historiographical narratives; in recent years scholars working on ancient historiography have turned their attention to these problems: see Hornblower (1994) 54–72; Grethlein (2006) 486–7; Dillery (2009); O’Gorman (2009); Levene (2010) 82–163; Damon (2010); Marincola (2010). A session titled ‘Allusion and Intertextuality in Classical Historiography’ organised by John Marincola at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (now Society for Classical Studies) has propelled the discussion and led to many thoughtful insights (see https://histos.org/Histos_WorkingPapers.html). Cf. also Hutchinson (2013) and, for intertextuality between Plato and Xenophon, Danzig–Johnson–Morrison (2018). Further thoughts on Homeric and Herodotean intertextuality are developed by Pelling, below, Ch. 2.

⁵⁸ Stein’s commentary on Book 1 was published in 1856 and went as far as the sixth edition in 1902. For the details regarding each book and edition: Corcella (2018) 47 n. 42.

but offers no general outline on Herodotus' use of Homer—the same is true of other modern commentators, from Macan to How and Wells to the Valla and Cambridge 'Green and Yellow' Herodotus commentaries.

While Stein was going through the various editions of his lifelong engagement with Herodotus, a rather obscure Austro-Hungarian schoolteacher named P. Cassian Hofer published in 1878 a book titled *Über die Verwandtschaft des herodoteischen Stiles mit dem homerischen*. Hofer collected a substantial number of *Wortformen* where Herodotus' choice of words resembles Homeric poetry.⁵⁹ But even more striking for our present purposes is the fact that he listed thirty-one occurrences of *Homerische Reminiszenzen* ('Homeric reminiscences') in the text of Herodotus.⁶⁰ This list represents the first systematic, albeit dry, study of the intertextual relation between Homer and Herodotus. Well-known scholars have relied on Hofer's study: from Eduard Norden in *Die antike Kunstprosa*, to Felix Jacoby in the extensive *RE*-article on Herodotus, to Wolfgang Aly in *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*.⁶¹

Jacoby's work was particularly influential. Section 31 of his *RE*-article was devoted to 'Herodot als Schriftsteller: Komposition, Sprache und Stil', where he programmatically stated: 'Deutlich ist es, daß in der Komposition der Einfluß des Homerischen Epos ... eine gewisse Rolle spielt. Man kann nicht zweifeln, daß H[erodotos] sich an ihm [sc. Homer] direkt inspiriert hat, sollte aber den Einfluß auch nicht überschätzen'.⁶² Even if there is a strong link between these two authors, Jacoby also stressed the importance of other genres, such as rhetoric.⁶³

Other scholars before and after World War II dealt generally with the significance of epic poetry for ancient historians, especially Herodotus,⁶⁴ but

⁵⁹ Hofer (1878) 12–18.

⁶⁰ Hofer (1878) 18–24.

⁶¹ Norden (1898) I.40 n. 1; Jacoby (1913) 502–3; Aly (1921) 266–71.

⁶² Jacoby (1913) 491.

⁶³ Jacoby was probably influenced by his *Doktorvater*, Hermann Diels, who stated in an article in 1887: 'Neben der traditionellen Naivität der ionischen *λογοποιία* vernimmt man schon oft die scharfgespitzte Antithese und die Periodenzirkelei der gleichzeitigen Sophistik' (Diels (1887) 424).

⁶⁴ I limit the references to the most significant titles, even though it is only a portion of the works published in German on this topic: Schwartz (1928); Schadewalt (1934); Pohlenz (1937); Immerwahr (1966) 19, 51, 73, 263, 311; Strasburger (1966), esp. 47; Zoepffel (1968). Cf. Myres (1953) 51, 68–74. There is the curious case of Kurt von Fritz's *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* which included five factors for the beginnings of historical writing, but surprisingly omitted the Homeric poems: see Griffin (2014) 2 for further details and more

only in 1965 did Ludwig Huber tackle in detail the relationship between Herodotus and Homer in his seminal ‘Herodots Homerverständnis’. Relying on the work of previous scholars—especially Norden, Jacoby, Aly, and Steinger (the author of a dissertation on *Epische Elemente im Redenstil des Herodot*)⁶⁵—he offered a categorisation of the uses of Homeric epic poetry in the *Histories*: explicit quotations; presence of epic particles, words, and phrasings; imitation of Homer in direct speeches; similarity of subject matter.⁶⁶ He argued that Herodotus used Homeric poetry at significant turns in the narrative or in particularly important episodes: the final chapters of the Croesus-*logos* (1.86–91); the dialogue between the Athenian and Spartan envoys with Gelon (7.157–62) discussed above; Thermopylae, Salamis, and so on. For Huber, Herodotus did not simply rely on Homer to confer an epic flavour to his charming narrative: he also exploited the compositional features of the grand narrative of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to create his own historiographical work. In short, Huber argued that Homer was in a way Herodotus’ teacher.⁶⁷

Hermann Strasburger developed these same topics, in a less systematic way, in his *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (1972). In his view, there are several points of contact between Homeric epic and Greek historiography: insistence on accuracy; focus on war; historical presentation of the causes of war; concentration on the famous deeds of great men. Homer influenced Herodotus’ work at different levels: from explanatory treatment of the subject (the war between Greeks and Persians) to the dramatisation of the narrative through speeches; Thucydides went even further with some of his speeches conveying the moral beliefs of the author.

In the anglophone context, the work of Charles W. Fornara has been particularly influential, especially his treatment of Homer’s influence on historiography in *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*.⁶⁸ He highlighted the significance of the expression κλέα ἀδυνῶν, which occurs

specific references. Similarly to von Fritz’s stance, Santo Mazzarino, in his celebrated *Il pensiero storico classico* (1966), does not consider Homer *per se* as an influential figure in Greek historical writing, but indicates poetry and rhetoric in general as two categories that modelled Greek historiography: see Mazzarino (1966) III.467.

⁶⁵ Steinger (1957).

⁶⁶ Huber (1965) 29–31.

⁶⁷ Huber (1965) 41–46: ‘Die Mannigfaltigkeit der Ereignisse und Eindrücke in der Einheit eines großen Geschehens zusammenzufassen hat erst er [sc. Herodot] vermocht, und Homer hat es ihn gelehrt’ (45).

⁶⁸ Fornara (1983) 31–2, 62–3, 76–7.

repeatedly in Homeric epic,⁶⁹ and is strictly related to war in both epic and early historiography. Moreover, Herodotus famously laid out the reasons for writing his history in the prologue, which included the wish to save from oblivion the great and marvellous deeds of both Greeks and barbarians so that these should not remain without glory (*ἀκλεᾶ γένηται*). The adjective *ἀκλεής* is a clear reference to the epic concept of *κλέος*, ‘glory’ or ‘fame’,⁷⁰ and perhaps reminded some readers of specific Homeric episodes, such as the one that portrays Achilles in his tent playing the lyre and singing of the glorious deeds of warriors (Hom. *Il.* 9.189: *ᾄειδε δ’ ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν*).⁷¹ A few hundred hexameters later, Achilles reflects on his fate: ‘I will lose my homecoming, but my fame will remain immortal’ (Hom. *Il.* 9.413: *ᾄετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται*), thus plainly expressing the immortality of the protagonists of epic poetry. Homeric *κλέος* is used sparingly by Herodotus. In fact, the word is employed only on three occasions in the *Histories*: (1) Herodotus assumes that Leonidas sent away the allies on the eve of the last stand at Thermopylae because ‘by staying, he left behind a great fame for himself, and the prosperity of Sparta was not obliterated’ (*μένοντι δὲ αὐτοῦ κλέος μέγα ἐλείπετο, καὶ ἡ Σπάρτης εὐδαιμονίη οὐκ ἐξηλείφετο*, Hdt. 7.220.2, cf. 7.220.4), thus echoing the same immortality of men who obtain *kleos* in the epic tradition; (2) at 9.48.3 Mardonios accuses the Spartans of shying away from battle and thus not living up to their ‘fame’ (*κατὰ κλέος*); (3) finally, after the battle of Plataea, Pausanias’ victory is referred to as a deed of exceptional greatness and beauty (*ἔργον ἔργασταί τοι ὑπερφυῆς μέγαθός τε καὶ κάλλος*) so much so that ‘the god has granted you the greatest glory of all Greeks of whom we know’ (*καὶ τοι θεὸς παρέδωκε ῥυσάμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα κλέος καταθέσθαι μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*, 9.78.2). How these occurrences react *intratextually* within the *Histories* and *intertextually* with the Homeric epic is explored by Tuplin, below, pp. 315–8 and 354–5.

The praise of the ‘glorious deeds’ that took place during the Persian Wars began immediately after the events: epigrammatic and elegiac poetry

⁶⁹ Hom. *Il.* 9.189: *ᾄειδε δ’ ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν* (‘Singing of the glorious deeds of warriors’); *Il.* 9.524–5: *οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπειθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν | ἠρώων* (‘So it was in former times too, the famous tales we have heard of heroes’); *Od.* 8.73: *Μοῦσ’ ἄρ’ ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν* (‘The Muse inspired the bard to sing the glorious deeds of men’).

⁷⁰ Goldhill (1991) 69 rightly remarks: ‘In ancient Greek culture of all periods, the notion of *kleos* is linked in a fundamental way to the poet’s voice’. On *kleos* see also: Nagy (1979) and (1990), esp. ch. 7; Svenbro (1988) 14–16; Boedeker (2002) 97–9; Garcia (2020).

⁷¹ On Herodotus’ prologue and its relation to the earlier Greek poetic tradition: Chiasson (2012).

(especially Simonides), paintings (Stoa Poikile), tragic performances (Aeschylus' *Persians*, produced in 472 BCE). Herodotus' *Histories* are thus part of a wide and complex scenario where the Homeric epic was used to create new meaning and pay tribute to the Greeks' successes (Plataea) and glorious failures (Thermopylae) during the Persian Wars.⁷²

Our overview of Herodotean scholarship cannot avoid a controversial book: Hayden White's *Metahistory*.⁷³ White's famous (or notorious, depending on one's perspective) assertion was that all historiography is essentially rhetorical. Since its publication, most of the works done on ancient historiographical texts were influenced by, or responded critically to, White's assertions. A. J. Woodman's *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* built on White's theoretical premises claiming that ancient historians were primarily dramatic and rhetorical narrators.⁷⁴ In Woodman's radical stance, the works of the ancient historians aimed at exploiting the same literary devices used by epic and tragic poets in order to stimulate their audiences. This led other theorists to assume that all narrative history is inherently subjective, thus eliding the boundaries between historical and fictional narrative.⁷⁵ This has not been accepted uncritically, and many scholars have defended the historicity and veracity of ancient historiographical texts.⁷⁶ But at least Woodman's study brought a renewed appreciation for Thucydides' engagement with the Homeric epic tradition and, contextually, with his prose predecessor, Herodotus. This has led to new studies and new perspectives on Homeric influences on historiography—and especially on the *Histories*—in the past couple of decades: from the use of poetic language to the analysis of the Homeric character of speeches and dialogues, from Herodotus' overall structure and purposes to the examination of specific passages and episodes.

Various articles and book chapters by Deborah Boedeker, John Marincola, Antonios Rengakos, and Christopher Pelling, among others, have helped us to understand better the general influence of Homer on Herodotus. Boedeker has displayed the broad parallels in shaping the

⁷² Cf. Marincola (2006) 18 with further references. See also Donelli, below, Ch. 7.

⁷³ White (1973).

⁷⁴ Woodman (1988) 26–38.

⁷⁵ This is especially true of Thucydides: see Dewald (2005) 1–22 for further references.

⁷⁶ Attacks on White's assumptions on historiography began with Momigliano (1981) and were further developed in Momigliano (1990) and Ginzburg (1992). Cf. Rhodes (1994), Bosworth (2003).

narrative of events in both poet and historian.⁷⁷ Marincola has focused on those conceptual areas where Herodotus shows indebtedness to his poetic predecessors: in subject matter, interests, and methods Herodotus relies on Homeric poetry. But not everything in Herodotus is Homeric: he distances himself from the poetic traditions and attempts to display the fact that the conflict he sets out to narrate is the greatest of all times, thus superseding Homer and other poetic antecedents.⁷⁸ Moreover, in a long essay on Odysseus and the historians, Marincola considered the figure of Homer's Odysseus in the light of later historiography.⁷⁹ Despite the controversial reception of Odysseus in ancient literature, his appeal to historians was unmistakable. In his preface Herodotus presents himself as 'an alter ego of the great Odysseus':⁸⁰ when stating that his account will 'go through small and great cities of men alike' (Hdt. 1.5.3: *ὁμοίως σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄστυα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιῶν*), he was clearly recalling the Odyssean phrase *ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστυα* at *Od.* 1.3. The changing fortunes of men are a central topic for both the author of the *Odyssey* and Herodotus, not only in the preface, but also in Solon's encounter with Croesus in Book 1. Finally, the Egyptian *logos* shows strong similarities with Odysseus' narrative of his adventures in Books 9–11 of the *Odyssey*. In general, the figure of Odysseus is recognisably embedded in Herodotus' own persona.⁸¹

Antonios Rengakos explored how epic narrative technique influenced the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides.⁸² He analysed how Herodotus recounts events that are far apart from each other, events happening simultaneously at different locations, and his use of 'epic suspense' through the techniques of retardation, dramatic irony, and misdirection of the audience. Herodotus' handling of time is at least as complex and sophisticated as Homer's, especially in the *Odyssey*. He borrows some of the narrative techniques from his epic predecessor that enable him to write a history in prose encompassing large stretches of time and space.

⁷⁷ Boedeker (2002).

⁷⁸ Marincola (2006). Cf. also Marincola (2011), an overview on the relation between Homer and ancient historians in the *Homer Encyclopedia*.

⁷⁹ Marincola (2007).

⁸⁰ Moles (1993) 96.

⁸¹ Marincola (2007) 13–14, 35–9, 38–9, 51–66. Cf. Moles (1996) 265–6.

⁸² Rengakos (2006a); cf. also Rengakos (2006b) for Thucydides' indebtedness towards both the epic tradition and Herodotus.

Jonas Grethlein, in the second half of his book *The Greeks and Their Past*, examined with lucidity and clarity the idea of the past in Herodotus and Thucydides, their critique of contemporary uses of exemplarity, and the roles of Homeric poetry in the Syracusan embassy scene (7.153–63) and in the Tegean-Athenian debate before Plataea (9.26–7). He argues that even though Herodotus intended to expose the inadequacies of *exempla* from the heroic past, alerting his audience to the dangers that lay ahead, his treatment of the Homeric poems displays an exemplary, though cautious, use of the past.⁸³

Richard Rutherford similarly explored the relation of both Herodotus and Thucydides to Homer.⁸⁴ Herodotus and Thucydides do not stand in the same relation to their predecessors for the obvious reason that Thucydides looks back at both Homer and Herodotus. But they all have in common the scale of the narrative, which is extensive and complex: this leads inevitably to considerations on historical and fictional narrative. Like Rengakos, Rutherford considers Herodotus' and Thucydides' use of literary devices which have a precedent in epic poetry, such as progressive iteration, i.e., something that happens on a small scale is later developed with greater narrative impact and emotional force. This is familiar ground for any reader of Herodotus' *Histories*: the Croesus story and its echoes in Book 7; the succession of Persian kings; the Scythian expedition in Book 4 and the Persian invasion in Books 6–9; Athenian and Spartan archaic history in Books 1 and 5. Another area of contact is the 'wise adviser' figure who gives much-needed warnings to a leader and is then utterly ignored. There is Polydamas in the *Iliad* and the prophet Theoclymenus in the *Odyssey*; Solon, Artabanus, and Amasis in Herodotus; in Thucydides, the advisers are directly involved in the actions and their consequences: famous examples include the Spartan king Archidamus and especially Nicias in the context of the Sicilian expedition. In general, Rutherford focused on similarities in the narrative techniques of Herodotus and Thucydides when compared to Homer, and effectively argued for the flexibility of the epic narrative technique.

Several scholars have focused on specific Herodotean passages that display indebtedness towards Homer. This is especially true in descriptions of battle scenes, including the lead-up to the fighting and the battle's aftermath: Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis, and Plataea all include

⁸³ Grethlein (2010) 149–87.

⁸⁴ Rutherford (2012).

references to Homer, whose verses are adapted and often altered to fit each context.⁸⁵

4. Examples of Homeric Intertexts in the *Histories*

As already noted, Book 7 displays numerous Homeric intertexts, from the very beginning of the Book to the catalogue of Persian troops, from the Syracusan debate mentioned above, to the death of Leonidas.⁸⁶

Homeric intertexts have also been detected in less dramatic portions of the *Histories* which still represent key moments in the narrative. This is the case of the twenty Athenians ships sent to aid Aristagoras of Miletus and the other Greeks against the Great King labelled the ἀρχὴ κακῶν ('beginning of troubles') for both Greeks and barbarians.⁸⁷ Plutarch believed that to refer to these ships as 'the beginning of troubles' was outrageous: in Plutarch's eyes, the Athenian ships were rightly sent to aid Greek cities under Persian rule (*Her. mal.* 861A). However, he did not pause to consider a very likely Homeric echo. In fact, the phrasing ἀρχὴ κακῶν relates to the 'well-balanced ships beginners of trouble' built by Alexander/Paris (*Il.* 5.62–4):

ὄς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τεκτῆνατο νῆας εἴσας
ἀρχεκάκους, αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γέγοντο
οἱ τ' αὐτῶ, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι θεῶν ἐκ θέσφατα ἦδη.

It was he [Phereclus] who had built for Alexander the well-balanced ships beginners of trouble, which brought misery to the Trojans and to himself, because he knew nothing of the gods' will.

If we consider this Homeric parallel, Herodotus' reference to ships as the beginning of the disaster is much more meaningful, and perhaps should not have incurred Plutarch's ire.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ In general, see Lendon (2017) and Marincola (2018). Marathon: Pelling (2013b); cf. the commentary in Hornblower–Pelling (2017) *passim*; Thermopylae: Munson (2001) 175–8; Boedeker (2003) 34–6; Pelling (2006) 92–8; Marincola (2016); Vannicelli's commentary in Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) *passim*.

⁸⁶ See the bibliography quoted above, pp. 9–10 with nn. 39–40.

⁸⁷ Hdt. 5.97.3: αὐταὶ δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἑλλήσι τε καὶ βαρβάροισι ('These ships were the beginning of troubles for Greeks and barbarians').

⁸⁸ See Pelling (2006) 79–81.

Herodotus' narrative is embedded with hexametric verses, or at least endings (*Hexameterschluß*), that previous scholars have carefully picked up. Three examples will suffice:

(a) ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ ('on the threshold of old age') occurring at *Il.* 22.60 (δύσμορον, ὃν ῥα πατὴρ Κρονίδης ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ | αἴση ἐν ἀργαλέῃ φθείσει, 'ill-fated man, whom the father, the son of Cronus, will destroy at the threshold of old age'); 24.486–7 (μνήσαι πατρὸς σοῖο, θεοῖς ἐπιείκει' Ἀχιλλεῦ | τηλίκου ὡς περ ἐγών, ὀλοῶ ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ, 'Achilles, man like the gods, think of your own father, a man who is of my age, on the grim threshold of old age'); and *Od.* 15.348 (εἶπ' ἄγε μοι περὶ μητρὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θεῖοι | πατρὸς θ', ὃν κατέλειπεν ἰὼν ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ, 'come now, tell me of Odysseus' divine mother, and of his father, whom he has left on the threshold of old age'). It is also attested at *Hdt.* 3.14.10 where Psammenitus speaks to Cambyses: τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐταίρου πένθος ἄξιον ἦν δακρῶν, ὃς ἐκ πολλῶν τε καὶ εὐδαιμόνων ἐκπεσὼν ἐς πτωχήν ἀπίκται ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ ('I could not but weep for the troubles of a friend who has fallen from great wealth and good fortune and been reduced to beggary on the threshold of old age').⁸⁹

(b) οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον ('this would not be better') closing Darius' speech in the well-known constitutional debate at *Hdt.* 3.82.8 might recall the closing of some Homeric hexameters as well: *Il.* 1.217 (ὡς γὰρ ἄμεινον 'for it is better this way'); *Il.* 1.274 (ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον, [Nestor to Achilles and Agamemnon] 'So you both should listen to me, since it is better to listen'); *Il.* 11.469 (ἀλεξέμεναι γὰρ ἄμεινον, 'rescue is the better course'); *Od.* 22.104 (τετευχῆσθαι γὰρ ἄμεινον, 'it is better to be armed'). However, οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον has an oracular ring: whether Herodotus is echoing oracles or oracles echoing epic poetry is a question open for debate.⁹⁰

(c) in the dialogue between the Lydian Pythius, the son of Atys, and Xerxes at *Hdt.* 7.28.1 (ὦ βασιλεῦ, οὔτε σε ἀποκρύψω οὔτε σκήψομαι τὸ μὴ εἰδέναί τὴν ἐμεωτοῦ οὐσίην, ἀλλ' ἐπιστάμενός τοι ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω, 'O King, I will not conceal the quantity of my property from you, nor pretend that I do not know; I know and will tell you the exact truth'), the hexametric expression ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω ('I will give an exact account') is possibly a Homeric intertext: in *Iliad* 10, when the Trojan Dolon is caught by Odysseus and Diomedes while attempting to spy on the Greeks, Odysseus questions

⁸⁹ *Hdt.* 3.14–16 has been profitably compared to *Hom. Il.* 22.60 by Pelling (2006) 87–9. Cf. Huber (1965) 33.

⁹⁰ I wish to thank Christopher Pelling for pointing out the oracular ring of the expression οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον.

him beginning with ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον (*Il.* 10.384: 'But come, tell me all this, and give me an exact account'), repeated at *Il.* 10.405, while at *Il.* 10.413 we find Dolon's answer: τοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τοι ταῦτα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω ('I will give you an exact account of all this'), which occurs again at *Il.* 10.427. However, these and other hexametric endings are not always and not exclusively Homeric. In various instances Herodotus was probably exploiting a generic epic-sounding word or phrase that made his narrative so charming for ancient readers. Simon Hornblower has pointed out that in Greek historical prose texts metrical reminiscences often avoid perfect metricality, which is exactly the case with some of the passages just quoted.⁹¹

Epic formulae also occur fairly often in Herodotus' narrative. For example, Pythius' refusal to conceal anything but the truth to Xerxes at *Hdt.* 7.28.1 (quoted extensively in the previous paragraph), which includes the expression ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω, echoes the dialogue between Telemachus and Menelaus in *Odyssey* 4, and especially *Od.* 4.350: τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω ('I will not hide any of that, nor will I conceal words').

Another instructive example involves the questioning of strangers. In the formulaic language of Homeric poetry, it is typical to ask a stranger: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἦδ' ἐτοκῆες; ('Who among man are you and from where? Where is your city and where are your parents?').⁹² Such a series of questions probably reflects customary modes of identification in the archaic age, and must have been familiar to Herodotus' audience not only from epic poetry but also from ordinary speech. The Athenians presented the young males to their father's *demos* to be included as members, a practice known as *dokimasia*, which involved similar questioning.⁹³ In Herodotus' Book 1, Gordias comes to the Lydian king Croesus as a suppliant requesting and obtaining purification from a blood-related crime. Then Croesus asks: ὄνθρωπε, τίς τε ἐὼν καὶ κόθεν τῆς Φρυγίης ἦκων ἐπίστιός μοι ἐγένεο; τίνα τε ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν ἐφόνευσας; (1.35.3: 'What is your name, stranger, and what part of Phrygia have you come from to take refuge with me? What man

⁹¹ Hornblower (1994) 66. Cf. Tribulato, below, p. 277.

⁹² This hexameter appears only in the *Odyssey*, where strange and unusual encounters are quite common: see *Od.* 1.170; 7.238; 10.325; 14.187; 15.264; 19.150; 24.298. But see also the confrontation between Achilles and Asteropaeus at *Hom. Il.* 21.150: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν ὄ μιν ἔτλης ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν; ('Who among man are you and from where, that you dare fight me?').

⁹³ See [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 42.

or woman did you kill?'). The encounter between Gordias and Croesus is indeed a key passage in Herodotus' display of divine *nemesis* in the Croesus *logos*, but it is possible that this kind of questioning was considered a commonplace in the ways one related to strangers, without having to refer to Homeric epic poetry. Not everything we find in both Homer and Herodotus must be connected: several alleged epic references and echoes in the historian's narrative could belong to everyday speech or relate to other works of poetry.⁹⁴

This kind of relation to previous poetry—including Homer—can be located at the beginning of Book 6, just before the battle of Lade and the end of the Ionian revolt. Here one of the leaders, the Phocaeen Dionysius, begins his speech with the words: 'everything stands on a razor's edge, men of Ionia, whether we are to be free or slaves' (ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἢ εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἢ δούλοισι, 6.11.2). The proverbial expression 'to stand on a razor's edge' (ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται) used by Herodotus is previously attested in Hom. *Il.* 10.173–5 (νῦν γὰρ δὴ πάντεσσιν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται ἀκμῆς | ἢ μάλα λυγρὸς ὄλεθρος Ἀχαιοῖς ἢ ἐβίωναι· | ἀλλ' ἔθι νῦν ... 'For now it stands on a razor's edge for all the Achaeans, whether to die grimly or to live; so come now...'),⁹⁵ but also in several other extant Greek authors: Thgn. 557 (κίνδυνός τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται ἀκμῆς); *Anth. Pal.* 7.250.1, ascribed to Simonides (ἀκμᾶς ἔστακυῖαν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν, cf. Plut. *Her. mal.* 870A); *Anth. Pal.* 9.475.2, anonymous (ὑμῖν ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται ἀκμῆς).⁹⁶

Another such instance is the expression 'to fill one's heart' or 'to place something in one's mind' through the use of the verbs βάλλω and ἐμβάλλω, together with ἐς θυμόν, ἐνὶ θυμῷ, or simply θυμῷ. This phrasing is used extensively in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: *Il.* 13.82 (τῆν σφιν θεὸς ἐμβαλε θυμῷ); 20.195–6 (ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ | βάλλεαι); 23.313 = 15.172–3 (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ σὺν φίλος μῆτιν ἐμβάλλεο θυμῷ); *Od.* 1.200–1 (ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ | ἀθάνατοι βάλλουσι); 2.79 (νῦν δέ μοι ἀπρήκτους ὀδύνας ἐμβάλλετε θυμῷ); 12.217–18 (ἀλλ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ |

⁹⁴ See the cautious remarks in Boedeker (2002) 101, and now Barker, below, Ch. 6.

⁹⁵ Cf. Dover (1997) 110; Nenci (1998) 177; Boedeker (2002) 101–2; Pelling (2006) 80–1; Pelling (2013a) 7–8; Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 95–7.

⁹⁶ Cf. also ἐπὶ ξύρου with the same meaning in Aesch. *TrGF* F 99.22, Soph. *Ant.* 996, Eur. *HF* 630, and Theocr. *Id.* 22.6. Hdt. 6.11.2 is quoted in [Longin.] *Subl.* 22 as an example of hyperbaton.

βάλλει); 19.485 = 23.260 (ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθησθε καὶ τοὶ θεοὶ ἔμβαλε θυμῷ).⁹⁷ It also occurs several times in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*,⁹⁸ and once in Hesiod's *Works and Days*,⁹⁹ but is not attested in later poetry or prose, except Herodotus, where it occurs three times: Hdt. 1.84.4 (ἐφράσθη καὶ ἐς θυμὸν ἐβάλετο); 7.51.3 (ἐς θυμὸν ὧν βαλεῦ); and 8.68γ.1 where Artemisia tries to convince Xerxes not to engage the Greeks' ships by introducing one of the arguments with the following expression: 'my king, put away in your heart another point, etc.' (πρὸς δε, ὧ βασιλεῦ, καὶ τόδε ἐς θυμὸν βαλεῦ, κτλ.).

These examples mean that we must deal carefully with Homeric intertexts in Herodotus and always keep in mind that most of the archaic poetry and prose that Herodotus and his audience had access to is unavailable to us.¹⁰⁰

5. An Overview

As illustrated in the previous sections, many scholars have offered valuable insights on Homeric influences in Herodotus' *Histories*. However, there is no single volume dealing with the historian's relation to Homeric poetry. The present book seeks to put together these various threads of Herodotean scholarship and cover some new ground.

Firstly, Christopher Pelling ('Homeric and Herodotean Intertextuality: What's the Point?') tackles the issue of Homeric intertextuality in Herodotus by problematising it and by putting forward questions that the other chapters dealing with intertextuality will attempt to respond to. Pelling brings out the range of problems that an intertextual relation between a

⁹⁷ For the sake of completeness, we should add that in Homeric poetry there is also the use of ἐνὶ φρεσὶ instead of ἐνὶ θυμῷ: *Il.* 1.297: ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσι ('But I will tell you another thing, and you should store it in your mind') = *Il.* 4.39; 5.259; 9.611; 16.444, 851; *Od.* 11.454; 16.281, 299; 17.548; 19.236, 495, 570.

⁹⁸ See *h.Hom. Ven.* 45–6: τῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ Ζεὺς γλυκὴν ἕμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ | ἀνδρὶ καταθηγῆται μιχθήμεναι ('But Zeus cast a sweet longing into Aphrodite's own heart to couple with a mortal man'); 53: Ἀγχίσεω δ' ἄρα οἱ γλυκὴν ἕμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ ('So he cast into her heart a sweet longing for Anchises'); 143: ὡς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὴν ἕμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ ('With these words the goddess cast sweet longing into his heart', transl. M. L. West).

⁹⁹ *Hes. Op.* 297: ὅς δέ κε μήτ' αὐτὸς νοέη μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων | ἐν θυμῷ βάλλεται, ὁ δ' αὐτ' ἀχρήσιος ἀνὴρ ('But whoever neither thinks by himself nor pays heed to what someone else says and lays it to his heart—that man is good for nothing', transl. Most).

¹⁰⁰ For further methodological considerations on Homeric intertextuality in Herodotus, see Pelling, below, Ch. 2.

poetic and a prose work entails. The questions that he addresses are many and far-reaching, from the special character, now and then, of both Homer and Herodotus, to Homer's place in the epic tradition and his own intertextual relationship with other poems of the epic cycle; from the interplay between author and reader as well as between an ideal reader and a number of actual readers; from Thucydides' relation with both Herodotus and Homer in the context of the final stages of the Athenian Sicilian expedition, to the interplay with tragedy; from Homeric presence in Herodotus' authorial voice and in his characters' voices within his narrative; from the interaction between *intertexts* and *intratexts*, to the question of how intertextuality can affect historical interpretations. The methodological significance of Pelling's chapter resounds throughout the rest of the book, especially within those chapters that deal with Homeric intertexts in Herodotus (Fragoulaki, Barker, Donelli, Tuplin).

After Pelling's methodological approach, the next chapter by Jan Haywood ('Homeric Criticism and Homeric Allusions in Herodotus') focuses on the explicit references that show Herodotus' willingness to engage with Homer and the tradition related to the Trojan War. A few significant passages are discussed: the Helen story in the Egyptian logos (2.112–20), where Herodotus aims at establishing his own authority as a serious historian; Herodotus' engagement with Homer and Hesiod and the names of the gods (2.53), which is discussed from another perspective in Tom Harrison's chapter; Herodotus' criticism of Ocean and of ancient *mythoi* that surround it (2.23); the Spartan and Athenian embassy to Gelon of Syracuse (7.157–62); and, finally, the dispute between the Athenians and Tegeans on the eve of Plataea (9.26–8). These are very relevant episodes that display, according to Haywood, how Herodotus adopted different registers when dealing with Homer, and especially with the *Iliad*, albeit carefully avoiding a simple juxtaposition of heroic deeds and recent events.

Tom Harrison ('Herodotus, Homer, and the Character of the Gods') reconsiders a famous Herodotean passage, namely 2.53 on the Greeks' knowledge of the gods and Homer's and Hesiod's involvement in this knowledge. It is well known that Herodotus ascribes to these two poets the invention of a theogony for the Greeks and the names and characters of the gods. Harrison argues, against recent scholarship, that it is not at all necessary to interpret Herodotus' words in 2.53 as sceptical of religion and of the gods' existence. To substantiate his claim, Harrison exploits various pre-Socratic authors, Attic comedy, and Pindar, thus offering a wide perspective on religious beliefs in the fifth century BCE. Even though

Harrison's chapter looks at one single reference to Homer in the *Histories*, he shows the significance of this passage for our broader understanding of Herodotus' approach to previous poetry and religion.

The following chapters by Fragoulaki, Barker, and Donelli engage with meaningful Homeric intertexts in Herodotus. Maria Fragoulaki ('Bloody Death in Greek Historiography: Homeric Presences and Meaningful Absences in Herodotus') deals with Herodotus' 'un-Homeric' descriptions of the dying body on the battlefield, focusing especially on battle-scenes in the *Iliad*, the absence of human body from combat scenes in Herodotus, and the inclusion of gory details in narratives unrelated to the battlefield. On the one hand, we find words such as 'blood' (αἷμα) often appearing in Homer, while being characteristically absent from Herodotus' narrative. The narrative of the battle of Thermopylae in Herodotus' Book 7 and the importance of *kleos* for Leonidas and the seer Megistias displays heroic psychology and emotions that can be meaningfully compared to the single combat of Achilles and Hector in *Iliad* 22. Through linguistic and narratological analysis of Herodotus' text, Fragoulaki argues that the 'meaningful absence' of descriptions of the dying body on the battlefield in Herodotus distances the historian from his poetic archetype.

Elton Barker ('Die Another Day: Aristodemos and a Homeric Intertext in Herodotus') focuses on the episode of Aristodemos' death in Herodotus' postscripts to the battle of Thermopylae (7.229). The expression λιποψυχέοντα ('with his spirit leaving him'), a *hapax* in Herodotus, together with the Spartan warriors suffering from ophthalmia, represent a possible intertext with Sarpedon's ψυχή leaving him and a mist spreading over his eyes in Hom. *Il.* 5.696 (τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς). Barker carefully examines the lexical similarities and the general context, and stresses the distinctive complexity of the Aristodemos episode. Its intertextual resonance with Sarpedon allows the reader to think more cautiously on the memorialisation of the battle of Thermopylae, especially from a Spartan perspective.

Giulia Donelli ('Truth, Fiction, and Authority in Herodotus' Book 8') discusses a programmatic announcement in Hdt. 8.8.3 involving the author's γνώμη ('opinion'), which represents at the same time a prose version of a poetic statement found in Homer, Hesiod, and Theognis. Donelli examines other methodological sections of the *Histories* where γνώμη is set in a hierarchical arrangement with other meaningful words such as ἀκοή ('hearing'), ὄψις ('sight'), and ἱστορίη ('investigation') that determine the search for historical truth and accuracy. The poetic frames of truth and

fiction that are entailed in Herodotus' Book 8 (and esp. at 8.8.3) show the historian at his best: applying his own *γνώμη* not to the criticism of myth, as poets and logographers (Hecateaus) did, but to history and historical truth.

After these studies of specific instances of Herodotean and Homeric intertextuality, Olga Tribulato ('The Homericness of Herodotus' Language (with a Case-Study on -έειν Aorist Infinitives in the Histories)') produces an account, from a linguistic perspective, of Herodotus' often elusive Homericness. This entails dealing with the historian's Ionic dialect, the issues posed by the textual transmission of the *Histories*, and the editorial practices of modern editors of Herodotus. Tribulato reviews ancient and modern perspectives on the language of Herodotus, and, finally, discusses a problematic Homeric feature in Herodotus, uncontracted present and aorist infinitives in -έειν, together with -έειν aorist infinitives in inscriptions and post-Classical literature. Her conclusion is rightly cautious: -έειν aorist infinitives are probably not originally Herodotean, but they certainly display the influence of Homeric poetry on the ancient reception of Herodotus' language and text.

In the final chapter—which takes up and develops Pelling's methodological premises—Christopher Tuplin ('Poet and Historian: the Impact of Homer in Herodotus' *Histories*') offers a thorough overview of Homeric and Herodotean intertextuality in a dialogue with the rest of the chapters of this book. After reviewing the ancients' thoughts on the Homeric character of Herodotus' *Histories* and the explicit references to Homer and the Trojan War in Herodotus, Tuplin offers original readings of several Herodotean passages, from minute and apparently unimportant episodes to the methodological statements and the most famous scenes. His chapter discusses: Herodotus' detailed knowledge of Homeric language through the use of *hapax legomena* that display an intertextual use of Homer; the small number of Homeric intertexts, considering the size of the *Histories*, and the problem of establishing a connection between Herodotus' relationship with Homer and later authors (these authors—and especially Thucydides—had to deal not only with Homer, but also with Homeric Herodotus); the relevance of specific intertexts with *Iliad* 2, 24, and the middle books of the *Iliad* where the Achaeans are in trouble; at the same time, less relevant intertexts with the *Odyssey*; the small number, from Herodotus' perspective, of Homeric intertexts in the ethnographic descriptions in Books 1–4, and contextually many Homeric intertexts in the narrative of the Persian Wars proper (Books 5–9); the specific role that Homeric intertexts have in the narrative structure of the *Histories*; the importance of *intratextual* connection

with *intertextual* material; intertexts can be in the narrator's voice, but also that of his characters; the variable nature of intertexts: some strengthen an evident message, some other reveal less obvious messages, often involving a negative twist; some ambiguous intertexts (we cannot always determine whether this ambiguity is intentional or not). Lastly, Tuplin questions the relevance of Homer for Herodotus as a historian, claiming that intertexts were not meant to provide direct answers but provoke questions about the present, especially for the Athenians.

It is easy to say that Herodotus was the most Homeric historian, and everyone tends to accept this. But it is quite another story to try to explain, by means of concrete examples, what the reasons have been that led to this belief, both in antiquity and in modern scholarship. The nine chapters that make up this book attempt to problematise the assumption of ancient and modern literary critics on the Homeric nature of Herodotus' *Histories*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aly, W. (1921) *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen. Eine Untersuchung über die volkstümlichen Elemente der altgriechischen Prosaerzählung*, (Göttingen; 2nd edition, with additions by L. Huber, Göttingen, 1969).
- Bakker, E. J., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).
- Baron, C., ed. (2021) *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*, 3 vols (Hoboken, N.J.).
- Boedeker, D. (2002) 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 97–116.
- (2003) 'Pedestrian Fatalities: The Prosaics of Death in Herodotus', in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 17–36.
- Bosworth, A. B. (2003) 'Plus ça change ... Ancient Historians and Their Sources', *ClAnt* 22: 167–97.
- Butti de Lima, P. (1996) *L'inchiesta e la prova: immagine storiografica, pratica giuridica e retorica nella Grecia classica* (Turin).
- Carey, C. (2016) 'Homer and Epic in Herodotus' Book 7', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou, edd., *Homeric Receptions Across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–89.
- Cavallo, G. (2019) 'Uccelli famelici ad Atene', in id., *Scrivere e leggere nella città antica* (Rome) 11–38.
- Chaniotis, A. (1988) *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart).
- (2004) 'Justifying Territorial Claims in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: The Beginning of International Law', in E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein, edd., *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece* (London) 185–213.
- (2009) 'Travelling Memories in the Hellenistic World', in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, edd., *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge) 249–69.
- Chiasson, C. (2012) 'Herodotus' Prologue and the Greek Poetic Tradition', *Histos* 6: 114–43.
- Cingano, E. (1985) 'Clistene di Sicione, Erodoto e i poemi del Ciclo tebano', *QUCC* 20: 31–40.
- (2015) 'Epigonoï', in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015b) 244–60.
- Conte, G. B. (1985) *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*² (Turin).
- Corcella, A. (1984) *Erodoto e l'analogia* (Palermo).

- (2018) ‘Heinrich Stein e i suoi studi erodotei’, in R. Otranto and P. M. Pinto, edd., *Storie di testi e tradizione classica per Luciano Canfora* (Rome) 39–56.
- Currie, B. (2015) ‘Cypria’, in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015b) 281–305.
- (2020) ‘The Birth of Literary Criticism (Herodotus 2.116–117) and the Roots of Homeric Neoanalysis’, in J. J. Price and R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, edd., *Text and Intertext in Greek Epic and Drama: Essays in Honor of Margalit Finkelberg* (London) 147–70.
- (2021) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Supplement 13; Oxford, Edmonton, and Tallahassee).
- Damon, C. (2010) ‘Déjà vu or déjà lu? History as Intertext’, *PLLS* 14: 375–88.
- Danzig, G., D. Johnson, and D. Morrison, edd. (2018) *Plato and Xenophon: Comparative Studies* (Leiden and Boston).
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. (1987) *Le discours du particulier: essai sur l'enquête hérodotéenne* (Paris).
- Dewald, C. (2005) *Thucydides' War Narrative: A Structural Study* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Diels, H. (1887) ‘Herodot und Hekataios’, *Hermes* 22: 411–44; repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, ed. W. Burkert (Darmstadt, 1969) 411–44.
- Dillery, J. (2009) ‘Roman Historians and the Greeks: Audiences and Models’, in Feldherr (2009) 77–107.
- Dover, K. (1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose* (Oxford).
- Erbse, H. (1992) *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin).
- Fantuzzi, M. and C. Tsagalis (2015a) ‘Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle and Cyclic Poetry’, in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015b) 1–40.
- , ed. (2015b) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge).
- Farinelli, C. (1995) ‘Le citazioni omeriche in Erodoto ii, 116–17’, *AION* (filol) 17: 5–29.
- Feldherr, A., ed. (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge).
- Fornara, C. W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford).
- (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Foster, E. and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Fowler, R. (2003) ‘Herodotos and Athens’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 305–18.

- (2006) ‘The Homeric Question’, in id., ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge) 220–32.
- Garcia, L. F., Jr. (2020) ‘Kleos’, in Pache (2020) 167–8.
- Ginzburg, C. (1992) ‘Just One Witness’, in S. Friedländer, ed., *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the ‘Final Solution’* (Cambridge Mass. and London) 82–96.
- (1994) ‘Aristotele, la storia, la prova’, *Quaderni storici* 85: 5–17.
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet’s Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge).
- González, J. M. (2013) *The Epic Rhapsode and His Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective* (Washington, D.C.): <https://chs.harvard.edu/book/gonzalez-jose-the-epic-rhapsode-and-his-craft-homeric-performance-in-a-diachronic-perspective/> (last accessed 3 March 2021).
- (2020) ‘Rhapsodes and *Homēridai*’, in Pache (2020) 196–8.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer* (Cambridge).
- and J. Haubold (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).
- Grethlein, J. (2006) ‘The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: The Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153–63’, *AJPh* 127: 485–509.
- (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (2014) ‘The Emergence of Herodotus’, *Histos* 8: 1–24; orig. pub. ‘Die Ursprünge der Historien Herodots’, in W. Ax, ed., *Memoria Rerum Veterum: Neue Beiträge zur antiken Historiographie und Alten Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1990) 51–82.
- Grimaldi, W. M. A. (1980) ‘*Semeion, Tekmerion, Eikos* in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*’, *AJPh* 101: 383–98.
- Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Harrison, T. and E. Irwin, edd. (2018) *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Hartog, F. (1980) *Le miroir d’Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l’autre* (Paris); Engl. transl. by J. Lloyd, *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988).
- Haubold, J. (2007) ‘Xerxes’ Homer’, in E. Bridges, E. Hall, and P. J. Rhodes, edd., *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford) 47–63.
- Haywood, J. and N. Mac Sweeney (2018) *Homer’s Iliad and the Trojan War: Dialogues on Tradition* (London).
- Hemmerdinger, B. (1981) *Les manuscrits d’Hérodote et la critique verbale* (Genoa).
- Higbie, C. (1997) ‘The Bones of a Hero, the Ashes of a Politician: Athens, Salamis, and the Usable Past’, *CLAnt* 16: 278–307.

- (2010) ‘Divide and Edit: A Brief History of Book Division’, *HSCP* 105: 1–31.
- Hofer, P. C. (1878) *Über die Verwandtschaft des herodoteischen Stiles mit dem homerischen (Programm des Kaiserl.-Königl. Gymnasiums zu Meran; Meran)*.
- Hornblower, S. (1991–2010) *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols (Oxford).
- (1994) ‘Introduction’, in id., ed., *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 1–72.
- and C. Pelling, edd. (2017) *Herodotus: Histories Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Huber, L. (1965) ‘Herodots Homerverständnis’, in H. Flashar and K. Gaiser, edd., *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt* (Pfullingen) 29–52.
- Hutchinson, G. (2013) *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. L. (1989) *Herodotus and the Epic* (Athens).
- Immerwahr, H. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland).
- Jacoby, F. (1913) ‘Herodotos’, *RE Suppl.* II: 205–520.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1963) *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton).
- Kim, L. (2020) ‘Homer in Antiquity’, in Pache (2020) 417–34.
- Lamberton, R. (1997) ‘Homer in Antiquity’, in I. Morris and B. B. Powell, edd., *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne) 33–54.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Lendon, J. E. (2017) ‘Battle Description in the Ancient Historians, Part I: Structure, Array, and Fighting’, *G&R* 64: 39–64.
- Levene, D. S. (2010) *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).
- Luraghi, N., ed. (2001) *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Mac Sweeney, N. (2018) *Troy: Myth, City, Icon* (London).
- Marincola, J. (2006) ‘Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past’, in C. Dewald and J. Marincola, edd., *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge) 13–28.
- (2007) ‘Odysseus and the Historians’, *SyllClass* 18: 1–79; partially repr. in R. V. Munson, ed., *Herodotus*, vol. 2: *Herodotus and the World* (Oxford, 2013) 109–132.
- (2010) ‘The “Rhetoric” of History: Intertextuality and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches’, in D. Pausch, ed., *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* (Berlin and Boston) 259–80.
- (2011) ‘Historians and Homer’, in M. Finkelberg, ed., *The Homer Encyclopedia*, 3 vols (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) II.357–9.
- (2016) ‘The Historian as Hero: Herodotus and the 300 at Thermopylae’, *TAPhA* 146: 219–36.
- (2018) ‘Ομηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus’, in E. Bowie, ed., *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston) 3–24.

- Matijašić, I. (2018) *Shaping the Canons of Ancient Greek Historiography: Imitation, Classicism, and Literary Criticism* (Berlin and Boston).
- (2019) ‘Herodotus in the Theatre in Alexandria? On Athen. 14.620d’, *JHS* 139: 83–93.
- (2020) ‘Erodoto tra Powell e Hemmerdinger’, *QS* 92: 125–52.
- Mazzarino, S. (1966) *Il pensiero storico classico*, 3 vols (Rome and Bari).
- Moles, J. L. (1993) ‘Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides’, in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman, edd., *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter and Austin) 88–121.
- (1996) ‘Herodotus Warns the Athenians’, *PLLS* 9: 259–84.
- (2002) ‘Herodotus and Athens’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 33–52.
- Momigliano, A. (1978) ‘The Historians of the Classical World and Their Audiences: Some Suggestions’, *ASNP*⁵ 8: 59–75; repr. in id., *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 2 vols (Rome, 1980) I.361–76.
- (1981) ‘The Rhetoric of History and the History of Rhetoric: On Hayden White’s Tropes’, in E. S. Shaffer, ed., *Comparative Criticism: A Yearbook*, vol. 3 (Cambridge) 259–68; repr. in A. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1984) 49–59.
- (1990) *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Morrison, A. D. (2020) *Apollonius Rhodius, Herodotus and Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the World of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).
- Myres, J. L. (1953) *Herodotus: Father of History* (Oxford).
- Nagy, G. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore).
- (1990) *Pindar’s Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).
- Nenci, G., ed. (1998) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VI, La battaglia di Maratona* (Milan).
- Nicolai, R. and P. Vannicelli (2019) ‘Il consiglio, il sogno, il catalogo: *Iliade* II, i *Persiani* di Eschilo, Erodoto VII’, *SemRom* 26: 201–26.
- Norden, E. (1898) *Die antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert vor Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols (Leipzig).
- O’Gorman, E. (2009) ‘Intertextuality and Historiography’, in Feldherr (2009) 231–42.
- Pache, C. O., ed., (2020) *The Cambridge Guide to Homer* (Cambridge).
- Pallantza, E. (2005) *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Stuttgart).

- Pelling, C. (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* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2013a) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- (2013b) 'Herodotus' Marathon', in C. Carey and M. Edwards, edd., *Marathon—2,500 Years*, (BICS Suppl. 124; London) 23–34.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin, TX).
- , ed. (2021) *Thucydides: Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Philipp, R. (1955) 'ἀείδω, ἀοιδίαω', in B. Snell, ed., *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, vol. 1 (Göttingen) 155–9.
- Piccirilli, L. (1985) *Storie dello storico Tucidide* (Genoa).
- Priestley, J. (2014) *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories* (Oxford).
- Pohlenz, M. (1937) *Herodot: der erste Geschichtsschreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig).
- Powell, J. E. (1935) 'Notes on Herodotus', *CQ* 29: 72–82.
- Raaflaub, K. A. (2002) 'Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 149–68.
- Rengakos, A. (2006a) 'Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos, edd., *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Entretiens Hardt 52; Vandœuvres-Genève) 183–209.
- (2006b) 'The Epic and Herodotean Heritage in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis, edd., *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden) 279–300.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1994) 'In Defence of the Greek Historians', *G&R* 41: 156–71.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in Foster–Lateiner (2012) 13–38.
- Said, S. (2012) 'Herodotus and the 'Myth' of the Trojan War', in E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker, edd., *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford) 87–105.
- Sammons, B. (2012) 'History and *Hyponoia*: Herodotus and Early Literary Criticism', *Histos* 6: 52–66.
- Santini, M. (2016) 'A Multi-Ethnic City Shapes Its Past: The "Pride of Halicarnassos" and the Memory of Salmakis', *ASNP*⁵ 8: 3–35.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1934) 'Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen', *Die Antike* 10: 144–68; repr. in id., *Hellas und Hesperien*², 2 vols (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1970) I.559–80.

- Schepens, G. (1980) *L'autopsie' dans le méthode des historiens grecs du V^e siècle avant J. C.* (Brussels).
- Schwartz, E. (1928) 'Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen', *Die Antike* 4: 14–28; repr. in id., *Gesammelte Schriften: Vergangene Gegenwartigkeiten*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1938) 67–87.
- Slings, S. R. (2002) 'Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 53–77.
- Steinger, G. (1957) *Epische Elemente im Redenstil des Herodot* (Diss. Kiel).
- Strasburger, H. (1966) *Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden; with Nachträge, 1975); repr. in id. (1982) 963–1016.
- (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg); repr. in id. (1982) 1057–97.
- (1982) *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, Band II (Hildesheim and New York).
- Svenbro, J. (1988) *Phrasikleia: anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne* (Paris); Engl. transl. by J. Lloyd, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca and London, 1993).
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- Vannicelli, P., A. Corcella, and G. Nenci, edd. (2017) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VII, Serse e Leonida* (Milan).
- White, H. (1973) *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore and London).
- Wilson, N. G., ed. (2015) *Herodoti Historiae*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London, Sydney, and Portland).
- Zoepffel, R. (1968) 'Griechische Geschichtsschreibung', in J. Scheschkewitz, ed., *Geschichtsschreibung. Epochen–Methoden–Gestalten* (Düsseldorf) 29–44.

HOMERIC AND HERODOTEAN INTERTEXTUALITY: WHAT’S THE POINT?

Christopher Pelling

One thing is clear. There is never likely to be just one ‘point’ to intertextuality, but all sorts of different point. This chapter sets the scene by introducing a series of questions that are worth bearing in mind.

Question 1: A Special Sort of Intertextuality?

A few years ago there began a vigorous debate whether historiographic intertextuality worked in the same way as other sorts, given that historiography at least purports to be dealing with real-life events. The principal contributions were made by Cynthia Damon and David Levene, with Ellen O’Gorman an important forerunner;¹ there were follow-up panels at two meetings of the Society of Classical Studies and one of the Classical Association, and most of these have been published as *Histos* working-papers.² I had my say in one of those,³ and will go over as little as possible of the same ground here. My basic answer was ‘no, or not much’, and insofar as there is any difference it is because we care about real-life events, not necessarily more than, but in a different way from how we care about fiction. Others were inclined to state the differences more emphatically.

Now we can add to that issue a further one: does intertextuality with Homer, especially Herodotean intertextuality with Homer, work in a different way from, say, Thucydidean intertextuality with Herodotus or for that matter Catullan intertextuality with Callimachus or Sappho? In those

¹ Damon (2010); Levene (2010) 84–6; O’Gorman (2006) and (2009).

² https://histos.org/Histos_WorkingPapers.html.

³ Pelling (2013).

other cases it is tempting to think of intertextuality as partly—only partly—a way of building a bond between author and reader, one where the reader may have an ‘I see what you did there’ response: it creates a sense, quite a cosy one, of sharing a joint culture, intimating that the reader is the sort of person that the text is targeting and that the author has in mind. If one was listening to a neoteric poet and picked up a hint of an inconspicuous line of Aratus or Pacuvius, one can imagine—human nature being what it was and is—listeners looking around the room, wondering how many others noticed it, and perhaps hoping that the answer was ‘not very many’, perhaps just relishing the feeling of being part of such a cultural in-group.

There is almost always more to it, of course: the point may be that someone’s experience, perhaps my own, is *not* quite like Sappho’s. When Plutarch echoes the erotic symptoms of Sappho 31 when talking of a young man’s falling for philosophy (*How to measure one’s own progress in virtue* 81D), we might suspect that the youth’s experience is not really quite as exciting as Sappho’s, and Plutarch’s own tongue was probably in his cheek as well.⁴ But Sappho’s excitement at least gives a start: author and reader both have something there that they can work on, they are part of the same, semi-private conversation, and the more arcane the model, the closer the bond. Luke Pitcher has talked about ‘author theatre’, the way an author contrives to project a particular personality;⁵ if this were, say, Virgilian or Plutarchan rather than Herodotean intertextuality, we might play with the idea of ‘reader theatre’ too, building a constructed ideal reader who picks up all the hints. There can then be an interesting interplay between real readers and that ideal reader, flattering an audience with the implication that they know so much and are so well-read; with some authors—Plutarch again—this may have an educational aspect too, inspiring readers to close the gap between their real, rather more deficient cultural level and the ideal one that is implied by the text.

Perhaps there can be a little of the same author–reader bonding if one notices a touch of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* in Herodotus, or of the Bible in Milton, but there cannot be much. The poems were too well-known for that, even though some readers still knew the poems more thoroughly and intimately

⁴ The attentive reader will notice several comparisons with Plutarch in this paper. This is doubtless connected to the fact that I contributed a similar discussion on the ‘point’ of Plutarchan intertextuality to a Fribourg conference in 2017, now published as Pelling (2020a). The two papers cover some of the same ground, especially in the opening paragraphs, but then diverge.

⁵ Pitcher (2009) 34–9.

than others.⁶ At the same time Herodotus could count on that familiarity, and perhaps therefore make it work harder: the task in this volume is to say more about what that work might be.

Question 2: Intertextuality—With What?

There are other complications too. What do we mean by Homer?⁷ Just the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*? Herodotus himself did not count the *Cypria* as Homeric (2.117) and had his doubts about the *Epigoni* (4.32),⁸ but the case about *Cypria* needed to be made, and not all of his readers will have agreed. There is also the question of genre: how far is any thought ‘how Homeric!’ and how far ‘how epic!’? If ‘how epic!’, does that just mean ‘how grand!’, or is it something sharper and more specific? Is it ‘ah, Homer!’? Or ‘ah, the Trojan War!’? Or more specifically ‘ah, what an Odysseus this man Themistocles is!’ Or is it narrower still, focusing only on the particular passage that is recalled, tracing similarities or differences in detail?⁹ Or is it broader, to the epic tradition rather than specifically ‘Homer’?¹⁰ Or broader still, summoning up not just the poetry or its themes but the whole world of long ago when heroes might be found and gods might personally intervene?

These questions only partly overlap with Question 1, for similar issues arise with other authors too, especially those dealing with historical events.¹¹ Does Thucydidean intertextuality with Herodotus point primarily to the writer or to the Persian Wars? Is Plutarchan intertextuality pointing more to Thucydides or to, say, Pericles as Thucydides depicted him, or to the general hard-headed way in which Thucydides interpreted historical actions, or even to canonical historiography as opposed to biography? We can do little but examine each case on its merits, and accept that usually it will be a bit of more than one of these.

⁶ Cf. Kelly (forthcoming), suggesting that some might know little more than a ‘highlights reel’; cf. Kelly (2015) and Haywood, below, p. 76.

⁷ Cf. esp. Graziosi (2002).

⁸ See Matijašić and Barker in this volume, above, p. 7 and below, pp. 175–6.

⁹ As, for instance, with the evocation of Sarpedon’s death posited by Barker, below, Chapter 6, but Barker finds that case exceptional; his broader stress falls on the evocation of an epic and Homeric tradition rather than the echoing of particular passages.

¹⁰ Kelly (2020).

¹¹ Damon (2010).

Question 3: What Counts as Intertextuality?

Take what Fraenkel called the ‘grammar of dramatic technique’¹², not just echoes of particular scenes or phrases but of whole ways of doing things; in this case we might rephrase it as a ‘grammar of narrative shape’. It is reasonable to think of Herodotus building towards an interim climax in the battle of Salamis at the end of Book 8, a sort of south summit before the final push in Book 9. It is reasonable too to think of Salamis as somehow proleptic of the end of the war and of Persia’s final defeat. These are both artistic points and ones of historical interpretation, as they indicate a chain of causation as well as a literary prefiguring. In its turn it is reasonable to think of Thucydides as doing something similar with Syracuse in Book 7, and to regard those events too as prefiguring and eventually causing the eventual defeat. Now is that Thucydidean intertextuality with Herodotus, or is it just that both are doing the same sort of thing? Is this elementary reception criticism or elementary comparative criticism or both? And if the resonance is felt as distinctively Herodotean, how much does that add to Thucydides? Is it just that Athens is the new Persia?

In the background there is also Homer, just as there so often is. When Hector dies, ‘it was as if all Troy were collapsing in flames’ (*Il.* 22.410–11), and many critics have found here a prefiguring of the fall of Troy just as the early Books, the catalogue of ships and the duel of Menelaus and Paris and so on, re-enact events that ‘feel as if’ they belong earlier. So are both Herodotus and Thucydides intertextually echoing, not a Homeric passage, but a Homeric mannerism? Is Thucydides producing a ‘window reference’ to Homer via the open window of Herodotus? Or, once again, is it all three of them just doing the same thing? It is likely to be a bit of all of these, but does it make a difference to interpretation exactly where our emphasis falls?

Question 4: Authors or Readers?

This is already treating intertextuality as a two-way thing, a matter of a dynamic between author and reader. We often talk, and I have just been writing, with the focus more on the author—what is he or she up to here? What, indeed, is their ‘point’?—but when Julia Kristeva coined the term in

¹² Fraenkel (1950) 305 on Aesch. *Agam.* 613f.: ‘for Greek tragedy there exists also something like a grammar of dramatic technique’.

1966 it was at least as much about readers.¹³ The role of the reader duly figured more in the early stages as the idea was taken up, with the insistence that what we remember from other books will always affect the way we read whatever we have open in front of us. David Lodge's Persse McGarrigle puts it very well, not without some playful intertextuality of its own with Kristeva:

‘Well, what I try to show,’ said Persse, ‘is that we can’t avoid reading Shakespeare through the lens of T. S. Eliot’s poetry. I mean, who can read *Hamlet* today without thinking of “Prufrock”? Who can hear the speeches of Ferdinand in *The Tempest* without being reminded of “The Fire Sermon” section of *The Waste Land*?’¹⁴

Now an article on ‘the snakepit of intertextuality’ has pointed to an increasing focus on reader-response as a new turn in intertextuality scholarship:¹⁵ but in many ways that marks a return to Kristeva rather than a fresh start. That focus is also adopted by many of the papers in this volume.

Still, getting rid of the author from literary criticism has always proved more difficult than it might seem; indeed, when we talk of how texts work and how one aspect of a creation may go with another, we are usually piggybacking on assumptions of how an individual human mind works and how different thoughts may comprehensibly cohere with each other. Not long after Kristeva, ‘intertextuality’ came to be used in a way not far different from old-fashioned ‘allusion’, though with more of a nod towards the role of the reader. Stephen Hinds, in his very thoughtful book (1998), had to work quite hard to reintroduce the notion of ‘allusion’ as carrying a nuance not necessarily present in ‘intertextuality’, one where the reader’s role is partly one of identifying intentionality on the part of the author—that ‘I see what you did there’ response. One question for this volume is how far that identifying of authorial intentionality matters.

¹³ E.g., Kristeva (1986) 37 (written in 1966 and first published in 1969), discussing the contribution of Bakhtin to the idea of ‘the addressee’: ‘each word (text) is an intersection of word (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read. ... The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*’.

¹⁴ Lodge (1985) 51–2.

¹⁵ Soerink (2013) 362: ‘In recent times, critics have attempted to break free from these vexed problems of intertextuality [in that case, the question of whether Statius is imitating Silius Italicus, Silius imitating Statius, or both] by embracing a post-modern, reader-response, point of view’.

**Question 5: Different Readers, Different Intertextualities:
How Much Does That Matter?**

It is all very well to talk about ‘the’ reader, real, constructed, ideal, or in-the-text: but all readers are different, and commentators on any passage have to be wary of suggesting that only one inference can be drawn. Nor do we even need to go beyond ‘the’ reader to a plurality of readers, for we are sometimes more readerly alert than others. There are times when we let a text wash over us like a hot bath, and times when the brains are much more actively in gear.

Take for instance the story of the marriage of Agariste at Herodotus 6.126–31: that strange year-long competition, announced at the Olympic games, which ends with Hippocleides dancing upside down, very possibly *sans* underpants, and the Athenian Megacles winning in his stead. It ends with the tracing of Megacles’ descendants through to that later Agariste, dreaming in the last stages of her pregnancy that she will give birth to a lion-cub—hardly, as Stephanie West has commented, a dream likely to set a nervous soon-to-be mother’s anxieties at rest¹⁶—and the child turns out to be Pericles. Some readers or listeners (or ‘the’ reader/listener in some moods) may just have thought that the initial marriage-competition seems to belong in a world of long ago; some may have remembered particular literary works, perhaps dealing with the marriage competition for Tyndareus’ daughter Helen or perhaps the one in which Pelops won the hand of Oenomaus’ daughter Hippodameia (the Olympic games context might give a prompt in that direction); some might think not of particular literary treatments but of the myths themselves. The author cannot control which of those, if any, it will be.

Did it make a difference which train of thought a particular member of the audience chose to follow, or more likely unconsciously followed? Perhaps it did, at least to a degree (cf. Hornblower and Pelling (2017) *ad loc.*). If they were thinking of Pelops, they might dwell particularly on the competition itself, and think that this one at least had a different and less bloody conclusion; if they thought of Helen, they might think more of what it all led to, and reflect that the marriage had not gone well. That in its turn might affect how they responded to that final tracing down to Pericles, and whether they might think this a good lion or a bad lion, the sort to put on a gate at Mycenae or the sort to sing about in the *Agamemnon* (717–36). So yes, different

¹⁶ West (1987) 267 n. 26.

readers can find a passage thought-provoking without always having the same thoughts provoked.

Should, then, commentators and critics be chary about tying down implications, and simply regard an intertextually rich passage as an invitation to ponder, a start of a conversation that might take indefinitely varying lines?

Question 6: Is Intertextuality Complicating or Strengthening a Simpler Reading?

What about a reader who misses the intertextuality completely? Even with Homer, that must sometimes have happened. How much does he or she miss? In this last case even this reader might wonder anyway if this is quite the best way to set up a wedding; the ambivalence of the lion figuring too has been discussed often enough without any reference to any Agariste intertextuality, though usually with reference to those other literary and artistic lions. Similarly, even if readers dozily missed the recollection of Paris's 'evil-starting ships' (*νηας ἀρχεκάκους*, *Il.* 5.62–3), they would anyway know that the ships Athens sent to Ionia were going to be 'the beginning of evils' (*ἀρχὴ κακῶν*, 5.97.5): that after all is what the text says, and it would not have said it unless the evils were going to be big ones. Still, there may be subtler complications that that culturally uninformed reader would miss: evils for whom? Just for Paris's Trojans in the *Iliad*, but for both 'Greeks and barbarians' now, with a typically Herodotean double gaze:¹⁷ are these evils, then, even more far-reaching? Should we broaden our own perspective accordingly? Yet, once again, even the Homer-alert reader might not happen to think precisely along those lines, and we must be careful not to exaggerate the gulf between an informed and less informed response.

A different sort of complication, one that amounts almost to undermining, may come especially in character-speech, when the original Homeric context may intimate that the grandiloquent speaker is getting something wrong. More on this later (Question 8).

Question 7: What Value is Added?

By now we have moved beyond that initial 'game for two' approach, a line linking author and audience, and turned the line into a triangle. The third

¹⁷ Pelling (2006) 79–80.

point is the material—the plot, the narrative, what the writer is writing about and the audience is hearing about. In what ways can intertextuality colour the events that are described? This, probably, is the most important dimension of all.

In my earlier paper on historiographic intertextuality I made two points in particular, one of immediacy and one of plausibility;¹⁸ persuasiveness, *πιθανότης*, or believability might have been better terms than plausibility. When a narrative evokes an earlier, classic account the audience puts the two together; the event in the narrative here-and-now is no longer wholly singular, even if there are also ways in which it may differ from the more distant model. As Aristotle sagely pointed out, what happened once must be possible, as otherwise it would not have happened (*Poet.* 9, 1451b17–19): so if Thucydides echoes Salamis when describing the battle in the Great Harbour at Syracuse,¹⁹ or if Plutarch or Dio echoes Salamis or Syracuse when describing Actium,²⁰ that makes the narrative more believable. These things happened once, and so there is no reason why they should not have happened again. The echoes also make the narrative more immediate, for it enables the later author to summon up an idea already there in his listeners' and readers' mental furniture, so that they can more or less consciously join the dots and 'perhaps even feel'²¹ what it must have been like: pretty grim, to say the least.

Mutatis mutandis, we can say the same about Herodotus' echoing of the fighting in the *Iliad*, and fill out their picture of how it must have been: see Fragoulaki in this volume. That need not imply that all the audience took the *Iliad* to be literally and historically true (or true enough), though some may have done: all that is necessary is that they took it as conveying some impression of what warfare was really like and had always been like. Different members of an audience would doubtless remember (say) *Iliad* 17 in differing degrees of detail, just as different people in the comic theatre might identify a piece of paratragedy in differing detail: Antiphon in one row might think 'prologue of the *Andromeda*', whereas Crito sitting behind him might only think 'that character sounds a bit tragic and overblown', but both would be using those memories to add more colouring to what would be, if not exactly black-and-white, a little less colourful if they did not. The same

¹⁸ Pelling (2013).

¹⁹ Rood (1999) 159–62.

²⁰ Pelling (1988) 283.

²¹ O'Gorman (2006) 103.

goes for the battle-scenes of Herodotus, and readers would find the narrative more convincing too. There is some research suggesting that something similar is still true in jury rooms, where juries are more likely to believe a narrative if it maps on to a pattern that they find familiar from their reading or listening or viewing, though these days it is more likely to be from TV or film than from a literary epic.²² That is an interesting parallel in another way too, as it suggests that the awareness may be subconscious: it 'feels right', whether or not the juror could put a finger on exactly where that feeling comes from.

'Pretty grim', then, they might indeed conclude—but clearly more than that. A Homeric resonance can also add momentousness and elevation: this is the new Trojan War, and will live in memory just as Homer's war did. It is the same sensibility as we see when Simonides has the Spartans march out in his Plataea elegy with echoes of Achilles;²³ or when, apparently some time around 460, the Athenian Stoa Poikile included scenes of Marathon alongside ones of Theseus and of, once again, the Trojan War.²⁴ Thucydides brashly set out to go one step further when he made the case that the Peloponnesian War was even bigger and bloodier than the Trojan War, and for that matter than the Persian War as well (1.23); Livy would make a similar claim about the Second Punic War (21.1.1).²⁵ If it is right to find an echo of *Iliad* 15.716–8, Hector firing the ships, as the Persians scramble into their ships after Marathon (6.113.2), this sort of 'elevation' is one of the effects.²⁶ Many too have found hints of the *Iliad* in Herodotus' opening chapters, and if that is right all three of these categories can be at play, immediacy, believability, and momentousness: once again things start with a woman, here Candaules' wife as earlier Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen, but in more than a routine a-woman's-place-is-in-the-wrong way: it is when it all becomes a matter of masculine assertiveness and pride that it really escalates. And it will all end in many, many tears. That, then, is a matter of

²² Dershowitz (1996); cf. Pelling (1999) 343–4.

²³ Fr. 11 W², with, e.g., Rutherford (2001) 38, 'surely the point of the Achilles paradigm is ... the fact that his war was a panhellenic effort, like the Plataea campaign, and that his exploits were immortalized in song, just as Simonides promises to immortalize the Plataiomachoi'. As Elton Barker points out, it is interesting that Achilles is pointed to, not Agamemnon, though the Peloponnesian connections might rather have suggested the latter: Agamemnon's various deficiencies in the *Iliad* might have compromised the 'elevation'.

²⁴ Paus. 1.15, with, e.g., Arafat (2013) and Arrington (2015) 201–3.

²⁵ O'Gorman (2009) 236.

²⁶ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) *ad loc.*; Fragoulaki in this volume, below, pp. 122–4.

interpretation too, structuring the way the reader looks at events and the strands that make it intelligible. It all builds our ‘cognitive framework’ for making sense of what might otherwise be just one thing after another, helping to transform a mere chronicle into a history.²⁷ We shall return to this later.

Differences though are usually more interesting than similarities. Here it is not just that Candaules’ wife becomes something of a personality as well as a sex-object, for that is already true of Homer’s Helen; she also becomes an initiator. Candaules’ wife is not prepared to play the Briseis and wait around for nineteen Books before she becomes a personality: she is a Queen, after all. She therefore becomes the first of several strong Herodotean women who have a vast impact on history: Tomyris, Atossa, Artemisia, Masistes’ wife. The world of the *Iliad* has changed; perhaps it had already changed a little by the time of the *Odyssey*, as Penelope and Arete and even Nausicaa are not bad at taking the initiative themselves. So broader reflections can be prompted by difference as much as by similarity, and we shall see more of that too when we turn to historical interpretation (Question 9).

Immediacy may have a further aspect too. If things happened once, they can happen again; if they happened twice, it is even more likely that they can happen a third time, and that may be in an audience’s lifetime. Pondering intertextuality may make readers and listeners more alert to further parallels in their own past experience, or more aware that a pattern may reassert itself even if it has not done so yet.²⁸ We are more used to thinking in such terms with Thucydides, given his explicit reflections on the further repetitions that history may have in store (1.22.4, 3.82.2). But nothing precludes their relevance to Herodotus too.

Question 8: How Does Character-Text Intertextuality Interact with the Narrative Voice?

So far then we have a triangle, author, audience, and material. It often becomes a quadrilateral when a fourth viewpoint is added, that of characters within the text, for it is not just the narratorial voice that can turn Homeric. Artabanus ends his diatribe against Mardonius with a picture of him lying dead in defeat, torn apart by dogs and birds (7.100.3): that appalling threat

²⁷ Particular thanks to Elton Barker for re-emphasising this point to me.

²⁸ O’Gorman (2009) 236–7.

must recall the proem of the *Iliad*. When Dionysius of Phocaea says that ‘now everything is on a razor’s edge, men of Ionia ...’ (6.11.1–2), he may or may not be quoting Homer, for perhaps it was already a proverb at the time of the *Iliad* and stayed that way for Dionysius and for Herodotus. But the audience can think of Homer in any case, and Dionysius can himself be sensed as ‘elevating’: it is as serious, as momentous, as that. If some of the audience remember that in *Iliad* 10 the razor’s choice was between ‘life and grim death’, better still, and here too a difference is evocative: for the Greeks now it is a fate ‘whether to be free or slaves, and runaway slaves at that’, and that may be even worse than death. A Book later the Spartan ambassador at Syracuse gives a near-quotation and near-hexameter—near but not quite in each case—when the possibility is raised of Spartans ceding their leadership to Gelon: ‘Loud would be the cry of Agamemnon, scion of Pelops’ line ...’ (7.159.1, ἦ κε μέγ’ οἰμώξειε ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων ...).²⁹ It is outrageous—so the ambassador implies—for this upstart Syracusan to think that he is in that legendary league.

In these last two cases at least, there is a mismatch with what actually materialises. Dionysius’ rhetoric is inspiring, but only for a few days. That sun is so hot, the training is so laborious, and before long the workshy Ionians are saying that ‘it is better to put up with anything rather than suffer like this, and accept the slavery that looms, whatever that may turn out to be’ (6.12.3). So much for that razor’s edge: they will now go with the slavery, please. As for all that grand Spartan talk in Syracuse, Gelon has got the right answer: it looks as if you have leaders but are short of people for them to lead. Go back home and tell them that the spring has gone out of the year (7.162.1); and that last phrase is a piece of intertextuality as well, summoning up a speech of Pericles where he spoke of Athens’ war-dead in those terms (Arist. *Rhet.* 1365a31–3, 1411a24). That is what such grandiose Greek posturing will lead to, the slaughter of the flower of their youth, epic enough, it is true, but not the sort of outcome that the ambassadors have in mind. So these character-text ‘elevations’ have a habit of falling flat, something that will recur in later narratives and events as well: Agesilaus starts off his Asian campaign with a sacrifice at Aulis, but all is spoilt when the Boeotians come up and wreck the ceremony, and anyway Agesilaus is not going to get far before he is recalled (Plut. *Ages.* 6.6–10).

²⁹ The near-but-not-quite quotation and hexameter: Hornblower (1994) 66 and Dover (1997) 106–7. On the Gelon episode more generally see Grethlein (2006), Pelling (2006) 89–92, and Matijašić and Haywood in this volume, above, pp. 9–10 and below, pp. 75–8.

And yet, and yet ... Things fall flat—for *the moment*. Agesilaus does not get far, in reality or in Plutarch; Alexander though will, two generations later, and the text reminds us of that soon enough (*Ages.* 15). In many ways the battle of Lade, the one that Dionysius is trying to train his rowers for, prefigures the later battles of the Persian Wars; but those battles go Greece's way, not Persia's, and not least because then the Greeks are more in tune with Dionysius' inspirational tone. The Spartan ambassador might be over-cocky, but Thermopylae is looming, and Sparta will indeed produce heroes on a Homeric scale. In the battle-narratives things often go badly wrong, sometimes farcically wrong. That is particularly true in the preliminaries at Plataea, where discipline on the Greek side breaks down completely. So much for all that Spartan military skill and the grandiosity of their claims. Yet for all those false starts and stumbles, there will be fighter after fighter who, in those Laconic phrases, 'becomes a good man' on the battlefield, fights 'remarkably' (*ἀξίως λόγου*), and dies a hero. That character-text elevation was not so wrong after all: it might have given a wrong idea of the distance still to be travelled before we see its vindication—itself a Homeric technique³⁰—but in the end this will indeed after all be Greece's finest, and most momentous, hour.

Question 9: How can Intertextuality Affect Historical Interpretation?

Such intertextual parallels have their intratextual counterparts, with a similar sense that events or morals are repeating themselves. Thus Xerxes' expedition seems to re-enact aspects of Darius' march into Scythia, while Solon's insights are echoed in a number of later events and other characters' musings. True, this recurrence does not always happen. Persia does not usually lose, and there are Babylon and Egypt and Ionia as well as the Massagetae and Scythia and Greece. It is a pattern of *potential* recurrence, no more, and it may also be that some aspects recur and some aspects do not.

³⁰ Schadewaldt (1938) 15, 'The poet deceives the listeners over the distance of the path in front of them'. Thus Zeus' promise at *Il.* 11.186–94 would seem to point to success for Hector immediately after Agamemnon's removal from the battlefield: 284–309 seems to be delivering on that expectation, but then Hector himself is removed, and the real *aristeia* begins only in Book 15. The long-distance preparation is itself a mark of the momentousness of what is to come.

It is arguable that these qualified patterns play an important part in historical explanation: one notices which parts of a pattern recur and which do not, and uses these as a prompt for identifying what could have made the difference. The procedure is theorised by the Hippocratics for isolating the causes of disease (*On the Nature of Man* 9; *Epidemics* 6.3.12; *On Ancient Medicine* 17–19). Historical explanation is more complicated, and the essential singularity of each event will anyway exclude exact repeatability;³¹ but something can still be done, and we can see Herodotus doing it. If the Spartans cared immensely about Athens' support in 480 and rather less in 479, something must have changed, and that will be the building of the Isthmus Wall (9.8.2); or a constant rather than a variable may offer an explanation, when one needs to invoke Corinth's inveterate hatred of Corcyra to make sense of their involvement in an apparently surprising war (3.49.1). I say a good deal more about this elsewhere.³²

With intertextuality too the most interesting aspects are often not what is recurrent but what is different: I have discussed this too elsewhere,³³ and in particular the way that differences can track a pattern of historical change. My prime test-case there was once again the battle of Thermopylae, and in particular the themes of 'wrath', *μῆνις*, and 'fame', *κλέος*, both of them very Homeric notions. At Thermopylae though, they are refracted in a new and different way, one that throws more weight on to the collective and less on the individual (see also Fragoulaki in this volume). It is now the wrath of the city as a whole that is in point, not just of the single superhero; it is now the glory and fame not just of an Achilles or a Helen but of 300 Spartans. Things have moved on.

Something similar can be said of Themistocles. He has more than a touch of the Odysseus about him: recent scholarship has made that clear.³⁴ Evidently there is still room for an Odysseus figure in the world of the *polis*, and it is just as well for Athens that there is. But how will the collective of the city cope with having men as big as this? Not too well; there are enough hints that there may be trouble ahead, for Themistocles as for Pausanias, and his future will not be one of growing peacefully old in his grateful and appreciative equivalent of Ithaca. Times have changed in other ways too. This time it is not an Athena that plants a crucially good idea in

³¹ O'Gorman (2006) 102–3.

³² Pelling (2019).

³³ Pelling (2006).

³⁴ Blösel (2001) 185–6 and (2004) 158–60; Baragwanath (2008) 317.

Themistocles' mind, it is the very human Mnesiphilus—not unlike the way that Herodotus himself no longer has a Muse to appeal to, but human eyes and ears and intelligence. So is this a new and godless world, rather as many have found in Thucydides? No, not at all: the gods *will* be seen to be active, but in a non-Homeric way, and still leaving a very great amount for the mortals to achieve by themselves.

Perhaps one could say some at least of the same about the relation of the *Aeneid* to the *Iliad*, with all the reflections that prompts on how Homeric heroism adapts to an enhanced, though not wholly new, sense of collective responsibility; or indeed of the relation already of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*, with new and more devious arts necessary in a world away from the battlefield.

Question 10: Is Intertextuality So Very Different from Other Forms of Allusiveness?

One sort of critic tends to talk about intertextuality, another about Herodotus' allusions to his contemporary world; yet similar things can be said. Plotting of historical change: yes. If Hippias warns the Corinthians that they, of all people, will have reason to rue not strangling the infant Athenian democracy at birth (5.93.1), those who had lived through the late 430s would know what he meant; they will similarly catch the understated point when Corinth lends Athens ships and Herodotus notes that 'at that time the two cities were on the friendliest terms' (6.89). When he comments how unpopular it will be to say that Athens was the saviour of Greece at 7.139.1, again everyone will know why, and see the paradox of how so many roles had changed since the time that Sparta and Athens worked in unity—fractious unity, it is true, but unity that somehow managed to pull it all off. Believability: yes. When Herodotus notes that Corinth would not have gone to war over Samos if it had not been for their inveterate hatred of Corcyra (3.49.1), those who knew what had been happening in the 430s would find it all too credible. The same goes for Athens and Aegina: could they really have hated one another as much as Herodotus' account so often implies? Those who remembered the mass expulsion of 431 (Thuc. 2.27.1) or the slaughter of 424 (Thuc. 4.57.4, noting 'the hatred that had always existed') would need no convincing. Immediacy? Yes: these things still mattered greatly, and Thucydides' Plataean debate (3.52–68) suggests how memories of 480–79 could still be a matter of life and death. Momentousness? Yes: those living through the Peloponnesian War, or for that matter the decades

beforehand when they might have heard Herodotus reciting, would need no persuasion that the fractiousness between the Greek states that is always simmering in the narrative was going to have very big consequences indeed; so would the similarities, as well as any differences, that Herodotus suggests between imperialists eastern and western. Those ‘three generations of evils’ of 6.98.2, ‘some coming to Greece from the Persians and some from themselves as they contended for the ἀρχή’ would be all too clear to those who had lived through them: ‘the’ ἀρχή, one notices, as if there is always one at least in prospect, and it is just a question of who will have it.

Historical interpretation is always a game for two, fitting a picture of the past into a framework that is already part of a reader’s or listener’s mental furniture. A large part of that mental furniture is constructed out of past narratives, whether those are drawn from literature or from life. Stories work ‘in cahoots’.³⁵

Question 11: Any Light on Homer Too?

Intertextuality can say something about both authors, not just one. At the very least, it may cast light on how an author might be read, and very often that may strike a modern reader as one-sided, even simple. As Virgil’s *Aeneid* became an Augustan classic for later authors to define themselves against, any ‘further voices’ questioning the hero or the Roman achievement could be drowned out: ‘the *Aeneid* of Vergilian scholars is very different from the *Aeneid* of Lucan specialists’.³⁶ When Dio or Appian or Plutarch added a Thucydidean patina to a passage, it could conjure up a world where politics was always a matter of hard-headed and brutal pragmatism;³⁷ there is not much hint of emotion, still less of any ‘humanitarian aspect’,³⁸ yet it is not too much of a stretch to find both in Thucydides’ Mycalessus (7.29–30). In *Ajax* Sophocles exploits Homeric hints to sketch a value-scheme of heroic individualism to which Ajax subscribes and which Odysseus qualifies; but Ajax ‘carries the implications of the heroic code to the extreme possible point, as no-one in Homer, and perhaps no one in life, ever did’.³⁹ What of

³⁵ I again develop these ideas further in Pelling (2019), esp. 55–7.

³⁶ Fowler (1994) 239 = Fowler (2000) 16. ‘Further voices’: Lyne (1987).

³⁷ Pelling (2010).

³⁸ Bosworth (1993), on the Melian Dialogue—not, admittedly, a reading with which all would agree.

³⁹ Winnington-Ingram (1980) 19.

Herodotus' intertextuality with Homer? Does it point not merely to ways that Homer could be read, but to how he could be *under*-read?

Take that example again of Thermopylae, with ideas of *μῆνις* and *κλέος* being recast in a new, more communitarian light (Question 9). It is not hard to find some less individualistic thinking in the *Iliad* too. The community matters already, and it is easy enough to find passion if one lets one's colleagues down. Achilles feels it himself: his rage at Agamemnon has led him to fail Patroclus and his own men (*Il.* 18.98–126). Nor is the tension between individual *κλέος* and the community's interests absent from Hector's dilemma in *Iliad* 22: should he stay and fight, or should he return within the walls as Priam and Hecuba plead? If Herodotus is implying a clear-cut set of 'heroic values' that have now changed, is he being over-simple about the *Iliad*, whether or not he is over-simple about Leonidas too?

Perhaps; but also perhaps not, if we prefer to see this in terms not of Herodotus defining this world against Homer, but of his appropriating a tension already there in Homer and exploring it in a world that is different but not as different as all that. Here again, similar issues come up with other authors and genres, and we could debate Sophocles' *Ajax* or Flavian 'secondary epic' in the same way. Virgil's *Aeneid* again raises similar questions: if an Augustan hero requires different virtues, is this because the values of the *Iliad* will no longer do? Or is it that the clash between the martial and the humane is already there in the *Iliad*, and the poem is still as relevant and as thought-provoking as ever?

Question 12: Is Homer Already Doing the Same?

Might the Homeric poems themselves already be doing something along the same intertextual lines? This takes us into the murky world of Neoanalysis, and there is a debate about whether 'intertextuality' is the right word to describe the gesture to an earlier version in a world where, probably, we should not be thinking of fixed texts.⁴⁰ Still, whether or not we use the word, it is not unreasonable to find the thing. Earlier I made very familiar points about the way that the catalogue of ships or the duel of Menelaus and Paris may 'feel as if' they belong at the beginning of the war or the death of Hector

⁴⁰ For the debate see, e.g., the various papers in Montanari–Rengakos–Tsagalis (2012), together with the thoughtful reflections of Burgess (2006). The opposite points of view are clearly put by Kelly (2012) and Currie (2016). I develop some of the points in this paragraph further in Pelling (2020b).

'feels as if' all Troy is falling; but it may be more than that, with an audience—certainly a seventh-century, perhaps still a fifth-century audience—mindful of other epic poems, perhaps on the same poet's lips or perhaps on others', treating precisely those themes. Much could then be summoned up and conveyed very succinctly, with an audience very well primed to 'fill in the dots'; this could also—again, a very familiar point—do something to raise a story of four days to a story of the war as a whole, bringing out the fuller significance of these four days and their 'momentousness'. And people might find a few extra resonances in 'And Zeus' will was being accomplished' (Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, *Il.* 1.7) if they recalled from the *Cypria*, or the oral tradition that surfaced in the *Cypria*, how Zeus had sought to solve the overpopulation problem by fanning up the Trojan War (*Cypr.* fr. 1)—and so on. It may even be that there is some 'intertraditionality' if it is right to think of Homer evoking 'Heracles epic', poems embodying a bygone age of even greater individualism and one in which the seriousness of human mortality is underplayed in the ease with which a father god will save his son.⁴¹ At some early stage, then, it may be that intertextuality of any sort, with any author, would have been felt as a gesture towards Homer, an intertextuality of its own within that earlier category of the 'grammar of technique': 'ah yes, it's doing that Homeric thing again'. Whether that was still the case for Herodotus I rather doubt; too much has happened in between, not least Pindar and Simonides with their own intertextual games (even if they did not have a word to describe it: I skirt carefully around that important issue). Maybe we should be content to say that the technique was yet another part of historiography's multifarious debt to grandfather Homer. But others may disagree.

No shortage, then, of questions; and later in this volume there will be no shortage of answers.⁴²

⁴¹ Barker and Christensen (2014); Tsagalis (2014a).

⁴² My thanks to the editor and to Elton Barker for perceptive comments on an earlier draft.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arafat, K. (2013) 'Marathon in Art', in C. Carey and M. Edwards, edd., *Marathon—2500 years: Proceedings of the Marathon Conference 2010* (BICS Supp. 124; London) 79–89.
- Arrington, N. (2015) *Ashes, Images, and Memories: the Presence of the War Dead in Fifth-Century Athens* (New York and Oxford).
- Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Barker, E. and J. Christensen (2014): 'Even Herakles had to Die: Homeric "Heroism", Mortality and the Epic Tradition', in Tsagalis (2014b) 249–77.
- Blösel, W. (2001) 'The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: a Mirror of Fifth-Century Athens', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 179–97.
- (2004) *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert: Studien zur Geschichte und historiographischen Konstruktion des griechischen Freiheitskampfes 480 v. Chr.* (Stuttgart).
- Bosworth, A. B. (1993) 'The Humanitarian Aspect of the Melian Dialogue', *JHS* 113: 30–44.
- Burgess, J. S. (2006) 'Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: an Examination of Homeric Motif Transference', *Oral Tradition* 21: 148–89.
- Currie, B. (2016) *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford).
- Damon, C. (2010) 'Déjà vu or déjà lu? History as Intertext', *PLLS* 14: 375–88.
- Dershowitz, A. (1996) 'Life is Not a Dramatic Narrative', in P. Brooks and P. Gewirtz, edd., *Law's Stories: Narrative and Rhetoric in the Law* (New Haven and London) 99–105.
- Dover, K. J. (1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford).
- Fowler, D. P. (1994) 'Postmodernism, Romantic Irony, and Classical Closure', in I. J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan, edd., *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden) 231–56, repr. in D. P. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford, 2000) 5–33.
- Fraenkel, E., ed. (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, 3 vols (Oxford).
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: the Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein J. (2006) 'The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: the Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153–63', *AJPh* 127: 485–509.
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertextuality: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hornblower, S. (1987) *Thucydides* (London and Baltimore).

- (1994) 'Introduction', in id., ed., *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 1–72.
- and C. Pelling, ed. (2017) *Herodotus: Histories VI* (Cambridge).
- Kelly, A. (2012) 'The Mourning of Thetis: "Allusion" and the Future in the *Iliad*', in Montanari–Rengakos–Tsagalis (2012) 221–68.
- (2015) 'Stesichorus' Homer', in P. J. Finglass and A. Kelly, ed., *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge) 21–44.
- (2020) 'With, or Without, Homer: Hearing the Background in Sappho', in P. Finglass, A. Rengakos, and B. Zimmerman, ed., *More than Homer Knew: Studies on Homer and his Ancient Commentators in Honour of Franco Montanari* (Berlin) 269–92.
- (forthcoming): 'Homer and Hipponax', in V. Cazzato and E. E. Prodi, ed., *The Limping Muse: Hipponax the Poet* (Cambridge).
- Kraus, C. S., ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne)
- Kristeva, J. (1986) 'Word, Dialogue, and the Novel', in T. Moi, ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (New York) 34–61.
- Levene, D. S. (2010) *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).
- Lodge, D. (1985) *Small World: an Academic Romance* (Harmondsworth).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1987) *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- Montanari, F., A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, ed. (2012) *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Theory* (Berlin).
- O'Gorman, E. (2006) 'Intertextuality, Time, and Historical Understanding', in A. L. Macfie, ed., *The Philosophy of History: Talks Given at the Institute of Historical Research, London, 2000–2006* (London) 102–17.
- (2009) 'Intertextuality and Historiography', in A. Feldherr, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Ancient Historians* (Cambridge) 231–42.
- Pelling, C. (1999) 'Epilogue', in Kraus (1999) 325–60.
- (2006) 'Homer and Herodotus', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, ed., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition presented to Jasper Griffin* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2010) "'Learning from that Violent Schoolmaster": Thucydidean Intertextuality and Some Greek Views of Roman Civil War', in B. W. Breed, C. Damon, and A. Rossi, ed., *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars* (New York and Oxford) 105–18.
- (2013) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- (2020a) 'Intertextuality in Plutarch: What's the Point?', in T. S. Schmidt, M. Vamvouri and R. Hirsch-Luipold, eds., *The Dynamics of Intertextuality in Plutarch* (Leiden) 11–27.

- (2020b) ‘Homer and the Question Why’, in M. Fragoulaki and C. Constantakopoulou, edd., *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece* (*Histos* Suppl. 9; Newcastle Upon Tyne) 1–35.
- , ed. (1988) *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge).
- Pitcher, L. (2009) *Writing Ancient History* (London and New York).
- Rood, T. (1999) ‘Thucydides’ Persian Wars’, in Kraus (1999) 141–68.
- Rutherford, I. (2001) ‘The New Simonides: Toward a Commentary’, in D. Boedeker and D. Sider, edd., *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (New York and Oxford) 33–54.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1938) *Iliasstudien* (Leipzig).
- Soerink, J. (2013) ‘Statius, Silius Italicus, and the Snake Pit of Intertextuality’, in G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, edd., *Flavian Epic Interactions* (Berlin) 361–77.
- Tsagalis, C. (2014a) ‘*γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δώρων*: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic’, in Tsagalis (2014b) 357–98.
- , ed. (2014b) *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic* (*Trends in Classics* 6; Berlin and Boston).
- West, S. R. (1987) ‘And it Came to Pass that Pharaoh Dreamed: Notes on Herodotus 2.139, 141’, *CQ* 27: 262–71.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1980) *Sophocles: an Interpretation* (Cambridge).

HOMERIC ALLUSIONS IN HERODOTUS' *HISTORIES**

Jan Haywood

It has been long been recognised—and no doubt even more so amongst his contemporary audience—that Herodotus' prose manner displays a profound debt to earlier epic poetry.¹ This is no more clearly expressed than in Pseudo-Longinus' famous remark that Herodotus is *homērikōtatos* ('most Homeric').² To this, readers may add the Salmacis inscription, discovered in 1998 and dated to the mid-to-late second century BCE, which declares Herodotus 'the prose Homer in the historical genre' (τὸν πρὸς τὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὅμηρον).³ It is unfortunate then, that such a striking sobriquet as this had not subsequently paved the way for a more extensive investigation into Herodotus' relationship with Homer than has historically been the case.⁴ Up until more recently, critical analyses had not proceeded very far

* Several individuals have contributed significantly to this paper, which emerges out of a section of my doctoral thesis. First and foremost, I would like to thank Ivan Matijašić for hosting such a splendid workshop on Homer and Herodotus in Newcastle upon Tyne in 2019, and for providing such encouraging and generous advice during the development of this paper. I am also grateful to Tom Harrison, Christopher Tuplin and Simon Hornblower, for reading and improving earlier versions of the material here presented, as well as audiences at the University of Nottingham, University College Dublin and the University of Leicester. Finally, I wish to thank the two anonymous readers for their helpful and incisive comments, as well as John Marincola and all the *Histos* editorial team.

¹ For the far-reaching impact that the epic tradition exerted on Greek historiography, see above all Strasburger (1972); Hornblower (1994) 7–15 and 64–7; Marincola (2007).

² [Longin.] *Subl.* 13.3. Cf. also Plutarch's remarks on Herodotus' bard-like delicacy and smoothness coupled with his lack of true knowledge (*Her. mal.* 43), a critique which transforms [Longinus'] positive appeal to Homer, instead including Homer in order to class Herodotus as one of the lying poets, Kurke (2011) 385; Kirkland (2019).

³ See principally Isager (1998).

⁴ The bibliography on Herodotus' relationship with Homer has expanded exponentially in the last few decades but see especially: de Jong (1999); Pelling (1999) 332–5; (2006); Grethlein (2006); (2010) 151–8; Baragwanath (2008) 35–54; Marincola (2006); (2007); Barker

from Dionysius of Halicarnassus' rather unsatisfying observation that Herodotus 'wished to provide variety within his text, being an emulator of Homer' (ποικίλῃν ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τὴν γραφὴν Ὀμήρου ζηλωτῆς γενόμενος, D.H. *Pomp.* 3).

This notion that Herodotus sought to lend his work variety by mimicking Homer advances a much too simplistic picture, however, as evinced by the wide number of recent studies that have addressed various questions concerning Herodotus' debt to the language and content of the Homeric corpus. Christopher Pelling, for instance, has explored how Herodotus adopts a distinctive approach to Homeric values, an approach that is clearly shaped by the cultural and political realities of fifth-century Greece.⁵ Focusing specifically on Herodotus' reading of Homer in the Helen *logos*, Irene de Jong has illustrated the way in which Herodotus' account reinforces the characteristic elements of his own research procedure (*akoē*, *opsis*, and *gnōmē*).⁶ Meanwhile, other scholars have centred their investigations on certain Homeric allusions and parallels in Herodotus' work.⁷ For example, Jonas Grethlein has demonstrated the tendency of various individuals or communities to cite Homeric *exempla* in order to legitimise present actions; he shows then how this is contrasted with Herodotus' much more critical appeals to such a mode of memory, 'namely to highlight issues of his own time'.⁸ The result of analyses such as these has been a far more nuanced appreciation of Herodotus' approach to, and use of, the Homeric poems.⁹

This chapter looks to build on this greater understanding of Herodotus' relationship with Homer by analysing a range of passages in the *Histories* that offer an explicit or implicit allusion to the Homeric poems or to the Homeric poet himself. I will argue that although Herodotus establishes clear distinctions between his work and that of his epic predecessor, he nonetheless intentionally sets out to demonstrate his impressive knowledge of Homer's texts through a series of layered engagements, which range from the

(2009) 138–43; Sammons (2012); Rutherford (2012); Currie (2020); (2021); Rozokoki (2021); and the contributions by Saïd, de Jong and de Bakker in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012). For earlier treatments, see especially Huber (1965), Strasburger (1972).

⁵ Pelling (2006); cf. Pelling (2019) 202–4 and 213.

⁶ de Jong (2012).

⁷ E.g., Jacoby (1913) 502–4; Hornblower (1994) 65–9; Boedeker (2002) 100–9; Grethlein (2006); Saïd (2012).

⁸ Grethlein (2010) 158–87 (quotation at 184).

⁹ As Boedeker (2002) 109 puts it: 'it is no exaggeration ... to say that without Homeric epic's sustained narrative of great deeds behind it, the *Histories* would not exist at all'.

transparent quotation by the narrator himself to the rather more esoteric evocation of a Homeric passage, phrase or word, given in direct speech by another character. So, alongside certain (well explored) passages that recall the Homeric poems, such as the opening chapters of the *Histories*,¹⁰ or Herodotus' excursus on the vast size of the Persian army (7.60–99), the latter clearly inspired by the Iliadic 'Catalogue of Ships',¹¹ readers can perceive specific verbal allusions to Homer across the *Histories*, some no doubt more than others evoking a particular Homeric passage for Herodotus' contemporary (and later) audiences. For instance, when the Egyptian king Psammenitus is reduced to tears by the sight of a companion's spectacular fall into destitution 'on the threshold of old age' (*ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ*, 3.14.10), many amongst Herodotus' readers cannot fail to recall Priam's speech in the *Iliad*, when he laments his many losses 'on the threshold of old age' (*ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ*, 22.60).¹² Although 'on the threshold of old age' may have already become a proverbial formula, perhaps even by the time of Homer, the overlap between Psammenitus' and Priam's stories—each losing a son and having a daughter taken into slavery (cf. *Il.* 22.62)—undoubtedly sharpens and enriches this intertext.¹³ But Homeric engagements in the *Histories* are not limited to the evocation of particular words or phrases from the Homeric corpus, and I will begin this examination of Herodotus' Homeric allusions by turning to the systematic critique in Book 2 of Homer's presentation of Helen at Troy. In the discussion that follows, therefore, I will suggest that Homeric allusions in the *Histories* are used both to reflect on the limitations of the epic poet's ability to convey the past accurately, thus serving as a foil for Herodotus' own innovative prose work, but also to draw on an authoritative *textual* source in order to shed light on certain similarities and differences between conflict in the heroic age and the more recent past.

¹⁰ For the *Iliad*, see Pelling (2019) 22–3 and Matijašić, above, pp. 9–14; for the *Odyssey*, see Nagy (1990) 231–3; Moles (1993) 92–8; Pelling (1999) 332–3; Harrison (2003) 242; Marincola (2006) 14; (2007) 13–5; Chiasson (2012) 123.

¹¹ *Il.* 2.484–785; see, e.g., Thomas (2000) 238–9 and Nicolai–Vannicelli (2019).

¹² How–Wells (1923) ad loc.; Huber (1965) 33; Pelling (2006) 88 with n. 35; (2013) 7–8; (with cautions) Kazanskaya (2014) 172–3; Matijašić, above, p. 23.

¹³ As already argued by Pelling (2006) 88. On Homeric intertexts in Herodotus, see especially Pelling (2006); (2013) 7–13; Kazanskaya (2014); cf. the contributions by Pelling, Barker, and Tuplin in this volume.

1. Arbitrating Traditions

Andrew Ford has argued that, in contrast to his somewhat gnomic appreciation of lyric poetry, Herodotus displays a real expertise in epic poetry, and that this knowledge derives from a close and studious analysis of the epic texts.¹⁴ It is certainly the case that in one of the best known passages from the second book of his *Histories* (2.112–20),¹⁵ in which Herodotus adduces competing Trojan War traditions, audiences can discern his appreciation—and use of—Homer as a fixed (and presumably written?) text.¹⁶ For it is here that Herodotus most clearly illustrates his belief that, regardless of its poetic nature, Homer’s poetry offers a narrative based on real, historical events.¹⁷ This section of the Egyptian *logos* has often been interpreted as an extraordinary section of the *Histories*, particularly since Herodotus attempts to disprove the commonly held belief, which is reaffirmed by a surface reading of Homer’s poetry, that the ‘real’ Helen was held captive in Troy.¹⁸

Herodotus begins his account by stating that the Egyptian priests, those knowledgeable authorities whom he ostensibly consults for much of his Egyptian *logos*,¹⁹ told him about the events concerning Helen (2.113.1; cf.

¹⁴ Ford (2002) 148.

¹⁵ On this passage, see useful remarks in V. Hunter (1982) 52–65; Fehling (1989) 59–65; Vandiver (1991) 124–32; West (2002) 31–9; Grethlein (2010) 151–8; Sammons (2012); de Jong (2012); de Bakker (2012); Haywood–Mac Sweeney (2018) 117–25; Currie (2020); Rozokoki (2021).

¹⁶ Lloyd (1975) 121–3 examines the role that the Homeric tradition plays in Herodotus’ *Aigyptios logos*.

¹⁷ On Herodotus’ firm belief in the Trojan War, partially affirmed by his Egyptian sources, see variously V. Hunter (1982) 53–4; Vandiver (1991) 127; Stadter (2004) 33–8; Grethlein (2010) 153; Saïd (2012).

¹⁸ Of course, the sixth-century lyric poet Stesichorus had already suggested that the ‘real’ Helen was never at Troy; cf. further discussion below. For the connections between Herodotus’ and the lyric poets’ ambiguous relationship with Homer, see Donelli (2016) 12–18.

¹⁹ Fehling (1989) 59–65 argues that here, as elsewhere, Herodotus has fabricated the entire story, in part because the Egyptians could not possibly have invented the story of Helen’s stay in their country. Cf. West (2002) 36: ‘it is much too readily assumed that Egyptians—and other non-Greeks—were likely to interest themselves in Hellenic legend ... the Egyptians had no reason to regard [the Greeks] as culturally or intellectually superior’. Regardless of this considerable scepticism, Lloyd (1976–88) I.89–113 provides a valuable discussion on those passages in which Herodotus purportedly derives his information from the priests, including many useful insights into the long-standing cultural interaction between Greeks and Egyptians, which almost certainly would then have influenced the

2.118.1–120.1).²⁰ They inform him that Paris had intended to travel back with Helen to his native Troy, but after being driven off course by violent winds the couple landed in Egypt, where Paris would eventually be caught and arrested, before being taken to King Proteus in Memphis. Herodotus writes that while Paris was guilty of breaking the laws of hospitality,²¹ he was treated with the highest respect by Proteus; nonetheless, he was ultimately ordered to leave Egypt, while Helen remained in the safe care of the king (2.115.4–6).

Far from considering Homer ignorant of Helen's true location, Herodotus writes: 'it appears to me that Homer knew this account' (δοκέει δέ μοι καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν λόγον τοῦτον πυθέσθαι),²² but did not use it, since he 'did not consider it to be *suitable* for an epic poem such as the one he used' (ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιίην εὐπρεπῆς ἦν).²³ In support of this, he refers directly to a passage in the *Iliad* in which Hecabe ascends to her chamber:

ἔνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν
Σιδονίων, τὰς αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής
ἤγαγε Σιδονίηθεν, ἐπιπλὼς εὐρέα πόντον,
τὴν ὁδὸν ἦν Ἑλένην περ ἀνήγαγεν εὐπατέρειαν.

And there were many-coloured robes, the products of
Sidonian women, whom God-like Alexander himself
Led from Sidon, sailing over the broad sea,
On that journey in which he brought the noble-born Helen.²⁴

priests' accounts of, for example, Egyptian history; cf. Moyer (2002); (2011) 42–3. Of course, this is not to say that we should therefore too readily assume that Herodotus' account is a verbatim report based on the Egyptian priests' knowledge; de Jong (2012) shows the considerable extent to which Herodotus' hand is at work in this narrative, demonstrating the prevalence here of 'the story pattern of the enquiring king, the motif of incredulity, and the principle of divine retribution' (141)—all characteristically Herodotean themes.

²⁰ Cf. Dio Chrys. 11.37–41.

²¹ Cf. *Il.* 3.351–4. For the *xenia* concept in Herodotus' Proteus passage as an allusion to the Homeric epic, see Vandiver (2012) 146–55; for a broader investigation into the allusive relationship between the Herodotean and Homeric Proteus, see de Bakker (2012) 118–22.

²² Greek passages from Herodotus are taken from Nigel Wilson's OCT edition of the *Histories*; all translations are my own.

²³ On which criteria Herodotus might have deemed suitable for epic poetry, see further Ford (2002) 150; Pallantza (2005) 154; Grethlein (2010) 155.

²⁴ 2.116.3 = *Il.* 6.289–92. In his recent OCT, Nigel Wilson retains §§4–5 of this chapter (though, following Powell (1935) 76, accepts that these lines could be an awkward

So it is Paris' connection with the Syria-dwelling Sidonian women that leads Herodotus to surmise that Homer knew of his wanderings, concluding that 'these verses' (τοῖσι ἔπεσι) show Homer knew perfectly well of Paris' diverted trip to Egypt, 'for Syria borders upon Egypt, and the Phoenicians, who constitute Sidon, dwell in Syria' (ὁμοῦρέει γὰρ ἡ Συρία Αἰγύπτω, οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες, τῶν ἐστὶ ἡ Σιδών, ἐν τῇ Συρίῃ οἰκέουσι, 2.116.6). The narrator hardly regards these Homeric lines as being recondite; there is no suggestion of any difficulty attached to his acquisition of this highly specific citation. (Indeed, Herodotus cites Homer again, this time *Odyssey* 4, to support his theory that the horns in an animal's head grow more quickly in hot countries than in cold ones, 4.29.²⁵) And strikingly, as I will demonstrate further below, Herodotus deploys these Homeric lines as an effective proof for his own idiosyncratic account of Helen's involvement in the Trojan War.

After positing that Homer was in fact aware of the true version of events related by the Egyptian priests, Herodotus then halts the narrative to show that Homer cannot be the author of the *Cypria*: 'These verses and this passage most acutely show that the *Cypria* is not the work of Homer but of someone else' (κατὰ ταῦτα δὲ τὰ ἔπεα καὶ τόδε τὸ χωρίον οὐκ ἦκιστα ἀλλὰ μάλιστα δηλοῖ ὅτι οὐκ Ὀμήρου τὰ Κύπρια ἔπεα ἐστὶ ἀλλ' ἄλλου τινός, 2.117). This, he argues, is precisely because the *Cypria* relates that Paris and Helen reached Troy within three days with a fair wind and smooth sea,²⁶ whereas

amendment by Herodotus, not fully worked into his text), often regarded as a later interpolation, since §6 appears to refer exclusively to the Iliadic quotation in §3. In the disputed §§4–5, Herodotus also quotes two passages from the *Odyssey* (4.227–30, 35–1), which further support his argument that Homer knew of Helen's true whereabouts. Ultimately, it does not matter for the purposes of the argument presented here whether these additional quotations from the *Odyssey* are authentically Herodotean, since the quotation from the *Iliad* in §3 is beyond dispute. I am persuaded, however, by the view of Sammons (2012) 57 n. 12, who argues that 'the very irrelevance of the *Odyssey* passages argues against interpolation, for an interpolator seeking to buttress the historian's argument could hardly have introduced a less helpful addition'. For the authenticity of these quotations from the *Odyssey*, see now Currie (2021) 11–13, who argues that 'the entirety of chapters 116–17 can be regarded as genuine' (quotation at page 13).

²⁵ Elsewhere in Book 4, note also the reference to the Λωτοφάγοι at 4.177–8, 183, a tribe who first appear in Homer (*Od.* 9.83–97). Herodotus even writes of one Libyan tribe, the Μάξυες: 'These people claim to be descended from the men of Troy' (φασὶ δὲ οὗτοι εἶναι τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀνδρῶν, 4.191.1); cf. Hecataeus' reference to the Nomadic Μάξυες (*FCrHist* 1 F 334), for which see Corcella (2007) ad 4.191.1.

²⁶ Lloyd (1976–88) II.51 notes that Herodotus' testimony contradicts later accounts on the *Cypria*, and tentatively suggests that Herodotus may have confused this with another of

the *Iliad* shows that Paris wandered far out of his way. Herodotus ultimately draws his negative conclusions regarding the authorship of the *Cypria* from his analysis of the Homeric verses cited in the preceding chapter. In this way, he not only accentuates his narratorial interest in the epic canon (more on this below), but he also shows how the close examination of a fixed text can prove an effective tool in addressing a controversial issue: the Homeric Question. The very discrepancy between the message conveyed about Helen by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* on the one hand, and the *Cypria* on the other, is ultimately demonstrable proof for Herodotus, who clearly expects consistency from Homer,²⁷ that the *Cypria* is the work of some other poet.²⁸

Some scholars have deduced from this brief excursus on Homer that Herodotus displays a Thucydidean distrust of poets.²⁹ But such a conclusion hardly seems tenable given his overall treatment of Homer and epic poetry here or elsewhere in the *Histories*. Herodotus does not aim to challenge the historical foundations of the events recorded in Homer's poems; rather, he implies that there are rules and limits imposed upon the epic genre which limit its capacity to provide an exact representation of the past in comparison to his own genre.³⁰ He directs his criticism of poetry towards specific details and not general ones; his account does not suggest that Homer must be

the Cyclic poems. Herodotus similarly questions the true authorship of the *Epigoni* (4.32): see further below.

²⁷ Vandiver (1991) 127 n. 3. Cf. Graziosi (2002) 194 who argues that scholars underappreciate how Herodotus expects consistency in Homer in a way that he would not, for example, of contemporary dramatists.

²⁸ Currie (2021) 66 argues that this passage can be taken to suggest that the authorship of the *Cypria* was more widely contested when Herodotus was writing.

²⁹ Legrand (1936) 145 n. 1: ('Hérodote n'a pas plus de confiance dans les dires des poètes en général que Thucydide (1.9–10) dans les dires d'Homère'); cf. Lateiner (1989) 99; Austin (1994) 123: 'Homer is being relegated to no more than a poet who would sacrifice historical truth to romantic fancy'. Herodotus is by no means the first to offer a critique of Homer: cf. already Pind. *Nem.* 7.20–3, Heracl. DK 22 B 42; see further Marincola (1997) 219.

³⁰ Cf. Flory (1987) 65. As Sammons (2012) 57 n. 14 notes, Herodotus' use of *πυθέσθαι* here and in other passages concerning the methods of the poet, implies that Herodotus believed that the poet learnt through inquiry. Cf. also Graziosi (2002) 116–17; Grethlein (2010) 156; V. Hunter (1982) 54: 'Herodotus pictures Homer as working rather like himself gaining knowledge through enquiry ... and at times choosing among variant versions'. I am not, however, entirely convinced by de Jong (2012) 133 n. 24: '[Herodotus is] enlisting him as much as possible in the historiographical camp', as this seems to be going a step beyond what is undoubtedly a clear distinction that Herodotus makes between the genres that he and Homer are working in. Cf., however, [Plut.] *Vit. Hom.* 74–90, which credits Homer as the inventor of the *ἱστορικὸς λόγος*!

regarded with less respect or confidence, or even that Homer's poetry conveys falsehoods, but rather that his own innovative work, which is built on inquiry, is one that gives readers a lucid and critical understanding of the past.³¹ As Ligota has observed, Herodotus' motivation here 'is to show not so much that Homer's version is not true, as that it is out of place in a rationalist historical discourse'.³² It is revealing that Herodotus places the greatest trust in his Egyptian informants, precisely because they had conducted the same kind of *historiē* that he repeatedly appeals to, relying as they do on eyewitness accounts.³³ For when he returns to his description of the priests' account, Herodotus notes that they said they 'inquired and knew [much] from Menelaus himself' (*ἱστορίησι φάμενοι εἰδέναι παρ' αὐτοῦ Μενέλεω*, 2.118.1).³⁴ And again, at the end of the priests' description of Menelaus' subsequent impious behaviour in Egypt, sacrificing two local children, he reiterates that 'the priests said that they had learnt of some of these things by inquiry, and that they repeated with knowledge and accuracy those things which happened in their own country' (*τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν ἱστορίησι ἔφασαν ἐπίστασθαι, τὰ δὲ παρ' ἑωυτοῖσι γενόμενα ἀτρεκέως ἐπιστάμενοι λέγειν*, 2.119.3). Herodotus thus presents his own inquiry as being derived from a series of inquiries that were informed by eyewitness accounts.³⁵

Herodotus' focus on inquiry in these chapters interestingly pre-empts in a number of respects the methods of the modern historian, whose research in part relies on accessing original documents.³⁶ His attitude here cannot

³¹ Marincola (1997) 225–6. Thucydides also questions the subject matter of Homer's work, criticising the historical accuracy of his work (1.9.3, 10.1, 10.3–5, 11.1–2); cf. Moles (1993) 100. On Thucydides' relationship with Homer, see Hornblower (1994) 64–5, 67–9.

³² Ligota (1982) 11.

³³ So V. Hunter (1982) 56–61; Fornara (1971) 19–20; Bakker (2002) 16; de Jong (2012) 128. de Bakker (2012) 122–6 further explores the similarity between the research methods of Proteus and Herodotus in this passage, and demonstrates the persuasive power this elicits for the Herodotean enquirer. For Herodotean *historiē* and other events in the heroic age, see Munson (2012) 210.

³⁴ Austin (1994) 120 n. 4 speculates that when Herodotus asked the priests whether the Greek version of events was just a 'foolish account' (*μάταιον λόγον*, 2.118.1), we may well be detecting an oblique acknowledgment of Stesichorus (*PMG* 257). For similar uses of *ἱστορίη* in the sense of oral enquiry in Book 2, see Lloyd (1975) 88–9 (though he neglects 2.118.1).

³⁵ Cf. de Bakker (2012) 122.

³⁶ Thus Sammons (2012) 64: 'Herodotus' use of *hyponoiai* in combination with the resources of historical inquiry ... with an eye to discovering a verifiable truth rather than

simply be interpreted as reflecting a straightforward preference towards his oral informants, even though it is unequivocally clear that his aim is to show that the priests' account of Helen is correct.³⁷ In fact, this passage shows him working with numerous types of sources of information, attempting to discern some sense of harmony across all of them. Although Homer records a different version of events—a choice that, according to Herodotus, in no small way reflects the constraints of his chosen genre, his central assertion is that a close reading of the *Iliad* nonetheless reveals that Homer was in fact aware of the same tradition reported to Herodotus by the Egyptian priests.³⁸ In the Helen *logos* then, Herodotus operates in much the same way that Stephen Halliwell has proposed for Gorgias in his *Encomium*, not presenting himself 'as the exponent of a rationalizing repudiation of myth but as its reinterpreter'.³⁹ The point conveyed by Herodotus is that the myth must be re-interpreted in light of conflicting evidence in order for it to gain credence in his *Histories*.

Of course, the origins of Herodotus' sophisticated re-reading of Homer's knowledge concerning Helen's whereabouts during the war can be traced back to the archaic period, notably in the so-called 'palinode' (or 'palinodes') of the early sixth-century lyric poet Stesichorus.⁴⁰ Although very little of Stesichorus' poetry has survived, and we rely on later references by authors such as Plato and Isocrates to determine what his 'palinode' (literally a 'retraction') might have looked like, it is clear that Stesichorus offered a radical revisionist account of Helen's actions during the Trojan War. For he appears to have been the first to challenge fundamentally the Homeric

corroborating an imagined one, clearly looks forward to a tradition in the study of literary monuments that is alive and well today'.

³⁷ Herodotus reflects elsewhere on the bookish culture of the Egyptians: they are considered the most *logioi* of all nations, keeping records of the past (2.77.1; cf. Pl. *Tim.* 23.4); some Egyptian priests recite to Herodotus a written list of 330 consecutive monarchs (2.100.1); cf. 2.82.2: the Egyptians keep a written record of omens and unusual phenomena in anticipation of a similar event in the future. On the Egyptian literary tradition in Herodotus' age, see Lloyd (1975) 104–11.

³⁸ Sammons (2012) 57–64 argues that Herodotus aims to show that Homer not only knew the true version of events, but also intended to reveal this through a series of cryptic hints. For Sammons, Herodotus interprets Homer by way of *hyponoia* or 'hidden-meanings', a device used amongst ancient critics; cf. Graziosi (2002) 116–18.

³⁹ Halliwell (2011) 271.

⁴⁰ See Davies–Finglass (2014) 121–6, 299–343 for text and analysis (with commentary) respectively; cf. Allan (2008) 18–22. Davies–Finglass (2014) 308–17 weigh up the evidence for more than one 'palinode'; cf. Kelly (2007) 15–9.

account of Helen by replacing the real Helen at Troy with an *eidōlon* or phantom (Pl. *Resp.* 9.586c).⁴¹ In a separate fragment, also preserved by Plato, Stesichorus states firmly that ‘This story is not true, You did not embark the well-decked ships, You did not arrive at the citadel of Troy’ (οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, | οὐδ’ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσέλμοις, | οὐδ’ ἴκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας’, Pl. *Phdr.* 243a). Moreover, according to another anonymous fragment, Stesichorus placed Helen’s *eidōlon* at Troy, arguing like Herodotus that the ‘real’ Helen resided with Proteus (fr. 90.14–5).⁴² Similarly to Herodotus’ later account then, Stesichorus’ challenge to Homer centres around the figure of Helen, who is no more firmly based at Troy than she is in the *Histories*; in both works, Helen is in fact a resident at the court of king Proteus in Egypt.⁴³

As much as these similarities might tempt one to argue for a Stesichorean model underlying Herodotus’ account, it is important to acknowledge that no such *eidōlon* features in his Helen *logos*, which is even more radical than the narrative of the lyric poet in its insistence that no manifestation of Helen, whether real or imagined, could be found at Troy.⁴⁴ What is more, almost nothing is known of the “palinode” other than these preliminary observations,⁴⁵ and it is unlikely that many other features of the poem’s narrative, beyond its commentary on Helen’s location, substantively shaped the Herodotean narrative. For, as I have argued, Herodotus’ *logos* is highly idiosyncratic in its repeated emphasis on the motif of inquiry and in its projection of a self-conscious narrator who weighs up rival, overlapping yet conflicting traditions.⁴⁶

⁴¹ For the presence of phantoms elsewhere in epic literature, see Davies–Finglass (2014) 305–6. One testimonium suggests that Hesiod introduced the motif of Helen as *eidōlon*, fr. 358 M–W; for a thorough critique, see Davies–Finglass (2014) 302–3.

⁴² Cf. Davies–Finglass (2014) *ad* 90.15.

⁴³ The other major (surviving) literary work to deny that Helen ever went to Troy is, of course, Euripides’ *Helen*, first performed in 412 BCE; see Allan (2008). This widespread interest in Helen during the latter half of the fifth century can also be extended to include the Gorgianic *Encomium of Helen*, a work that possibly predates Herodotus and sets out to rebuke the ‘univocal and unanimous’ (poetic) interpretations of Helen’s life (*Hel.* 9).

⁴⁴ As Currie (2020) 153–4 points out, the Stesichorean account of the phantom Helen is incompatible with Herodotus’ account; this might well explain, therefore, Herodotus’ notable silence regarding Stesichorus’ version.

⁴⁵ Kelly (2007) 20–1.

⁴⁶ See also Haywood–Mac Sweeney (2018) 120–3. For the contrast between the Helen of Homer with the Helen of Stesichorus and Herodotus, see Austin (1994) 127–36.

What emerges most pointedly from the extant Stesichorean fragments, therefore, is the difficulty that readers face in charting the level (if any) of Stesichorus' influence on Herodotus. The impact of Homer in 2.112–20 is inarguable, and I have argued above that Herodotus artfully shapes specific lines taken from the *Iliad* to support his central thesis that Helen lived in Egypt, not Troy. In contrast, while it is possible to recognise some clear affinities between the Herodotean and Stesichorean accounts on Helen, it remains impossible to determine the level of narratorial interaction with the 'palinode' in the *Histories*, since so little of Stesichorus' poetry has survived and Herodotus makes no explicit reference in this account or elsewhere to the 'palinode' (or even to Stesichorus himself).⁴⁷ The Stesichorean account nonetheless forms an important locus in the elaborate, intertextual web of mythological traditions regarding Helen that Herodotus had inherited;⁴⁸ so just as his composite account unambiguously foregrounds a diverse set of intellectual affiliations and relationships, it also obscures, marginalises, and even erases other likely or potential connections. From this point of view, the precise nature of Stesichorus' influence can remain only provisional, but his elusive 'palinode' surfaces as another one of those textual traditions that Herodotus might well have shaped his account around and/or alluded to, even though such a textual interaction goes entirely unsignalled in his work.⁴⁹

In his quasi-scholastic deconstruction of Homer's famous text, then, and through his engagement with a well-established tradition that challenged the Homeric version of Helen's location during the Trojan War, I propose that Herodotus is chiefly concerned not with denouncing Homer as a liar, but rather with displaying his own critical acumen as an inquirer interested in the value that different kinds of literature bring to historiographical

⁴⁷ Allan (2008) 23 argues that Homer is the chief target in Herodotus' account. While I agree that the epic poet comes to the forefront in this narrative, readers should remain open to other, potentially significant allusions to those texts that have since become lost, such as Stesichorus' 'palinode'; cf. E. L. Bowie (2018) 56.

⁴⁸ See further Allan (2008) 10–28; Blondell (2013). Given the lack of substantial evidence concerning the content of Stesichorus' account of Helen, however, it is difficult to sustain West's view that Herodotus' account is 'quite plainly a version of Stesichorus' (West (2004) 89); cf. (more cautiously put) Blondell (2013) 154. For other critical readings of Homer's account on Helen in early lyric poetry, see Donelli (2016) 14–15.

⁴⁹ Note also Diels (1887) 441–4, followed by Lloyd (1976–88) II.47, who proposes Hecataeus as another likely source for Herodotus in this *logos* (based on Hecataeus' reference to Menelaus' journey in *FGrHist* 1 FF 307–8).

research.⁵⁰ Herodotus' use of Homer as text looks to underline the superiority of history-writing, which, through critical engagement with others' *logoi*, is best equipped to reveal the realities of the past.⁵¹ The *logos* highlights Herodotus' wider belief that, as Stephanie West puts it, where non-poetic sources are lacking, 'it might be possible to strip off fabulous and fictional accretions and expose a sound historical core'.⁵²

Before leaving this passage, I would like to consider one further point, which sheds additional light on Herodotus' relationship with Homer here. Irene de Jong has well demonstrated the conspicuousness of Herodotus' own fingerprint throughout this passage, despite the various appeals to the priestly authorities from whom Herodotus purportedly derived his information.⁵³ This is no clearer than in the concluding chapter, where Herodotus argues from probability that (2.120.2)

οὐ γὰρ δὴ οὕτω γε φρενοβλαβῆς ἦν ὁ Πρίαμος οὐδὲ οἱ ἄλλοι <οἱ>
προσῆκοντες αὐτῷ, ὥστε τοῖσι σφετέροισι σώμασι καὶ τοῖσι τέκνοισι καὶ
τῇ πόλι κινδυνεύειν ἐβούλοντο, ὅκως Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένη συνοικέη.

⁵⁰ Cf. the rather more dogmatic formulation proffered by Ford (2002) 152: 'in his historicising approach, *Herodotus regards epics fundamentally as texts* [my italics], valuable for their antiquity but to be critically and closely collated with other traditions and other texts'. Though it is indisputable that Herodotus treats the Homeric poems at various points as texts, it is far less clear as to whether the same can be said for the epic tradition *in toto*.

⁵¹ Similarly, Brown (1962) 262; Marincola (1997) 226; Asheri (2007a) 31.

⁵² West (2002) 47; cf. Munson (2012) 197, although I am not persuaded that Herodotus displays 'more confiden[ce]' than Thucydides in recovering events from the heroic age; Herodotus' unwillingness at 1.5.3 to validate the stories told by Persians and Phoenicians paves the way for his account, which looks to the much more recent past. The notion that poets embellished their accounts, or veered away from the truth, is of course prevalent in various authors predating Herodotus, see, e.g., Hes. *Theog.* 27–8: 'we know how to tell many lies that appear to be like true things, but we know, when we are willing, to tell the truth' (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, | ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι); Solon (F 29 *IEG*²): 'many poets lie' (πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἄιδοί); Pind. *Ol.* 1.28–30: 'In a way the speech of mortals also [goes] beyond the true word, and tales, mixed up with multi-faceted lies, deceive' (καὶ πού τι καὶ βροτῶν | φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον | δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι). For further discussion on the vast topic of 'truth' and the poets, see E. L. Bowie (1993) 11–20; Pratt (1993) 106–13; Halliwell (2011) 13–24, with further bibliography at 13 n. 26.

⁵³ de Jong (2012).

Surely Priam, or those others closest to him, were not so deranged that they would wish to endanger their own lives and their children and their city, just so that Alexander could live with Helen.⁵⁴

A little further on, by way of a final flourish, he asserts (2.120.5):

ὥς μὲν ἐγὼ γνώμην ἀποφαίνομαι, τοῦ δαιμονίου παρασκευάζοντος ὄκως πανωλεθρίῃ ἀπολόμενοι καταφανὲς τοῦτο τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι ποιήσωσι, ὥς τῶν μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων μεγάλαι εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ τιμωρίαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν.

Thus I declare my opinion, that the god prepared things for them [the Trojans], so that in complete destruction, they should make clear to all of humanity that great injustices meet great retribution from the gods.⁵⁵

In his concluding remarks, Herodotus incorporates the idea of divine retribution—a motif that pervades his work—into his own explanation of the Trojan War.⁵⁶ In doing so, he refracts the Homeric version of the war, reimagining the gods' actions as being based on a set of ethical values.⁵⁷ This further helps to make the Trojan War a precursor to the more recent Greek–Persian Wars, which, as narrated by Herodotus, were at least partly the result of the *hybris* of Xerxes.⁵⁸ Such a re-interpretation of the gods' involvement in the Trojan War betrays not only Herodotus' refusal banally to regurgitate any accepted reading of Homer, but also implies a more discursive approach to his epic predecessor, to such a degree that he opens

⁵⁴ Cf. 1.4.3: 'And the people of Asia, according to the Persians, when their women were seized by force, had made it a matter of no account' (*σφέας μὲν δὴ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας λέγουσι Πέρσαι ἀρπαζομένων τῶν γυναικῶν λόγον οὐδένα ποιήσασθαι*). On the insupportable grounds for the '*cherchez-la-femme* motif' as an adequate historical explanation for Herodotus (or for Homer), see Węcowski (2004) 152–3.

⁵⁵ For the final clause and the focus on divine punishment as a response to criminal or profane acts, cf. the similar sentiments expressed at 4.205; 6.84.3, 91, 139.1; 7.134–7; 8.129.3. In this context, I find the following statement of Fowler (2011) 61 surprising: [amongst Herodotus' many achievements is] 'the manoeuvre [he] adopted in order to discuss heroic legends such as that of Helen—I mean the *elimination of supernatural involvement* [my italics]'; for a more precise formulation, see Austin (1994) 135; Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012a) 18.

⁵⁶ See, i.a., Harrison (2000) 102–21; Munson (2001) 183–94.

⁵⁷ Similarly, the chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (60–2) assert that Zeus Xenios necessitated the fall of Troy after Alexander's theft of Helen.

⁵⁸ Cf. de Jong (2012) 140–1.

up new possibilities (obliquely related by Homer) to explain the reasons behind the Greek and Trojan hostilities at Troy.

2. Homer the Poet

Herodotus' extended discussion of Helen's whereabouts is not, of course, the only passage to refer to Homer in the *Histories*. Elsewhere in Book 2, Herodotus engages in the difficult question of dating when Homer was active (2.53). In this passage, Herodotus is principally concerned with showing that the Greeks had only recently acquired any knowledge of the gods (2.53.2):

Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὀμηρον ἠλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μεν
πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι. οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες
θεογονίην Ἑλλησι καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμὰς τε
καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἶδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες.

For Hesiod and Homer, as it seems to me, lived no more than four hundred years ago; and it is these [two poets] who informed the Greeks of the gods' genesis and gave the gods their titles and divided up their honours and specific skills and indicated their forms.⁵⁹

Herodotus then tackles what is clearly a controversial issue, namely, the precise order of the poets, and he brusquely asserts his belief that all of the other poets said to pre-date Homer or Hesiod came later (οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γενέσθαι ὕστερον, ἔμοιγε δοκέειν, ἐγένοντο, 2.53.3).⁶⁰ As is characteristic of much of the *Histories*,⁶¹ the narrator

⁵⁹ Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 112. Modern scholarship largely conforms with Herodotus' dating of Homer to the eighth century: Lloyd (2007) ad 2.53.1. Note Herodotus' interest in the Greek gods' names earlier at 2.50.1–3, 52.1–3; cf. Gould (1994) 103–4 on the names of Greek and non-Greek divinities in the *Histories* more broadly.

⁶⁰ This is a clear case of open polemic against other writers who place Orpheus (e.g., Damastes (*FGrHist* 5 F 1) and Musaeus (e.g., Gorgias (DK 82 B 2)) before Homer and Hesiod; further references in Lloyd (1976–88) I.247–8, 251. Cf. also Burkert (1990) 26, who argues that the line 'but from where each of the gods had their birth, or whether all of them had always existed, and of what form they are' (ἔνθεν δὲ ἐγένετο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε αἰεὶ ἦσαν πάντες, ὁκοῖοί τε τινες τὰ εἶδεα, Hdt. 2.53.1) 'entspricht auffällig' with Protagoras' famous remark on the gods: 'Concerning the gods, I have no means of knowing either that they exist or that they do not exist' (οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναί οὔθ' ὡς εἰσίν, οὔθ' ὡς οὐκ εἰσίν οὔθ' ὁποῖοί τινες ἰδέαν).

⁶¹ For a useful overview, see Marincola (1987).

finishes by indicating the provenance of his information: he derived the first section from the priestesses of Dodona, while the latter material on Homer and Hesiod is the author's own opinion.⁶²

The passage is significant for our immediate purposes for three reasons: first, as John Gould argued, it clearly illustrates that 'there was no other or earlier source [than Homer or Hesiod] that Herodotus could think of for the shared religious perceptions and imagery of the Greeks'.⁶³ Secondly, and related to this, the implicit reference to others' opinions shows that Herodotus is actively engaging with other intellectuals in his attempt to clarify the inchoate picture of early Greek religion.⁶⁴ When seeking to clarify the origins of Greek religious ideologies and praxes, Herodotus, like his contemporaries, mines his knowledge of earlier poetry (including the works of Homer and Hesiod), specifically because it is these texts that best reveal the religious-cultural heritage of the Greeks.⁶⁵ Thirdly, the passage makes an important methodological point; for Herodotus supposes that Homer was operative some four hundred years after the time of the Trojan War (cf. 2.145.4: Πανὶ δὲ τῷ ἐκ Πηνελόπης ... ἐλάσσω ἕτερα ἔστι τῶν Τρωικῶν, κατὰ ὀκτακόσια μάλιστα ἐς ἐμέ)—a considerable length of time in comparison to the few decades between the conflict that he relates. His remark thus further demarcates the generic boundaries between his own brand of historiography and Homeric epic, since only the latter looks to narrate in detail events from a distant epoch.⁶⁶

These boundaries are distinguished even further in an earlier passage from Book 2, where Herodotus remarks on the *muthos* concerning the River Ocean that is carried into the 'obscure' (*ἀφανές*) and asserts that 'Homer or one of the earlier poets must have invented this name and introduced it into his poetry' ('Ὅμηρον δὲ ἢ τινα τῶν πρότερον γενομένων ποιητέων δοκέω τοῦνομα εὐρόντα ἐς ποίησιν ἐσενείκασθαι, 2.23). This passage forms a useful companion-piece to Herodotus' later remarks concerning the true version of Helen's whereabouts being unsuitable for epic poetry (2.116.1), since it offers some indication of what, in contrast, (he presumes) Homer considered *is*

⁶² τούτων τὰ μὲν πρῶτα αἱ Δωδωνίδες ἰέρειαι λέγουσι, τὰ δὲ ὕστερα τὰ ἐς Ἡσίοδον τε καὶ Ὅμηρον ἔχοντα ἐγὼ λέγω; cf. Lloyd (2007) 228–32.

⁶³ Gould (1994) 104–5.

⁶⁴ Cf. Burkert (1990) 26: 'So ordnet sich Herodot in das Diskussions-niveau seiner Zeit ein'.

⁶⁵ R. Hunter (2018) 81.

⁶⁶ So Graziosi (2002) 112.

suitable for epic poetry. With this talk of poets and their invented *mythoi*, Herodotus reinforces a theme picked up already, namely his desire to treat others' reports critically and his methodological avoidance of embellished or invented stories.⁶⁷

In addition to his concern over the date of Homer's *floruit*, Herodotus is also interested in outlining the extent of genuine Homeric authorship. Indeed, his scepticism as to whether Homer is the authentic author of the *Cypria* is not the only instance in which he questions whether a text is genuinely Homeric or not. Embedded within one of the *Histories'* ethnographic accounts,⁶⁸ Herodotus writes that neither the Scythians nor anybody else is able to speak of the Hyperboreans; he then adds, however, that Hesiod speaks of them, 'and Homer too in the *Epigonoï*, if Homer really was the composer of that epic poem' (καὶ Ὀμήρω ἐν Ἐπιγόνουσι, εἰ δὲ τῶ ἐόντι γε Ὀμηρος ταῦτα τὰ ἔπεα ἐποίησε, 4.32).⁶⁹ While Herodotus' attitude is notably more ambivalent in comparison to his outright rejection of the *Cypria* as a genuine Homeric poem earlier in Book 2, this second passage both confirms his expansive knowledge of the Homeric poems and reinforces the way that *historiē* compels him to collect and assess various sources, questioning others' assumptions. And it is noteworthy too, that once again Herodotus refers to Homer as an authority on a pertinent topic but does not specifically set out to reject what he says is false.

It is clear, then, that Herodotean allusions to Homer and his poems in the author's own voice present a somewhat textured picture. Herodotus evinces a firm sense that his aims as author are quite different from those of his epic predecessor, notably on account of the generic gulf between Homer's poems and his own prose account. Nevertheless, he also emerges as something of a connoisseur of the Homeric poems, displaying a willingness to refer to and quote from Homer, who might even serve, as seen in the case of Helen's whereabouts during the Trojan War, as an authoritative (albeit obscure) source of information.

⁶⁷ That Herodotus never uses the term *muthos* to denote his own work and that he demonstrates a critical awareness towards poetic inventions shows, *pace* Williams (2002) 149–71, that the epistemological gap between Herodotus and Thucydides, who famously criticises τὸ μυθώδες (1.21.1), is not as profound as some have argued.

⁶⁸ Cf. Skinner (2012) 243–8, arguing for the need to see ethnography and history intertwined in the *Histories*.

⁶⁹ Verdin (1977) 59 comments approvingly on the critical ramifications of this passage.

3. Recalling the Homeric Past

The discussion thus far has focused on explicitly marked references in the narrator's own voice to Homer in the *Histories*; yet there are a host of occasions in which a passage in his *logos* forms a less overt intertextual relationship with a specific account in the Homeric corpus. A well-known intertext surfaces, for instance, in the embassy scene between the Athenians and the Spartans on the one hand, and Gelon of Syracuse on the other.⁷⁰ The Spartan Syagrus takes exception to the idea of Syracusan leadership of the Greeks against the mounting Persian threat,⁷¹ remarking (7.159):

ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων πυθόμενος Σπαρτιήτας τὴν ἡγεμονίην ἀπαραιρησθαι ὑπὸ Γέλωνός τε καὶ Συρηκοσίων.

Surely, he would groan aloud, Agamemnon, the son of Pelops, if he heard that Spartiates had been deprived of their leadership by Gelon and the Syracusans.⁷²

For many readers—both ancient and modern—this line immediately evokes the *Iliad*,⁷³ when King Nestor chides his fellow countrymen for their lack of

⁷⁰ On the strong intertextual links with Homer in this passage, see How–Wells (1923) *ad loc.*; Hornblower (1994) 66; Pelling (2006) 89–90; Grethlein (2006); (2010) 160–73; A. M. Bowie (2012) 281–2; Kazanskaya (2014) 163–4. Note, however, the cautious reservations of Boedeker (2002) 101, who argues that certain phrases may have become common rhetorical expressions and were not necessarily intended to evoke a specific Homeric passage for the reader. Despite Boedeker's caveats, I am persuaded by the following axiom formulated by Hinds (1998) 26: 'There is no discursive element ... no matter how unremarkable in itself, and no matter how frequently repeated in the tradition, that cannot in some imaginable circumstance mobilize a specific allusion'.

⁷¹ On the Homeric intertext serving to undermine Syagrus' outrage here, see further Grethlein (2006); Pelling (2006) 90; Saïd (2012) 94; A. M. Bowie (2012) 281–2. On the 'complex network of Spartan motivation' behind this reference to Agamemnon, see the valuable discussion in Zali (2011) 71–5, who illustrates conflicting, unresolved interests—both parochial and panhellenic (quotation at p. 74).

⁷² Pelling (2006) 89–90 and Grethlein (2006) 489 note that the first part of the sentence is a near-hexameter; cf. Hornblower (1994) 66, who argues that Herodotus intentionally avoided the hexameter, *contra* Griffiths (1976). For hexameters elsewhere in Herodotus, see Jacoby (1913) 502–3; Boedeker (2001) 124; Pelling (2006) 90 n. 40. For the significance of Πελοπίδης, see Hornblower (1994) 66.

⁷³ In Xenophon's *Symposium*, Niceratos states that he was forced to learn the *Iliad* by heart (*Symp.* 3.5); further examples of the popular consumption of the epics in Greece are listed in Howie (1995) 143–6.

courage in facing Hector by activating the memory of Peleus (7.124–5):

ὦ πόποι ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιΐδα γαλαν ικάνει.
ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε γέρων ἰππηλάτα Πηλεὺς.

O shame! For a great sorrow attends the land of the Achaeans,
Surely he would groan aloud, Peleus, the aged horseman.

While others have rightly stressed that readers should avoid assumptions concerning intertextual relationships, unrealistically expecting Herodotus' original audience to spot them at every turn (some intertexts being far less marked than others, and besides that, always experienced differently by each recipient), the wider context of this passage reveals how this will resonate as a Homeric allusion with many amongst Herodotus' audience.⁷⁴ After Gelon states that the Syracusans would be content with leading the army or the navy (7.160.1–2), the Athenian envoy present also protests, citing amongst other things the strength of the Athenian navy; the envoy closes in a similar manner to the Spartan Syagrus, by recalling an epic precedent, namely Athens' role in the Trojan War (7.161.3):⁷⁵

... τῶν καὶ Ὅμηρος ὁ ἐποιοὺς ἄνδρα ἄριστον ἔφησε ἐς Ἴλιον ἀπικέσθαι
τάξαι τε καὶ διακοσμήσαι στρατόν.

... and [Menestheus] was one of [the Athenians], of whom even the epic poet Homer says was the best man who came to Ilium in ordering and marshalling armies.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Grethlein (2006) 487–8 (cautious approach to studying intertexts), 488–90; cf. further cautions in Rood (1998) 41. In this context, note the instructive comments of Raaflaub (1987) 233 on fifth-century Athenians: '[they were trained] to grasp a wide variety of poetic allusions and moral and political 'messages' in the annual theatrical performances. They had learned to understand the contemporary relevance of mythical paradigms presented to them on stage and to recognize the importance of new variations of traditional myths introduced with specific inventions by the poets'. Cf. also Fornara (1971) 65; Vandiver (1991) 12–13.

⁷⁵ For an earlier Athenian appeal to an epic *exemplum* in a political situation, observe the Athenians' claim to Sigeum in the Troad, based at least partly on their participation in the Trojan War, as portrayed in the *Iliad* (5.94.2). For references to the Trojan War elsewhere in Herodotus' latter books, see Richardson (1993) 27; Carey (2016).

⁷⁶ Cf. *Il.* 2.552–3: τῶν αὐθ' ἡγεμόνευ' υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς. | τῷ δ' οὐ πώ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ' ἀνὴρ | κοσμήσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας. Although Menestheus'

On this occasion, the reference to Homer is explicit. Given the close proximity between this speech and Syagrus' earlier defence, and that both the Athenians and Spartans are appealing to the heroic past in order to establish their right to hegemony, readers can place more confidence that the reference to Agamemnon's 'groaning' (*οἰμώξειε*), embedded in Syagrus' speech, transposes the strikingly similar line enunciated by Nestor in the *Iliad* (7.125).⁷⁷

Gelon's oft-cited subsequent dismissal of the Greek envoys, 'announce to Greece that the Spring has been taken out of her year' (*ἀγγέλλοντες τῇ Ἑλλάδι ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὸ ἔαρ αὐτῇ ἐξαραίρηται*, 7.162.1),⁷⁸ clearly emphasises the fissiparous nature of the Greek alliance in 480/479—a point repeated elsewhere in Herodotus' battle narratives, notably, the damaging dispute over leadership between the Spartans and Argives (7.148–9), or that between the Athenians and the Tegeans before Plataea (9.26–7; see further below). This rather un-Panhellenic state of affairs in turn evokes the disjointed relations between the Achaeans that occupies much of the *Iliad*.⁷⁹

attributes are slightly different in this Homeric context (namely, excellence in arranging horses and shielding the men) than in the Herodotean passage, it is probable that the Athenian envoy is nevertheless referring to this passage, particularly given his proud remark that his proof derives from what 'the epic poet Homer says'. Another possible source that might have inspired this episode is one of the three Eion epigrams composed in the 470s, celebrating the Athenians' victory over the Medes at the Strymon river in 475 ('Simonides' XL *FGE* = Aeschines 3.185): *ἔκ ποτε τῆσδε πόλῃος ἄμ' Ἀτρείδῃσι Μενεσθεὺς | ἠγέλτο ζάθειον Τρωικὸν ἄμ πεδίον, | ὄν ποθ' Ὀμηρος ἔφη Δαναῶν πύκα χαλκοχιτώνων | κοσμητῆρα μάχης ἔξοχον ἄνδρα μολεῖν. | οὕτως οὐδὲν ἀεικὲς Ἀθηναίοισι καλεῖσθαι | κοσμητὰς πολέμου τ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ἡγορέης.*

⁷⁷ Indeed, Grethlein (2006) 489 notes that this is the only place in which the phrase *ἢ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε* is found in epic poetry. For other appeals to myth in Herodotus' text, see further Zali (2011).

⁷⁸ Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.7; 3.10, who twice ascribes these same words to Pericles, from a funeral oration given after the Samian War of 440. For further intertextual links between the embassy scene and the *Iliad*, see Grethlein (2010) 162–4, who notes the similarity between Gelon's ultimate rejection of the Hellenic ambassadors with Achilles' dismissal of the Greek delegation sent to reintegrate him into the ranks in *Iliad* 9. Cf. also the useful comments in Pelling (2006) 91–2.

⁷⁹ *Contra* Zali (2011) 74. See also Miltiades' speech before Marathon at 6.109.3–6: 'of us generals, who are ten in number, the opinions are divided, some urging to attack, others not' (*ἡμέων τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐόντων δέκα δίχα γίνονται αἱ γνώμαι, τῶν μὲν κελευόντων τῶν δὲ οὐ συμβάλλειν*, 6.109.4); cf. Pelling (2013) 10–11 for similarities and differences with the *Iliad* here.

As Christopher Pelling observes, ‘So it happened in the Homeric past; it happened in 480 ... overreaching hegemonic ambitions and inter-*polis* jealousies were continuing to devastate Greece still’.⁸⁰ In this way, the evocation of the Homeric poems in this episode enables readers to engage with themes and ideas that are no less relevant for the recent past than they were in the distant past. The clear intertextual link here with Pericles’ Funeral Speech, articulated many years after this event, is also a noteworthy feature.⁸¹ It illustrates that the *Histories*’ temporal gaze is not restricted to the past, but also to the present, or the ‘future-past’ within his narrative.⁸² Just as the evocation of Homeric heroes by the Athenians and the Spartans bridges the gap between the ancient past and the more recent past, the spring metaphor acts as both an analepsis and a prolepsis, inviting Herodotus’ immediate audience to reflect too on the bleak struggle for hegemony in their own contemporary context and how such contemporary struggles interact with and inform their understanding of inter-poleis dissent in the recent past.⁸³

A similar passage to the debate between the Syracusans, Athenians, and Spartans in Book 7, is the reported dispute between the Tegeans and Athenians about the Greeks’ battle formation at Plataea in Book 9 (9.26–8).⁸⁴ But while in the earlier scene it is the extradiegetic narrator that undercuts the Spartans’ and Athenians’ appeals to the epic past by underlining Gelon’s firm refusal to send help, in the latter passage it is the intradiegetic narrators—the Athenians—who question explicitly the validity of such a rhetorical manoeuvre. To begin, the Tegeans cite a longstanding pact made with the Peloponnesians, in which the Tegeans have always been granted the privilege to command a wing in battle, ever since their king

⁸⁰ Pelling (2006) 92; cf. Pelling (2013) 12; (2020) 5–6; Baragwanath (2012) 35. I am not persuaded by van Wees (2002) 341, who argues that Herodotus represents the ‘Spartans as the villains of this episode’; rather, it is more the case that Herodotus portrays the Spartans in such a way as to reflect on the (f)utility of citing ancient *exempla* for present purposes.

⁸¹ See Munson (2001) 218–9; cf. Grethlein (2010) 168–70; and already, Hauvette (1894) 337.

⁸² On the complex panopticon of different times in Herodotus, see Grethlein (2010) 172.

⁸³ Another, more explicit reference to the Atheno-Peloponnesian War occurs at 6.98.2; cf. Fornara (1971) 32. For Herodotus’ critical view of contemporary Athens, see especially Fornara (1971); van der Veen (1996) 90–110; Moles (1996); (2002); Harrison (2009); Irwin (2018).

⁸⁴ Good discussions in Solmsen (1944) 248–50; Vandiver (1991) 64–7; Grethlein (2010) 173–86; Boedeker (2012) 18–23; (2013) 150–91; Zali (2014) 275–91. For the historicity of this debate, see How–Wells (1923) II.296.

Echemus successfully defeated king Hyllus, thus excluding the Heraclidae from settling in the Peloponnese for one hundred years (9.26.2–7).⁸⁵ In response to this, the Athenians refer to various past achievements, including, amongst others: the significant support they offered to the Tegeans in overcoming the tyrant Eurystheus; their memorable exploits against the Amazons; and their by no means insignificant role at Troy (9.27.2–4). Having cited this combination of historical and mythical precedents, however, the Athenians continue (9.27.4–5):

ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ τι πρόχει τούτων ἐπιμενησθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἂν χρηστοὶ τότε
 εἶντες ὡστοὶ νῦν ἂν εἶεν φλαυρότεροι καὶ τότε εἶντες φλαῦροι νῦν ἂν εἶεν
 ἀμείνονες. παλαιῶν μὲν νῦν ἔργων ἄλις ἔστω.

But it is to no avail in recalling these things, for those powers that were previously great may now be rather more trivial, and those who were formerly trivial might now be much stronger [cf. 1.5.4]; *now let that be enough of these ancient matters*.⁸⁶

Having thus questioned the value of appealing to ancient *exempla*, and remarking on the instability of individual prosperity, as does Herodotus at the close of the *Histories*' proem, the Athenians resume their list of achievements by referring to their far more recent valour at Marathon, arguing (*contra* Herodotus) that they alone fought off the Persian forces, overcoming forty-six nations (9.27.5).⁸⁷ Following some brief concluding

⁸⁵ Grethlein (2010) notes the correspondence between the Tegeans' ancient *exemplum*, and their present situation, since in 'in their attempt to conquer Greece, the Persians resemble the Heraclidae who tried to push into the Peloponnese' (174).

⁸⁶ Flower–Marincola (2002) 156 note that the Athenians' rejection of ancient deeds mirrors Herodotus' 'rejection of the mythical stories with which his history begins in favour of historical time, what he himself knows'. While it is of course true that Herodotus verbalises his intention to begin from the 'first of whom we know' to have committed unjust deeds against the Greeks, it is not straightforwardly the case that Herodotus rejects the mythical stories with which he opens his account. Indeed, he pointedly remarks that *he will not pass judgement* over the truth or falsity of the Persian and Phoenician *logoi* that comprise the opening chapters (1.5.3). Cf. the more measured observations of Fowler (2011) 46–7, 59 n. 54, emphasising the primacy of 'knowability'; cf. too Fowler (2009) *passim*, esp. 33. On the very peculiar, un-Herodotean nature of these opening traditions, see Węcowski (2004) 149–53.

⁸⁷ On the Athenians' characterisation of Marathon as a purely Athenian victory (*contra* Hdt. 6.108.1), both here and in the Attic orators, see further Loraux (1986) 158–9; Zali (2014)

remarks, Herodotus states that the Lacedaemonians unanimously voted in favour of the Athenians' speech (9.28.1).⁸⁸

There are several important points to be made about this passage. First, as Elizabeth Vandiver notes, these chapters indicate that by the early fifth century BCE it was now possible to employ historical as well as mythical *exempla*.⁸⁹ Like the fourth-century orators, the Athenians prefer to focus on more recent achievements, elevating their significance to that of the great deeds of the heroic past,⁹⁰ and even suggesting that they are more pertinent for present purposes.⁹¹ In so doing, the Athenians clearly look to epicise the battle of Marathon. Secondly, the Athenians' curt dismissal of the practice of evoking long-gone matters for present purposes (*παλαιῶν μὲν νῦν ἔργων ἄλλῃς ἔστω*) can certainly be read as an implicit Herodotean reflection on the construction of memory, that is, as a metahistorical moment in the text in which Herodotus' readers are encouraged to reflect actively on how past events are perceived and drawn upon in the present.⁹² Such metahistorical moments of course occur elsewhere in Herodotus' work, for example, when he veers away from a critique of the Persian and Phoenician *logoi* presented in his opening chapters, opting instead to report from the much more recent time of Croesus onwards.⁹³ But it is also worth bearing in mind a contrary

281–2. Branscome (2013) 150–91 reads Herodotus' variant account as a rejection of the epitaphic tradition, which held that the Athenians alone fought at Marathon.

⁸⁸ Zali (2014) 288–9 observes the scene's forensic qualities, with the Spartans arbitrating between the Tegeans and Athenians.

⁸⁹ Vandiver (1991) 66; cf. Rood (2010) 67, noting the distorting quality of 'claims made on the more recent past'. For the use of historical *exempla* in oratorical works, see Grethlein (2010) 127–33; cf. Calame (1999) 135–6.

⁹⁰ Flower–Marincola (2002) 152.

⁹¹ So Boedeker (2012) 23. Indeed, at the end of their speech, the Athenians ask 'do we not, for this single deed [the defeat of Persia at Marathon], deserve to hold the right wing?' (*ἀρ' οὐ δίκαιοι εἰμὲν ἔχειν ταύτην τὴν τάξιν ἀπὸ τοῦτου μόνου τοῦ ἔργου*; 9.27.6); cf. [Dem.] *Epitaph*. 8–10.

⁹² Grethlein (2010) 159, following Fornara (1983) 104–20, argues that given the rhetorical, presentist nature of ancient historiography, 'references to the past by characters invite a meta-historical interpretation'; cf. Grethlein (2011); Zali (2014). Related to this issue, of course, is the highly vexed question of the authenticity of speeches as reported by Herodotus: see Solmsen (1944); Høhti (1974). Add too Schellenberg (2009), exploring the prevalence of irony in numerous Herodotean speeches, a technique befitting his 'congenially intrusive narrative persona' (135).

⁹³ Flower–Marincola (2002) 156; Saïd (2012) 95. For Herodotus' account of Croesus, see Haywood–Post forthcoming.

example in the form of the 'Wise Adviser' Artabanus, who urges Xerxes: 'Therefore take to heart the ancient saying (*palaion epos*), since it has been said well that the end of all things does not reveal itself entirely at the beginning' (ἐς θυμὸν ὦν βαλεῦ καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔπος ὡς εὖ εἴρηται, τὸ μὴ ἅμα ἀρχῇ πᾶν τέλος καταφαίνεσθαι, 7.51.3). It scarcely needs to be noted that Artabanus' *palaion epos* echoes the sentiments of Solon's advice on 'the necessity of looking to the end of all matters' (σκοπέειν δὲ χρὴ παντὸς χρήματος τὴν τελευτήν, 1.32.9);⁹⁴ the outcome of Herodotus' work shows that such advice proves to be well-grounded, though neither recipient (Xerxes and Croesus respectively) is shrewd enough to realise this in the heat of the moment. It is not straightforwardly the case then, that Herodotus rejects the utility of citing ancient deeds *tout court* (the *palaion epos* at 7.51.3 surely a fine example of the ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά that the *Histories* save from oblivion).⁹⁵ But Herodotus' audience and their recent forebears, who were steeped in Homeric tradition, were clearly able to offer and accept alternative rhetorical uses of the past, in which myth could play a much more muted role.⁹⁶

While these episodes constitute only a few instances of the various appeals to Homeric precedents and epic formulae across the *Histories*, they illustrate well the complex nature of Herodotus' Homeric allusions. It is historical actors such as the Spartan Syagrus or the Athenians before Plataea who, in direct speech, evoke a Homeric saying, word, or idea in support of their claims for legitimacy, and yet the context of such appeals at significant moments in the *Histories* shows how readers should be alert to Herodotus' role as compiler and author. The placement of Homeric allusions is rarely, if ever, incidental, and such moments create a range of effects on the reader, who must wrestle with the validity of, purposes behind, and effects of such intertextual references to the Homeric corpus.

⁹⁴ Grethlein (2011) 119.

⁹⁵ Rejecting *ta palaia* becomes a standard trope from Thuc. 1.22.4 onwards. For instance, Ephorus passes over what 'is hardly accessible to investigation' (*FGrHist* 70 F 31b); Demosthenes homes in on more recent deeds that have not yet been exalted by the epic poets (60.9); and Strabo states that he 'must omit most of what is really ancient and mythical' (9.4.18). For further discussion, see Saïd (2007) 80; Zali (2014) 287–8.

⁹⁶ Similarly, Baragwanath (2012) 42–3.

4. A ‘Most-Homeric’ War

To conclude, I have argued for a consciously critical engagement with Homer in the *Histories*, identifying some of the different registers adopted by Herodotus when he alludes to Homer and the Homeric poems. Certain passages illustrate a pattern in which recent events are elevated to that of the heroic deeds at Troy, although the Herodotean narrator is more typically cautious than his protagonists in straightforwardly juxtaposing heroic events against more recent ones.⁹⁷ But regardless of such prudence, Herodotus’ subtle criticism of Homer’s genre, his tendency to ratify traditions which are in some way derived from the characteristic elements of his *historiē*, his interest in the authorship of several epic works, his own close intertextual engagement with specific scenes in Homer (often illustrative of paradigmatic motifs concurrent in both the Homeric poems and the *Histories*), all combine to demonstrate the very pervasiveness of Homer and epic paradigms in Herodotus’ work.⁹⁸

This analysis of the various explicit and implicit references to the Homeric corpus has illustrated not only Herodotus’ pointedly critical and discursive approach to his epic predecessor, but also both his and his readers’ extensive poetic repertoire. The specific appeal to the Homeric past in the *Histories* by various Greek states, such as that debate between Tegeans and Athenian before Plataea, reflects the extent to which a fifth-century Greek was steeped in the past as filtered through the poets. As John Dillon observes:

the tendency to buttress one’s arguments by adducing characters or situations from the great store of Greek mythology, as portrayed by Homer, Hesiod, or any of the lyric or tragic poets, is deeply ingrained in the psyche of educated Greeks.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Grethlein (2010) 171; Baragwanath (2012) 55 (‘his entry into this terrain as narrator is more often complicating and destabilizing, alerting readers to problems surrounding the past and its application to the present’).

⁹⁸ Cf. Huber (1965) 29.

⁹⁹ Dillon (1997) 211; cf. Arist. *Metaph.* 994b: ‘Some people, therefore, will not accept the statements of a speaker unless he gives a mathematical proof; others will not unless he makes use of illustrations; others expect to have a poet cited as witness’ (οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐὰν μὴ μαθηματικῶς λέγῃ τις οὐκ ἀποδέχονται τῶν λεγόντων, οἱ δ’ ἂν μὴ παραδειγματικῶς, οἱ δὲ μάρτυρα ἀξιούσιν ἐπάγεσθαι ποιητήν).

Herodotus' exposition of Trojan War traditions at 2.112–20, illustrates this deep familiarity with the Homeric poems (and no doubt other unsigalled 'sources' such as Stesichorus' 'palinode'), showing that Herodotus regards Homer not only as a preeminent authority, but equally as a textual rival, whose presentation of the past is open to scrutiny and refinement. As I have argued, the metahistorical significance of this rather academic approach to the Homeric text in these chapters is vital: in presenting himself as weighing up Homer's poetry against other traditions, Herodotus accentuates the truth value of his own inquiry into the past.

Alongside the metahistorical significance generated by Herodotus' engagement with Homer, the discussion has also highlighted how Herodotus skilfully incorporates Homeric characters, lines, and patterns into various speeches and *logoi*, in order to reflect the way that Homer's poetry was indeed a distinctive, and at times integral, feature of people's lives in fifth-century Greece.¹⁰⁰ This point reminds me of a line from an interview with the modernist film director Michelangelo Antonioni, who asserted that 'we are still living with the moral concepts of Homer': such blurring of the boundaries between fiction and real life holds no less true for Herodotus' age than it does our own. Given this, it would be truly remarkable if Herodotus were to have presented an account of the Greek-Persian Wars which concealed or erased any such real-life engagement with the Homeric texts and their characters.

¹⁰⁰ Pelling (2013) 1–3 focuses on the way that fiction informs our lives, on how narrative codes impose order on 'the messiness of reality' (1); similarly, see Pelling (2000) 166–7 for example, on 'types' in tragedy; Damon (2010) 381 ('historical actors ... were themselves aware of the literary and historical precedents for their situations').

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, W., ed. (2008) *Euripides: Helen* (Cambridge).
- Asheri, D. (2007a) ‘General Introduction’, in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 1–56.
- (2007b) ‘Book I’, in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 57–218.
- , A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV* (Oxford).
- Austin, N. (1994) *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom* (London).
- Bakker, E. J. (2002) ‘The Making of History: Herodotus’ *Historiês Apodexis*’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 3–32.
- , I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).
- de Bakker, M. (2012) ‘Herodotus’ Proteus: Myth, History, Enquiry and Storytelling’, in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012a) 107–26.
- Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- (2012) ‘The Mythic Plupast in Herodotus’, in Grethlein–Krebs (2012) 3–56.
- and M. de Bakker (2012a) ‘Introduction’, in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 1–56.
- , edd. (2012b) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Barker, E. T. E. (2009) *Entering the Agôn: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography, and Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Blondell, R. (2013) *Helen of Troy: Beauty, Myth, Devastation* (New York and Oxford).
- Boedeker, D. (2001) ‘Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea’, in ead. and D. Sider, edd., *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (New York and Oxford) 120–34.
- (2002) ‘Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 97–116.
- (2012) ‘Speaker’s Past and Plupast: Herodotus in the Light of Elegy and Lyric’, in Grethlein–Krebs (2012) 17–34.
- Bowie, A. M. (2012) ‘Mythology and the Expedition of Xerxes’, in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 269–86.
- Bowie, E. L. (1993) ‘Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry’, in Gill–Wiseman (1993) 1–37.
- (2018) ‘The Lesson of Book 2’, in Harrison–Irwin (2018) 53–74.
- Branscome, D. (2013) *Textual Rivals: Self-Presentation in Herodotus’ Histories* (Ann Arbor).

- Brown, T.S. (1962) 'The Greek Sense of Time in History as Suggested by Their Accounts of Egypt', *Historia* 11: 257–70.
- Burkert, W. (1990) 'Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen', in G. Nenci and O. Reverdin, edd., *Hérodote et les peuples non Grecs: neuf exposés suivis de discussions* (Geneva) 1–39.
- Calame, C. (1999) 'The Rhetoric of *Mythos* and *Logos*: Forms of Figurative Discourse', in R. Buxton, ed., *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford) 119–43.
- Carey, C. (2016) 'Homer and Epic in Herodotus' Book 7', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou, edd., *Homeric Receptions Across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–90.
- Chiasson, C. C. (2012) 'Herodotus' Prologue and the Greek Poetic Tradition', *Histos* 6: 114–43.
- Corcella, A. (2007) 'Book IV', in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 543–721.
- Currie, B. (2020) 'The Birth of Literary Criticism (Herodotus 2.116–17) and the Roots of Homeric Neanalysis', in J. J. Price and R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, edd., *Text and Intertext in Greek Epic and Drama* (London) 147–70.
- (2021) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Supplement 13; Oxford, Edmonton and Tallahassee).
- Damon, C. (2010) 'Déjà vu or déjà lu? History as Intertext', *PLLS* 14: 375–88.
- Davies, M. and P. J. Finglass, edd. (2014) *Stesichorus: The Poems* (Cambridge).
- Dewald, C. and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Diels, H. (1887) 'Herodot und Hekataios', *Hermes* 22: 411–44; repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, ed. W. Burkert (Darmstadt, 1969) 411–44.
- Dillon, J. M. (1997) 'Medea among the Philosophers', in J. J. Clauss and S. I. Johnston, edd., *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art* (Princeton) 211–8.
- Donelli, G. (2016) 'Herodotus and Greek Lyric Poetry', in V. Liotsakis and S. Farrington, edd., *The Art of History: Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography* (Berlin and Boston) 11–36.
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds); revised and updated translation by J. G. Howie of *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* (Berlin, 1971).
- Flory, S. (1987) *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit).

- Flower, M. and J. Marincola, edd. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Ford, A. (2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton).
- Fornara, C. W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford).
- (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Fowler, R. L. (2009) ‘Thoughts on Myth and Religion in Early Greek Historiography’, *Minerva* 22: 21–39.
- (2011) ‘*Mythos* and *Logos*’, *JHS* 131: 45–66.
- Gill, C. and T. P. Wiseman, edd. (1993) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Austin).
- Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (London and New York).
- (1994) ‘Herodotus and Religion’, in Hornblower (1994b) 91–106.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein, J. (2006) ‘The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: The Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153–63’, *AJPh* 127: 485–509.
- (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past* (Cambridge).
- (2011) ‘Herodot und Xerxes: Meta-historie in den Historien’, in R. Röllinger, B. Truschnegg, and R. Bichler, edd., *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich* (Wiesbaden) 103–22.
- and C. Krebs, edd. (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The ‘Plupast’ from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge).
- Griffiths, A. H. (1976) ‘What Syagrus Said: Herodotus 7.159’, *LCM* 1: 23–4.
- Halliwel, S. (2011) *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus* (Oxford).
- Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- (2003) ‘“Prophecy in Reverse?”: Herodotus and the Origins of History’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 237–55.
- (2009) ‘Herodotus on the American Empire’, *CW* 102: 383–93.
- and E. Irwin, edd. (2018) *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Hauvette, A. (1894) *Hérodote: Historien des guerres médiques* (Paris).
- Haywood, J. and N. Mac Sweeney, edd. (2018) *Homer’s Iliad and the Trojan War: Dialogues on Tradition* (London).
- Haywood, J. and D. Post (forthcoming) ‘The Downfall of Croesus and Oedipus: Tracing Affinities between Herodotus’ *Histories* and Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*’, *CW*.

- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hohti, P. (1974) 'Freedom of Speech in Speech Sections in the *Histories* of Herodotus', *Arctos* 8: 19–27.
- Hornblower, S. (1994a) 'Introduction', in id. (1994b) 1–72.
 ———, ed. (1994b) *Greek Historiography* (Oxford).
- How, W. W. and J. Wells (1923) *A Commentary on Herodotus*² (Oxford).
- Howie, J. G. (1995) 'The *Iliad* as *Exemplum*', in Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie, edd., *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality* (Bergen) 141–73.
- Huber, L. (1965) 'Herodots Homerverständnis', in H. Flashar and K. Gaiser, edd., *Synusia: Festgabe für W. Schadewaldt* (Pfullingen) 29–52.
- Hunter, R. (2018) *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, V. (1982) *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton).
- Irwin, E. (2018) 'The End of the *Histories* and the End of the Atheno-Peloponnesian Wars', in Harrison–Irwin (2018) 279–334.
- Isager, S. (1998) 'The Pride of Halikarnassos: Editio Princeps of an Inscription from Salmakis', *ZPE* 123: 1–23.
- Jacoby, F. (1913) 'Herodotos', *RE Suppl.* II: 205–520.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1999) 'Aspects narratologiques des *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 9: 217–75.
 ——— (2012) 'The Helen *Logos* and Herodotus' Fingerprint', in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 127–42.
- Kazanskaya, M. (2014) 'Les expressions homériques dans les *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 34: 161–75.
- Kelly, A. (2007) 'Stesikhoros and Helen', *MH* 64: 1–21.
- Kirkland, N. B. (2019) 'The Character of Tradition in Plutarch's *On the Malice of Herodotus*', *AJPh* 140: 477–511.
- Kurke, L. (2011) *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose* (Princeton).
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Legrand, Ph.-E. (1936) *Hérodote: Histoires*, Tome II (Paris).
- Ligota, C. R. (1982) "'This Story is Not True": Fact and Fiction in Antiquity', *JWI* 45: 1–13.
- Lloyd, A. B. (1975) *Herodotus Book II: Introduction* (Leiden).
 ——— (1976–88) *Herodotus Book II: Commentary*, 2 vols (Leiden).
 ——— (2007) 'Book II', in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 219–378.
- Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City* (Cambridge).

- Marincola, J. (1987) 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence', *Arethusa* 20: 121–42.
- (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- (2006) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 13–28.
- (2007) 'Odysseus and the Historians', *SyllClass* 18: 1–79; partially repr. in R. V. Munson, ed., *Herodotus*, vol. 2: *Herodotus and the World* (Oxford, 2013) 109–32.
- Moles, J. L. (1993) 'Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides', in Gill–Wiseman (1993) 88–121.
- (1996) 'Herodotus Warns the Athenians', *PLLS* 9: 259–84.
- (2002) 'Herodotus and Athens', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 33–52.
- Moyer, I. S. (2002) 'Herodotus and an Egyptian Mirage: the Genealogies of the Theban Priests', *JHS* 122: 70–90.
- (2011) *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism* (Cambridge).
- Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).
- (2012) 'Herodotus and the Heroic Age: The Case of Minos', in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 195–212.
- Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).
- Nicolai, R. and P. Vannicelli (2019) 'Il consiglio, il sogno, il catalogo: *Iliade* II, i *Persiani* di Eschilo, Erodoto VII', *SemRom* 26: 201–26.
- Pallantza, E. (2005) *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jh. v. Chr.* (Stuttgart).
- Pelling, C. (1999) 'Epilogue', in C. S. Kraus, ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne) 325–60.
- (2000) *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London and New York).
- (2006) 'Homer and Herodotus', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, eds., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition presented to Jasper Griffin* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2013) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- (2020) 'Homer and the Question Why', in C. Constantakopoulou and M. Fragoulaki, edd., *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (Histos Supplement 11; Newcastle upon Tyne) 1–35.
- Powell, J. E. (1935) 'Notes on Herodotus', *CQ* 29: 72–82.

- Pratt, L. H. (1993) *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics* (Ann Arbor).
- Raaflaub, K. A. (1987) 'Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History', *Arethusa* 20: 221–48.
- Richardson, N. J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, VI: Books 21–4* (Cambridge).
- Rood, T. (1998) 'Thucydides and His Predecessors', *Histos* 2: 230–67.
- (2010) 'Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time, and the Origin of International Relations', *Ariadne* 16: 43–74
- Rozokoki, A. (2021) 'The Helen *Logos* in Herodotus: A Philological Approach', *QUCC* 129: 21–52.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 13–38.
- Said, S. (2007) 'Myth and Historiography', in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford) 76–88.
- (2012) 'Herodotus and the "Myth" of the Trojan War', in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 87–106.
- Sammons, B. (2012) 'History and *Hyponoia*: Herodotus and Early Literary Criticism', *Histos* 6: 52–66.
- Schellenberg, R. (2009) "'They Spoke the Truest of Words": Irony in the Speeches of Herodotus' Histories', *Arethusa* 42: 131–50.
- Skinner, J. (2012) *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (New York and Oxford).
- Solmsen, L. (1944) 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea', *CPh* 39: 241–53.
- Stadter, P. A. (2004) 'From the Mythical to the Historical Paradigm: The Transformation of Myth in Herodotus', in J. M. Candau Morón, F. J. González Ponce, and G. Cruz Andreotti, edd., *Historia y Mito: El pasado legendario como fuente de autoridad* (Málaga) 31–46.
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg); repr. in id., *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, vol. 2 (Hildesheim and New York, 1982) 1057–97.
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- van der Veen, J. E. (1996) *The Significant and the Insignificant: Five Studies in Herodotus' View of History* (Amsterdam).
- Vandiver, E. (1991) *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History* (Frankfurt am Main).

- (2012) “‘Strangers are from Zeus’”: Homeric *Xenia* at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus’, in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012b) 143–66.
- van Wees, H. (2002) ‘Herodotus and the Past’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 319–49.
- Verdin, H. (1977) ‘Les remarques critiques d’Hérodote et de Thucydide sur la poésie en tant que source historique’, in T. Reekmans and W. I. G. M. Peremans, edd., *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in Honorem W. Peremans Septuagenarii Editae* (Leuven) 53–76.
- Węcowski, M. (2004) ‘The Hedgehog and the Fox: Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus’, *JHS* 124: 143–64.
- West, S. (2002) ‘Demythologisation in Herodotus’, *Xenia Toruniensia* 6: 1–48.
- (2004) ‘Herodotus and Lyric Poetry’, *Letras Clássicas* 8: 79–91.
- Williams, B. A. O. (2002) *Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay in Genealogy* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Zali, V. (2011) ‘Agamemnon in Herodotus and Thucydides: Exploring the Historical Uses of a Mythological Paradigm’, *Electra* 1: 61–98.
- (2014) *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus’ Histories with Special Attention to Books 5–9* (Leiden).

HERODOTUS, HOMER, AND THE CHARACTER OF THE GODS

Thomas Harrison

At the heart of his Egyptian *logos*, Herodotus contrasts his fellow-Greeks' knowledge of the gods with that of the Egyptians (2.53):

ἔνθεν δὲ ἐγένοντο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε αἰεὶ ἦσαν πάντες, ὁκοῖοί τε τινὲς τὰ εἶδεα, οὐκ ἠπιστέατο μέχρι οὗ πρῶην τε καὶ χθὲς ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ. [2] Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὀμηρον ἠλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μεν πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσὶ οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἑλλήσι καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμὰς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἶδεα αὐτῶν σημῆναντες. [3] οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γενέσθαι ὕστερον, ἔμοιγε δοκέειν, ἐγένοντο. τούτων τὰ μὲν πρῶτα αἱ Δωδωνίδες ἱρεῖαι λέγουσι, τὰ δὲ ὕστερα τὰ ἐς Ἡσίοδον τε καὶ Ὀμηρον ἔχοντα ἐγὼ λέγω.

But whence the several gods had their birth, or whether they all were from the beginning, and of what form they are, they did not learn till yesterday, as it were, or the day before: [2] for Hesiod and Homer I suppose were four hundred years before my time and not more, and these are they who made a theogony for the Hellenes and gave the titles to the gods and distributed to them honours and arts, and set forth their forms; [3] but the poets who are said to have been before these men were really in my opinion after them. Of these things the first are said by the priestesses of Dodona, and the latter things, those namely which have regard to Hesiod and Homer, by myself.

Unlike other chapters in this volume, this paper does not seek to explore specific Homeric (or Hesiodic) intertexts. (The most obvious point of parallel with this passage would perhaps be with Hesiod's *Theogony*, where the gods

allocate themselves their *timai* rather than having them given to them.¹) Nor will it directly explore wider parallels between Herodotean and Homeric worlds—the different ways, for example, in which gods operate in each text.² Instead it will attempt simply to elucidate the meaning of Herodotus’ reference to Homer and Hesiod (or, rather, Hesiod and Homer) in this passage. What is their status for Herodotus here? In what sense did they give the gods their titles and indicate their ‘honours’ and ‘skills’ and their ‘forms’ or characters? In attempting to answer these questions, the emphasis—in keeping with other contributions to this volume—will frequently be on the influence of Homer and Hesiod as mediated through other authors. Like policemen or low comedians, moreover, the two poets will almost always feature as a double-act.

The promise ‘simply to elucidate’ such a passage should perhaps elicit a hollow laugh. The interpretative questions that arise from this passage are such that ‘if you are not completely confused you have not begun to understand’.³ In broad terms, there are two interpretative routes. On the one hand, this passage is commonly seen as sceptical of conventional Greek approaches to divinity.⁴ So, for example, for Scott Scullion, it emerges⁵

that much or all of what constitutes for us and constituted for the Greeks the essential personality of the various gods was, on what Herodotus explicitly calls his own view, *invented* ‘yesterday or the day before’ by the poets Hesiod and Homer ...

Like many other scholars, Scullion then connects Herodotus’ statement here both with a network of other passages in the *Histories* (notably Herodotus’ statement at 2.3.2 that all men know equally about the divine⁶) and with some select pre-Socratic fragments. He then makes a wider case that

¹ Hes. *Theog.* 111–12: ‘Those who were born of them, gods, givers of good things, ... and how they divided up their wealth and how each one chose his or her *tīmē*’ (οἳ τ’ ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο, θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἐάων· ὡς τ’ ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὡς τιμὰς διέλοντο).

² See here, e.g., the observations of Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 70–1.

³ A catch-phrase of the late Oxford epigrapher and historian D. M. Lewis.

⁴ Munson (2001) 165.

⁵ Scullion (2006) 199–200. The italics are mine.

⁶ For an alternative reading, that it is the names (excepted from his policy of ‘reticence’) that men know equally, see, however, Thomas (2000) 279–80; see here the discussion of Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 85–6.

individual gods only rarely make appearances in the *Histories* in Herodotus' own mouth, and that these rare exceptions can be explained away.

This approach is, in many ways, an attractive one. It situates Herodotus at the cutting edge of late-fifth century thought (who could object to that?). Moreover, this reading of 2.53 is arguably of a piece with the picture of Homer that emerges from other passages: with the suggestion that Homer or another early poet had invented the name Ocean (τοῦνομα εὐρόντα, 2.23); or with the Helen-*logos* (2.112–20), where Homer is seen as serving a distinctively poetic agenda.⁷ There is no space here for the inspiration of the Muses; the critical historian instead envisages the Homeric texts as a resource to be read (and mined) against the grain of their authors' intentions.⁸

The alternative approach is to attempt to reconcile the apparent implications of this passage with 'conventional' Greek polytheism. 'This seems in no way to devalue those traditional sets of [divine] attributes', I wrote more than two decades ago, following on from the work of Rudhardt and Gould—a claim described as 'venturesome' by Scullion.⁹ This paper ventures a more detailed attempt at making this difficult case.

I begin with the pre-Socratic parallels. A wide range of intertexts can be adduced for our passage. First and foremost, the opening of 2.53 ('whence the several gods had their birth, or whether they all were from the beginning, and of what form they are?') is—together with Herodotus' statement at 2.3.2 (that all men have equal knowledge)—commonly connected to the famous fragment of Protagoras' *Peri theōn*:¹⁰

περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι, οὐθ' ὡς εἰσὶν οὐθ' ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶν οὐθ' ὁποῖοί
τινες ἰδέαν· πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ κωλύοντά με εἰδέναι, ἢ τε ἀδηλότης καὶ βραχύς
ὢν ὁ βίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

About the gods I am not able to know neither that they exist nor that they do not exist nor of what kind they are in form: for many things

⁷ For the Helen-*logos*, see de Jong (2012).

⁸ Cf. Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 61–2: 'L'investigation de l'enquêteur a remplacé l'inspiration des Muses'.

⁹ Harrison (2000) 192; Scullion (2006) 207 n. 41. Cf. Rudhardt (1992a) 88, 103–6; (1992b) 233–4; Gould (1994).

¹⁰ Protagoras 80 B 4 D–K = D 10 L–M. See, e.g., Burkert (1985) 131; Munson (2001) 165.

prevent me from knowing this, its obscurity and the brevity of man's life.

The basis for supposing a connection here is partly the pattern of the sentence as a whole, partly the verbal similarity (*ὄκοιόι τε τινές τὰ εἶδεα ὀποιοί τινες ἰδέαν*). There is then a wider body of parallel statements that can be drawn in: Xenophanes' declaration of the impossibility of clear knowledge (*τὸ ... σαφές*) about the gods,¹¹ for example, or the statement of Socrates in the *Cratylus*—a dialogue concerned with the thesis of the natural appropriateness of names—of a principle that sensible men must acknowledge in discussing the names of the gods: 'that of the gods we know nothing, either of their natures or of the names, whatever they may be, by which they call themselves' (*περὶ θεῶν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν, οὔτε περὶ αὐτῶν οὔτε περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἅττα ποτὲ ἑαυτοὺς καλοῦσιν*, Pl. *Crat.* 400e).

Next, Herodotus' statement of the centrality of Homer and Hesiod in Greek culture is also common to pre-Socratic thinkers: 'The teacher of the most people is Hesiod; they are certain that it is he who knows the most things', according to Heraclitus—before he disabuses them.¹² 'Since the beginning, all have learned according to Homer', according to Xenophanes (*ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον ἐπέι μεμαθήκασι πάντες*).¹³ If one were to follow an interpretation of 2.53 such as Scullion's, i.e., that Herodotus is distancing himself from individuated 'Homeric gods', one might suppose also that he subscribed more widely to a critical stance towards the poets' centrality.¹⁴ Xenophanes' famous fragments on the anthropomorphic representation of the gods might also be woven in; these have been seen, for example, as lying behind the statement in Herodotus' Persian ethnography that the Persians do not consider their gods to take human form (1.131.1–2).¹⁵

Finally, Herodotus' theorising in the previous chapter (2.52) on the original state of knowledge of the gods of the pre-Greek Pelasgians,¹⁶ i.e., before they had acquired the names—their inchoate sense of the gods, their calling them *theoi* because they had placed (*thentes*) all affairs in order—can

¹¹ Xenophanes D 49 L–M = 21 B 34 D–K.

¹² Heraclitus 22 B 57 D–K = D 25 L–M.

¹³ D 10 L–M = 21 B 10 D–K.

¹⁴ Cf. Raaflaub (2002) 157.

¹⁵ Raaflaub (2002) 157; Xenophanes, D 13 L–M = 21 B 16 D–K; D 14 = B 15. For alleged Persian influence on Protagoras, 80 A 2 D–K = P 7 L–M.

¹⁶ For the ambivalent ethnicity of the Pelasgians, see Sourvinou-Inwood (2003).

be connected to a whole series of broadly contemporary accounts of the origins of human perception of the divine: Democritus' account of how ancient men explained heavenly phenomena as caused by the gods out of fear;¹⁷ Prodicus' narrative whereby 'first the things that provided nourishment and help were considered gods and were honoured, and afterward those who had discovered means of nourishment, protection, or the other arts';¹⁸ the *Protagoras* myth (with the establishment of altars and *agalмата*, Pl. *Prot.* 322a); or the famous Sisyphus fragment attributed to Critias or Euripides,¹⁹ with its very different emphasis on a cynical individual who invented fear of the gods so that there might be something to 'frighten bad men even if they do or say or think (something) in secret'.

But how should we read these intertexts? Herodotus has been seen as a 'follower of Xenophanes' (by Edward Hussey) or as a disciple of Anaximander (by Peter Derow).²⁰ Kurt Raaflaub (in the context of 1.131) has suggested that Herodotus 'incorporates' into his *Histories* Xenophanes' critique of Homer's and Hesiod's stories about all-too-human gods and of the concept of anthropomorphic deities'.²¹ There are reasons for caution over such readings, however.

First, there are perhaps particular dangers which attach to pre-Socratic intertexts specifically. By virtue of their fragmentary nature, there is a risk that pre-Socratic positions take on the misleading appearance of clear doctrines. (This potential problem is exacerbated rather than assisted by the new Laks–Most edition with its division into P[erson], D[octrine], and R[eception].)²² As Milette Gaifman has observed in relation to Xenophanes' anthropomorphic fragments, however, these do not 'necessarily [constitute]

¹⁷ Democritus D 207 L–M = 68 A 75 D–K.

¹⁸ Prodicus D 15, 16 L–M = 84 B 5 D–K.

¹⁹ Critias, Fr. 1 Nauck = 43 F 19 *TGrF* = 88 B 25 D–K.

²⁰ Xenophanes: Edward Hussey, quoted by Gould (1994) 94 n. 7. See discussion of Versnel (2011) 120. Anaximander: Derow (1994) 78; see my discussion in Harrison (2000) 116.

²¹ Raaflaub (2002) 157. Cf. Gaifman (2012) 97 (Persian exclusion of images 'could be interpreted as an implicit rejection of anthropomorphism specifically, but it does not necessitate such a notion').

²² Some of the difficulties of categorisation (esp. the distinction between D and R) are explored by Mourelatos (2018), but the reviews of Laks–Most to date largely reflect the assumed primacy of the 'doctrinal' (so also Graham (2018)).

a reproof, but rather an observation on the tendency to project one's own appearance onto the divine'.²³

There is then a consequent danger that the significance of pre-Socratic intertexts may be exaggerated. The identification of parallels encourages a sense of discovery, that we have unearthed a kind of explanatory key to one text in another, and that we can use the wider thought of one figure to extrapolate that of the other.²⁴ But, to develop the example of the intertext with Protagoras' *Peri theōn*, although Herodotus' phrasing may resemble that of Protagoras, it is striking that he does not follow Protagoras in all respects. There is no evidence at 2.53 that the existence of the gods is open to question. Scullion and Burkert in essence read that meaning into the text (again by making the link with 2.3.2). As Robert Fowler has written, they 'mistake Herodotus' reluctance to speak of theology for scepticism about the existence of gods'.²⁵ An allusion—even if we could securely identify it as such—to Protagoras or to Xenophanes cannot be read as an indication of wholesale investment in a wider set of 'doctrines'.

This is for a number of reasons. First, given the nugatory state of survival of the pre-Socratic authors, we can hardly gauge the level or extent of any author's familiarity with them. Robin Lane Fox once observed to me—in Oxonian style—that Herodotus had been to his pre-Socratic tutorials but could not remember them very well. (Influence can indeed occur in many ways. Books, it has been suggested, can be divided into four categories: those that you have read, those that you have forgotten, those you have only heard about, and those that you do not know at all.²⁶ In a society on the cusp of the oral and the written, in which 'publication' of a work such as the *Historiēs* should be thought of as a process rather than a moment,²⁷ the notion of any straightforward influence is confounded to an even greater extent.) Even, then, where a reader recognises an allusion from one author to another—with an internalised 'I see what you did there' (in Pelling's phrase, above, p. 40)—, the force of such a moment of connection between author, reader/listener, and reference-text may be as much to highlight differences in meaning, to create a jarring effect, as to signal a common perspective. Far

²³ Gaifman (2012) 79. Cf., more broadly, Tor (2017).

²⁴ So, e.g., Roubeckas (2019) 142, building on Whitmarsh (2015) 87–91.

²⁵ Fowler (2010) 319 n. 5; see also Lloyd ad loc. (L18), Munson (2001) 165 ('it is not Herodotus but Protagoras who denies the possibility of human knowledge about the gods').

²⁶ Bayard (2007) 17 n. 1, cited by Racine (2016) 197.

²⁷ See, e.g., Hornblower (2005) 19–38 for a review, and esp. now Irwin (forthcoming).

from being the passive receiver of the pre-Socratics' 'doctrines', it is possible that Herodotus may actively have been engaging in, or commenting on, their debates.²⁸ The more that we expand the range of possible pre-Socratic intertexts, moreover, the more likely it is that the relationship is less direct and mechanical than a mere alignment.

I look here at a group of overlapping areas: the evidence for Herodotus' 'monotheism'; the status of Homer and Hesiod; and finally, as a coda, the nature of the primordial religion that preceded the poets' allocation to the gods of their eponyms, honours, skills, and forms.

First, 'monotheism'. Scullion is drawn to the possibility of what we might term a Xenophonean Herodotus who distances himself from the Homeric gods—to the extent that he suggests that there are only three occasions on which he names a Greek god in his own narrative voice:²⁹

The first is Herodotus' argument that Heracles the god is primary and taken over from the Egyptians, Heracles the hero a late derivative of the god (2.43–5). He concludes this startling reversal of Greek tradition with a wish for benevolence from the gods and heroes (2.45.3). This passage may be paired with his later comment 'I suppose, if one may make suppositions about divine matters' that Demeter kept the Persians who had burnt her sanctuary at Eleusis out of that at Plataea (9.65.2). So straightforward an application of the sacrilege model needs no excuse, and the easiest explanation is that both here and in the controversial case of Heracles Herodotus is marking and excusing speculation about a named divinity undertaken on his own narrative initiative. There is finally the 'anger of Talthybius' (7.134–7), which Herodotus emphatically counts a 'divine matter' (7.137.1–2). This tale, pretty clearly invented by Athenians to whitewash their killing of Spartan heralds in 430 BCE, is not only very tendentious in itself but also tendentiously narrated by Herodotus. It seems then that a strong political rather than religious motive prompted him to endorse this story and the essential role played in it by the Spartan patron of heralds. By my reckoning Herodotus nowhere else chooses to speak *in propria persona* of named Greek gods, and, subjective as such reckoning inevitably is, there is at any rate a reticence here that needs explaining.

²⁸ Cf. Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 73, seemingly conceiving of the pre-Socratic influence as one-way.

²⁹ Scullion (2006) 198; cf. Lateiner (1989) 66–7, Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 74 n. 50.

Reducing the number of such instances to three involves a certain strain. There are more cases in which the intervention of a particular god, if not always a particular identifiable god, is strongly implied. What distinguishes the intervention of Demeter at Plataea is that there is clear evidence to support the case that the goddess was responsible. Similarly, in the case of the Potidaea floodtide, the evidence points to the identity of Poseidon (8.129). Special pleading is also required then to undermine the significance of the three remaining instances. A political motive hardly excludes a religious one. As for Herodotus' expression 'I suppose, if one may make suppositions about divine matters' (εἴ τι περὶ τῶν θεῶν πρηγμάτων δοκέειν δεῖ), this cannot reasonably support the weight put on it, as effectively neutralising this passage as an instance of a named god's intervention.³⁰ Such expressions are widespread across Greek literature. 'If a mortal must make conjecture of the intention of the gods ...' (εἰ δὲ δεῖ θνητὸν ὄντα τῆς τῶν θεῶν στοχάσασθαι διανοίας, Isoc. *Dem.* 50). 'If it is necessary to speculate about the gods ...' (εἴπερ οὖν δεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ὑπονοεῖν, Andoc. 1.137–9). What unites all these expressions of uncertainty over theologising is that they do not prevent subsequent speculation but are precisely a prelude to it. Isocrates' caution prefaces a statement of what 'all people believe' about the gods. Andocides, like Herodotus, makes a trenchant judgement on the operation of divine retribution for human crimes.

Overall, it seems, there is a strain in Scullion's account to render the wider fabric of the *Histories* consistent with the desired picture—the picture, that is, of a pre-Socratic Herodotus who distances himself from individual gods. How else then can we reconcile the seeming contradiction between 2.53 and the representation of the gods elsewhere in the *Histories*? The answer is, in essence, to embrace the contradiction. Xenophanes' 'one god' was, of course, 'One god, among both gods and humans the greatest | Neither in bodily frame similar to mortals nor in thought' (εἷς θεός, ἐν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος | οὔτε δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίος οὔτε νόημα, D 16 L–M = 21 B 23 DK). ('How are we to explain', as Versnel asks, 'that the first intransigent monist of Greek philosophy admits through the back door what he has just previously ousted triumphantly through the front door?')³¹

³⁰ Contrast the position of Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 72 ('Cette remarque ... atteste *a contrario* la réserve globale ...').

³¹ For Xenophanes, and for the manoeuvre of embracing contradiction, see Versnel (2011) 244–67 (quotation from p. 247).

Herodotus' attraction to 'monotheistic' usages can both be tied to context (such terms tend to appear in generalising contexts, or where divine intervention is being diagnosed but there is insufficient evidence to pin responsibility to a particular divinity³²) and at the same time does not preclude a role for individuated divinities.

What then is the status of Homer's (and Hesiod's) characterisations of the gods? Again, the sceptical nature of Xenophanes' position can be exaggerated. Xenophanes' critique of Homer and Hesiod—his pointing out of the morally blameworthy actions attributed to the gods (thieving, adultery, deceit: D 8, 9 L–M = B 11, 12 D–K)—can be characterised as contemptuous of traditional piety (so, 'deriding (ἐπικόπτων) what [Homer and Hesiod] said about the gods'³³). But it can also be given a more positive construction. So, according to Arius Didymus,³⁴

Ξενοφάνους πρώτου λόγος ἦλθεν εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἄξιος γραφῆς, ἅμα παιδιᾷ τὰς τε τῶν ἄλλων τόλμας ἐπιπλήττοντος καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ παριστάντος εὐλάβειαν ὡς ἄρα θεὸς μὲν οἶδε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.

Xenophanes was the first author of a discourse worthy of mention that came to the Greeks, playfully rebuking the audacities of other people and at the same time demonstrating his own piety, on the idea that god knows the truth, 'but opinion extends over all men'.

Since truth is a divine prerogative, we are freed up to express our own opinion without fear of impiety.³⁵ In a similar vein, the acknowledgement that the names of the gods (i.e., the names that the gods use amongst themselves) are unknowable allows for us to investigate the conventional human names without fear of impiety (Pl. *Crat.* 400). Such expressions of unknowability, however, do not merely qualify Greek beliefs concerning the gods.

If the gods are unknowable, how does one respond? Should one, first, desist from speculation on their nature? This is the approach credited to

³² See, e.g., Harrison (2000) 169–81; more exhaustively, François (1957).

³³ D 1 L–M = 21 B 1 D–K.

³⁴ Xenophanes D 5 L–M = A 24 D–K; cf. Heraclitus, esp. D 22, 25 L–M = 22 B 56, 57 D–K.

³⁵ Cf. Xenophanes D 49 L–M = 21 B 34 D–K.

Protagoras and others in Plato's *Theaetetus*. “My good people, young and old”, Protagoras is envisaged as saying, “you sit here orating; you drag in gods, whose existence or non-existence I exclude from all discussion, written and spoken ...” (Pl. *Theaet.* 162d; cf. 80 B 4 D–K = D 10 L–M). But there is also a contrary position reflected, for example, in the passing questioning of whether one can conjecture about the gods that we saw earlier: such questioning of the difficulty of conjecture about the gods is invariably a formulaic prelude to precisely that, or indeed to dogmatic assertion. How then should one *act* on the unknowability of the divine? Overwhelmingly, the answer is that one should proceed with the propitiation of the gods. For the Socrates of the *Cratylus*, the initial principle (‘that of the gods we know nothing ...’) is followed by a second: ‘namely to call them, as is customary (νόμος) in prayers, by whatever name and from whatever provenance they prefer to be called (οὔτινές τε καὶ ὁπόθεν χαίρουσιν ὀνομαζόμενοι) since we do not know of any other’, Pl. *Crat.* 400e). A fragment credited to the late fourth-century new comedian Philemon adopts a similar stance, albeit coupled with an expression of the futility of ‘seeking out’ the god:³⁶

θεὸν νόμιζε καὶ σέβου, ζήτει δὲ μὴ
 πλεῖον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἄλλο τοῦ ζητεῖν ἔχεις.
 εἴτ' ἔστιν εἴτ' οὐκ ἔστι μὴ βούλου μαθεῖν,
 ὡς ὄντα τοῦτον καὶ παρόντ' ἀεὶ σέβου.

Believe in god and worship him, but seek him not:
 you'll have no other profit than the search.
 Don't try to find out if he is or not,
 but worship him always as if he exists and is present!

In Versnel's paraphrase, ‘Stop wasting your time with worrying and thinking’; just ‘*Do as if* by just performing the proper rituals’.³⁷ Or in the analogy of Simmias in Plato's *Phaedo*, in the absence of certain knowledge, one should ‘adopt the best and most irrefutable of men's theories and, borne upon this, sail through the dangers of life as upon a raft, unless someone

³⁶ Fr. 118 a–b (Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, II.515) from Stob. *Ecl.* 2.1.5; the attribution to Philemon disputed by Kassel–Austin, n. on Philemon fr. 198 (VII.317). I am indebted here to the discussion of Versnel (2011) 473, whose translation I adapt.

³⁷ Versnel (2011) 473.

should make that journey safer and less risky upon a firmer vessel of some divine doctrine (λόγου θείου τινός, Pl. *Phd.* 85b–d).³⁸

It is in this context then that 2.53 (and its sister passage, 2.3.2) should be seen. Both passages may reflect pre-Socratic influence (or, perhaps we should say, a pre-Socratic background), and yet there is no need to see a harsh distinction between revolutionary scepticism, on the one hand, and traditional piety on the other.³⁹ Herodotus' comment on human knowledge of the divine at 2.3.2 need not imply a lack of human insight (that all men understand 'equally badly'⁴⁰); instead it may suggest that 'they all "really know" something', albeit 'an (indeterminably) equal amount'.⁴¹ The closest parallel to Herodotus' expression of the equal knowledge of the divine comes arguably not from a philosophical context but from a fragment of a *paean* of Pindar (Pindar fr. 61 Snell–Maehler, from Stob. 2.1.8):

τί ἔλπεαι σοφίαν ἔμμεν, ἂν ὀλίγον τοι
 ἀνὴρ ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἴσχει;
 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως τὰ θεῶν
 βουλευμάτων ἔρευνάσει βροτέα φρενί·
 θνατᾶς δ' ἀπὸ ματρὸς ἔφθ.

What do you imagine wisdom to be, which one man possesses in slightly greater degree than another? For it is impossible that he will search out the gods' plans with a mortal mind, since he was born from a mortal mother (tr. Race).

Here one man can (scarcely) exceed another in wisdom (implicitly, wisdom in relation to the gods' plans). But the position does not then render any speculation on the divine otiose. Unknowability indeed, far from diluting—

³⁸ A similar pattern of thought is perhaps reflected at Eur. *Bacch.* 200–9.

³⁹ Cf. the comments of Rudhardt (1992a) 104 (of 'monotheistic' expressions): 'Cette tendance, contrairement aux apparences, n'est pas révolutionnaire; elle ne conduit pas au monothéisme. Loin de briser le cadre des habitudes ancestrales, elle correspond à l'un des traits fondamentaux de la psychologie religieuse hellénique, que nous avons déjà souligné. Le Grec saisit concrètement le dieu sous des formes et pour ainsi dire dans les incarnations diverses, mais il sait que la divinité reste au-delà, profondément inconnaissable.'

⁴⁰ Thomas (2000) 279; cf. Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 73–4.

⁴¹ Munson (2001) 165; see also Schwab (2020) 36. Cf. Lateiner (1989) 65; that is, all men have beliefs and rituals which satisfy them, and they are inaccessible to testing for objective truth.

or somehow rendering *merely* conventional—the worship of individuated gods, is the necessary *complement* to that continued propitiation. It is *because* of (and not despite) the gods’ unknowability that one can proceed with apparent and unquestioning conviction.⁴² One can believe that the epithets, the honours, and the skills were given to the gods by Homer and Hesiod, and that it was they that indicated their forms—that the demarcation of the gods was, in effect, a human construct⁴³—and nevertheless credit these characterisations with validity. One can believe equally that ‘God is like no one, and on account of this fact no one knows him through an *eikōn*’ (according to a fragment of Antisthenes⁴⁴) and yet—as Milette Gaifman has argued—‘these comments do not necessarily imply the rejection of figural images, nor do they promote an alternative.’⁴⁵

Finally, some brief remarks on ‘primordial religion’. If Homer and Hesiod first created a theogony, and gave to the gods their eponyms, their honours, skills, and forms, what did they have before that point? Scullion suggests reasonably that this ‘leaves a remainder we might identify as their essential, existent personalities, but it is difficult to see what this remainder might consist of, unless a sort of disembodied ethos.’⁴⁶ Some kind of picture can be pieced together, however, with the help of pre-Socratic intertexts, accounts such as those of Prodicus, Democritus, and the Platonic *Protagoras*, as well as his own text. What one can discern is an evolutionary model in which an inchoate sense of the divine is gradually fleshed out with a more detailed recognition of the gods⁴⁷ and with the paraphernalia of worship. At 2.4.2, the Egyptians are credited with being the first to introduce altars, and images (*ἀγάλματα*) and temples. Implicitly, then, there is a previous stage of

⁴² Cf. Harrison (2000) 188–92, and more broadly Sourvinou-Inwood (2000) 20: ‘The Greeks did not delude themselves that their religion incarnated the divine will’.

⁴³ Contrast Scullion (2006) 199. See also here Currie (2020) 155–6, countenancing various softenings of the meaning of the primacy of Hesiod and Homer (either that Herodotus’ statement ‘could amount to a claim that we are unable to point to any other named individual as having created a theogony for the Greeks’, or that he might have allowed that there were Greek poets before Hesiod and Homer, but discounted these as, to all intents and purposes, irrelevant’).

⁴⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Protrept.* 6.71.2.

⁴⁵ Gaifman (2012) 80.

⁴⁶ Scullion (2006) 200.

⁴⁷ Cf. 2.145–6 where Herodotus concludes that the Greeks dated the origin of Pan and Dionysus to the time at which they first gained knowledge of these gods. I attempt to flesh out Herodotus’ picture of the earliest human development in Harrison (forthcoming).

development—one of which we can still gain glimpses in contemporary foreign contexts—before any people possessed such things. The Pelasgians of 2.52 strikingly appreciate the plurality of the gods; they then obtain a basic level of confirmation of the names of the gods they receive from abroad from Dodona.⁴⁸ Homer and Hesiod fill out that picture: with a mythological narrative, eponyms (leading to the specificity of cult), worked-out characterisations or forms, and the honours they receive. ‘The gods’, according to another fragment of Xenophanes, ‘have not indicated all things to mortals from the beginning. But in time, by searching, they find something more that is better’ (οὗτοι ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς πάντα θεοὶ θνητοῖσ’ ὑπέδειξαν, ἀλλὰ χρόνῳ ζητοῦντες ἐφευρίσκουσιν ἄμεινον).⁴⁹ We are all, like the Pelasgians, fumbling in the dark. And so we hold on to whatever points of reference we can find. Do as if.

⁴⁸ I will not explore here the vexed issue of the meaning of the gods’ names, discussed, e.g., by Harrison (2000) 251–64; Thomas (2000) 275–81; Roubeckas (2019) 134; Pirenne-Delforge (2020) 75–7.

⁴⁹ Xenophanes D 53 L–M = 21 B 18 D–K, from Stob. 1.8.2; 3.29.41.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayard, L. (2007) *Comment parler des livres que l'on n'a pas lus?* (Paris).
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Currie, B. (2020) 'The Birth of Literary Criticism (Herodotus 2.116–17) and the Roots of Homeric Neoanalysis', in R. Zelnick-Abramovitz and J. J. Price, edd., *Text and Intertext in Greek Epic and Drama: Essays in Honor of Margalit Finkelberg* (London) 147–70.
- Derow, P. S. (1994) 'Historical Explanation: Polybius and his Predecessors', in S. Hornblower, ed., *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 72–90.
- Fowler, R. (2010) 'Gods in Early Greek Historiography', in J. N. Bremmer and A. Erskine, edd., *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations* (Edinburgh) 318–34.
- François, G. (1957) *Le Polytheisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots ΘΕΟΣ, ΔΑΙΜΩΝ* (Paris).
- Gaifman, M. (2012) *Aniconism in Greek Antiquity* (Oxford).
- Gould, J. (1994) 'Herodotus and Religion', in S. Hornblower, ed., *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 91–106.
- Graham, D. W. (2018) 'Review of Laks–Most (2016)', *CW* 111: 433–9.
- Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- (forthcoming) 'Herodotus on the Evolution of Human Society', in Truschnegg, et al. (forthcoming).
- Hornblower, S. (2005) *A Commentary on Thucydides Volume II: Books IV–V.24* (Oxford).
- Hussey, E. (unpubl.) 'The Religious Opinions of Herodotus'.
- Irwin, E. (forthcoming) 'The *Histories* in Context: some Reflections on Publication, Reception, and Interpretation', in Truschnegg, et al. (forthcoming).
- de Jong, I. (2012) 'The Helen Logos and Herodotus' Fingerprint' in M. de Bakker and E. Baragwanath, edd., *Myth, Truth and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford) 127–42.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Laks, A. and G. W. Most, edd. (2016) *Early Greek Philosophy*, 9 vols (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Lloyd, A. B. (1975–88) *Herodotus, Book II*, 3 vols (Leiden).
- Mourelatos, A. P. D. (2018) 'Review of Laks–Most (2016)', *BMCR* 15 March 2018, <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2018/2018.03.15> (last accessed 26 Jan. 2021).

- Munson, R.V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2020) *Le Polythéisme grec à l'épreuve d'Hérodote* (Paris).
- Raaflaub, K. A. (2002) 'Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in E. Bakker, I. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd., *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden) 149–86.
- Racine, F. (2016) 'Herodotus' Reception in Latin Literature from Cicero to the 12th century', in J. Priestley and V. Zali, edd., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden) 193–212.
- Roubeckas, N. P. (2019) 'Theorizing about (which?) Origins: Herodotus on the Gods', in id., ed., *Theorizing 'Religion' in Antiquity* (Sheffield) 129–49.
- Rudhardt, J. (1992a) *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique²* (Paris).
- (1992b) 'Les attitudes des Grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 209: 219–38; Eng. transl. by A. Nevill, 'The Greek Attitude to Foreign Religions', in T. Harrison, ed., *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh, 2002) 172–85.
- Schwab, A. (2020) *Fremde Religion in Herodots "Historien": religiöse Mehrdimensionalität bei Persern und Ägypten* (Stuttgart).
- Scullion, S. (2006) 'Herodotus and Greek Religion', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola, edd., *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge) 192–208.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2000) 'What is *Polis* Religion?', in R. Buxton, ed., *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford) 13–37; orig. in O. Murray and S. Price, edd., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford, 1990) 295–322.
- (2003) 'Herodotus (and Others) on Pelasgians', in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 147–88.
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- Tor, S. (2017) *Mortal and Divine in Early Greek Epistemology* (Cambridge).
- Truschnegg, B., R. Rollinger, J. Degen, H. Klinkott, and K. Ruffing, edd. (forthcoming) *Herodotus' World* (Wiesbaden).
- Versnel, H. S. (2011) *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Leiden).
- Whitmarsh, T. (2015) *Battling the Gods: Atheism in the Ancient World* (London).

BLOODY DEATH IN GREEK
HISTORIOGRAPHY AND HOMER:
DISCURSIVE PRESENCES AND MEANINGFUL
ABSENCES IN HERODOTUS' BATTLE
NARRATIVES*

Maria Fragoulaki

1. Introduction: Meaningful Absences

This chapter revisits the question of Herodotus' descriptions of the dying body on the battlefield and reads them against Homer's different treatment of this theme, aiming to bring to light new aspects of Herodotus' interaction with the Homeric text. In the *Histories*, deaths of warriors in battle are reported briefly, often by a single verb or with minimal information, provided in the form of a vignette of the warrior's body and the wound received. In most cases there is no reference to the last moments of the dying individual, such as his words or thoughts, the way he falls onto the ground or loses his senses. This is in sharp contrast to Homeric descriptions of death, which can be extensive, often providing graphic details of the wound and the warrior's way of dying.¹ This striking difference is of

* I dedicate this chapter to the memory of Ioannis-Theophanis Papadimitriou, Emeritus Professor of Classics at the University of Athens (EKPA) and President of the Hellenic Humanistic Society, who died on 8 May 2021, after a short illness. He was an excellent classicist and a man of rare integrity, generosity, and fine humour. I was blessed and honoured by his teaching, unfailing support, and friendship.

A note on translations: For Herodotus, I have used Waterfield (1998), and for Homer's *Iliad*, Murray (1924–5), with my adaptations, in both cases. Other translations are my own.

¹ Homeric descriptions of injury and death in combat are not found in Thucydides either (see also below, on the word 'blood', αἷμα, below, pp. 116–22, but resurface in historical accounts of the Roman period, such as the Alexander-historian Arrian and the Byzantine Procopius: Salazar (2000) 159–60; Hornblower (2007) 48–50. Tragedy seems to be Homer's most obvious inheritor in the physicality and gruesomeness of death-scenes in the fifth century BCE, e.g., de Jong (1991) for death in messenger speeches. The way in which the

special importance, since the way one dies on the battlefield is intimately connected with the heroic ethics of death, thus posing challenging questions about the reception of Homer within the political, social, and military context of the classical period in which Herodotus is situated, including new technologies in war and political institutions.

The study of the absence of descriptions of death on the battlefield in Herodotus as an un-Homeric feature is not new in the bibliography. Important suggestions have been made as to why Herodotus, the so-called ‘prose Homer’ (*SEG* 48.1330, the Salmacis Inscription) or ‘the most Homeric’ of authors ([Long.], *Subl.* 13.3),² departs from his predecessor so sharply in his habits of describing death on the battlefield. For example, Deborah Boedeker has argued for a contrast between Homer and Herodotus using the theoretical framework of Bakhtin’s monologic vs dialogic/multiplicity of voices. According to this view, Homer is a basically monologic text in its commitment to the heroic honour and subjective description of death from the dying hero’s viewpoint; by contrast, Herodotus’ interest in multiple and competing levels of discourse bestows a dialogic or polyphonic quality to the *Histories*.³ Yet studies on the complexities of motivation in Herodotus and Homer permit us to argue that polyphonic complexity can also be sought within Homer’s world too and in the relationship between the Homeric narrator and his subject matter.⁴ The complexities of Homeric focalisation can expose very different views of the most incontestably heroic deaths, such as Hector’s. As Christopher Pelling points out to me, ‘Hector’s death may be as good a death as one can get—glorious, fighting for the city, eternally remembered as Homer has seen to that—but it means something very different for Andromache’.⁵ On the other hand, there are occasions when the multifocal world of Herodotus can be ‘poetically’ monologic. Again, Ove Strid has argued for Herodotus’ interest in recording solely extraordinary deaths in some detail.⁶ This idea too can be complicated further, if we consider, for example, Leonidas’ death at

early historians interact with tragedy’s tropes in reporting death deserves separate examination.

² See Matijašić in this volume, above, pp. 2–4.

³ Boedeker (2003).

⁴ See, e.g., Baragwanath (2008); Pelling (2019) and (2020a) showing that the boundaries between epic and historiographic tropes of aetiology are permeable.

⁵ Per email of 25.9.2019.

⁶ Strid (2006).

Thermopylae (on which see below, §4), which is pretty extraordinary, but is still reported tersely; a case which shows that presence and/or amplification is only one way to signpost the memorable and the extraordinary.⁷

Through linguistic and narratological analysis of Herodotus' 'un-Homeric' descriptions of the dying body on the battlefield, this chapter will argue that the absence of detailed information is part of Herodotus' Homeric allusive practice or Homeric intertextuality. As has been noted, later writers may wave at an earlier writer, by means of a brief allusion, a sort of shorthand, asking their audience to use the memory of the earlier writer to fill in the details of their own story.⁸ In modern literary and cultural theory, this 'waving' and 'filling in' of gaps are central in the notions of reception and intertextuality, or of the discursive space in which a work is received and meaning is created. But as is also widely acknowledged in the bibliography, such a network of textual discourse is complicated and elusive, and the understanding of its mechanism is difficult, if not impossible, at times. Suffice it only to note the intense discussions about texts relating to distant or foreign systems, codes, and traditions, which deal with questions such as 'what happens when specific intertexts are culturally lost?' and the role of philology as 'an archaeology of reading' in surmounting 'the intertext's obsolescence'.⁹

In order to address Herodotus' Homeric intertextuality focusing on descriptions of death on the battlefield, attention will be paid to the interplay between Homeric presences and absences on the surface of Herodotus' discourse. Critical discourse analysis has engaged with questions of 'meaningful absences' or 'meaningful silences' and how these might be investigated in an empirical way, dealing with questions such as: 'How do we come to notice absences?' or 'How are absences determined by what is semiotically present?'¹⁰ For something to be perceived as meaningfully absent, there has to be at least one thinkable alternative presence that comes to mind. And in order for this alternative presence to come to mind, there has to be a context in which this presence is possible or expected. 'Silence and absence are of interest to us in that they can be interpreted, and this is

⁷ Pelling (2006) 94: 'There is indeed something magnificent about Leonidas and the three hundred'. On descriptions of death on the battlefield in Herodotus, see also Darbo-Peschanski (1988); Friedrich (2002); Marincola (2018).

⁸ Pelling (2013a). On intertextuality and allusion, see also Machacek (2007). On Homeric allusions in Herodotus see Matijašić, Haywood, Barker, and Tuplin, above, Chs 1, 3, 6, 9 (respectively).

⁹ Allen (2000) 126.

¹⁰ Schröter-Taylor (2018) 5.

only possible if they are relatable to an alternative presence that can be spelled out'.¹¹

In relation to our investigation, the many Homeric features (or presences) of Herodotus' narrative create a Homeric context or a suitable textual environment, where Herodotus' audience could construe something as meaningfully absent. An important aspect of this open-ended negotiation of 'Homeric' presences and 'un-Homeric' absences is the experiential and performative relationship of Herodotus' audiences with the Homeric text; among other things, a cultural bank of rich, detailed, and grisly descriptions of injury and death in battle.¹² This is further connected with the complex question of orality and literacy in ancient Greece and how their interaction determined the way in which a word remembered 'its own path and [could not] completely free itself from the power of those concrete contexts into which it ha[d] entered', in Michael Bakhtin's words.¹³ The memory space of a word can be vast and deep, however desperate and frustrated we might be in our investigation of ancient texts by the feeling of building so much on small details. Memory space can also be painful; suffice it to think how trauma and memory studies deal with narrative and silence.¹⁴ Even in victory, war and heroism are inextricably connected with the pain of loss. Homer speaks a good deal about this pain and from various perspectives, and so do the tragic poets who have been influenced by epic tropes of heroism.¹⁵ Herodotus' war narrative is no exception.

The oral context holds an important place in the bibliography on Herodotus, and its challenges must always be kept in mind when using tools of philology (or the 'archaeology of reading'; see above), such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG)—an invaluable tool for the modern reader. There is no doubt that poets such as Simonides (and Homer) were quoted and studied from memory at the level of word and particle in the classical period:

¹¹ Schröter–Taylor (2018) 6, and *passim*.

¹² See Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) xviii on the preponderance of the epic genre among Herodotus' influences and debts. The accomplished, refined, and deeply original narrative of Herodotus is also a reflection of his audience's horizon of expectations: Vannicelli (ibid.) xix. On the deep familiarity of fifth-century BCE audiences with the Homeric text in relation to Thucydides, see Fragoulaki (2020b).

¹³ Bakhtin (1984) 201 and Thomas (1992), esp. 101–8; in relation to Thucydides and collective memory, see Fragoulaki (2020a) and (2020b).

¹⁴ See, for example, Dessingué–Winter (2016).

¹⁵ See below, pp. 143–4, on Hector's address to his heart in *Iliad* 22. For the Homeric background of the heroic in tragedy, see Easterling (1997).

The intellectuals who gather for discussion in Plato's *Protagoras* rely on their collective memory to quote large portions of a complicated Simonidean ode that they proceed to subject to extremely close verbal analysis (339a–347a) [...] These savants are doubtless exceptional, and the scene in *Protagoras* comes from one of the most literate of fourth-century authors, but nothing in principle prevents an orally circulating song from being carefully quoted and studied.¹⁶

The oral memory of the text is crucial, and my aim in this discussion is to pay attention to the literary level as a means of approaching (indirectly but no less clearly) questions posed not only for poetry but also for fifth-century historiography, such as: 'the nature of the performance itself (which is very hard to determine, but extremely important, as recent work shows); the character and role of the audience; the relation of the written text to the performed version; the social and political context'.¹⁷

In my effort to deal empirically with the question of Herodotus' 'un-Homeric' way of depicting death in battle, I follow specific steps, always putting emphasis on the relational nature of meaning. I start with a brief overview of descriptions of death in the *Histories* (what I call 'Herodotus' landscape of death') (§2), followed by an examination of Herodotus' descriptions or 'typology' of death in combat (§3), drawing a comparison between death in combat and non-combat contexts in the text. This comparison reveals a significant disparity within the *Histories*, since in many non-combat contexts descriptions of the dying and dead body can easily be characterised as 'Homeric', in their grisliness and anatomical detail, by contrast with the 'un-Homeric' description of death in combat. This disparity within the *Histories* adds a further relational dimension to the discussion of Herodotus' 'un-Homeric' treatment of death in battle, which is further established through tracing the word 'blood' (αἷμα) in Herodotus. This linguistic element is widely used in descriptions of death in Homer (and is an element present in the harsh realities of war in all periods), but is totally absent from Herodotus' battle descriptions, although it appears (rarely) in non-battle contexts. Focusing on the interplay between discursive absences and presences in the construction of meaning, I also pay attention to the intertextual potential of rare or *hapax* words (such as the rare word *kleos* in

¹⁶ Ford (2002) 154.

¹⁷ Thomas (1992) 102.

Herodotus). The same applies to the examination of specific vignettes and longer episodes in the *Histories*, which to their greatest extent have been acknowledged in the bibliography as ‘Homeric’. My discussion will be rounded off by such a ‘Homeric’ episode, namely the battle of Thermopylae (§4). In general, I concentrate on comparisons between battle scenes in Herodotus and the *Iliad*.¹⁸ At points, a comparison with Thucydides is also drawn, in order to put the descriptions of the dying body in Herodotus into the wider canvas of fifth-century historiography and contemporary cultural and ideological aspects of the heroic ethics of death. At all levels of examination (language, narrative organisation and patterning, and themes), I am building on existing scholarship on Herodotus and Homer, hoping to offer new perspectives of Herodotus’ Homeric intertextuality through the application of the methodological tool of discursive presences and meaningful absences.

2. The Landscape of Death in Herodotus: The Suffering and Dying Body

In non-combat scenes, Herodotus does not shun providing detailed descriptions of the human body in moments of suffering, exposure, trauma, and humiliation. ‘Landscape of death’ is a metaphor, used to convey the richness and variety of death in the *Histories*, also conjuring up the visual and spatial dimensions, which are central to our examination.¹⁹ Death and suffering in Herodotus involve different contexts of death, torture, and maltreatment of the dead or living human body, female or male: mutilation, death in the sea by drowning or devouring by big fish, illness, cannibalism, crucifixion, decapitation and impalement, individual and mass murders, necrophily, human sacrifice, and suicide are some of the scenes of death and suffering found in Herodotus. Such descriptions resemble the ‘Homeric’ mode of describing death, and their level of detail varies: more detailed descriptions tend to surface in connection with Herodotus’ deep themes and

¹⁸ Cf. Mueller (2011) 125: ‘To talk about Homeric battle-scenes is to talk for the most part about the *Iliad*’. There are gruesome descriptions of death in the *Odyssey* too, in contexts which can be viewed as ‘alternative’ battlefields (e.g., the cave of the Cyclops or the extermination of the suitors in Odysseus’ palace). The Epic Cycle is another influence: West (2013) 149 and n. 35, ‘it is a typical motif that at the fall of the champion the troops turn to flight’. Cf. the effect of the death of Mardonius at Hdt. 9.63; Briscoe–Hornblower (2020) on Livy 22.6.5. Saunders (1990), for wounds in the *Iliad*.

¹⁹ On ‘death’ in the *Histories*, see Fragoulaki (2021).

programmatic interests, such as characterisation of individuals and groups, ethnography and its ability to explain history, and different systems of political administration and their impact on individuals and groups. The way death, of significant individuals in particular, is described in Herodotus (and Thucydides) also relates to the early historians responding to other contemporary prose sources regarded as precursors of biography. These sources were likely to have contained proto-biographical material (such as anecdotal vignettes or grisly details of an individual's death), which would have been filtered out or drastically recycled by the historians to suit the purposes of their works.²⁰

In battle-narrative contexts brief descriptions of the human body tend to surface in the framing narrative, that is, either before or after the description of the battle. A representative example is Herodotus' version of Cyrus' death.²¹ Here the Persian king died after a prolonged and difficult battle with the Massagetans, in which many of his Persians lost their lives. Both collective (the Persian army) and individual (Cyrus) deaths are reported by a single verb, *διαφθείρεσθαι* and *τελευτᾶν*, respectively: ἡ τε δὴ πολλή τῆς Περσικῆς στρατιῆς αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ διεφθάρη καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς Κύρος τελευτᾷ ('most of the Persian army lost their lives there and Cyrus himself died too', 1.214.3). Within this short death report, the shift from past tense to historical present (*διεφθάρη ... τελευτᾷ*) in the original text, underscores the unexpectedness of Cyrus' death, adding drama to the narrative. This is a trope characteristic of historiography and tragedy: for example, the death of the Athenian general Lamachus in Sicily is reported in a similar manner by Thucydides: ἀποθνήσκει αὐτὸς τε καὶ πέντε ἢ ἕξ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ ('he was killed together with five or six of his companions', Thuc. 6.101.6).²² The naming of

²⁰ For example, Pelling (2016) 114–15 reads Herodotus' 'in a way which does not bear mentioning' (*οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγγήσιος*, 3.125.1), said of Polycrates' death, 'as a potential response to something like a *Life of Polycrates* by Stesimbrotus of Thasos, which might have contained graphic details about the manner in which Polycrates was killed. Ion of Chios' *Epidēmiāi* has been identified as another forerunner of biography: 'his forte was the anecdotal vignette, with an eye for the good remark and an eye for the visual' (Pelling (2020b) 93). All this was Herodotus' forte too, and if we were to risk making a hypothesis based on Sophocles' quotations found in Ion's fragments, Ion's biographic elements could have been mediated to Herodotus via the tragic poet Sophocles, who was known to have been an Athenian connection of Herodotus since antiquity (Plut. *Mor.* 785B).

²¹ On versions of Cyrus' death, see Asheri (2007) 216.

²² Hornblower (2008) 531 cites (*ad loc.*) more examples of abrupt deaths in Thucydides, also mentioning (in his introductory note) that 'the key-moments are signalled by the historical present ... [which] is, for Livy, as for Th., the "initiative-tense"; for historical

a single dying individual against the non-naming of his fellow-combatants is another trope underscoring drama and the significance of the individual. Cyrus (and Lamachus in Thucydides) are the only named individuals who fall in battle, among a group of other unnamed men who fall with them. The death of Leonidas and the Three Hundred at Thermopylae too is reported by a present tense in a similar patterning of named and anonymous deaths (see below, §4).

In contrast to the economic statement, ‘Cyrus himself died too’ (1.214.3), the scene of the posthumous maltreatment of his body, which follows, is rich in gory details (1.214.4–5):

ἄσκον δὲ πλήσασα αἵματος ἀνθρωπηίου Τόμυρις ἐδίζητο ἐν τοῖσι τεθνεῶσι τῶν Περσέων τὸν Κύρου νέκυν, ὡς δὲ εὔρε, ἐναπήκε αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐς τὸν ἄσκον· λυμαιομένη δὲ τῷ νεκρῷ ἐπέλεγε τάδε· ‘σὺ μὲν ἐμὲ ζώουσάν τε καὶ νικῶσάν σε μάχῃ ἀπώλεσας παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν ἐλὼν δόλω· σὲ δ’ ἐγώ, κατὰ περ ἠπειλήσα, αἵματος κορέσω’.

Tomyris filled a wineskin with human blood and searched among the Persian corpses for Cyrus’ body. When she found it, she shoved his head into the wineskin, and as she maltreated the dead body addressed it as follows: ‘Although I have come through the battle alive and victorious, you have destroyed me by capturing my son with a trick. But I warned you that I would quench your thirst for blood, and so I shall.’

This is a story of wine, blood, and revenge, in which Tomyris, the queen of the Massagetans, is involved (on blood, see below, §3). Herodotus has an interest in royal women who demonstrate extraordinary cruelty, especially in contexts of revenge, such as the Persian queen Amestris, Xerxes’ wife (9.108–13), or the Greek queen of Cyrene Pheretime (4.162–5, 200–5).²³ Herodotus’ story of Tomyris communicates with a deeper vein of Near Eastern stories with women protagonists.²⁴ At the same time, in the ethnographic spectrum of the *Histories* and the different shades of Otherness

present in Thucydides, see Lallot et al. (2011); cf. Basset (2011) 160: ‘an unexpected event with heavy consequences is indeed what this tense seems to express’. For the use of historical present in messenger speeches reporting death, see, e.g., Eur. *Ion* 1207, with de Jong (1991).

²³ On the connection between Amestris and Pheretime and ethnography’s aetiological function, see Baragwanath (2020).

²⁴ Weststeijn (2016).

in it, Tomyris' vengeful defilement of Cyrus' body invites a cross-cultural comparison with Xerxes' punishment and hubristic maltreatment of the Hellespont, by having its water flogged, while addressing it with words 'outlandish and presumptuous' (*βάρβαρά τε καὶ ἀτάσθαλα*, 7.35). Clashes or commonalities of culture suggest historical interpretations, and Tomyris' bloodthirstiness is central to the ethnographic characterisation of the Massagetans as paradigms of crude and deep-shaded Otherness.²⁵

3. Where is the Blood? Meaningful Absences in Herodotus' Discourse of Death

In most battle scenes in Herodotus, death is usually reported briefly, without descriptions of the wound or other details. In Homer on the other hand details about types of wounds and anatomical details abound, and it is no exaggeration to say that descriptions of battles in Homer are soaked in blood. Unsurprisingly, the word 'blood' (*αἷμα*) itself is very frequent in Homeric battle scenes, whereas it is totally absent from battle descriptions in Herodotus, and scarce in his work more generally. In this section, we will examine the interplay of presences and absences of the word *αἷμα* in Homer and Herodotus, in order to observe the differences between the two authors in descriptions of death, by means of this linguistic element. Before doing so, a brief survey of Herodotus' language of death will help us situate the presence (or absence) of *αἷμα* in his discourse against the Homeric discourse of death.

In Herodotus, verbs reporting the warrior's death from different narrative viewpoints are: *πίπτειν* ('fall', metaphorically for dying; frequent, e.g., 1.76.4, 82.7; 4.201.1; 7.210.2, 223.3, 224.1); *ἀποθνήσκειν* (*μάχη*) (5.46.1); *συναποθνήσκειν* ('dying/falling together with': 5.46.2; 7.222); *ἀπόλλυμι* (7.209.1); *ἀπόλλυσθαι* (5.126.2; 7.209.2); *καταβάλλειν* (7.211.3); *διαφθείρειν* (7.213.1); *τελευτᾶν* (5.48; 6.1, and in the Cyrus passage above);²⁶ *διαφθείρεσθαι* (1.82.8, 214.3); *ἀποκτείνειν* (1.100.3); *φονεύειν* (4.204); *κατεργάζεσθαι* (7.211.2; 9.106.1); *ξίφει διεργάζεσθαι* (7.224.1); *κατασφάζειν* (8.127);²⁷ *κατακρεοργεῖσθαι* (7.181.1); *κρεοργηδὸν διασπᾶν* ('tear apart limb

²⁵ Cf. Munson (2001) 97–8, on the 'same degree of primitivity' between the Nasamones and the Massagetae (*ibid.* 161–3).

²⁶ *τελευτᾶν* is often used in phrases such as *τελευτᾶν τοῦ βίου* ('end one's life') or *νοῦσῳ τελευτᾶν* ('die of illness'); rarely in battle contexts.

²⁷ Not of death on the battlefield in the strict sense, but the context is war-related.

from limb’: 3.13.2); *κατατραυματίζεσθαι* (‘suffer casualties/wounds’: 7.212.1).²⁸ Some of these verbs, such as *πίπτειν*, are found in Homer too (and elsewhere). Others, such as *κατακρεοργεῖσθαι*, *κρεοργηδὸν διασπᾶν*, and *κατατραυματίζεσθαι*, are rare and their earliest appearance in the surviving literary sources is in Herodotus.²⁹ Death in combat may also be reported through short verbal phrases containing the noun *θάνατος* (‘death’), as in the Thermopylae narrative: *τὸν μέλλοντα σφίσι ἔσεσθαι θάνατον* (‘the death that was approaching for them’, 7.223.4; cf. 7.219.1 for the seer Megistias) and *τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἔξοδον ποιούμενοι* (‘making a sortie to meet their death’, 7.223.2). Comparing numbers of survivors after battle with the number of the initial force is another way to suggest a large number of casualties and a bloody and gruesome battle, without using the vocabulary of death or bodily injury and suffering, e.g., in the battle of the Lacedaemonians and Argives (sixth century BCE): *ὑπελείποντο ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἑξακοσίων τρεῖς* (‘of six hundred men three survived’, 1.82.4). The trope is also found in Thucydides (7.87.6: *ὀλίγοι ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐπ’ οἴκου ἀπενόστησαν*, ‘few out of many returned home’).

3.1. αἷμα (‘blood’) in Homer and Herodotus

Let us now turn our focus to the word ‘blood’ and the presences and absences of this word in Homer and Herodotus. A search of *αἷμα* on the *TLG* database yields 116 occurrences in Homer, 80 in the *Iliad*, and 36 in the *Odyssey*.³⁰ The much greater frequency of the word in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*, over 50%, reflects the preponderance of battlefield scenes in the former. The focus in the *Iliad* may be either on collective deaths reported in high-camera mode, or on individual deaths of named heroes in middle- or low-camera narrative mode.³¹ Though individual deaths tend to stand out, examples are plenty in each category. In addition to the visual aspect of

²⁸ Many of these verbs, such as *πίπτειν*, *συναποθνήσκειν*, *ἀπολλύειν*, *ἀπόλλυσθαι*, *διαφθεῖρειν*, *κατεργάζεσθαι*, *ξίφει διεργάζεσθαι* and *κατατραυματίζεσθαι* appear in the Thermopylae narrative (7.201–33; see below, §4).

²⁹ *κατατραυματίζεσθαι* also in Thucydides (e.g., 7.41.4, 79.5).

³⁰ The word *αἷμα* alone was looked up as a *TLG* lemma; compounds or *αἷμα*-rooted words have not been included in the search. Cf. Neal (2006).

³¹ I employ Lendon’s (2017) cinematic language to describe the different heights (high, middle, low) from which the battle narrator’s camera hangs when recording motions of army units, groups, individuals, and different amount of detail; with Marincola (2018) 10–13 and *passim*. For Homeric battle narratives, see also Fenik (1968); Latacz (1977).

blood and imagery of massive loss of life, Homeric battle scenes contain auditory imagery of loud sounds of weapons and human bodies (*Il.* 8.62–5):

... ἀτὰρ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι
ἔπληντ' ἀλλήλησι, πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει.
ἔνθα δ' ἄμ' οἴμωγῇ τε καὶ εὐχολῇ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, ῥέε δ' αἷματι γαῖα.

They dashed their bossed shields together, and a great din arose. Then were heard alike the sound of groaning and the cry of triumph of the slayers and the slain, and the earth flowed with blood.³²

The soaking of earth—or the water growing red with human blood—belongs to formulaic imagery,³³ and blood is often found in paratactic relationship with slaying and death.³⁴ Human blood is often described as dark in Homer, and so is death itself.³⁵

When the camera zooms into individual (fatal or non-fatal) wounds, the length and detail of descriptions vary. Often snapshots of anatomical details and information about armour and weapons used to inflict the wound are provided.³⁶ The variety of fatal wounds inflicted by Achilles towards the end of Book 20 and the details and vividness of these descriptions sketch a particularly fierce and unrelenting personality (cf. οὐ γάρ τι γλυκύθυμος ...

³² Cf. the formulaic 'he fell to the ground with a thud and his armour rattled around him', *Il.* 4.504; 13.187, with Fenik (1968) 3.

³³ E.g., *Il.* 4.451; 20.494 (water: *Il.* 21.21); variants: *Il.* 21.119; 17.360–1.

³⁴ *Il.* 11.164: ἔκ τ' ἀνδροκτασίης ἔκ θ' αἵματος ἔκ τε κυδοιμοῦ, 'from the man-slaying and the blood and the din'; *Il.* 19.214: φόνος τε καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἀργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν, 'slaying, and blood and the grievous groans of men'.

³⁵ E.g., adjectives such as μέλας, κελαινός, κελαινεφής are standard epithets of αἷμα: *Il.* 4.140, 149; 7.329; πορφύρεος used both for death and blood: *Il.* 5.83; 17.360, respectively (with Kelly (2007) 236); for the darkness enfolding the eyes of the dying hero, see, e.g., *Il.* 4.461; 5.82–3). For blood and blood spilt in Homer, Neal (2006) 185–266. Cf. Griffin's (1980) 91–3 panorama of death in the *Iliad*.

³⁶ Examples: 'smote him as he rushed onwards upon the right shoulder on the plate of his corselet; through this sped the bitter arrow and held straight on its way, and the corselet was spattered with blood', *Il.* 5.98–100 (Diomedes' non-fatal wound); 'he let fly a bronze-tipped arrow ... Him Paris struck beneath the jaw under the ear, and swiftly his spirit went away from his limbs, and hateful darkness seized him', *Il.* 13.662–72 (Euchenor's fatal wound). For gruesome deaths and heroic ethics in Homer, see, e.g., Schein (1984); Vernant (1991) 50–74; Rutherford (2013) 62–4.

ἐμμεμαώς, *Il.* 20.467–8).³⁷ Even when wounds are reported briefly, sensory information of astonishing vividness is provided, typical of the Homeric physicality of death. The speed with which the metal blade gets warm inside Achilles' hand by the blood of the dying Echeclus is a case in point (*Il.* 20.474–7):

... ὁ δ' Ἀγήνορος υἷὸν Ἔχεκλον
 μέσσην κὰκ κεφαλὴν ξίφει ἦλασε κωπήεντι,
 πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι· τὸν δὲ κατ' ὄσσε
 ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή.

He struck him square on the head with his hilted sword, and all the blade grew warm with his blood, and down over his eyes came dark death and mighty fate.

How fast can a metal blade get warm from the victim's blood? There is arguably a degree of poetic hyperbole in this sensory detail. On the other hand, the scene surely communicates with sensory realities, not only of the battlefield but also of animal sacrifices. From the modern reader's point of view, it arguably stretches the limits of modern cultural experience and sensory imagination, and therefore the modern audience's capacity to assess the scene's realism.

The imagery of blood and the descriptions of the dying body are central to the exploration of human mortality and divine immortality in Homer. It might be argued that blood, as human biological substance, is the single most palpable criterion that separates men from gods, who most of the time mingle on the battlefield and elsewhere in Homer's world.³⁸ In the episode of Sarpedon's death, one of the most extensive descriptions of death in the *Iliad*, the ingenious poetic handling of the imagery of blood signposts the special significance of the dying hero, also exposing the closeness of ancient theology and the realities of war. Sarpedon is hit by Patroclus' spear close to

³⁷ E.g., *Il.* 20.469–71: 'He [Achilles] smote him upon the liver with his sword, and forth the liver slipped, and the dark blood welling forth from it filled his bosom' (Tros' fatal wound).

³⁸ See, for example: ἀναίμονές εἰσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται, 'they are bloodless and are called immortals', *Il.* 5.342. In fact the gods have blood, but not that of mortals; and they can be wounded, but cannot die: ἀμβροτον αἷμα θεῶ, ἰχώρ, 'the immortal blood of the goddess, the ichor' (5.339–40), of the episode of Aphrodite's wounding by Diomedes; cf. Neal (2006) 151–84.

‘the throbbing heart’ (16.481). No information is provided about the profuse blood loss and the quickness of Sarpedon’s death suggested by the adjective *ἀδινός* (‘throbbing’), at this point in the poetic narrative. This is unusual, in light of similar Homeric descriptions of death from a fatal wound, as we saw. Instead, the imagery of blood in the episode is organised in three vignettes of displaced temporality vis-à-vis Sarpedon’s moment of death from the wound received, as all three take place either before or after that moment. The first vignette concerns the time before: the bloody rain-drops (16.458–60: *αἱματοέσσας ψιάδας*), which Zeus sends to honour his son, whose death is still ahead in the narration. The second turns the focus to the bloody dust (16.486: *κόνις δεδραγμένος αἱματοέσσης*) which the hero clutches as he falls dead, in the few seconds following his death. The third concerns a much later time, when the battle over Sarpedon’s corpse takes place; the hero’s corpse is depicted as ‘utterly covered with missiles and blood and dust, from his head right to the tips of his feet’ (16.639–40: *βελέεσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίησιν | ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἴλοντο διαμπερές ἐς πόδας ἄκρους*; cf. 16.667).³⁹

In Herodotus the presence and frequency of the word *αἷμα* are totally different. As shown in the Appendix at the end of this chapter, it is used only fifteen times.⁴⁰ This is a surprisingly low number, considering the rich and diverse landscape of death and bodily suffering in the *Histories*, as we saw above (§2). None of these occurrences relates to battle descriptions. Thirteen concern non-Greek individuals and groups, and are related to the ethnographic vein of the work and its explanatory function, with four of them appearing in the episode of Cyrus’ death and posthumous maltreatment (see above, pp. 113–15). Some of the ethnographic references of *αἷμα* concern scenes of blood rituals or human sacrifice (e.g., Scythian or Arab customs). It may also appear in (semi-)medical scenes (e.g., the Egyptian Psammenitus or the Persian Pharnuches); or in the Persian Zopyrus’ self-mutilation in the siege of Babylon. Although a military aspect may exist in some of these scenes, nowhere does blood relate to injury or death on the battlefield.

³⁹ For the role of blood in the episode, see Brügger (2018) 216–17 and *passim*; Janko (1992).

⁴⁰ The word *αἷμα* in Herodotus was looked up as a lemma (cf. above, n. 30). In all cases the word is used in its literal sense. But the compounds *ὁμαίμος* and *ὁμαίμων* (‘of the same blood’) are used to denote intercommunal kinship (*syngeneia*) and not for the battlefield: 1.151.2; 5.49.3; and 8.144.2 (in a famous statement of panhellenic identity (*Hellenikon*)). For kinship in Herodotus, see Hornblower (2013) 21–3 and 164, on Hdt. 5.49.3). Other purely poetic words for ‘of the same blood’ are *σύναιμος*, *αἰθαίμος*, *αἰθαίμων* (used in Sophocles: LSJ, s.v.), none of which is found in Herodotus or Thucydides.

Only in two passages in Herodotus (Appendix, nos. 14 and 15) is the word used in relation to Greek contexts, both in hexametric Delphic oracles received by the Greeks in relation to the battle of Salamis.⁴¹ I am not interested here in problems of authenticity or the poetic quality of the oracles, but in the fact that Homeric echoes and other poetic intertexts are loud and clear at the level of the oracles' metrical form (epic hexameter), vocabulary, style, and imagery. For example, in the first oracle (Hdt. 7.140), the Pythia's bloody vision of temple roofs dripping with blood interacts with Theoclymenus' prophetic vision in the *Odyssey* (20.351–7); and ὀξύς Ἄρης ('bitter Ares') as personification of War is also Homeric.⁴² Again, in the second oracle (Hdt. 8.77), among other poetic overtones,⁴³ the polyptoton in the phrase χαλκὸς γὰρ χαλκῶ συμμίξεται ('bronze shall clash with bronze') and αἶματι δ' Ἄρης πόντον φοινίξει ('Ares will dye the sea red') evoke Homeric archetypes: χαλκόφι χαλκός (*Il.* 11.351), for the clashing of bronze; and Ares' darkening the banks of Scamander with blood (τῶν νῦν αἶμα κελαινὸν ἐύρροον ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον | ἐσκέδασ' ὀξύς Ἄρης, *Il.* 7.329–30).

It is worth pausing to glance at Thucydides, the other early Greek historian who communicates with Herodotus closely. Thucydides too avoids graphic descriptions of the dying and suffering human body in battle, and the word αἶμα is not found in his *History*.⁴⁴ There are only two αἶμα-rooted words. The first is αἵματώδης ('of blood-red colour'), used in the medical

⁴¹ On the absence of the word 'blood' (αἶμα) in Greek-related contexts in Herodotus, see, for example, the episode of the Spartan king Cleomenes' death, caused by self-mutilation, which must have involved blood loss (6.75.3); or amputation scenes, such as 9.37, involving a leg; 8.106.4, involving male genitals. Nowhere does the word αἶμα crop up. See also below, the first vignette concerning Cynegirus. For Cleomenes, mutilation, and thigh wounds in Herodotus, see Felton (2014).

⁴² For the oracle's 'epicising language' and poetic intertextuality, including Hesiod and Aeschylus' *Persians*, see Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 468–70, who also notes the need for a systematic study of the language of Herodotus' oracles; Russo (1992) 125 (on *Od.* 20.351–7 and Hdt. 7.140).

⁴³ E.g., see Nagy (1990) on Herodotus' implicit interaction with the poetics of *kleos* in relation to the oracles he cites, and more specifically the convergences in theme and divergences in style between the oracle in Hdt. 8.77 and Pindar's *Ol.* 13.6–12. Cf. Nagy (1979), on *kleos aphthiton* ('undying fame'), *timē* ('honour'), and other terms/means of heroism in poetry.

⁴⁴ For Thucydides' reporting of individual and collective deaths, see, e.g., 'He was killed, along with five or six of those with him' (Lamachus, 6.101.6; with Hornblower (2008) 531, on similar brief statements); above p. 116 on 7.87.6, 'few out of many returned', with Hornblower (2008) 745, for poetic and Herodotean echoes.

context of the Great Plague of Athens to describe the intense blood-red colour of the throat and the tongue of the person affected by the disease (2.49.3). The plague is the only section in Thucydides (2.47.3–54) where the diseased and dying body is described in excruciating detail, vying, it could be argued, with the Homeric text, and coming much closer to the physicality of human suffering in a medical-scientific context than Herodotus ever does, whose communication with the early medical authors is much more diffused in his work.⁴⁵ The second occurrence is *ἡματωμένον* (passive participle of *αἵματώω*, ‘turn bloody’), in the description of the final moments of the Sicilian expedition. In a scene of culminating drama, we watch the Athenian hoplites striving to drink the bloody and muddy water of the river Assinarus in Sicily, as they are being slaughtered by the Syracusans on the river’s banks (*καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εὐθὺς διέφθαρτο, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἦσσον ἐπίνετό τε ὁμοῦ τῷ πηλῷ ἡματωμένον*, ‘the water quickly turned foul, blood mingling with mud, but the Athenians drank on’, Thuc. 7.84.5).⁴⁶ It is worth noting that the later Diodorus Siculus (first century BCE) does use the word ‘blood’ in a scene with clear epic overtones, namely Brasidas’ fainting at Pylos: *διὰ τῶν τραυμάτων αἵματος ἐκχυθέντος πολλοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λιποψυχήσαντος αὐτοῦ* (‘he suffered much loss of blood from the wounds, and as he lost consciousness’, D.S. 12.62.4). Diodorus’ passage represents the same scene as that in Thucydides (*τραυματισθεὶς πολλὰ ἐλιποψύχησε*, 4.12.1), but the specific and explanatory mention of loss of blood is additional. The intermediate source is probably Ephorus (fourth century BCE), but it is not possible to say for sure whether he or Diodorus himself was responsible for the interesting amplification. Whoever added the words seems to have thought that Thucydides should have mentioned blood but did not.⁴⁷

The absence of references to blood in the early historians surely cannot be viewed as an indication that hoplite warfare in the classical period became less bloody or that it claimed fewer human lives. This chapter argues that far from effacing, as it were, the Homeric imagery of death, the ‘meaningful’ absence of descriptions of battle injury and death in Herodotus (as defined by critical discourse analysis) evokes the rich Homeric landscape of death even more powerfully, in the context of historiography’s re-configured

⁴⁵ For the influence of medical writers on Herodotus, see Thomas (2000).

⁴⁶ Thucydides’ description of the slaughter at Assinarus evokes Achilles’ slaughter of the Trojans at the banks of Xanthus in Homer, *Il.* 21.1–16, 21, 147, 325. For Thucydides’ interaction with Homer, see Fragoulaki (2020b).

⁴⁷ I am grateful to Simon Hornblower for pointing this out to me.

relationship with the poetics and politics of *kleos* and the living experience of war in the fifth century BCE. Through the interplay between Homeric presences and meaningful absences on the surface of Herodotus' battle narrative, the audience's textual memory and imagination is activated, against the background of fifth-century warfare realities and ideologies, while the boundaries between poetry and prose remain distinct.

3.2. Three Vignettes in Herodotus and their Homeric Contexts

So far we have used the absence of explicit mentions of blood from Herodotus' battlefield as a linguistic means by which the interplay between presences and absences in the two texts can be observed, and as revealing of Herodotus' interaction with Homer. In the following three Herodotean vignettes, we will continue to examine the interplay between discursive presences and meaningful absences as a mechanism of Homeric evocation, by encompassing within our scope more aspects of the dying body, in addition to blood, before concentrating on the battle of Thermopylae.

The first vignette is one of the rare cases in which some details concerning the dying body on the battlefield are given. It concerns the death of Cynegirus, one of the distinguished Athenians, who fell at the battle of Marathon (Hdt. 6.113.2–114):

φεύγουσι δὲ τοῖσι Πέρσησι εἶποντο κόπτοντες, ἐς ὃ ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπικόμενοι πῦρ τε αἶθρον καὶ ἐπελαμβάνοντο τῶν νεῶν. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος Καλλίμαχος διαφθείρεται, ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός, ἀπὸ δ' ἔθανε τῶν στρατηγῶν Στησίλεως ὁ Θρασύλεω· τοῦτο δὲ Κυνέγειρος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἐνθαῦτα ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νεός, τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεῖς πελέκεϊ πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοὶ τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί.

They harried the retreating Persians and cut them down until they reached the sea, where they demanded fire and laid hold of the Persian ships. During this *mêlée* the War Archon Callimachus was killed, fighting bravely, and one of the commanders, Stesilaus, the son of Thrasylaus, died as well. It was also at this point that while Cynegirus, the son of Euphorion, was grabbing hold of the stern of one of the ships, he was fatally wounded when his hand was chopped off by a battle-axe. A number of other famous Athenians fell as well.

Having recorded the retreat of the Persians to the sea en masse, their cutting down by the Athenians, and their wish to set the Persian ships on fire from a high-level camera, Herodotus lowers the camera to the battlefield to record the death of Cynegirus, providing some ‘contextual information’,⁴⁸ namely the type of wound (loss of arm), the weapon used (battle-axe), and topographical detail (the stern of the ship is the epicentre of action and probably of a death in water).⁴⁹ Cynegirus’ death is recorded together with those of two other named individuals, the polemarch Callimachus and the general Stesilaus, which are reported each by a single verb (*διαφθείρεται* and *ἀπέθανε*, respectively), in the usual terse manner of historiography.

The fashioning of the episode under the influence of the Homeric scene in which Hector grasps the stern of an Achaean ship and calls the Trojans to action with the words, ‘Bring fire!’ (*Il.* 15.716–18) has been well acknowledged.⁵⁰ But most importantly for our discussion, the episode’s interaction with Homer has been dealt with not only in relation to what occurs on the surface of the text, but also to what does not. One such non-occurrence in the Cynegirus vignette is the lack of any reference to the marshy area of Marathon. The intriguing absence of such an important element of the battle’s topography has been viewed as a ‘deliberate choice’ meant not to spoil the evocation of the Homeric model, which does not involve fighting in the marshes.⁵¹ By the same token, the absence of cavalry in the fighting or the emphasis on the hoplite charge (6.112) have been viewed

⁴⁸ Fenik’s term: (1968) 16–17.

⁴⁹ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 211 note Hdt. 6.91.2 as the only other occasion in Herodotus where *χείρ* and *ἀποκόπτω* are combined in a less glorious scene.

⁵⁰ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 243: ‘Cynegirus is presented by Herodotus as a “modern-day Hektor”’. Ibid. 254–5 for the words *πῦρ*, *ἀφλάστων* (a rare word, only in Homer and Herodotus in the surviving literature until the fifth century BCE and alluding to *Il.* 15.717–18 (Hector scene)), and *κόπτοντες* in the sense of ‘smiting’ (Hdt. 6.113.2) as resonating with other Homeric passages (e.g., *Il.* 13.203–4 for Imbrius’ head), with Pelling (2013b) 25–6, and Flower (1998).

⁵¹ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 243–5 also point out the logistical problems of Herodotus’ topography (‘the Greeks would by now be some way from their camp, and it is hard to see where such fire could come from’, 255), which they attribute to Homeric influence. Cf. Janko (1994) 306. For the marsh in Marathon, see Paus. 1.32.3, with 1.15.3 as noting that it was depicted on the Stoa Poikile. Herodotus must have visited the Stoa in the 420s, so he could have been aware of the marsh at least from this monument. For analogies between this scene and Hdt. 7.224.1–3, see Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 576; also below, p. 135, on 7.225.3, ‘with hands and mouths’; Wilson (2015) 151, on two post-classical vignettes of Cynegirus’ death, in which mouth and teeth take part.

as part of Herodotus' strategy of constructing a Homeric background against which his description of the battle of Marathon is placed.⁵²

Without the interference of elements alien to Homer, the Homeric background of Herodotus' vignette can thus be evoked through the presence of formulas typical of heroic ideology, such as *ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός* and *πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί*,⁵³ and the variation on a theme-wound. Cynegirus' arm wound activates the textual memory of alternative Homeric arm wounds, such as the high-camera scene occurring immediately before Hector grasps the ship's stern (in the low-camera scene we have just seen), where massive arm and hand amputations are described, causing swords to fall to the ground (*Il.* 15.713–15):

πολλὰ δὲ φάσγανα καλὰ μελάνδετα κωπήεντα
 ἄλλα μὲν ἐκ χειρῶν χαμάδις πέσον, ἄλλα δ' ἀπ' ὤμων
 ἀνδρῶν μαρναμένων· ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα μέλαινα.

And many fair blades, bound with dark thongs at the hilt, fell to the ground, some from the hands and some from the shoulders of the warriors as they fought; and the black earth flowed with blood.

This image of mass carnage communicates with other images of individual deaths caused by arm mutilation. One such is that of Hypsenor, son of Dolopion, priest of the river god Scamander. Though the scene is fairly typical in terms of narrative patterning, the mini-narrative about the individual's identity and the description of his arm amputation are not (*Il.* 5.76–83):⁵⁴

Εὐρύπυλος δ' Εὐαιμονίδης Ὑψήγορα δῖον
 υἷον ὑπερθύμου Δολοπίονος, ὅς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου
 ἀρητῆρ ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὡς τίετο δῆμῳ,
 τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Εὐρύπυλος, Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός,

⁵² Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 244 and 253, also citing van Wees (2004).

⁵³ *ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός* is an epigraphic formula: cf. Hdt. 6.14.3, with Hornblower–Pelling (2017) ad loc.; *ibid.* 243 'lapidary words of highest praise'. On *ὀνομαστοί* see also 8.89.1; 9.72.1. The phrases are also found in the Thermopylae narrative (7.224.1–2); see below pp. 132–3.

⁵⁴ Fenik (1968) 11, 19; cf. *Il.* 11.145–7 for Agamemnon cutting off both arms of Hippolochus and then his head, which he rolled amid the crowd; Neal (2006).

πρόσθεν ἔθεν φεύγοντα μεταδρομάδην ἔλασ' ὤμον
 φασγάνῳ αἶξας, ἀπὸ δ' ἔξεσε χεῖρα βαρεῖαν
 αἱματόεσσα δὲ χεῖρ πεδίῳ πέσε· τὸν δὲ κατ' ὄσσε
 ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταίῃ.

Meanwhile Eurypylus, son of Euaemon, slew godlike Hypsenor, son of Dolopion high of heart, who served as priest of Scamander and was honoured like a god by the people. As Hypsenor fled before him, Eurypylus, Euaemon's glorious son, rushed with his sword and in mid-course smote him upon the shoulder and lopped off his heavy arm. The arm full of blood fell to the ground; and down over his eyes came dark death and mighty fate.

The words *φάσγανον*, *ὤμος*, and *χεῖρ* also appear in the scene of Hector grasping the stern of an Achaean ship. Both Homeric scenes are grisly with powerful imagery of blood; Hypsenor's in particular is intensified by the formulaic closure in which blood and the darkness of death dominate (see also above, in relation to *Il.* 20.476–7).⁵⁵ In Herodotus, the absence of an explicit mention of blood from Cynegirus' massive amputation activates, I suggest, a range of alternative presences from the rich repository of injury and death in Homer, such as Hector's and Hypsenor's archetypal scenes, where blood is dominant and explicit. In this paradoxical game of evocation through absence, both audience and text partake in a cultural experience, co-constructing meaning through relationality.

The second vignette concerns the death of Masistius, commander of the Persian cavalry at the battle of Plataea. As in the case of Cynegirus' death, there is a shift from a high-camera collective description of the battle ('they fought long and hard, and the battle was eventually resolved as follows', 9.22.1) to a low-camera description of the individual death: wounded by an arrow in its side, Masistius' horse reared on its back legs in pain and shook off its rider. When Masistius fell to the ground, he was killed after having fought back. Killing Masistius was not a straightforward task, Herodotus continues, because he had a special breastplate made of golden scales hidden under his red tunic, which was impenetrable. 'Eventually someone realised

⁵⁵ Also: *Il.* 16.333–4; Kirk (1990) 62: 'The "purple death over the eyes" is associated with blood in all three contexts, here through *αἱματόεσσα δὲ χεῖρ*'. The more gruesome wounds appear to be reserved for the Trojans: Salazar (2000) 130.

what was happening and struck Masistius in the eye. This is how he fell and died' (ἔπεσέ τε καὶ ἀπέθανε, 9.22.2–3).

In Homer the death of a hero of Masistius' calibre would normally involve a duel between two named and distinguished individuals. Presenting, rather 'un-Homerically', the killing of a distinguished Persian as the achievement of an anonymous hoplite (τις), appears to be an homage to classical period hoplite ethics. At the level of battlefield realities, there were differences between the mode of fighting described in Homer and fifth-century hoplite fighting, though the debate is complicated.⁵⁶ What is important for our discussion is the interaction of 'un-Homeric' and Homeric elements in this episode. The fierce battle around dead Masistius (μάχη ὀξέα περὶ τοῦ νεκροῦ, 9.23.1) and the size and beauty of his corpse as objects of spectacle (ὁ δὲ νεκρὸς ἦν θέης ἄξιος μεγάθεος εἶνεκα καὶ κάλλεος, 9.25.1) are distinctively Homeric.⁵⁷ As has been observed by scholars, Masistius' fatal eye wound could also be seen in the light of Ilioneus' eye wound in the *Iliad* (14.492–9), and against the wider category of bloody head-wounds of Homeric heroes, although, again, no explicit mention of blood is made.⁵⁸

The inability of Masistius' golden breastplate to protect him from death evokes the logistics of human frailty and mortality, so salient in Homer.⁵⁹ Gold, bronze, or iron, the armour is unable to provide full protection to the human body and cover all of its vulnerable parts. There is an ethnographic dimension in the close association of the Persians with gold and their overreliance on its power; on this occasion, its power to protect human life on the battlefield. Xerxes' Immortals too are decked in gold, yet despite their valuable imperial gear, their fame, and their very name, they die at the battle of Thermopylae (7.211; gold: 7.83). The Immortals' death illuminates a deeper theme of Herodotus' narrative: the vulnerability of the Great King's expeditionary force, despite its superiority in numbers, abundant resources, and use of cutting-edge technology. This subversiveness, inherent in war,

⁵⁶ E.g., van Wees (1994).

⁵⁷ The battles around Sarpedon's and Patroclus' corpses (*Il.* 16.485–683 and 17.1–18.238, respectively) are key Homeric intertexts. Flower–Marincola (2002) ad loc. for many of these Homeric features; note their point on size (Hdt. 9.20: Μακίστιον καλέουσι): 'it is well possible that knowing their *Iliad* well, the Greeks purposefully called him by a name which meant "tallest"' (139).

⁵⁸ This applies to the Ilioneus' scene too, though anatomic details, such as the eyeball being thrown out of the skull, vividly evoke blood imagery. For the Masistius–Ilioneus analogy, see Boedeker (2003); Aly (1921) 162–3, 274–5.

⁵⁹ E.g., Griffin (1980); Pelling (2006); Baragwanath (2008).

finds its poetic expression in Homer in the thin and often blurry line that separates mortality from immortality, also in contexts of wounding and death. A case in point is the post-Homeric tradition about Achilles's death by an arrow piercing the only vulnerable point of his body, which his divine mother Thetis had made impenetrable to iron by dipping him in the waters of Styx.⁶⁰

The third and final vignette relates to another episode of individual heroism in the panhellenic context of the Greek victory at Plataea. It is the death of the Spartan Callicrates. At least one analogy with the episode of Masistius' death is that Callicrates too is overwhelmingly good-looking (*ἀνὴρ κάλλιστος ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν τότε Ἑλλήνων, οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων*, 9.72.1). His death is narrated analeptically in relation to the narrative of the main battle, while the death itself is reported to have taken place in the preliminaries and outside of the battle itself (*ἔξω τῆς μάχης ἀπέθανε*, 9.72.1). The historical narrator provides contextual information about the weapon and the body part wounded: Callicrates was injured by an arrow in his side while he was sitting in position. The picture is amplified with the description of the last moments of the hero: Callicrates was transferred outside the battlefield and died a 'difficult death' (*ἐδυσθανάτεε*, 9.72.2); the verb is rarely attested in classical Greek, and probably means a lingering and painful death.⁶¹ Callicrates is given the 'narratological time' to express his regret to a named fellow fighter, Arimnestus (or Aeimnestus) of Plataea (tellingly bearing a name related to memory), not because he was dying, as he said, but because he was not given the opportunity to see battle and perform as well as he knew he could and wanted to.⁶²

⁶⁰ The first source known to us which speaks of a vulnerable foot is first-century BCE Statius' *Achilleis* (e.g., 1.268–70), though the story must have been known to his audience already (Gantz (1993) 625–5). Cf. Hom. *Hymn. Dem.* 239ff. for fire as another element bestowing immortality to humans. Monsacré (2018), on the transformative power of armour.

⁶¹ *δυσθανάτεω* is a *hapax* in Herodotus and very rare in general in early Greek literature (not in Homer or other epic or lyric); next found in prose at Pl. *Rep.* 406b. Cf. Eur. *Ion* 1051, *δυσθάνατος* (adj.), 'bringing a hard death'.

⁶² In Herodotus, Philippus of Croton, who joined the Spartan Dorieus in a colonising expedition to Sicily (end of the sixth century BCE), is a figure of distinctively archaic and Homeric resonances, comparable to Callicrates. In typically historiographic vein, Philippus' death is reported briefly: *συνέσπετο δὲ Δωριέι καὶ συναπέθανε*, 5.47.1–2. The paratactic verbal construction (*συνέσπετο ... καὶ συναπέθανε*) and the use of the same preposition (*συν-*) in the two compound verbs underscore heroic—and Homeric—companionship in battle.

Unlike the words of Homeric heroes, usually provided in direct speech, Callicrates' thinking process and feelings are authorially mediated; but the aspiration of a heroic death is similar to that of a Homeric hero such as Hector.⁶³ Analogous is the thinking process of the Spartan Leonidas at the battle of Thermopylae, which precedes in Herodotus' narrative (more on this below, §4). The type of Callicrates' wound and its timing in relation to the main battle can be compared with the scene of Menelaus' wounding by the Trojan Pandarus' arrow in his side (*Il.* 4.141–7). Both Callicrates' and Menelaus' scenes prefigure fighting between whole armies: in the *Historiēs* Callicrates' wound takes place during Pausanias' pre-battle sacrifices; in the *Iliad* Pandarus' arrow initiates war by violating the truce. But the comparison between the two scenes brings to light some differences too, which relate to the 'un-Homeric' elements of Herodotus' battle narrative and the discursive category of meaningful absence, which we have been using in this discussion: in Callicrates' episode there is no mention of blood or a zooming in on other parts of the hero's body, whereas in the *Iliad* the image of Menelaus' bleeding is vivid (*αὐτίκα δ' ἔρρεεν αἷμα κελαινεφές ἐξ ὠτειλῆς*, 'forthwith the dark blood came from the wound', *Il.* 4.140), further intensified by 'one of the most striking and unusual of Iliadic similes' (*Il.* 4.141–5),⁶⁴ occurring in the poetic narrator's direct address to the hero (*τοιοῖ τοι Μενέλαε μιάνην αἵματι μηροῖ | εὐφύεες κνήμαί τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ κάλ' ὑπένερθε*, 'So now Menelaus your well-shaped thighs were stained with blood and your shins and beautiful ankles', *Il.* 4.146–7). Another difference between the two scenes is that unlike Herodotus' Callicrates, Homer's Menelaus is healed from his wound by the divine doctor Machaon and his soothing drugs, passed on to him by his father, the god Asclepius, who had received them from the Centaur Chiron as gifts of friendship (*Il.* 4.208–19). Soon afterwards in the Homeric narrative we watch Menelaus fighting with his usual strength (*Il.* 5.50–8), miraculously healed from his wound. Whether a doctor in the Greek camp at Plataea tried

Philippus of Croton is the epitome of the archaic hero: like Callicrates, he was 'the most handsome man of his generation in Greece', *κάλλιστος τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν κατ' ἑωυτόν* (5.47.2), and in addition he was an athlete and Olympic victor, and took part in Dorieus' colonial expedition with his own trireme (5.47.2). The idea of staying and dying together is stated emphatically in the Thermopylae episode too (see below, §4), in both negative and affirmative mode. Cf. Salazar (2000) 172, for the combination of handsomeness and the aspiration of a 'beautiful death'.

⁶³ Boedeker (2003) 13.

⁶⁴ Kirk (1985) 345.

to soothe Callicrates while he was dying ‘a difficult death’, does not surface in Herodotus’ narrative.⁶⁵

The influence of medical authors on both Herodotus and Thucydides has been well-acknowledged, and mentions of doctors do appear in their works, but they are rare, generally associated with either technical contexts or politics, and always outside action on the battlefield.⁶⁶ It is against common sense to believe that doctors did not exist in Greek armies, operating on the battlefield or in the camp. Attributing the absence of references to doctors to the relative lack of organised medical support in Greek armies of the classical period seems improbable.⁶⁷ They could not have disappeared after the archaic period only to reappear later.⁶⁸ Doctors are mentioned in Thucydides in the technical language of the Great Plague, where a cognate of *αἶμα* also appears, as we saw above (pp. 120–1); on the other hand, for example, there is no reference to doctors taking part in the expeditionary force which sailed out for Sicily in 415 BCE, although the description of preparations and the army’s different compartments is fairly detailed (Thuc. 6.20–3, 30–1; no mention of a doctor either in relation to Nicias’ kidney disease and its serious repercussions, 6.102.2; 7.15.1). Operating in the same historiographic vein, the Hellenistic historians likewise provide numbers of casualties, but no information about the treatment of wounded soldiers.⁶⁹

The appearance of physicians in the Greek historians is a topic which deserves separate investigation. Within the limits of this discussion, I would like to suggest that fifth-century physicians were associated with technical and scientific contexts, which tended to surface in specific parts of the historical narratives of Herodotus (and Thucydides). Descriptions of battles were not such contexts, for which the historians tapped into the rich

⁶⁵ Hdt. 7.181.2 is the only passage in the *Histories* in which the treatment of wounds is mentioned, but no mention of professional doctors is made (Salazar (2000) 170–1).

⁶⁶ Cf. Democedes of Croton, a Greek doctor working for the Aeginetans, the Athenians, and Polycrates of Samos (Hdt. 3.131); and specialist doctors in Egypt (Hdt. 2.84). For Thucydides’ description of the plague in Athens, see above, pp. 120–1. See also Thuc. 6.14 for a metaphorical use of the word *ιατρός* (‘doctor’): Thomas (2000); Demont (2018).

⁶⁷ E.g., Gabriel (2011).

⁶⁸ E.g., Xen. *Anab.* 3.4.30: eight doctors treating different types of the soldiers’ wounds; cf. *Anab.* 2.5.33, a graphic vignette of a soldier holding his intestines having suffered an abdominal wound. The absence of vultures and animals of prey from the battlefield of Herodotus and other Greek historians is another un-Homeric feature, discussed in Kostuch (2018).

⁶⁹ Chaniotis (2005) 96.

mythopoetic background of the epic. Unlike their fifth-century counterparts, doctors in Homer are semi-divine, associated with the mortal hero and his many encounters with death. References to physicians in a fifth-century context would have worked against the heroic tenor of Herodotus' battle narrative, in the same way that in the Cynegirus vignette (see above, pp. 122–4) a reference to the marshes of Marathon would have worked against the evocation of its Homeric model, where no marshes appear. From a narratological and allusive perspective, the absence of doctors from Herodotus' battlefield can be viewed as one of the 'un-Homeric' elements in the historian's engagement with the human body in descriptions of battles, alongside the absence of anatomical details and explicit references to blood. In a textual environment under the heavy influence of Homeric descriptions of battles, the absence of blood, anatomical details, and doctors should be viewed, I suggest, as meaningful absences, which enhance the resonance of the Homeric context by effectively preventing the interference of dissonant elements.

4. The Battle of Thermopylae (7.201–39) and Herodotus' Homeric Allusive Practice

Herodotus' narrative of the battle of Thermopylae is a section with acknowledged Homeric debts to a degree unparalleled in the work.⁷⁰ 'The Persian Wars were the new Trojan War, the stuff of legendary heroism',⁷¹ and analogies that have been drawn in form and content are many. Features that stand out are the heroic code of Leonidas and his Three Hundred Spartans who fell on the spot, expressed in Homeric vocabulary and concepts—such as *ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἄριστος* (7.224.1; cf. 209.5) and *κλέος μέγα* (7.220.2 and 220.4)—especially in relation to Hector. It has also been pointed out that in the narrative of Thermopylae Leonidas, the Spartan king, and Xerxes, the Persian king, resemble each other in their singularity, and that 'the way the spotlight singles out both leaders presents the encounter almost as a duel, one which (at least at the level of *kleos*) Leonidas will win'.⁷² Other

⁷⁰ Boedeker (2003); Pelling (2006); Foster (2012); de Jong (2015); Carey (2016); Marincola (2018); Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 547–92.

⁷¹ Pelling (2019) 202; cf. Gainsford (2013) 131: 'On a mythological level, the heroism of Leonidas' Spartans at Thermopylae compensates for the Dorians' supposed absence from the Trojan War'.

⁷² Carey (2016) 83. On the battle: Cartledge (2007); Carey (2019).

Homeric features are the battle (*ὄθισμός*) around the corpse of Leonidas, a ‘kind of narrative detail [which] is normally withheld by Herodotus’,⁷³ or the distinctively epic number of attempts to save the corpse from the enemy (four times they forced the Persians back, 7.225.1). The passage is usually compared with the struggle over the corpses of Patroclus (*Il.* 17.274ff.) and Sarpedon (16.485–683; see also above, pp. 125–7 on Masistius), but the numbers 3 and 4 are also typical of epic descriptions of offensive/defensive movements in combat more generally.⁷⁴

Building on this scholarly background, in the rest of this chapter I will aim to contribute some new observations on the Homeric interactions of the battle of Thermopylae, from the perspective of the typology of death on the battlefield and human mortality and suffering at war, pursuing Homeric presences and meaningful absences in Herodotus’ text. My examination is organised in themes and, for parts of this discussion, focuses on a comparison between the Thermopylae narrative and the conflict between Hector and Achilles outside the walls of Troy in *Iliad* 22.

4.1. Individual and Collective Death and Heroism

Like most of Herodotus’ battle narratives, the battle of Thermopylae (7.201–39) is an extended episode, in which the narration of the actual fighting and events taking place on the battlefield is restricted.⁷⁵ The organisation of the narrative is complex. The focal point of the action is the final day of the battle, when Leonidas and the Greeks, on the one side, and distinguished Persians, on the other, fell (7.223–5). Background information and the previous days of the fighting at Thermopylae occupy chapters 7.201–22, while the aftermath of the battle is described in 226–39.⁷⁶

In the Thermopylae episode collective and individual heroism mesh through the heroic deaths of named individuals and anonymous groups in the Greek and the Persian camps. Persian deaths are reported tersely at different phases of the fighting: *οἱ Μῆδοι, ἐπιπτον πολλοί*, ‘the Medes fell in large numbers’, 7.210.2; cf. *τρηχέως περιείποντο*, ‘they were badly mauled’, 7.211.1 (again with no detailed descriptions of wounds); and ‘they [= the

⁷³ Carey (2016) 84.

⁷⁴ E.g., Rengakos (2006). For Herodotus’ shaping of the narrative of Thermopylae, see, e.g., van Wees (2018).

⁷⁵ Cf. Marincola (2018).

⁷⁶ This is a broad-brush division of the narrative. For detailed presentations of the structure, see Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 547; De Bakker (2018) 62.

Lacedaemonians] cut the Persians down (*κατέβαλλον*) in untold numbers. However, a few Spartans would be lost (*ἐπιπτον*) during this manoeuvre', 7.211.3. Persian casualties in large numbers are contrasted with the Greeks' and especially the Spartans' superior knowledge of the art of war, even when fighting against the Immortals: 'they [= the Lacedaemonians] were experts, fighting against amateurs' (*ἐν οὐκ ἐπισταμένοισι μάχεσθαι ἐξεπιστάμενοι*, 7.211; cf. 211.3). On the sixth and decisive day of the battle, which takes place outside the wall in the broader part of the neck of the battle ground (7.223; see below on space), anonymous crowds in the Persian army ('barbarians') are reported to fall in great numbers again (*ἐπιπτον πλήθει πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων*, 7.223.3), flogged and urged to move forwards by their leaders. This is another instance in Herodotus when death becomes an ethnographic criterion: the way the Persians are forced to their death is meant to be contrasted with the Greeks' agency over their own death (see below on *παραχρῶμενοί τε καὶ ἀτέοντες*, 7.224.1). Within this patriotic agenda, there is room for cultural nuancing: from this general picture of massive loss of anonymous 'barbarians' emerge deaths of individuals and smaller groups of the Persian élite, who are singled out for fighting and falling in battle (*πίπτουσι ἐνταῦθα ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ ὀνομαστοί*, 7.224.2), among them two brothers of Xerxes, Abrocomes and Hyperanthes, whose mention is accompanied by brief kinship material about their relationship to the King's royal family.

In the Greek army, Leonidas is presented as the key heroic individual from the beginning: 'he was admired the most, above all the other generals' (*οἱ ἄλλοι στρατηγοί*, 7.204). His genealogy and descent from Heracles, son of Zeus (7.204, 208.1), create a sharp contrast with the anonymity and collective mention of the other generals. As for the anonymous collective mention of the Three Hundred Spartans, it is presented by the historical narrator as deliberate non-naming: 'I was told the names of all the Three Hundred' (7.224.1). Here, the narratorial voice not only creates a moment of meaningful absence of a catalogue of warriors, a distinctively Homeric feature, but also flags it as deliberate suppression.⁷⁷

In addition to Leonidas, there are a few other named individuals in the whole episode. But all named casualties in both camps are listed after the statement about the stand and heroic death of Leonidas and the Three

⁷⁷ For an explanation, see Fragoulaki (2020a) xxiii–xxv. Cf. Marincola (2016), on Herodotus' heroisation as a historian through his handling of the catalogue of the Three Hundred, whose names he claims he has learnt.

Hundred, in which individual and collective achievements are closely bound: ‘Leonidas fought to the death (*πίπτει*) with the utmost bravery during this *mêlée*; and with him fell other famous Spartans too’ (*Λεωνίδης τε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ πίπτει ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἄριστος, καὶ ἕτεροι μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὀνομαστοὶ Σπαρτιητέων*, 7.224.1). It is at this point that we get the statement about the deliberate omission of the names of the Three Hundred. The use of a single word (*πίπτει*) for the death description of the Three Hundred and their leader is typical of the historiographic mode of describing death on the battlefield, as we have seen. The verb itself is not distinctively Homeric; it is in fact one of the most frequent words used to denote death in our literary and epigraphic sources. But *ἀνὴρ ἄριστος* resonates with heroic vocabulary and ideology of the archaic and classical periods, whose archetypal expression was Homer.

The statement about the death of Leonidas and the Three Hundred is not the first mention of the Greeks’ collective heroism in the Thermopylae episode. The first, proleptic, reference to the outcome of the battle concerns the Greeks as a whole, and the individual pointed at as responsible is the Greek Epialtes, and not Xerxes and his army: ‘he [= Epialtes] caused the deaths of the Greeks who had taken their stand there’ (*διέφθειρε τοὺς ταύτη ὑπομείναντας Ἑλλήνων*, 7.213.1). Herodotus’ polemical authorial commemoration is noteworthy: ‘it is him I include in my written account as responsible’ (*τοῦτον αἴτιον γράφω*, 7.215.1). The idea of ‘bearing’ (*ὑπομείναντας*) is repeated, in the variant *καταμείναντες* ‘stay in place’, in another brief statement of the heroic death of Leonidas and the Greeks around him (*Λεωνίδην καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ*), which precedes the focal 7.224.1, including the unwilling Thebans and the willing Thespians, in addition to the Spartans: ‘they stayed and died with them’ (*καταμείναντες συναπέθανον*, 7.222;⁷⁸ cf. *κατέμειναν μόνοι παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοισι*, 7.222).

The contextual information of the scene, describing the mental state of the heroes and their weapons, points specifically to the Homeric text (7.223.4–224.1):

The Greeks knew they were going to die at the hands of the Persians who had come around the mountain, and so they spared none of their strength, but fought the enemy with reckless disregard for their lives (*παραχρεώμενοί τε καὶ ἀτέοντες*). By now most of their spears (*δόρατα*)

⁷⁸ See above, n. 62, on Philippus of Croton and the Spartan Dorieus.

had been broken and they were using their swords (*τοῖσι ξίφεσι*) to kill the Persians.

The Spartans' use of their swords, after their spears had been broken, describes fifth-century hoplite fighting and Spartan military ethics. At the same time, in this heroic context it alludes to the typical Homeric 'sequence of spear followed by sword in two quick slayings', frequent in the *Iliad*, a 'typical' incident.⁷⁹ The word *ἀτέοντες* is worth pausing at, since the only other use of the word in our sources before Herodotus is in the *Iliad*, in Poseidon's address to Aeneas, urging him not to fight Achilles yielding to a 'blindness of heart' (*ἀτέοντα*, *Il.* 20.332).⁸⁰

4.2. The Dying and Dead Body

As in the case of Cyrus (above, §2), the only glimpse of Leonidas' body is that of posthumous maltreatment, reported after the main battle narrative. Xerxes is described as walking through the corpses of his enemies, when someone identifies Leonidas for him as the dead Spartan king. Then the Persian king orders the decapitation and impaling of Leonidas' head (7.238.1). Once again through his ethnographic lens Herodotus comments that such an act of brutality is normally untypical of the Persians, who honour men who fight bravely, attributing it instead to personal animosity (*ὅτι βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης πάντων δὴ μάλιστα ἀνδρῶν ἐθυμώθη ζῶοντι Λεωνίδην*, 7.238.2). It can be argued that a further posthumous glimpse of Leonidas' metaphorical body is the stone lion standing (in Herodotus' time) on the spot where he and the Greeks fell. The resonances of not only Leonidas' funerary monument but also his own name (< *λέων* 'lion') with lion imagery in Homer have been pointed out in scholarship.⁸¹ As for the maltreatment of a corpse as the result of raw emotion, the association with the archetypal Homeric example of Achilles' unprocessed anger and maltreatment of Hector's dead body on the battlefield cannot be missed.

Let us now concentrate on the culminating scene of the resistance and fall of the last Greeks at Thermopylae. Herodotus' description of the final moments of the Greeks who remained alive on the rise in the pass is the

⁷⁹ Fenik (1968) 6; Latacz (1977).

⁸⁰ Cf. Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 577–8.

⁸¹ Recently Pelling (2019) 203. Cf. Baragwanath's (2008) 77–8 apt remark about potential 'unheroic' associations of the lion monument, in relation to the 'Lion-related' name of the Theban commander *Leontiades* and his medism.

closest we get to a description of bodily injury and death on the battlefield in the episode (7.225.3):

ἐν τούτῳ σφέας τῷ χώρῳ ἀλεξομένους μαχαίρησι, τοῖσι αὐτῶν ἐτύγχανον ἔτι περιεοῦσαι, καὶ χερσὶ καὶ στόμασι κατέχωσαν οἱ βάρβαροι βάλλοντες, οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐπισπόμενοι καὶ τὸ ἔρυμα τοῦ τείχεος συγχώσαντες, οἱ δὲ περιελθόντες πάντοθεν περισταδόν.

In that place they defended themselves with knives, as many as yet had such, and with hands and mouths; till the foreigners overwhelmed them with missile weapons, some attacking them in front and throwing down the wall of defence, while the rest surrounded them on all sides.

This vignette is about the whole group and resumes the fighting from the death of Leonidas and other distinguished Spartans, who fell after having used first their spears and then their swords (7.224.1). In this climactic scene of group fighting, the short and vivid phrase *χερσὶ καὶ στόμασι* ('with hands and mouths/teeth') evokes a shocking and grisly range of wounds, without an explicit reference to blood, comparable to Cynegirus' death at Marathon after the massive amputation of his arm (above, pp. 122–4).⁸² As suggested earlier, Cynegirus' death in Herodotus interacts with Homeric fatal amputations of arms or head wounds, such as Hypsenor's in the *Iliad* (5.76–82; above, pp. 124–5) or Pedaeus' fatal head wound (*Il.* 5.74–5), which immediately precedes Hypsenor's death in the narrative sequence of the *Iliad*; again, the 'typical incident' sequence 'spear (*δόρυ*) [Pedaeus]—sword (*φάσγανον*) [Hypsenor]' may be observed.⁸³

Two Homeric presences at the level of word in Herodotus' scene are worth noting: *περισταδόν* ('surrounded on all sides', 7.225.3) is a *hapax* in Herodotus, resonating with Homeric (and Thucydidean) intertexts. The word is rare and a *hapax* also in Homer (*Il.* 13.551) and Thucydides (7.81.5).⁸⁴ The word *ἀλεξομένους* (7.225.3; cf. *στρατὸν τὸν Μήδων ἀλέξασθαι*, 7.207)

⁸² Livy's (22.51.9) horrible description of the morning following the battle of Cannae has been thought to have been inspired by Hdt. 7.225.3, creating a triple association with Homeric intertexts (de Bakker–van der Keur (2018) 330–1).

⁸³ *Il.* 5.73–5: ... βεβλήκει κεφαλῆς κατὰ ἰνίον ὀξείῃ δουρί· | ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀν' ὀδόντας ὑπὸ γλῶσσαν τάμε χαλκός, | ἦριπε δ' ἐν κονίῃ, ψυχρὸν δ' ἔλε χαλκὸν ὀδοῦσιν ('... with a cast of his sharp spear on the sinew of the head. Straight through amid the teeth the bronze shore away the tongue at its base. So he fell in the dust, and bit the cold bronze with his teeth').

⁸⁴ Hornblower (2008) 730, with other ancient intertexts and modern bibliography.

evokes similar language in the extensive episode of Hector and Achilles' conflict on the battlefield in *Iliad* 22, which results in Hector's death and the defilement of his corpse: the goddess Athena, having deceitfully taken the form of Deiphobus, Hector's brother, falsely appears to stand by Hector's side in his deadly combat with Achilles: 'let us make a stand and defend ourselves staying here' (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ στέωμεν καὶ ἀλεξώμεσθα μένοντες, *Il.* 22.231).⁸⁵ The conflict between Hector and Achilles outside the walls of Troy in *Iliad* 22 is an extensive episode of climactic quality,⁸⁶ similar to that of Thermopylae.

4.3. Gaze, Nudity, and the Athlete-Warrior

War as spectacle is distinctively Homeric. In the *Iliad* visibility has a central role in the way the poetic narrator delivers his story, engaging audiences within and outside of the narrative.⁸⁷ Gaze is a source of knowledge and understanding for those partaking in the act of gazing and is often associated with intense emotive responses. The central role of vision and gaze in the cognitive and emotive dimensions of the war narrative is another major 'meeting point' between epic and historiography. In the Thermopylae episode, the visit of Xerxes' scout to the Greek camp to observe the enemy and report back to the King (7.208) lends itself to examining Herodotus' response to the epic palette in relation to key themes of his work and its sociocultural context, namely war, athletics, and vision, and their role in the Greeks' ethnic self-definition vis-à-vis the ethnic Other.

There is a concentration of words related to vision and gaze in the episode. Xerxes sent a scout on horseback to the Greek camp, because he needed to 'see (*ιδέσθαι*) how many men they were and what they were doing' (7.208.1). The Greek word for 'scout' or 'spy' is *κατάσκοπος*, 7.208.1 ('one who keeps a look out', LSJ), deriving from *σκοπέω*, a word related to vision. Although the word *κατάσκοπος* itself is not found in Homer (the Homeric word is the cognate *ἐπίσκοπος*, e.g., *Il.* 10.38, 'one who watches over', LSJ), it is frequent in tragedy engaging with archetypal episodes of espionage and

⁸⁵ De Jong (2012), with further bibliography.

⁸⁶ Richardson (1993) 105: 'The event towards which the action of the poem has been tending'.

⁸⁷ Clay (2011); Blundell–Cairns–Rabinowitz (2013); Kampakoglou–Novokhatko (2018); Miltisios (2016), on Herodotus; on gaze viewing and theatricality in Thucydides, Greenwood (2006).

intelligence in the Trojan War and with Odysseus as an archetypal spy.⁸⁸ The visit of a mounted spy to the enemy camp is another discursive presence in the Thermopylae episode which interacts with the epic background.⁸⁹

Xerxes' scout was 'looking and observing' (ἐθελίτο τε καὶ κατώρα) (7.208.2; cf. *κατιδέσθαι, ὄρα*, 7.208.2), but he was not able to see the whole of the Greek camp, but only those men who were outside the recently repaired wall. These were the Spartans, 'some of whom were exercising in the nude while others were combing their hair' (τοὺς μὲν δὴ ὄρα γυμναζομένους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, τοὺς δὲ τὰς κόμας κτενιζομένους, 7.208.3), according to their custom, as Demaratus explained later to the King. The scout looked and marvelled at the sight (θεώμενος ἐθώμαζε, 7.208.3, cf. *ὀπώπεε*, 7.209.1), and tried to understand the numbers of the enemy (ἐμάνθανε, 7.208.3). He did make a note of them, and undisturbed ('no one paid any attention to him', 7.208.3) returned to Xerxes to report. The latter 'did not know what to make of this, namely that the Spartans were getting ready to be killed and to kill (ἀπολεόμενοι τε καὶ ἀπολέοντες) to the best of their ability' (7.209.1).

Xerxes' reaction to the scout's report is scorn and puzzlement. The pre-battle activities of the Spartans struck the King as laughable (*γελοῖα*, 7.209.1–2). He sends for the expatriate Spartan Demaratus 'wishing to understand' (ἐθέλων μαθεῖν, 7.209.2), but even after Demaratus' explanation, Xerxes reacts with laughter (*γέλωτα*, 7.209.2), finding the explanation hard to believe (7.209.5). Xerxes' laughter has sinister connotations, aiming to construct the portrait of the Oriental monarch as fundamentally unable to comprehend Spartan heroic ethics and the Greeks' relationship with freedom at large. Xerxes' lack of comprehension is a hint at the failure of the Persian King's campaign, enhancing the capacity of the *Histories'* external audience for comprehension and foresight.⁹⁰

Soon after the scout episode, Xerxes' scorn and laughter turn into fear, as his gaze ranges over the battle of Thermopylae. The Persian King—this time seeing with his own eyes—is described as watching his men, including the Immortals, falling in great numbers in their battle with the Greeks. This unmediated vision of his men's destruction causes Xerxes to leap from his seat three times in fear (*θηγόμενον, τρίς ἀναδραμεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, δείσαντα,*

⁸⁸ Wilder (2021).

⁸⁹ Cf. Hdt. 9.44–5, another episode with Homeric overtones, involving Alexander the Macedonian's clandestine night operation on horseback visiting the enemy.

⁹⁰ E.g., Redfield (1985) 115–16; Munson (2001). For the limits of Xerxes' understanding associated with the gaze, see Grethlein (2013) 195.

7.212.1). The phrase resonates with the Iliadic description of Hades' similar reaction in the Battle of the Gods (*Il.* 20.61–2: 'leapt screaming from his throne for fear', δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο καὶ ἴαχε).⁹¹ Once again Herodotus situates the conflict between Greeks and Persians in a Homeric background, reconfiguring heroism and masculinity for fifth-century panhellenic audiences. The Greco-Persian conflict is presented as a clash of political systems, military ethics, and cultures, also hinting at the importance of ethnographic factors in historical understanding.

At a linguistic level, it is worth pausing at two further Homeric presences in the scout episode in Herodotus: ἀπολεόμενοι τε καὶ ἀπολέοντες ('to be killed and to kill', 7.209.1) evokes the polyptoton ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων (employing the same verb ὀλλυσθαι) in the Homeric high-camera scene of large-scale death on the battlefield: ἔνθα δ' ἄμ' οἴμωγή τε καὶ εὐχολὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν | ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα, 'Then were heard alike the sound of groaning and the cry of triumph of the slayers and the slain, and the earth flowed with blood', *Il.* 8.64–5; (cf. *Il.* 4.450–1, and above p. 117).⁹² The second Homeric presence can be traced in Demaratus' address to Xerxes, where he refers to a rather peculiar Spartan custom (νόμος), associating it with exceptional bravery (7.209.3):

It is their custom to do their hair when they are about to risk their lives (κινδυνεύειν τῇ ψυχῇ). But you can rest assured that if you defeat these men and the force that awaits you in Sparta, there is no other ethnic group on earth which will take up arms and stand up to you, my lord, because you are now up against the noblest and most royal city in Greece, and the bravest of men.

The phrase κινδυνεύειν τῇ ψυχῇ occurs only here in Herodotus. κινδυνεύειν alone does not crop up in Homer, but the word ψυχῇ is used frequently for the human life (also 'soul' or 'spirit') leaving the body, often from the wound itself (*Il.* 14.518), when a warrior dies on the battlefield.⁹³ Its occurrence in

⁹¹ Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 563.

⁹² The use of τε ... καὶ joining the two participles in the polyptoton structure ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων is distinctively Homeric, serving 'to mark an assertion as general or indefinite': Monro (1891) 301.

⁹³ In the formula τοῦ δ' ἀθλι λύθη ψυχῇ τε μένος τε (*Il.* 5.296, 8.123), and elsewhere: e.g., 1.3; 5.696; 22.325; 24.168, 754.

Herodotus side by side with *κινδυνεύειν* in this unique formulation is a discursive presence, evoking Homeric contexts of heroic death.

Hector is a singularly significant hero in Homer, whose life (*ψυχή*) is put at risk in a dramatic, prolonged, and visually rich episode in *Iliad* 22, before leaving his body (361–2): *ὡς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε, ψυχή δ' ἐκ ῥέθρων παταμένη Ἀϊδούσδε βεβήκει*, 'As he spoke the end of death enfolded him: and his spirit flitted from his body and went on the way to Hades'. The climactic quality of both *Iliad* 22 and the Thermopylae narrative have been acknowledged.⁹⁴ Building on this idea, one can add that in both episodes death comes as an inescapable fate, after a prolonged struggle, and only after those who fall have provided ample evidence of their valour. In the episode of Hector's death, the idea of the warrior's life (*ψυχή*) being at risk is materialised through the deadly running contest of Achilles and Hector around the walls of Troy: *περὶ ψυχῆς θέον Ἔκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο*, 'it was for the life of horse-taming Hector that they ran' (*Il.* 22.161). When the heroes have completed three rounds and are about to start the fourth, Zeus opens up his golden scales and Hector's fate of death weighs down (*Il.* 22.208–13). As has been noted, 'Hector's fate is already decided in advance, and this is a visual or symbolic representation of the crucial moment at which the decision becomes irrevocable'.⁹⁵

This Homeric scene provides a blueprint for the intermingling of athletics and battlefield, with gaze playing a crucial role in the audience's emotional involvement and the hero's posthumous praise. In the *Iliad*, internal spectators (divine and human) have a full and painful understanding of the events unfolding before their eyes and lament Hector's loss, as a singularly important death (e.g. *Il.* 22.424–5), in a manner befitting their human or divine nature (Priam, Hecuba, Andromache, and the citizens of Troy: 22.25–

⁹⁴ See de Jong (2012) 13–15, 59 and *passim*, Lateiner (1989) 125 and *passim*, Pelling (2019) 202–3: 'The most Homeric battle of all is Thermopylae, that climax of Spartan heroism'. In the same context, Pelling compares the fighting with the struggle over Patroclus' body in *Iliad* 17–18.

⁹⁵ Richardson (1993) 129. The scene is said to have inspired Aeschylus' *Psychostasia*, of which only a few fragments survive, and its dramatic quality has been undoubtedly influential: Richardson (1993) 129–30. In Thucydides, the combination of *ψυχή* with *κίνδυνος/κινδυνεύειν* is similarly rare and distinctive (only in 3.39.8 and 8.50.5), interacting with the Homeric theme of *psychostasia*, and its many intertexts, with Hdt. 7.209.3 being a major one. Cf. *Il.* 8.68–74, where Zeus weighs the fates of the Achaeans and the Trojans collectively.

92, 405–36; Zeus and other Olympians: 166–76).⁹⁶ In the Thermopylae narrative, the cognitive and emotive reactions of the non-Greek internal viewers—the Persian scout and Xerxes (viewer by proxy)—of the pre-battle gymnastic spectacle are part of the larger schema of the heroization of the Three Hundred. Audiences external to the narrative are guided to view the collective death of the Three Hundred at Thermopylae, technically a Greek military disaster, as a triumphant episode of Greek national history and to ponder signs that foreshadow the disastrous outcome of Xerxes’ campaign against Greece.

The role of athletics in the Thermopylae episode and their close connection with war and spectacle further testify to culture’s role in the historical outcome of the conflict, as presented in the *Histories*. As we saw, before engaging in battle, some of the Spartans were combing their hair, whereas others were exercising naked. The heroic world of the Homeric epics is recognisable in both activities. ‘Long-haired Achaeans’ (κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί, e.g. *Il.* 2.472) is a formula describing the Achaeans in Homer, and the double identity of the warrior-athlete is particularly prominent in *Iliad* 23. There we watch the Achaean warriors pausing from war to compete as athletes at the funeral games for Patroclus, which Achilles has set up to honour the memory of his dear departed. At the same time, both activities, hair combing and exercising naked, were anchored in Greek and Spartan institutions of the archaic and classical periods: Herodotus (1.82) gives us the (fictional) explanation of the long hair of the Spartan warriors in the context of the Spartans’ decisive victory against the Argives over Thyrea in the archaic period (c. 546 BCE). More generally, the long hair of men past the age of adolescence is associated with Spartan customs and identity.⁹⁷ As for the scene of pre-battle athletic activities of the Spartans outside the wall at Thermopylae, it is the only image of nude athlete-warriors in Herodotus.⁹⁸ Through the mediated gaze of the Persian scout, the historical narrator takes pains to mention that the Spartans had laid their arms and armours against the wall (τοῖσι πρὸ τοῦ τείχεος τὰ ὄπλα ἔκειτο, 7.208.2) and that some of them were exercising naked (γυμναζομένους (7.208.3), deriving from γυμνός

⁹⁶ For the divine viewing of the scene, see Griffin (1978); Richardson (1993) 108–9, 125–7; de Jong (2018) on *oroskopia* (viewing from a mountain) as a literary topos, signposting detachment and superior gaze (p. 34 for ‘Homeric “ur”-intertext’); Myers (2019) 179–206. On Homer’s poetic geography and visuality, Clay (2011).

⁹⁷ Xen. *Lac.* 11.3; Plut. *Lyc.* 22.2, with Lipka (2002) 193–4.

⁹⁸ Athletics in Herodotus are often associated with political ambition: Munson (2001) 59–60.

(‘naked, unclad, or unarmed’, LSJ)). The aspect of nudity in this athletic scene evokes Greek élite masculinity, with a special focus on practices and institutions of the late archaic and classical periods.⁹⁹

Both Herodotus and Thucydides, early in their works, associate nudity with Greek identity. Herodotus’ remark (1.11.3) centres on the distinction Greek vs ethnic Other: ‘for the Lydians and more or less throughout the non-Greek world, it is a source of great shame even for a man to be seen naked’ (*παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰ <ἅπασιν> τοῖσι ἄλλοισι βαρβάροισι, καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνὸν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει*, Hdt. 1.10.3). Thucydides, who concentrates more on ethnic differences among the Greeks, turns the focus to the Spartans: ‘[The Spartans] were the first, too, to strip naked for the games, to take off their clothes in public and to rub themselves with oil after exercise’ (*γυμνάζεσθαι*, Thuc. 1.6.5). The old custom of absence of nudity is mentioned as a commonality ‘between the old Greek and the present barbarian ways of life’ (Thuc. 1.6.6: *τὸ παλαιὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὁμοίотροπα τῷ νῦν βαρβαρικῷ διαιτώμενον*). Nudity in sport was thus both a trait characterising the Greeks and marking them out from the non-Greek Other, and at the same time it was a post-Homeric development, since in Homer men compete wearing a loincloth (e.g., *Il.* 23.710). In Homer nudity (through the use of the word *γυμνός*) is associated with the warrior’s dead body and inability to fight, because of deprivation of armour (e.g., *Il.* 17.122, 711, weakness and shamefulness combined: 22.124–5). Priam’s words at 22.66–76, without actually including the term *γυμνός*, provide the most powerful description of shameful nudity of a dead man’s body in war setting, through the image of an old man’s corpse being mauled by dogs.

In the Thermopylae episode, the nudity of the Spartan athlete-warriors was an ‘un-Homeric’ feature in a generally Homeric textual environment. It is worth pointing out that, despite the startling effect that the unclad Spartans had on the Persian scout and Xerxes, there is no comment on Greek nudity by either Persian, although the sight of Greek nakedness too

⁹⁹ Christesen (2014) 146, on the snapshot at Thermopylae as representative of sport and society in fifth-century Sparta. For nude games (*ἀγῶνα γυμνικόν*) as distinctively Greek, see, e.g., Hdt. 2.91, with Kyle (2009) 186. Papakonstantinou (2012) 1660, focusing on tombstones from Athens, notes the association of youthful athletes with warriors and the role of nudity in underscoring masculinity. There is plenty of visual evidence from vases with naked athletes and semi-naked Greek warriors fighting Persians, the latter covered by oriental trouser-suits and other distinctive attire (e.g., British Museum Collection, Numbers 1867,0508.1060 and 1866,0415.244). On the boundaries between idealisation and realism regarding male nudity in Greek art and real life, see Osborne (1997); id. (1998) on nudity and athletic and military élite masculinity in the classical city.

must have contributed to the astonishment of the Oriental Other, given the absence of nudity in Persian culture. Herodotus' handling of the theme of nudity in the Spartan warrior-athletes' pre-battle activities should be viewed as a typical example of the interplay between Homeric presences and absences in Herodotus' discourse. On the one hand, corporeal nudity emerges in the narrative through the single word *γυμνάζεσθαι*, anchoring the scene in fifth-century Greek institutions; and on the other, the absence of the ethnic Other's gaze in relation to Greek nudity enables the Herodotean scene of Spartan athletics in a war setting to resonate with its Homeric contexts.

The Homeric resonance is further accentuated by the verb *ἀεθλέω* (epic of *ἀθλ-*), used not to praise Greek performance, but to put a spotlight on Persian ineffectiveness ('they laboured but fared no better', *οὐδὲν ἄμεινον ἀέθλεον*, Hdt. 7.212.1).¹⁰⁰ Self-praise focalised through the shortcomings of the 'barbarian' Other was a mechanism of Greek propaganda after the Persian Wars, with Aeschylus' *Persians* being a large-scale poetic example. The verb *ἀθλέω* (or *ἀεθλ-*) is rare in both Herodotus and Homer, but the noun *ἄθλον* ('prize') is much more frequent in both authors.¹⁰¹ In Homer it is prominent in the scene of Hector's chase around the walls of Troy by Achilles, underscoring the beauty and frailty of the mortal warrior-athlete's body within the thematic nexus of war, athletics, and the gaze (*Il.* 22.159–66):

... ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοεῖην
 ἀρνύσθην, ἃ τε ποσσὶν ἀέθλια γίγνεται ἀνδρῶν,
 ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεόν Ἔκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο.
 ὡς δ' ὄτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι
 ῥίμφα μάλα τρωχῶσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κεῖται ἄεθλον
 ἢ τρίπος ἢ ἔ γυνὴ ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος·
 ὡς τὰ τρεῖς Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην
 καρπαλίμοισι πόδεσσι· θεοὶ δ' ἔς πάντες ὄρῳντο.

... for it was not for beast of sacrifice or for bull's hide that they strove,
 such as are men's **prizes** for swiftness of foot, but it was for the **life** of

¹⁰⁰ The semantic variants of, e.g., *ἀέθλιον*, *ἄεθλον*, *ἀθλέω*, *ἄθλημα* etc. (see LSJ) are associated with contests of an athletic or military kind, further testifying to the closeness of the two spheres.

¹⁰¹ E.g., *Il.* 19.133, frequent in Book 23; Hdt. 5.8; 9.101.

horse-taming Hector that they ran. And as single-hoofed horses that are **winners of prizes** gallop lightly about the turning posts, and some great **prize** is set out to be won, a tripod or a woman, in the funeral games for a man who has died; so these two circled thrice with swift feet about the city of Priam; and all the gods **gazed** on them.¹⁰²

4.4. Space and Loneliness in Death

The so-called Phocian Wall near which the Persian scout watches the Spartans exercising and combing their hair is a crucial topographic element in the scenery of the Greek resistance and death, but it does not really contribute much to our understanding of the realities of the battle. Like many topographical details in Herodotus' battle scenes, the wall's position and precise function are matters of endless discussion.¹⁰³ As has been noted, 'the level of detail in [Herodotus'] description suggests the authority of an eye-witness. He had been there'.¹⁰⁴ Both in Marathon (another case of loose topography) and in Thermopylae, Herodotus was able to be more concrete with the space of the battle. The looseness of his topographical information when it comes to battles is, I suggest, not so much a question of access to information and ability to provide details, as one of shaping his battle narrative under the heavy influence of Homeric battle scenes and tropes of visualising landscape.

The topography of Hector and Achilles's battle scene in *Iliad* 22, where the walls of Troy play a crucial role in organising space and Hector's gradual isolation and loneliness towards the culminating moment of his death,¹⁰⁵ provides a helpful Homeric background for Herodotus' use of space in the Thermopylae narrative. As has been noted, 'in death Leonidas is

¹⁰² Cf. *Il.* 22.22 where again Achilles is likened to a prize-winning horse (*ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος*).

¹⁰³ For an updated discussion of the uncertainties, Carey (2019) 27–33; Matthews (2006) 155: 'the Phocian Wall was at the centre of the fighting and its importance must be understood if the fighting is to make sense'. Details of topography and chronology are often difficult to establish in Herodotus: cf., e.g., Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 569, in relation to Thermopylae. On wall imagery in general, see Baragwanath (2008) 144–7.

¹⁰⁴ Carey (2019) 25.

¹⁰⁵ For a 'lone fighter' type-scene, foreshadowing tragedy with Hector's monologue addressed to his own heart (*Il.* 22.99–130), see de Jong (2012) 80. On the organisation of space in Homer and the association of vision with cognition and memory, Clay (2011) 96–109 *et passim*; Purves (2010), esp. 55–9, on Hector's chase around the walls of Troy.

characterised by a kind of tragic isolation'.¹⁰⁶ Herodotus' configuration of space in which Leonidas and the Greeks move and fight magnifies the sense of individual and collective loneliness before death. The wall provided them with some protection until the moment of the final decision of the sortie for death, when they went out of it advancing to the broader part of the neck (οἱ ἀμφὶ Λεωνίδην Ἕλληνας, ὡς τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἕξοδον ποιούμενοι ... ἐπεξήρισαν εἰς τὸ εὐρύτερον τοῦ ἀρχένοσ, 7.223.2). In this broader space, they were much more exposed to the enemy, and knew that death was approaching them (ἐπιστάμενοι τὸν μέλλοντα σφίσι ἕσεσθαι θάνατον, 7.223.4); vision and landscape in the broader part of the neck contributed to this realisation. The idea of a sensory understanding of death approaching nods to the Homeric personification of Death (Θάνατος) and Sleep (Ὕπνος) in the *Iliad* (16.681–3), where the twin brothers collect Sarpedon's body to carry it to Lycia. War is the big theme of the historians, and in their works it can appear either personified (a violent teacher, Thuc. 3.82.2) or as something that can cause desire for sight (Hdt. 8.116.2, 'a desire to see the war', θυμός ἐγένετο θεήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον).

Walls and buttresses are important topographical elements in staging death in both the Homeric and the Herodotean episodes. It is worth reading the repetition of θάνατος ('death') in the deadly sortie from the wall at Thermopylae (7.223.2 and 223.4, as above) against the word's paired mentions in Hector's deadly sortie from the walls of Troy to face Achilles, in a scene of climactic isolation of the hero and his gradual realisation of approaching death (*Il.* 22.202 and 210; and in Hector's final monologue 297 and 300). Throughout the episode, the Trojan Walls are important spatial points of reference in Hector's dialogue with his heart, as he processes the prospect of his death. He leans his shield before a buttress before speaking to himself (*Il.* 22.97) and visualises the hypothetical uncladding and leaning of his spear against the wall to meet Achilles and negotiate peace with him (22.111–12).

Like the feeble Phocian Wall at Thermopylae, Troy's mighty wall circuits prove unable to protect Hector from death. His abandonment by Phoebus Apollo (*Il.* 22.213) sets the final countdown of his death into motion. We have already mentioned Deiphobus-Athene deceptively prompting the hero to

¹⁰⁶ Vannicelli (2007) 316. The loneliness of the resolute warrior appears also in the story of the Spartan Eurytus, one of the Three Hundred, who, although he could be excused from the battle on account of his eye infection and inability to see, asked his helot to lead him into the battle. The helot abandoned him, but Eurytus stayed and fell bravely (7.229.1). The story is narratologically displaced, since it is provided in the post-battle chapters.

stand and face Achilles outside Troy's walls. Hector's response to Deiphobus clearly locates the latter outside Troy's walls: 'you have dared for my sake ... to come outside the wall, while the others remain inside' (ὄς ἔτλης ἐμεῦ εἶνεκ', ... | τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν, ἄλλοι δ' ἔντοσθε μένουσι, *Il.* 22.236–7). Soon Hector realises he is alone before death, seeing that Deiphobus is in fact not on his side: 'Well now! Truly have the gods called me to my death' (θεοὶ θάνατόνδε κάλεσαν, 22.297; cf. ἐγγύθι μοι θάνατος κακός, 22.300). This realisation is turned to aspiration of fame and a great accomplishment, which the poetic narrator conveys through the hero's own words: 'Not without a struggle let me die, nor ingloriously (ἀκλειῶς), but having done some great deed for men yet to be born to hear' (*Il.* 22.304–5). In the Thermopylae narrative too, the Three Hundred's gradual isolation as death approaches is bound up with the aspiration to a heroic death. On this occasion, Leonidas' internal processing is mediated through the historical narrator: 'Feeling (ἦσθετο) his allies demoralised and unwilling to face the danger', Leonidas ordered them to go, but 'it did not seem right to him to leave' (the Spartan Callicrates' words too are mediated; see above, pp. 127–9). Leonidas' determination aims at his personal renown (*kleos*) and Sparta's prosperity (*eudaimoniē*, 7.220.2).

4.5. Fame and Fear

The aspiration of fame (*kleos*) and fear are a doublet defining the epic hero's utterances and actions, and are also prominent in the Thermopylae narrative. *Kleos* has been acknowledged as a major obvious hinge between the world of Homer and Herodotus. The powerful and programmatic presence of the compound ἀκλεᾶ (a single occurrence in the text, meaning 'being forgotten'¹⁰⁷) in the proem of the *Histories* sets the tone for the work's deep and consistent engagement with future memory. The word *kleos* does not in fact crop up more than four times in the *Histories*, but this linguistic rarity does not suggest that *kleos* is not important in the work; quite the opposite, as this discussion has also shown in relation to the word αἷμα ('blood') (see above, pp. 116–22 with Appendix, below, pp. 150–4). The Thermopylae episode is a case in point: amid the general scarcity of the word in the *Histories*, the double appearance of *kleos* in close textual proximity (7.220.2 and 7.220.4), before and after the hexameter oracle foretelling Leonidas' death, along with the fact that this is the first occurrence of the

¹⁰⁷ Cf. ἀκλειῶς in 5.77.1, another single occurrence; 7.228.3, κλεινοῖο [< κλέος] Μεγιστία in Simonides' oracle (7.228; see below).

word in the work, are emphatic affirmations of its importance in the episode.¹⁰⁸

The interplay between discursive presences and meaningful absences of the word *kleos* is combined with other means of Homeric evocation in the *Histories*. At the level of narrative patterning, the short scene of the Spartan Dieneces evokes the psyche and ethics of the Homeric hero. In a manner reminiscent of the low-camera mode in Homer, the historical narrator zooms into this scene and its main character, Dieneces, whose words are imbued by a keen concern for excellence on the battlefield and posthumous memory: ‘Such and similar words, it is said, the Lacedaemonian Dieneces left behind as memorials’ (ἔπεά φασι Διηνέκεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα, 7.226.2); a powerful evocation of *kleos* without the actual use of the word.¹⁰⁹

Kleos is inextricably connected with the way in which the warrior manages the fear of death on the battlefield. Again, the combat between Hector and Achilles outside the walls of Troy in *Iliad* 22 is a suitable comparandum for Thermopylae. I would like to consider the individual and collective fear of death as a central emotion of the warrior vis-à-vis the life-threatening conditions of the battlefield, against Boedeker’s critical background of monologic vs. dialogic, with which our discussion started. Arguably, in the Thermopylae episode the psychology of Leonidas and the Greeks around him (not least the Three Hundred) points to a monologic rather than dialogic approach to individual and collective heroism. Nowhere is fear or any mental wobbling mentioned in the mediated thoughts of Leonidas or any of the Greeks who stayed and died with him. The seer Megistias appears to be equally ‘monologic’ and uncomplicated, as it were, before death: he is the first to see the coming death in the sacrifices, but chooses to stay (7.219.1). We do not witness any internal dialogue with himself or a decision-making

¹⁰⁸ In addition to the two occurrences in the Thermopylae narrative, *kleos* also appears in 9.48 and 78; four times in total in the *Histories*. For the oracle’s (7.220.4) Homeric language, see Pelling (2006) 92–3 n. 48; Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 571–3; Darbo-Peschanski (2019) 165.

¹⁰⁹ I would be hesitant to accept that ‘it [= *kleos*] does not provide the matter for the making of *historiē*, namely for knowing what happened (*ta genomena*)’: Darbo-Peschanski (2019) 166. *Kleos* is pivotal in the historian’s shaping of *ta genomena*. As Christopher Pelling points out to me (per email of 25.9.2019), ‘*Kleos* does not need to be mentioned often explicitly because it is so present implicitly by the very act of recording: the text is performative, conveying the *kleos* by what it does as much as what it says’. For *kleos*’ role in collective memory, also in relation to Thermopylae and Dieneces, see Fragoulaki (2020a) xxii–xxix.

process in which the option fight-or-flight is somehow considered. His choice to die with *kleos* is underscored by the poetic κλεινοῖο Μειγιστία ‘famed Megistias’ (7.228.3), the only named individual in the funerary epigrams cited in the commemorative section of the Thermopylae narrative, following the description of the main battle.

The basic emotion of the fighter’s fear of death—or fear of combat, a universal sentiment—has been effaced from the narration of the battle. A reference to the Thebans ‘staying very much against their will’ (7.222) might be viewed as a hint towards this emotion, but very indirectly. It is only in the post-battle section that the fear of the hoplite in combat emerges in relation to two survivors of the battle, who are named, in contrast to the anonymous collective bravery of the Three Hundred.¹¹⁰ The first is Aristodemos, whose ‘heart failed him’ (λιποψυχέοντα, 7.229.2) and was later called ὁ τρέσας ‘the man who ran away’ (7.231).¹¹¹ Like λιποψυχέοντα (see above on ψυχῆ), τρέσας too is an epic word, resonating with the Homeric ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, *Il.* 14.502 (cf. *Il.* 22.143, in relation to Hector, below) and Tyrtaeus, fr. 11.14 *IEG*². The other individual is Pantites (7.232) who did not take part in the battle because he was sent as a messenger to Thessaly; back at Sparta he was met with such dishonour (ἡτίμωτο) that he hanged himself (7.232). In Pantites’ case, loss of courage is not explicitly mentioned, but his social exclusion and shaming are the outcomes of his inability to manage his fear on the battlefield. In narratological terms, both combat-fear stories are temporarily displaced in relation to the description of the battle, creating a monologic environment of solid unshaken bravery, as it were, for the Three Hundred and their leader.

The psychological and cognitive processes of Homeric Hector in *Iliad* 22, on the other hand, are much more complex and polyphonic. Hector’s internal turmoil in the face of death and his techniques to manage his fear on the battlefield emerge in a manner that foreshadows tragedy.¹¹² He is seized by trembling (ἔλε τρόμος) at the sight of Achilles, and he dares no longer remain where he was (οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔτ’ ἔτλη αὐθι μένειν); he leaves the gates behind him and flees in fear (φοβηθείς, *Il.* 22.136–7). Hector is then compared to a frightened dove and his fear is stated with another variant: τρέσε δ’

¹¹⁰ The two named individuals appear without patronymics, probably because the commemoration is negative.

¹¹¹ On this episode see Barker, below, Ch. 6.

¹¹² De Jong (2012) 80 on Hector’s address to his heart, reviewing fight-or-flight scenarios (*Il.* 22.99–130); cf. above, n. 105.

Ἐκτωρ (22.143), with which ‘the runaway Aristodemus’ (ὁ τρέσας Ἀριστόδημος) in Thermopylae resonates. Deceptively encouraged by Deiphobus (Athena in disguise), Hector proclaims: ‘I will be no more afraid of you, son of Peleus ... now my heart prompts me to stand and face you’ (*Il.* 22.250–3). At the moment of realisation of loneliness (Deiphobus is nowhere near) and imminent death (22.297–300), the heroic character and his total commitment to *kleos* comes into its own: ‘let me not die ingloriously (ἀκλειῶς), without a fight, without some great deed done (μέγα ῥέξας τι) that future men will hear of’ (*Il.* 22.304–5). The resonance with not only the Thermopylae episode, but also the proem of the *Histories* and its programmatic ἀκλεᾶ along with the historical narrator’s commitment to recording ‘great deeds’ (ἔργα μεγάλα), cannot be missed.

5. Conclusion

This discussion has revisited the old question of the absence of gory anatomical details of the wounded and dying body in combat in Herodotus’ *Histories*, as a feature which differentiates him sharply from his poetic archetype, Homer (§1).

We started our examination by considering the broader picture of reporting death in the *Histories*, beyond and outside of the battlefield (§2). It was observed that Herodotus does not shy away from rich and vivid descriptions of death and corporeal maltreatment in non-battle contexts, especially since these are often associated with the explanatory potential of ethnographic material. Nevertheless, when it comes to battle scenes his habits in describing the human body are different. In order to demonstrate this, we turned to Herodotus’ descriptions of death on the battlefield (which we named the ‘typology’ of death in battle), focusing on three vignettes, where the imagery of death and wounding is compressed and Homeric vestiges in them evoke models and large-scale examples in Homer. In §3, the scarce occurrence of the word ‘blood’ (αἷμα) in the *Histories* as a whole, and the word’s complete absence from battle scenes, were used as a means of observing Herodotus’ Homeric allusive practice, through meaningful absence and variation. In the final section (§4), we concentrated on the battle of Thermopylae in Herodotus. Building on the rich and important scholarship on the topic, we aimed at a fresh discussion of the Homeric resonances of the Thermopylae narrative, reading it against the poetics of *kleos* and key themes and institutions of archaic and classical Greece, such as individual and collective heroism and male nudity in athletic and military

contexts. In all this, Hector's and Achilles' combat in *Iliad* 22 was used as an illuminating comparandum.

This chapter suggested a new approach to Herodotus' Homeric intertextuality, using the notions of 'discursive presences' and 'meaningful absences', borrowed from the theoretical field of discourse analysis. It was argued that the resonance of the Homeric text in Herodotus can be sensed not only through tangible and explicit references (discursive presences), but also through meaningful absences. Herodotus' un-Homeric way of reporting wounds and death in battle was analysed as revealing of the interplay between discursive presences and meaningful absences and a broadened, cultural, sense of Homeric intertextuality. The absence from Herodotus' battlefield of blood and anatomical details of the human body were central in this intertextual discussion, and are associated, it was argued, with the reinvention of the ideology of *kleos* and the human body in the political and social realities of the Greek world in the fifth-century BCE.

APPENDIX

Appendix: Occurrences of αἷμα ('Blood') in Herodotus

	Hdt.	Extract	Context
I	1.74.6	<p>ὄρκια δὲ ποιέεται ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνεα τὰ πέρ τε Ἕλληνες, καὶ πρὸς τούτοισι, ἐπεὶ τὸν βραχίονα ἐπιτάμνεται εἰς τὴν ὀμοχροίην, τὸ αἷμα ἀναλείχουσι ἀλλήλων.</p> <p>These peoples formalise their treaties in the same way the Greeks do, with the extra feature that when they cut into the skin of their arms, each party licks the other's blood.</p>	<p>Non-military scene. Ethnographic: oath exchanges among Asiatic peoples, involving blood-rituals.</p>
2-5	1.212-14 x 4	<p>(1) ἀπληστέ αἵματος, Κύρῳ (1.212.2) 'Cyrus, insatiable for blood'</p> <p>(2) ἢ μὲν σε ἐγὼ καὶ ἀπληστον ἔοντα αἵματος κορέσω (1.213) 'Insatiable though you are for blood, I will quench your thirst'</p> <p>(3) ἀσκὸν δὲ πλήσασα αἵματος ἀνθρωπηίου Τόμυρις ἐδίζητο ἐν τοῖσι τεθνεώσι τῶν Περσέων τὸν Κύρου νέκυν (1.214.4) Tomyris filled a wineskin with human blood and searched among the Persian corpses for Cyrus' body</p> <p>(4) σὲ δ' ἐγώ, κατὰ περ ἠπέιλῃσα, αἵματος κορέσω (1.214.5) 'But I warned you that I will quench your thirst for blood, and so I shall'.</p>	<p>Non-military/post-battle scene. Ethnographic (related themes: ethics, characterisation): Cyrus' posthumous maltreatment at the hands of Tomyris, the queen of the Massagetans.</p>

6	3.8.1	<p>ἔπειτα λαβὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἱματίου ἑκατέρου κροκύδα ἀλείφει τῷ αἵματι ἐν μέσῳ κειμένους λίθους ἑπτὰ, τοῦτο δὲ ποιέων ἐπικαλεῖται τὸν τε Διόνυσον καὶ τὴν Οὐρανίην.</p> <p>Then he takes a tuft of material from each of their cloaks and smears seven stones, which have been placed between the two parties, with their blood, while calling on Dionysus and Urania.</p>	<p>Non-military scene. Ethnographic: blood-rituals of the Arabs (cf. 1.74.6 above).</p>
7	3.11.3	<p>διὰ πάντων δὲ διεξεληθόντες τῶν παίδων οἶνόν τε καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσεφόρεον ἐς αὐτόν ἐμπιόντες δὲ τοῦ αἵματος πάντες οἱ ἐπίκουροι οὕτω δὴ συνέβαλον.</p> <p>When they had finished with all the children, the mercenaries poured wine and water into the bowl, and when they had all drunk some of the blood they joined battle.</p>	<p>Non-military/pre-battle scene. Ethnographic: human sacrifice, blood-ritual.</p>
8	3.15.4	<p>νῦν δὲ μηχανώμενος κακὰ ὁ Ψαμμηνίτιος ἔλαβε τὸν μισθόν· ἀπιστὰς γὰρ Αἰγυπτίους ἦλω, ἐπέιτε δὲ ἐπάϊστος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Καμβύσειω, αἶμα ταύρου πῶν ἀπέθανε παραχρῆμα. οὕτω δὴ οὗτος ἐτελεύτησε.</p> <p>As things turned out though, Psammenitus conspired against the Persians and reaped the reward: he was caught inciting the Egyptians to rebellion, and when this was made known to Cambyses, he drank bull's blood and died on the spot. And that was the end of him.</p>	<p>Non-military scene. Death caused by drinking bull's blood, which was considered poisonous (one version about Psammenitus' death).</p>
9	3.157.1	<p>οἱ δὲ Βαβυλώνιοι ὁρῶντες ἄνδρα τὸν ἐν Πέρσῃσι δοκιμώτατον ῥινός τε καὶ ὠτων ἐστερημένον μᾶστιξί τε καὶ αἵματι ἀναπεφυρμένον, πάγχυ ἐλπίσαντες λέγειν μιν ἀληθέα ...</p> <p>The sight of one of the most distinguished Persians without his nose and ears, and covered with blood and welts from being flogged inclined the Babylonians to believe that he was telling the truth ...</p>	<p>Non-military scene. Blood loss caused by self-mutilation (Zopyrus' stratagem).</p>

<p>10-12</p>	<p>4.62, 4.64, 4.70 (x 3)</p>	<p>(1) ὅσους {δ'} ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ζωγήσωσι, ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἀνδρῶν ἄνδρα ἕνα ... ἐπεὰν γὰρ οἶνον ἐπισπείσωσι κατὰ τῶν κεφαλῶν, ἀποσφάζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐς ἄγγος καὶ ἔπειτα ἀνενείκαντες ἄνω ἐπὶ τὸν ὄγκον τῶν φρυγάνων καταχέουσι τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀκινάκεος (4.62.3). One prisoner in every hundred is selected ... they pour wine over the prisoners' heads, cut their throat over a jar, and then carry the jars up on to the pile of sticks and pour the blood over the <i>akinakes</i>.</p> <p>(2) ἐπεὰν τὸν πρῶτον ἄνδρα καταβάλῃ ἀνὴρ Σκύθης, τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπίνει (4.64.1). When a Scythian kills his first man, he drinks some of his blood.</p> <p>(3) ὄρκια δὲ ποιεῦνται Σκύθαι ὡδε πρὸς τοὺς ἂν ποιέωνται· ἐς κύλικα μεγάλην κεραμίνην οἶνον ἐγχέαντες αἷμα συμμίσγουσι τῶν τὸ ὄρκιον ταμνομένων ... (4.70.2). The procedure in Scythia for entering into a sworn agreement with anyone is as follows. Wine is poured into a large earthenware cup, and then the people swearing the oath mingle their blood with the wine in the cup.</p>	<p>Non-military scenes. Ethnographic: Scythian customs. (1) Human sacrifice (4.62.3)</p> <p>(2) Custom of war (4.64.1)</p> <p>(3) Oath-taking involving blood-ritual (4.70.2)</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>7.88.6</p>	<p>πεσὼν δὲ αἷμά τε ἤμεε καὶ ἐς φθίσιν περιῆλθε ἡ νοῦσος After his fall he began to vomit blood and developed consumption.</p>	<p>Non-military scene. Consumption (spitting blood) caused by a fall from horse.</p>

14	7.140.3	<p>ὦ μέλαιοι, τί κάθησθε; λιπὼν φύγ' ἐς ἔσχατα γαίης δώματα καὶ πόλιος τροχοειδέος ἄκρα κάρηνα. οὔτε γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ μένει ἔμπεδον οὔτε τὸ σῶμα, οὔτε πόδες νέατοι οὔτ' ὦν χέρες, οὔτε τι μέσσης λείπεται, ἀλλ' ἄζηλα πέλει· κατὰ γάρ μιν ἐρείπει πῦρ τε καὶ ὄξυς Ἄρης, Συριηγενὲς ἄρμα διώκων. πολλὰ δὲ κάλλ' ἀπολεῖ πυργώματα, κού τὸ σὸν οἶον· πολλοὺς δ' ἀθανάτων νηοὺς μαλερῶ πυρὶ δώσει, οἳ που νῦν ἰδρῶτι ρεοῦμενοι ἐστήκασι, δείματι παλλόμενοι, κατὰ δ' ἀκροτάτοις ὀρόφοισιν αἷμα μέλαν κέχυνται, προῖδὸν κακότητος ἀνάγκας.</p> <p>Fools, why sit you here? Fly to the ends of the earth, Leave your homes and the lofty heights girded by your city. The head is unstable, the trunk totters; nothing – Not the fleet below, nor the hands, nor anything in between – Nothing endures; all is doomed. Fire will bring it down, Fire and bitter Ares, hastening in an Syrian chariot. Many are the strongholds he will destroy, not yours alone; Many the temples of the gods he will gift with ranging fire, Temples which even now stand streaming with sweat And quivering with fear, and down from the roof-tops Dark blood pours, foreseeing the straits of woe.</p>	<p>Military context. Oracle in relation to the battle of Salamis (hexameter, epicising language) <i>Homeric intertexts:</i> Theoclymenus' prophetic vision (<i>Od.</i> 20.351-7): ἂ δειλοί, τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμέων εἰλύαται κεφαλαί τε πρόσωπά τε νέρθε τε γούνα, οἴμωγῇ δὲ δέδηε, δεδάκρυνται δὲ παρειαί, αἷματι δ' ἐρράδαται τοῖχοι καλάι τε μεσόδμαι· εἰδώλων δὲ πλέον πρόθυρον, πλείη δὲ καὶ αὐλή, ἰεμένων Ἐρεβόσδε ὑπὸ ζόφον· ἡέλιος δὲ οὐρανοῦ ἐξάπόλωλε, κακῇ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν ἀχλύς.</p> <p>'Ah, wretched men, what evil is this that you suffer? Shrouded in night are your heads and your faces and your knees beneath you; kindled is the sound of wailing, bathed in tears are your cheeks, and sprinkled with blood are the walls and the fair panels. And full of ghosts is the porch, full also the court, ghosts hastening down to Erebus beneath the darkness, and the sun has perished out of heaven and an evil mist covers all.'</p> <p>μέλαν αἷμα: e.g., Hom. <i>Il.</i> 21.119; cf. αἷμα κελαινόν, e.g., <i>Il.</i> 11.829, 845, etc.</p>
----	---------	--	---

15	8.77.2	<p>χαλκὸς γὰρ χαλκῷ συμμίζεται, αἵματι δ' Ἄρης πόντον φοινίξει. τότε ἑλεύθερον Ἑλλάδος ἡμᾶρ εὐρύοπα Κρονίδης ἐπάγει καὶ πότνια Νίκη.</p> <p>Weapon shall clash with weapon, and with blood shall Ares Crimson the sea. Then freedom will dawn for Greece, Brought on by far-seeing Zeus and noble Victory.</p>	<p>Military context. Oracle, Salamis <i>Homeric intertexts:</i> χαλκός (synecdoche for 'weapon' in Homer): πλάγχθη δ' ἀπὸ χαλκόφι χαλκός, <i>Il.</i> 11.351 (the bronze spear rebounded from the bronze)</p> <p>Blood, Ares, and Water (Homeric Imagery): τῶν νῦν αἶμα κελαινὸν εὐρροον ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐσκέδασ' ὄξυς Ἄρης, ψυχαὶ δ' Ἄιδόσδε κατηλθον, <i>Il.</i> 7.329-30 (Cruel Ares has darkened the banks of Scamander with the blood of our dead, whose souls have gone down to Hades)</p>
----	--------	--	---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, G. (2000) *Intertextuality* (London).
- Aly, W. (1921) *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen: eine Untersuchung über die volkstümlichen Elemente der altergriechischen Prosaerzählung* (Göttingen; 2nd ed., with additions by L. Huber, 1969).
- Asheri, D. (2007) ‘Book 1’, in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 57–218.
- , A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*, edd O. Murray and A. Moreno (Oxford).
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*; ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis).
- de Bakker, M. (2018) ‘A Narratological Comparison of Herodotus and Diodorus on Thermopylae’, in Van Gils–de Jong–Kroon (2018) 54–90.
- and M. van der Keur (2018) ‘Thermopylae and Cannae: How One Battle Narrative Enriches Another’, in Van Gils–de Jong–Kroon (2018) 319–41.
- Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- (2020) ‘History, Ethnography, and Aetiology in Herodotus’ Libyan Logos (4.145–205)’, in Constantakopoulou–Fragoulaki (2020) 155–88.
- Basset, L. (2011) ‘Imparfait, aoriste et présent historique dans les récits des quatre batailles navales de Syracuse (*Guerre du Péloponnèse*, livre 7)’ in J. Lallot, et al. (2011) 159–75.
- Blundell, S., D. Cairns, and N. Rabinowitz, edd. (2013) *Vision and Viewing in Ancient Greece* (*Helios* Special Issue, 40.1–2).
- Boedeker, D. (2003) ‘Pedestrian Fatalities: The Prosaics of Death in Herodotus’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 17–36.
- Bowie, E. ed. (2018) *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston).
- Briscoe, J. and S. Hornblower, edd. (2020) *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita Book XXII* (Cambridge).
- Brügger, C. (2018) *Homer’s Iliad: The Basel Commentary: Book XVI* (Berlin and Boston).
- Carey, C. (2016) ‘Homer and Epic in Herodotus’ Book 7’, in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou, edd., *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–89.
- (2019) *Thermopylae* (Oxford).
- Cartledge, P. A. (2007) *Thermopylae: The Battle that Changed the World* (New York).

- Chaniotis, A. (2005) *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford).
- Christesen, P. (2014) 'Sport and Society in Sparta', in id. and D. G. Kyle, edd., *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Malden, Mass.) 146–58.
- Clay, J. S. (2011) *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad* (Cambridge).
- Constantakopoulou, C. and M. Fragoulaki, edd. (2020) *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (*Histos* Supplement 11; Newcastle Upon Tyne).
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. (1988) 'La vie des morts : représentations et fonctions de la mort et des morts dans les *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *La Parola, l'Immagine, la Tomba, Archeologia e Storia Antica* 10: 41–51.
- (2019) 'The Place and Nature of Memory in Greek Historiography', in L. Castagnoli and P. Ceccarelli, edd., *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices* (Cambridge) 158–78.
- Demont, P. (2018) 'Herodotus on Health and Disease', in Bowie (2018) 175–96.
- Dessingué, A. and J. Winter, edd., (2016) *Beyond Memory: Silence and the Aesthetics of Remembrance* (London).
- Easterling, P. E. (1997) 'Constructing the Heroic', in C. Pelling, ed., *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford) 21–37.
- Felton, D. (2014) 'The Motif of the "Mutilated Hero" in Herodotus', *Phoenix* 68: 47–61.
- Fenik, B. (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description* (Wiesbaden).
- Flower, M. (1998) 'Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae', *CQ* 48: 365–79.
- and J. Marincola, edd. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Ford, A. (2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Foster, E. (2012) 'Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background', in ead. and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 185–214.
- Fragoulaki, M. (2020a) 'Introduction: Collective Memory in Ancient Greek Culture: Concepts, Media, and Sources', in Constantakopoulou–Fragoulaki (2020) ix–xliv.

- (2020b) ‘Thucydides Homericus and the Episode of Mykalessus (Th. 7.29–30): Myth and History, Space and Collective Memory’, in Constantakopoulou–Fragoulaki (2020) 37–86.
- (2021) ‘Death’, in C. Baron, ed., *The Herodotus Encyclopedia* (Hoboken, N.J.) 414–19.
- Friedrich, W.-H. (2002) *Wounding and Death in the Iliad: Homeric Techniques of Description* (London); trans. by P. Jones and G. Wright of *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (Göttingen, 1956).
- Gabriel, R. A. (2011) *Man and Wound in the Ancient World: A History of Military Medicine from Sumer to the Fall of Constantinople* (Washington, DC).
- Gainsford, P. (2013) ‘Herodotus’ Homer: Troy, Thermopylae and the Dorians’, in C. A. Matthew and M. Trundle, edd., *Beyond the Gates of Fire: New Perspectives on the Battle of Thermopylae* (Barnsley) 117–37.
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore and London).
- Greenwood, E. (2006) *Thucydides and the Shaping of History* (London and New York).
- Grethlein, J. (2013) *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: ‘Futures Past’ from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1978) ‘The Divine Audience and the Religion of the *Iliad*’, *CQ* 28: 1–22.
- (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (2007) ‘Warfare in Ancient Literature: The Paradox of War’, in P. Sabin, H. van Wees, and M. Whitby, edd., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, I: Greece, the Hellenistic World and the Rise of Rome* (Cambridge) 22–53.
- (2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Volume 3: Books 5.25–8.109* (Oxford).
- , ed. (2013) *Herodotus: Histories Book V* (Cambridge).
- and C. Pelling, edd. (2017) *Herodotus: Histories Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. (2018) *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. (Cambridge).
- Janko, R. (1992) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 4: Books 13–16* (Cambridge).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1991) *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden).
- (2015) ‘Leonidas “the Best of the Achaeans”’: How Herodotus Anchors Prose via Poetry’, *Proceedings of Anchoring Innovation in Antiquity, 17–20 December 2015* (online publication).
- (2018) ‘The View from the Mountain (*oroskopia*) in Greek and Latin Literature’, *CCJ* 64: 23–48.

- , ed. (2012) *Homer: Iliad Book XXII* (Cambridge).
- Kampakoglou, A. and A. Novokhatko, edd. (2018) *Gaze, Vision, and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature* (Berlin).
- Kelly, A. (2007) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Iliad VIII* (Oxford).
- Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 1: Books 1–4* (Cambridge).
- (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 2: Books 5–8* (Cambridge).
- Kostuch, L. (2018) ‘Have Vultures Left the Battlefield? Scavengers and War in Greek Historiography’, *Histos* 12: 116–38.
- Kyle, D. (2009) ‘Pan-Hellenism and Particularism: Herodotus on Sport, Greekness, Piety and War’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26: 183–211.
- Lallot, J., A. Rijksbaron, B. Jacquinod, and M. Buijs, edd. (2011) *The Historical Present in Thucydides: Semantics and Narrative Function / Le présent historique chez Thucydide: sémantique et fonction narrative* (Leiden).
- Latacz, J. (1977) *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos, und Tyrtaios* (Munich).
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Lendon, J. E. (2017) ‘Battle Description in the Ancient Historians, Part I: Structure, Array, and Fighting’, *G&R* 64: 39–64.
- Lipka, M., ed. (2002) *Xenophon’s Spartan Constitution* (Berlin).
- Machacek, G. (2007) ‘Allusion’, *PMLA* 122: 522–36.
- Marincola, J. (2016) ‘The Historian as Hero: Herodotus and the 300 at Thermopylae’, *TAPA* 146: 219–36.
- (2018) ‘Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus’, in Bowie (2018) 3–24.
- Matthews, R. (2006) *The Battle of Thermopylae: A Campaign in Context* (Stroud).
- Miltsios, N. (2016) ‘Sight and Seeing in Herodotus’, *Trends in Classics* 8: 1–16.
- Monro, D. B. (1891) *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (Oxford).
- Monsacré, H. (2018) *The Tears of Achilles* (Washington).
- Mueller, M. (2011) ‘Battle-Scenes’, in M. Finkelberg, ed., *The Homeric Encyclopedia*, 3 vols (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) I.125–28.
- Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).
- Murray, A. T. (1924–5) *Homer: The Iliad*, 2 vols (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- Myers, T. (2019) *Homer’s Divine Audience: The Iliad’s Reception on Mount Olympus* (Oxford).
- Nagy, G. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore and London).
- (1990) *Pindar’s Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore).

- Neal, T. (2006) *The Wounded Hero: Non-Fatal Injury in Homer's Iliad* (Bern).
- Osborne, R. (1997) 'Men without Clothes: Heroic Nakedness and Greek Art', *Gender & History* 9: 504–28.
- (1998) 'Sculpted Men of Athens: Masculinity and Power in the Field of Vision', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, edd., *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition* (London) 23–42.
- Papakonstantinou, Z. (2012) 'The Athletic Body in Classical Athens: Literary and Historical Perspectives', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 29: 1657–68.
- Pelling, C. (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* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2013a) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- (2013b) 'Herodotus' Marathon', in C. Carey and M. Edwards, edd., *Marathon—2,500 Years* (BICS Suppl. 124; London) 23–34.
- (2016) 'Herodotus, Polycrates—and Maybe Stesimbrotus Too?', *JHS* 136: 113–20.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- (2020a) 'Homer and the Question Why', in Constantakopoulou–Fragoulaki (2020) 1–35.
- (2020b) 'Fifth-century Preliminaries', in K. De Temmerman, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography* (Oxford) 87–99.
- Powell, A. (1989) 'Mendacity and Sparta's Use of the Visual', in id., ed., *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success* (London) 173–92.
- Purves, A. (2010) *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (New York and Cambridge).
- Redfield, J. (1985) 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CPh* 80: 97–118.
- Rengakos, A. (2006) 'Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos, edd., *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Entretiens Hardt 52; Vandœuvres-Genève) 183–209.
- Richardson, N. J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 6: Books 21–24* (Cambridge).
- Russo, J. A. (1992) 'Books 17–20', in id., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. 3: Books 17–24* (Oxford) 3–127.
- Rutherford, R. (2013) *Homer²* (G&R New Surveys in the Classics 41; Cambridge).
- Salazar, C. F. (2000) *The Treatment of War Wounds in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (Leiden).
- Saunders, K. B. (1999) 'The Wounds in *Iliad* 13–16', *CQ* 49: 345–63.

- Schein, S. L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Schröter, M. and C. Taylor, edd., (2018) *Exploring Silence and Absence in Discourse: Empirical Approaches* (Cham).
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (SHAW, Heidelberg); repr. in id., *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, vol. 2 (Hildesheim and New York, 1982) 1057–97.
- Strid, O. (2006) 'Voiceless Victims, Memorable Deaths in Herodotus', *CQ* 56: 393–403.
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- Van Gills, L. V., I. J. F. de Jong, and C. H. M. Kroon, edd., *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden).
- Van Wees, H. (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam).
- (1994) 'The Homeric Way of War: The *Iliad* and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)', *G&R* 41: 1–18.
- (2004) *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities* (London).
- (2018) 'Thermopylae: Herodotus versus the Legend', in Van Gills–de Jong–Kroon (2018) 19–53.
- Vannicelli, P. (2007) 'To Each his Own: Simonides and Herodotus on Thermopylae', in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford) 315–21.
- , A. Corcella, and G. Nenci, edd. (2017) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VII, Serse e Leonida* (Milan).
- Vernant, J.-P. (1991) *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, ed. F. I. Zeitlin (Princeton).
- Waterfield, R., trans. (1998) *Herodotus: The Histories*, with notes by C. J. Dewald (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2013) *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).
- Weststeijn, J. (2016) 'Wine, Women, and Revenge in Near Eastern Historiography: The Tales of Tomyris, Judith, Zenobia, and Jalila', *JNES* 75: 91–107.
- Wilder, U. M. (2021) 'Odysseus, the Archetypal Spy', *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 34: 799–815 (<https://doi.org/10.1080/08850607.2020.1847517>).
- Wilson, N. G. (2015) *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus* (Oxford).

DIE ANOTHER DAY: SARPEDON, ARISTODEMOS, AND HOMERIC INTERTEXTUALITY IN HERODOTUS*

Elton T. E. Barker

I, I can remember
Standing, by the wall
And the guns, shot above our heads
And we kissed, as though nothing could fall
And the shame, was on the other side
Oh we can beat them, for ever and ever
Then we could be Heroes, just for one day.
‘Heroes’, David Bowie

After his depiction of the desperate last defence at Thermopylae led by Leonidas and his three hundred Spartiates, Herodotus records the post-battle credits. First comes a roll call of the star performers, followed by a record of the inscriptions set up in commemoration. Then Herodotus recounts the story of Aristodemus (7.229):

But of two of the three hundred, Eurytos and Aristodemus, it is said, though it was possible for both of them to have come to an agreement either to be saved together [and return] to Sparta, since they had been

* The ideas in this chapter first breathed life in Christ Church, Oxford, where I held a temporary lectureship under the care of Richard Rutherford. Languishing in a drawer for over a decade after their author ‘lost his spirit’ on receiving harsh (but fair) feedback from two *JHS* reviewers, that they see the light of day now owes much to the continued support of Chris Pelling, who never lost heart that there was something worth discussing here, and to the prodding of Jan Haywood that I should call the *Herodotus Helpline*. Taking the opportunity to ‘revisit’ a failure, I am grateful for all the feedback I received there (and subsequently) from fellow Herodoteans David Branscome, Roger Brock, Paul Cartledge, Paul Demont, Tom Harrison, Scarlett Kingsley, John Marincola, Ivan Matijašić, and Rosaria Munson, as well as from Adrian Kelly, Tom Nelson, and the two *Histos* referees. I dedicate this essay to Richard, a singularly discerning scholar of Homer and Herodotus alike, and to the memory of my former PhD student Doris Post, whose sensitive and tenacious explorations into ambiguity helped me think anew about its value in Herodotus.

let go from the camp by Leonidas and were lying sick at Alpeni with an extreme eye problem, or, if they didn't want to return, to die along with the rest—though it was possible for them to do either of these things, they were not willing to agree, but being divided in opinion Eurytos, when he learned of the Persians' circuit, demanded his armour, put it on, and ordered his helot to lead him to those fighting; and just so the helot led him and then fled, while Eurytos rushed into the crowd and was killed. But Aristodemus with his spirit leaving him was left behind (Ἀριστόδημον δὲ λιποψυχέοντα λειφθῆναι).

When Aristodemus arrives home, his fellow Spartans are furious with him and shun him. Yet, according to Herodotus, he made up for it in the final battle of Plataea.¹

My concern here is with the word that I have clunkily translated as 'with his spirit leaving him', *λιποψυχέοντα*. Standard translations of this word range from 'swooning' (LSJ *s.v.* *λιποψυχία*) to 'be faint-hearted' (the *Cambridge Greek Lexicon*). The slippage from 'fainting' to 'faint-hearted' is evident in English translations of this passage, such as by George Rawlinson (1858) ('Aristodemus, on the other hand, *was faint of heart*, and remained at Alpeni'; Aubrey de Sélincourt (1954) ('Aristodemus, on the other hand, *finding that his heart failed him*, stayed behind at Alpeni'; or Robin Waterfield (1998) ('*Faint-hearted* Aristodamus, however, stayed away from the fighting').² In contrast, Tom Holland's 2013 Penguin renders *λιποψυχέοντα* as 'had passed out', while Andrea Purvis' Landmark translation (2007) opts for something in between: 'faint and feeble'.³

¹ Hdt. 7.231. All translations are mine. I return to this section in its entirety (7.229–32) below, §3.

² So too Carey (1847–9) ('But Aristodemus, *failing in courage*, was left behind'). Compare Macaulay's less judgemental 1890 version: 'But Aristodemus was left behind *fainting*'. Vacillation between fainting and faint-hearted is apparent in the two translations attributed to Godley (1920). The Loeb Classical Library text reads: 'But Aristodemus' *heart failed him*, and he stayed behind'. Contrast this to the version on Perseus: 'Aristodemus, however, *lost his strength* and stayed behind'.

³ Scarlett Kingsley suggests to me that the trend for (mis)translating *λιποψυχία* in Herodotus is established in the first Latin translation of the *Histories* by Lorenzo Valla (1406–57), who glosses Aristodemus' situation as: *sed quum discreparent, Aristodemus quidem prae ignavia remansisse: Eurytus vero audito Persarum circuitione* ('but, when they differed, Aristodemus indeed remained because of cowardice; but Eurytus, on hearing the circuit of the Persians ...'). In later Latin translations (e.g., Jakob Gronovius' 1715 edition) Valla's invention *Aristodemus*

The translation of this one word is significant because it makes a difference to what we think is going on in this passage. Two important recent discussions of Thermopylae turn on this translation of Aristodemos' loss of spirit. John Marincola describes how 'Eurytus heard that the battle had begun and ordering his helot to help him don his armor, he rushed back into the battle, where he died fighting. Aristodemos, however, did no such thing, and returned to Sparta *having saved his skin*'.⁴ Deborah Boedeker's paraphrasing is even more damning: 'Aristodamos was the sole Spartan to return home after Thermopylae: off-duty during the battle because of an eye ailment, *he stayed away from* the final struggle rather than going bravely and blindly to fight and die, as did his more *right-thinking* comrade Eurytos'.⁵ I will return to this polarised judgement of Eurytos and Aristodemos below, and particularly the idea that going off 'blindly' into battle to die is (or could be seen to be) thinking right.⁶ What I want to highlight here is the agency these two highly sensitive readers of Herodotus ascribe to Aristodemos. Implied in Marincola's translation 'having saved his skin' is the idea that Aristodemos actively avoids battle—a point that is made explicit in Boedeker's 'he stayed away from the final struggle'. That understanding is also evident in the three translations cited above, where it is said that Aristodemos 'remained at Alpeni' (Rawlinson), 'stayed behind at Alpeni' (de Sélincourt), and, the even more forceful Waterfield version, '*stayed away from* the fighting'. The clause in Herodotus, however, reads: Ἀριστόδημον δὲ λιποψυχέοντα λειφθῆναι, where λειφθῆναι is passive—'he was left behind'.⁷ Determining whether he *stays* or is *left* behind turns on the translation of λιποψυχέοντα.⁸

quidem prae ignavia remansisse replaces the Greek of Herodotus, Ἀριστόδημον δὲ λιποψυχέοντα λειφθῆναι.

⁴ Marincola (2016) 227 (my italics).

⁵ Boedeker (2003) 26 (my italics). In his important analysis of this passage (see below, §3), Lateiner (2002) 363 translates: 'Aristodamos, however, nearly *swooning* [in pain], stayed behind'. The parenthesis '[in pain]' mitigates somewhat his translation 'swooning' and his use of the active voice ('he stayed behind') for λειφθῆναι.

⁶ Whether or not the pun is intentional, Boedeker's use of 'blindly' (cf. Lateiner (2002) 366) draws attention to the 'extreme' state of ophthalmia with which both Eurytos and Aristodemos were suffering (ὀφθαλμιῶντες ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον, 7.229.1): it's a bit more than 'an eye ailment'. See below, pp. 196–7, 197–8.

⁷ The verb is also an infinitive, marking indirect discourse. This typical Herodotean strategy of recording an event through a point of view other than his own is another aspect to take into consideration: see my analysis of the passage in §3 below.

⁸ In her analysis of Brasidas at Pylos (Thuc. 4.12.1), Foster (2012) 194 n. 23 offers a similar translation: 'The Thucydidean *harpax* λιποψυχεῖν is not easy to connect with Herodotus (who

The issue here, and the reason why translators and critics tend to translate *λιποψυχέοντα* as ‘faint-hearted’, relates to the immediate fallout. Upon arriving back home, Aristodemus is roundly abused and dishonoured (7.231). So unambiguous is the Spartan condemnation of Aristodemus for making it back home alive that a description of him simply ‘fainting’ rather than actively shunning battle hardly seems sufficient. It’s a point noticed by the commentators like Reginald Macan:

λιποψυχέοντα... always refers to physical exhaustion, a bodily faint: Grote here renders it ‘overpowered with physical suffering’ (which is not quite its usual force). The alliteration *λιπ. λειφθῆναι* (which Baehr thinks designed) is also bad, but helps to explain a corruptela. Valckenaer’s emendation is also supported by Tyrtaios 10.7 [= 10.18 *IEG*²] *μηδὲ φιλοψυχέιτ’ ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενοι*.⁹

The proposal to emend the manuscript readings of *λιποψυχέοντα* to *φιλοψυχέοντα* has recently been forcefully reasserted by Annalisa Paradiso. Observing that *λ(ε)ιποψυχέω* is accepted by all editors in this passage,¹⁰ she argues that its apparent meaning here ‘to lose one’s spirit’ *out of cowardice*¹¹ contrasts with other evidence from our extant corpus of Greek literature, where it consistently denotes a fainting that is ‘physical in sense, without any moral connotations’.¹² Because this non-judgemental sense sits ill with the ‘logical need to see a reference to desertion’¹³ (as she sees it), Paradiso, like Macan and How and Wells, prefers the emendation *φιλοψυχέοντα*. To paraphrase the conclusion to her argument: *φιλοψυχέω* should be considered the more appropriate reading since it belongs to ‘a Spartan ethical political vocabulary’ as represented in the poetry of Tyrtaios; its presence in

also uses the verb once (7.229.1) of Aristodemus, where it seems to indicate faintheartedness, hardly characteristic of Brasidas here). I agree: it is hardly a characteristic of Brasidas, and should make us think again about Aristodemus. I return to Thucydides in my concluding paragraph.

⁹ Macan (1908) *ad loc.* See also How–Wells (1912) 231 *ad loc.*: ‘*λιποψυχέοντα* elsewhere (Thuc. iv. 12; Xen. *Hell.* v. 4. 58; Paus. iv. 10. 3) means “swooning”, hence *φιλοψυχέοντα*, “showing a faint heart” (cf. inf.), is better’.

¹⁰ Paradiso (2002) 163 n. 2.

¹¹ Paradiso (2002) 163: ‘per codardia’.

¹² Paradiso (2002) 164: ‘in senso fisico, non morale’. Her argument is based on its use in extant Greek literature, which she lists in 165 n. 6.

¹³ Paradiso (2002) 167: ‘la necessità logica di vedere nel punto un accenno alla diserzione’.

Herodotus would then indicate an explicit quotation from Tyrtaios.¹⁴ Thus *φιλοψυχέω* means ‘to choose life’ in the sense of ‘to desert’: fittingly Aristodemos is nick-named ‘the deserter’ (*ὁ τρέσας*) when he returns to Sparta.¹⁵

It seems to me that both the commentators and Paradiso are right to draw attention to the beats of Tyrtaios’ poetry in the background of this passage in Herodotus. We have just read a rip-roaring account of the courageous, but ultimately doomed, last stand of the three hundred at Thermopylae; in picking over the bones, we now learn that the Spartans were (at least)¹⁶ a man down: Aristodemos did not fight. Yet every Spartan knew and had been raised on the shield rattling poetry of Tyrtaios, where young men are cajoled to ‘fight, standing fast by one another’, to ‘make the spirit in your heart big and strong’, and not to ‘love life when you are fighting men’.¹⁷ Eurytos embodies this spirit. He calls for his armour as soon as he hears of the Persian encirclement of his comrades, and rushes back into battle to die. And then there’s Aristodemos, who has the same excuse,¹⁸ but is left behind because his spirit fails him and he didn’t want to die. No wonder the Spartans are so angry with him when he turns up back at home after the battle’s been lost and won, when Spartan reputation for fighting heroically has been affirmed. He is the living symbol of someone who ‘loved life’ (*φιλοψυχέοντα*), the one who ‘ran away’ (*ὁ τρέσας*).¹⁹ His non-dying threatens the Spartan way of life.²⁰

¹⁴ Paradiso (2002) 169: ‘al vocabolario etico-politico spartano’.

¹⁵ Paraphrasing Paradiso (2002) 169, who translates *ὁ τρέσας* as ‘il disetore’. I have benefitted from discussions about Paradiso’s argument with Angeliki Douri, Clivia Saracino, and Olga Tribulato.

¹⁶ Herodotus also gives an account of a Pantites who apparently didn’t die in battle either: see below, pp. 191–2, 197.

¹⁷ Tyrtaios, fr. 10.15–18 *IEG*²: ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε παρ’ ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες, | μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχρῆς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβου, | ἀλλὰ μέγαν ποιείσθε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμόν, | μηδὲ φιλοψυχεῖτ’ ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενοι.

¹⁸ Or *prophasis*: see below, n. 139.

¹⁹ Another echo of Tyrtaios: ‘But when men run away (*τρεσσάντων δ’ ἀνδρῶν*), all excellence is lost. No one could sum up in words each and every evil that befalls a man, if he suffers shame’ (fr. 11.14–16 *IEG*²).

²⁰ See especially the discussion in Ducat (2005) and (2006), to which my account owes much. I wonder too whether Aristodemos was such an attractive figure for Herodotus to think through and unpick Spartan ideology, especially after such a seemingly tub-thumping battle narrative, because of his name—Aristodemos, ‘the best of the demos’ (cf. Lateiner (2002) 369). Herodotus the punster: Irwin (2007), esp. 46–7, 51.

Or so the story goes. As I argue below, the account here is a good deal more complicated, and one critical question will be to what extent or in what way our reading of Aristodemos aligns with Spartan judgement of him. Still, Paradiso's brief article helps establish some important parameters. When she writes that λ(ε)ιποψυχέω has a uniform semantic range that means 'to faint' (*svenire*), what exactly is that semantic range?²¹ Or, when she talks about the logical need to see a reference to desertion (*diserzione*), how much of that logical need is driven by Spartan focalisation? Do we, should we, feel the logical need as strongly as the Spartans? More broadly, how is this section as a whole (7.229–32) structured and how does it relate to the follow-up battle at Plataea, which Herodotus briefly trails here? To put it bluntly: how does reading λιποψυχέοντα, with the non-ethical implications of this word, sit with the description of Aristodemos not wanting to die?²²

The argument to adopt the emendation, φιλοψυχέοντα, marks an attempt to remove the somewhat awkward disjunction between the description of Aristodemos being left behind and his total and utter rejection by Spartan society. In this paper, I want to argue the reverse: that we would do well to keep the manuscript reading of λιποψυχέοντα precisely because of this disjunction. To do so I take my cue from the D scholia to Book 5 of the *Iliad*, which describes 'the ψυχή leaving Sarpedon' at line 596 with the same word from Herodotus, λ(ε)ιποψυχέω (Σ *Hom. Il.* 5.696):

Z^s: ἔλιπε ψυχή· ἐλιποψύχησεν. Z (YQ ἐλειποψύχησεν).²³

The precise language that Homer uses to describe Sarpedon's swoon is significant, and I argue that being more precise about that language can help us better understand the semantic range of λ(ε)ιποψυχέω. That is to say, by examining what is meant by 'the ψυχή leaving' in Homer (and elsewhere) we can defamiliarise the idea of 'swooning' and gain a better sense of its use and

²¹ Paradiso (2002) 167: 'L'univocità semantica'. Similarly, when Macan writes that Grote's translation of λιποψυχέοντα (as 'overpowered with physical suffering') 'is not quite its usual force', *what* is its usual force?

²² Hdt. 7.229.2: οὐκ ἐθελήσαντος δὲ ἀποθνήσκειν. The description that Aristodemos 'was not willing to die' is a critical point for Paradiso (2002) 164, and the reason for her re-examination of the passage (and support for the emendation).

²³ Edition: van Thiel (2014).

implications in our passage.²⁴ My argument will be that, where the emendation of *φιλοψυχέοντα* would seem to straightforwardly map Herodotus' text to Spartan ideology, *λιποψυχέοντα* more problematically (and productively) brings this passage into contact with the *Iliad's* representation of Sarpedon's epic career, intertextual resonances that unsettle and destabilise the Spartan management of commemoration along Homeric lines.

At one level, then, this chapter is about one word, and how it may (or may not) be in Herodotus, and what's at stake in the choices we make about whether or not it is. But, at another level, it is about broader scholarly discussions on intertextuality.²⁵ And not only its points of contact with and differences from the idea of allusion (though that is important), but also what it means to use intertextuality (or allusion) as a strategy for reading points of contact with the Homeric poems, in comparison to oralist approaches that use traditional referentiality to tease out, and apart, interplay between any number of potential sources.²⁶ Herodotus' narrative straddles two distinct literary contexts—the oral texts of early Greek poetry (composed and performed at various institutional settings) and the written prose of individual inquiry.²⁷ On the cusp of a medial shift,²⁸ Herodotus potentially affords us a glimpse of these different interpretative strategies at play. To again anticipate my argument: I will suggest that being more precise by what we mean when we write about Homeric (or epic) resonance and/or an intertext (/allusion) can help us better understand how such moments work in Herodotus, and, crucially, how they work *differently*. In this way I hope to contribute both to an understanding of Herodotus' narrative on Thermopylae, particularly the contests over its memorialisation, and more broadly to discussions of Herodotus' interplay with Homer.

²⁴ I suspect that the common rendering of *λιποψυχεῖν* as 'to swoon' doesn't help, since it often has gendered connotations of over-corseted Victorian ladies getting hot under the collar for a Mr Darcy.

²⁵ See also Pelling, above, Ch. 2.

²⁶ Foley (1991) 7 defines traditional referentiality as the process by which repeated words and phrases (and whole scenes) in early Greek hexameter poetry 'are not simply compositionally useful, nor are they doomed to a "limited" area of designation; rather they command fields of reference much larger than the single line, passage, or even text in which they occur'.

²⁷ Goldhill (2002); cf. Barker (2009) ch. 3.

²⁸ Barker (2021).

1. The Living Daylights: The Departing *ψυχή* in Homer and Later Traditions²⁹

As we have already glimpsed, the conjunction λ(ε)ιποψυχέω has a counterpart in the Homeric collocation of λείπω with ψυχή. In fact, the two words belong to a formal unit of utterance in early Greek hexameter poetry—what scholars often term a ‘formula’³⁰—namely, τὸν δ’ ἔλιπε ψυχή.³¹ This phrase, or close variations of it, uniformly denote—with one exception—life leaving a body, whether real (τόν γε λίπη ψυχή, used by the narrator of Sarpedon, *Il.* 16.453), imagined (ψυχή δὲ λέλοιπεν, used by Eumaios of Odysseus, *Od.* 14.134), or of animals (τὸν δ’ ἔλιπε ψυχή, the sacrifice of a pig, *Od.* 14.426). At *Odyssey* 18.91, as he weighs up his options, Odysseus ponders punching his rival beggar at the banquet so hard that ‘his life would depart [from him]’ (ὥς μιν ψυχή λίποι, *Od.* 18.91). As it is, so as not to arouse the suspicion of the on-looking suitors, Odysseus only ‘lightly’ taps Iros; even so, Iros is knocked out cold, bleeding profusely from mouth and ears. We are left in little doubt that his life would have left him had Odysseus hit him as hard as he could. The traditional referentiality of λείπω combined with ψυχή to signify death is confirmed by the only other formula in which they are paired.³²

Support for the view that the ψυχή equates in some way to the life-spirit is provided by Achilles when refusing Agamemnon’s offer of recompense. ‘I have suffered many pains in my heart,’ he reflects, ‘always risking my ψυχή in making war’ (ἔπει πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ | αἰεὶ ἐμήν ψυχὴν παραβαλλόμενος πολεμίζειν, *Il.* 9.321–2). The risk is all too real, even for a goddess’ son since, he asserts, ‘a man’s ψυχή cannot come back (ἄνδρὸς δὲ ψυχή πάλιν ἐλθεῖν) either by theft or force, once it has crossed his teeth’s barrier’ (9.408–9). In both instances it is clear that by ψυχή Achilles means his ‘life’ (or, perhaps better, ‘life-breath’³³), meaning that to lose it is to die. Similarly in the

²⁹ The argument here represents a much-condensed version of Barker (2011), focusing only on those points directly pertaining to the proposed Homeric intertext in Herodotus.

³⁰ Foley (1997) 151–3. Bakker (1997) 48–50 describes formulas as intonation units.

³¹ *Il.* 5.696; *Od.* 14.426; cf. *Il.* 16.453; *Od.* 11.221; 14.134; 18.91. There are no other instances of this unit of utterance in extant early Greek hexameter epic.

³² *Il.* 16.855–7 = 22.361–3: ψυχή ... λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην. Used of the deaths of Patroklos and Hektor, this collocation of λείπω with ψυχή occurs nowhere else in early Greek hexameter poetry.

³³ On an etymological link between ψυχή and ψυχεῖν, meaning ‘to blow or breathe’: Snell (1953) 9. Cf. the scholia vetera on Hom. *Il.* 5.696, who gloss Sarpedon’s loss of ψυχή

Odyssey's shadowy Hades, Autokleia laments to her son that 'once the *θυμός* has left the white bones ... the *ψυχή* flutters out like a dream and flies away' ('ἐπεὶ κε πρῶτα λίπη λεύκ' ὀστέα θυμός, | ψυχή δ' ἤϊτ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται', *Od.* 11.219–23). In this case, the departing *ψυχή* is paired with the loss of *θυμός*—itself another indication of a person's life force—to fully embody the idea of death.³⁴

The one exception—that is, when the unit of utterance τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή means something else other than signifying death—occurs in the passage that I mentioned above, when the scholia had glossed the *ψυχή* leaving Sarpedon as ἐλ(ε)ιποψύχησεν (*Hom. Il.* 5.692–8):

οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἀντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα δῖοι ἑταῖροι
εἶσαν ὑπ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς περικαλλεῖ φηγῶ·
ἐκ δ' ἄρα οἱ μηροῦ δόρυ μείλινον ὥσε θύραζε
ἴφθιμος Πελάγων, ὅς οἱ φίλος ἦεν ἑταῖρος.
τὸν δὲ λίπε ψυχή, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς·
αὐτίς δ' ἐμπνύνθη, περὶ δὲ πνοιῇ βορέαο
ζώγρει ἐπιπνείουσα κακῶς κεκαφήοτα θυμόν.

Then his godlike companions sat divine Sarpedon
beneath a beautiful oak of aegis-bearing Zeus,
and from his thigh he pulled the ashen spear,
mighty Pelagon, who was [Sarpedon's] dear companion.
And the spirit left him [Sarpedon], and mist poured over his eyes.
But he breathed again, and Boreas' breath
invigorated him after he painfully gasped for breath.

The wound caused by Tlepolemos' spear cast is such that, when the spear is removed, Sarpedon's *ψυχή* leaves its body as if his life were departing with the flow of blood from the open wound. The impression of a fatal wound is made all the stronger by the presence of another unit of utterance that (almost) always denotes death: κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς, 'and mist

as a loss of breath: [*ψυχή*] *ψυχή ἐνταῦθα τὸ πνεῦμα φησι*. Clarke (1999) 57 defines *ψυχή* more strictly as 'the last gasp of breath exhaled by the dying man'.

³⁴ τὸν μὲν λίπε θυμός and the variant λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός are unequivocal death formulae: *Il.* 4.470; 12.386; 16.410, 743; 20.406; *Od.* 3.455; 11.221; 12.414; *h.Ap.* 361.

poured over his eyes'.³⁵ And yet Sarpedon does *not* die. Thus, this marks the only instance where a departing *ψυχή* does *not* indicate death. It's as if the *ψυχή* could pass the teeth's barrier *and* return again.

The oddity has been noticed by the commentator Geoffrey Kirk: 'That formular flexibility can be confusing is shown in this description of a warrior losing and then recovering consciousness, since the soul "leaving" the body, 5.696 *λιπέ ψυχή*, normally implies death (16.453; *Od.* 14.134, 14.426, 18.91)'.³⁶ Kirk is right to observe the formular flexibility but confusing may be the wrong word to describe what is going on. In fact, Homer works hard to clarify that Sarpedon has not died after all, repeating the word for breath in short succession in three different forms: Sarpedon 'breathed' (*ἐμπνύθη*) again, for the 'breath' (*πνοή*) of Boreas 'breathed' (*ἐπιπνείουσα*) life into him. Where an audience's understanding of the traditional referentiality of *τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή* (and *κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς*) would, from their knowledge of all its other instances, have created an expectation that Sarpedon has died, Homer gives his hero second wind.³⁷ By having Sarpedon 'die' here, only to bring him back to life, the poet marks Sarpedon out as an important figure in this Troy story.³⁸ He is preserved to play an important role later.

We learn what that role is when we next hear of a *ψυχή* leaving a body. For it is precisely *Sarpedon's* death that is, finally, fatally, signalled by the

³⁵ *Il.* 16.344 (Akamas); 20.421 (Polydoros); *Od.* 22.88 (Antinoos). The two exceptions are here and at *Il.* 20.321 (*κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν χέεν ἀχλύν*), where Poseidon steps in to save Aeneas in a clash of heroes and narrative traditions (sacking and surviving Troy).

³⁶ Kirk (1990) 128 *ad loc.* 5.696. Cf. Sullivan (1988) 158: of the thirteen examples of *psychē* as an active element, twelve signify death; only this one is different.

³⁷ Perhaps it is inevitable that the poet should draw on the language of death to denote a fainting episode since the loss of consciousness (albeit only temporary) looks to the outside observer like death. Still, this doesn't detract from the lengths to which Homer goes to make Sarpedon breathe again. The three other examples of 'fainting' (all in the *Iliad*) similarly rework death formulae (Kirk (1990) 129) to stress different aspects about the importance of the moment: Hektor (11.349–60; 14.419–39), like Sarpedon, is revived to die another day; Andromache's momentary 'death' (22.466–74) symbolises the impact of Hektor's death on her and the loss of her life as she knows it. Aeneas, Troy's great survivor (see above, n. 35), is initially rescued by Aphrodite (5.308–17), just as all indications suggested he was about to die: Morrison (1999) 139.

³⁸ As Adrian Kelly suggests to me, the dynamics surrounding Sarpedon's 'death' are a good example of the experience of the narrative in the flow of performance. At one point it looks like he's dead (which is fully traditional in the sense that he's not going to survive the war); at the next he lives on. This kind of excitement, and real directional shift, must have been vital to keeping audiences in thrall.

return of the departing soul motif. As Zeus looks down on Sarpedon readying himself to face the Achillean Patroclus and contemplates stepping in to save his son, Hera warns him: he can do it, but the other gods wouldn't approve. Instead, she suggests, he should take care of Sarpedon's body once its 'spirit and years of life have left him' (*ἐπήν δὴ τόν γε λίπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰών*, 16.453). This moment is all the more highly charged given Sarpedon's earlier recovery, and serves now not only to 'correct' the formular abnormality from back then but also to mark his death as the first fatality of someone who had enjoyed a certain amount of airtime in the narrative. What is more, Sarpedon's death marks the beginning of a *series* of important fatalities in the *Iliad*. The other two, the deaths of Patroclus and Hector, are connected not only logically—Patroclus' killing of Sarpedon leads directly to his own death at the hands of Hector, who in turn will be killed by Achilles as a result—but also linguistically: the same couplet, used for the deaths of both Patroclus and Hector, reworks the collocation *λείπω* with *ψυχὴ* for use in the death formula 'and his spirit flew from his limbs to Hades, lamenting its fate, leaving manliness and youth behind' (*Il.* 16.856–7; 22.362–3).

If, with one exception, the departing *ψυχὴ* signifies death in extant early Greek hexameter poetry, what then of its Homeric afterlife? The semantic range of the collocation of *λείπω* with *ψυχὴ* can be summed up briefly: all examples point to it signifying death, whether it is Pindar's Achilles, who 'lost his life' (*ἀπὸ ψυχάν λιπών*, *Pyth.* 3.101) in war by the bow, or Aelian's Cercidas, who, on the verge of death, consoles his friends with the prospect that he was going to meet Homer, Hecataeus, and others—and then 'he died' (*τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπέλιπεν*, *VH* 13.20).³⁹

More complex is the compound with which I am concerned in this chapter, *λ(ε)ιποψυχέω* or *λ(ε)ιποψυχία*.⁴⁰ Overwhelmingly, outside of Herodotus and other historiographical texts,⁴¹ evidence for this compound comes from two traditions. Throughout the Hippocratic corpus *λ(ε)ιποψυχία*

³⁹ While continuing the meaning from epic, nevertheless, both examples reveal a subtle shift in agency, as the departing *ψυχὴ* gives way to the person himself or herself 'leaving their *ψυχὴ* behind'. The finality of the soul's departure also appears to be reinforced by the addition of *ἀπὸ*, in the sense of 'from, away': Smyth (1956) §1684. See also: *h. Ven.* 272; Thgn. 1.569; Ar. *Av.* 1553–8; Eur. *Phoen.* 1554; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.22, 26; Pl. *Grig.* 523e5; *Phd.* 91d; Plut. *De Alex. fort.* 336F–337A.

⁴⁰ On *λειπο-* compounds: Tribulato (2015) 255. With compounds of this nature, the first member usually governs the second: so, *λ(ε)ιποψυχία* would literally mean 'one who leaves his *ψυχὴ* behind', which fits with the point in the previous note.

⁴¹ Discussed briefly at the end of this chapter, below, pp. 203–4.

occurs largely with the meaning of losing one's consciousness, as in *fainting*, which is the primary sense attributed to it in LSJ. The fifth-century *de diaeta acutorum* (11.13), for example, reads: 'if intense pain is present, to continue until the loss of consciousness (πρὸς λειποψυχίην); afterwards administer an enema'.⁴² Fainting episodes of this kind may also be denoted by the compound λ(ε)ιποθυμία.⁴³ In his discussion of bulimia, Plutarch uses both interchangeably (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 695A):

Bulimia is not, as people think, hunger, but a pathological state of the stomach that causes fainting (λειποψυχίαν) by concentration of heat. Just as smelling salts are useful in cases of fainting (λειποθυμίας), so ...

If we recall, however, that the unit of utterance τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχῆ (generally) signifies death (as τὸν μὲν λίπε θυμός does exclusively), it is interesting to note that there are other instances in the Hippocratic corpus where the compounds λ(ε)ιποψυχία and λ(ε)ιποθυμία preserve such a sense. In *Epidemics*, for example, λειποψυχία serves as a prelude to death: 'He appeared to have lapses of consciousness (λειποψυχίαι) ... All signs were bad. He said he wanted something under him, stared fixedly, resisted a brief time, and died (ἔτελεύτησεν)'.⁴⁴ It is this meaning that prevails in the Aesopic corpus. Here, λ(ε)ιποψυχέω/λ(ε)ιποψυχία *only* means death, as in *The bird catcher and the viper* (Gibbs 138 = Perry 115; Chambry 137):

The viper was enraged and bit the man. As he breathed his last (λειποψυχῶν), the bird catcher said, 'Woe is me! I was intent on stalking someone else, while I myself have been hunted to death (εἰς θάνατον) by another'.⁴⁵

⁴² For dating: Craik (2015). Cf. *Epid.* (mid-fourth century) 5.1.25; 7.1.24, 84; *Mul.* 9.3; 11.4; 14.4; *Ep.* 16.28.

⁴³ *Aph.* (c. 400 BCE): λειποθυμία, 1.23; 7.8 (or λειποψυχή? cod.: I, edd.). Cf. *Liqu.* (c. 400 BCE): λειποθυμίας, 2.16; λειποθυμικοῖσι, 2.28. Like λ(ε)ιποψυχία, λ(ε)ιποθυμία seems to derive from a hexameter unit of utterance, in this case the death formula τὸν μὲν λίπε θυμός: see above, n. 34.

⁴⁴ *Epid.* 7.1.10. Cf. *Liqu.* 1.32: a 'loss of consciousness—even to the point of death' (λειποθυμίας, ταῦτα ἔς θάνατον). Similarly, Plutarch recounts an episode concerning Xanthippus' dog, which swam across the strait at Salamis to be with his master 'only to faint and die straightway' (λειποθυμήσας ἀποθανεῖν εὐθύς, Plut. *Them.* 10.6); cf. *Pomp.* 49.5.

⁴⁵ Cf. *The one-eyed doe* (Perry 75 = Chambry 105, ἐλιποψύχει); *The tuna fish and the dolphin* (Gibbs 160 = Perry 113; Chambry 132, λειποθυμούντα, λειποψυχοῦντα). The same mortal

These examples are particularly pertinent to the case before us since, as recent scholarship has shown, Herodotus' *Histories* is in dialogue with both the Hippocratic corpus and Aesop 'the storyteller' (λογοποιός, Hdt. 2.134.3).⁴⁶ While it doesn't matter to my argument whether Herodotus himself coins the word λ(ε)ιποψυχέω/λ(ε)ιποψυχία from Homer or whether he takes it from another prose source such as the Hippocratic or Aesopic corpora,⁴⁷ it may be worth reflecting a moment on its duality in those traditions. Without the capacity to monitor a person's vital organs, it's hard to say how deep a loss of consciousness will be, how long it will last, and whether it might be fatal or not. What we see in Aesop, and to a lesser extent among the Hippocratics too, is a persistence of the idea that we saw in Homer, namely that fainting is closely associated with death.⁴⁸ As a 'prelude to death' motif, λ(ε)ιποψυχέω/λ(ε)ιποψυχία functions as medical knowledge (in the form of hindsight) in the Hippocratic writers and narrative logic (in the form of last words/punchlines) in the Aesopic fables.⁴⁹

This brief survey has helped flesh out the passing remarks made by both Macan and Paradiso about the semantic range and charge of λ(ε)ιποψυχέω/λ(ε)ιποψυχία. Uses of the word consistently and exclusively denote a corporeal loss of consciousness in all of our prose texts, which bears out Paradiso's gloss of λ(ε)ιποψυχέω as fainting ('svenire') 'in senso fisico, non morale'. There is nothing 'faint-hearted' in any of the examples that we have considered. But that is not all. On the one hand, as a compound denoting 'the ψυχή leaving' the body, it additionally has connotations of death, especially in Aesop; this is also the sole meaning of the collocation λείπω with ψυχή in all of Homer and early Greek poetry. On the other hand, such mortal resonances in λ(ε)ιποψυχία can, I suggest, be traced back to the epic unit of utterance, τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή. Based on evidence from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, this phrase too signifies death, bar one exception, when, with a skilful manipulation of its traditional referentiality, Homer has Sarpedon lose

connotations of λ(ε)ιποψυχεῖν are present in a fragment of Xenarchus' *Purple-shell* (Ath. 6.225c). λ(ε)ιποψυχεῖν is also preserved in a fragment of Sophocles (fr. 496.1 *TGF*), but with no context.

⁴⁶ Hippocratic corpus: Thomas (2000); Demont (2018); Pelling (2019) 80–105. Aesop: Kurke (2011), anticipated by Griffin (1990; republished in 2014); cf. Griffiths (2006) 139.

⁴⁷ On the other hand, it does matter to me whether we hear/read the specific case of τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή in relation to Sarpedon in Herodotus' use of the compound λ(ε)ιποψυχία. See below, §3.

⁴⁸ See above, n. 37.

⁴⁹ I owe this point to Roger Brock.

consciousness *and not die*. Flagging up Sarpedon's importance for this Troy story to the audience, Homer gives us a hero who lives to die another day.

It seems to me worth contemplating whether this arresting usage of a traditional formula attracted Herodotus' interest, or, at any rate, whether using it to think again about Aristodemos' own moment when 'he lost his *ψυχή*' (*λιποψυχέω*) can be a productive reading of Herodotus' Thermopylae narrative. But before homing in on that episode in more detail, there is much to unpack about the influence of Homer on Herodotus and the precise relationship of the latter to the former. Indeed, it is my broader goal to use a consideration of the Homeric influence on Herodotus' Thermopylae narrative and its fallout to contribute to how we can understand, define, and better discuss Herodotus' interplay with Homer.

2. A View to a Kill: Homer at Thermopylae

It is commonplace to talk about the Homeric influence on Herodotus, though the precise nature of that influence is more difficult to pin down.⁵⁰ Ancient witnesses testify to the debt Herodotus owes to Homer and to him assuming his predecessor's epic mantle in prose form.⁵¹ Modern critics have been no less interested in seeing Herodotus' evocation of Homer, and have catalogued instances where a debt may be perceived.⁵² A clear evocation of, and indebtedness to, Homer is on display in Herodotus' opening statement. His concern to preserve the deeds done by people so that they aren't 'without glory' (*ἀκλεᾶ*, *1.praef.*) headlines a critical feature of epic—to preserve the glory of men (*κλέα ἀνδρῶν*, *Il.* 9.189)—that his narrative aims at reproducing.⁵³ Similarly foregrounded is his concern to get to the bottom of *why* Greeks and barbarians came into conflict (I.I.I), just as Homer begins his narrative by asking which of the gods set Achilles and Agamemnon apart in strife, and why (*Il.* 1.8–9).⁵⁴ Herodotus' narrative of a momentous conflict

⁵⁰ As evidenced by the contributors to this volume.

⁵¹ 'Ὀμηρικώτατος, according to Longinus (*Subl.* 13.3); cf. D.H. *Pomp.* 3. A second-century BCE inscription from Halicarnassus proclaims Herodotus as the 'prose (*πεζόν*) Homer of historiography': Isager (1998). See Matijašić, above, pp. 1–2 and Haywood, above, pp. 59–61 for further discussion and bibliography.

⁵² E.g., Strasburger (1972); Boedeker (2002); Rutherford (2012); cf. Murnaghan (2021). See the discussion by Matijašić, above, pp. 15–22.

⁵³ Goldhill (2002) 12–13; Pelling (2019) 22–3; Matijašić, above, pp. 18–19.

⁵⁴ The question why: Pelling on Herodotus (2019); on Homer (2020).

that pits Greeks against foreigners (1.1.1; 7.20.2) clearly recalls the Trojan War context of Homer's *Iliad*,⁵⁵ while the inquisitive wandering Odysseus (*Od.* 1.4) provides a guide of some sort for his persona as a historian (1.5.3).⁵⁶ Homeric echoes can elevate the action, as in the description of the Athenian ships as ἀρχὴ κακῶν (5.97.3), like those ἀρχεκάκους-bearing ships of Paris (*Il.* 5.62–3).⁵⁷ They can also pattern experience, as when the panicked reaction of the fractious (and fracturing) Greek coalition at Salamis (8.56) to the Persian sack of Athens is set against the backdrop of the Achaeans' rush to the ships in *Iliad* Book 2 (especially *Il.* 2.149–54).⁵⁸

It is worthwhile asking, however, how many such examples directly recall episodes from or moments in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and how many more could equally be better regarded as conveying general 'epic' content, style, motifs, or themes? Some slippage is already evident in the way scholars describe scenes in Herodotus as having an 'epic coloring' or identify Herodotus' evocation of Homer by use of 'poetic' language.⁵⁹ As Chris Pelling has remarked:

It is easier to make, and indeed to accept, those grand generalisations than to be sure that 'Homer' is what comes to Herodotus' listeners' minds every time he occurs to us, or indeed that 'Homer' would have meant to Herodotus what he means to us.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Carey (2016) 71.

⁵⁶ Marincola (2007); Barker (2009) ch. 3.

⁵⁷ Pelling (2006a) 79–80.

⁵⁸ Pelling (2006a) 83–4, (2006b) 111; Bowie (2007) 144–5 *ad loc.*; Barker (2009) 163–72.

⁵⁹ Boedeker (2001) 122 and Marincola (2006) 14 (respectively). Marincola (2006) 14 continues: 'Herodotus' original audience *would not have failed to hear Homeric echoes* when Artemisia tells Xerxes to "put away in your heart this thing also" (8.68γ.1 ~ *Il.* 1.297), or when Psammenitus weeps for his friend "on the threshold of old age" (3.14.10 ~ *Il.* 22.60)—my italics. This is precisely the issue at stake: would audiences have identified these particular moments from the Homeric poems, rather than hearing the traditional referentiality of such language? And does it make a difference if they do? I am sure that I have also too readily conflated the two in the past.

⁶⁰ Pelling (2006a) 77. Urging caution when studying Homeric intertextuality in Herodotus: Grethlein (2006); cf. Rood (1998) 41. Haywood (above, Ch. 3) is more confident that Herodotus' reader would recognise engagement with Homer. My issue is less with the idea of recognition than that the intertext is always (only) (a specific moment or line in) the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. It is important to note, however, that, while Haywood is perhaps more willing to see examples of epic motifs as proof that 'Herodotus treats Homer at various points as text',

The problem is not only the point, as Chris Carey suggests, that: ‘Alongside such specific and general glances toward Homer and Troy Herodotus also draws on other epic cycles to shape his narrative’.⁶¹ There is also a broader problem about how we read, or *listen to*, intertextual allusions in and to early Greek hexameter poetry.

I have already touched upon the idea of traditional referentiality in my reading of the resonant phrase τὸν δ’ ἔλιπε ψυχῆ. There I argued that taking evidence of its uses (and variations) in and through early Greek hexameter poetry in toto can help us retrieve its (customary or normative) semantic charge as conveying death. Here I want to reflect briefly on the potential difference between listening out for a particular unit of utterance’s traditional import and thinking of it rather as intertextuality and/or allusion.

Attempts to disentangle different interpretative strategies *and why that matters* have recently been made by Homerist Adrian Kelly. Across a series of articles Kelly addresses the ‘WYSIATI, or what you see is all there is’ fallacy, by which ‘scholars are prone to filling the gaps in our evidence by pretending that there aren’t any’. This fallacy in turn:

leads them to construct the literary history of the Archaic period around the central pillars of the Homeric poems, and then to link those texts with every other ... In sum, we are told that we should use the same strategies of the Augustan poets in Rome as the model to understand the visible beginnings of Greek literature.⁶²

The issue with this strategy isn’t so much to do with the different textual status of the Homeric poems, or, as Don Fowler put it, the problem of talking about intertextuality when there aren’t texts. After all, as Fowler argues, ‘modern constructions of intertextuality in film and television, and of ancient

he is more sceptical ‘whether the same can be said for the epic tradition in toto’ (above, p. 70 n. 50).

⁶¹ Carey (2016) 87. Richard Hunter (2004) 238 elegantly sums up the problem of how to measure Homeric influence in later poetry: ‘The traditional language of epic is the basis of the language of all subsequent hexameter and elegiac poetry, as well as a vital component of the language of tragedy, and so Homer is immanently present in a special way in the very fabric of much Greek poetry. Nevertheless, the conservatism of poetic language over time, combined with the “formulaic” character of Homeric language itself, can place particular obstacles in the way of identifying significant re-use of Homeric language by later ... poets’.

⁶² Kelly (2020) 269.

theatrical intertextuality in respect of Aristophanic parody of tragedy, allow for precisely this kind of detailed reference in performed texts'.⁶³ Rather, it is the point, which Fowler glosses over here in his assertion of an intertextual approach, that there are *different kinds of referentiality* at play. With respect to Homer's poems, performed and composed within a framework in which traditional units of utterance—individual phrases, type scenes, story patterns—were continually being used and reused, referentiality 'entails the invoking of a context that is enormously larger and more echoic than the text or work itself'.⁶⁴ As Kelly argues, we shouldn't however limit our understanding of traditional referentiality to Homer's poems: this interpretative framework *also* has application to early Greek poetry more generally, especially the poems of Sappho and Archilochus.⁶⁵ Moreover—and this is the critical point—Kelly demonstrates⁶⁶ that our interpretation can be enhanced if we take this many-to-many approach, rather than seeking to establish a specific hierarchical relationship that limits us to a single direct reference which only goes in one direction, regardless of whether we conceive of that as marking allusion or intertextuality.⁶⁷

⁶³ Fowler (2000) 131–2.

⁶⁴ Foley (1991) 7. For the term of 'resonance', which aims to capture something of the echoic nature of listening (out) for poetic interplay: Graziosi and Haubold (2005); cf. Foley (1999) 6, 20, etc.

⁶⁵ Sappho: Kelly (2020); Archilochus: Barker–Christensen (2006).

⁶⁶ In his discussion of Sappho fr. 1, Kelly (2020) shows that the 'programmatically appeal to Aphrodite can be framed and understood next to any similar action in the multitude of epic narrative situations with which the individual audience member would have been familiar; its appeal is not limited to Homeric cognoscenti. This kind of intertextual dynamic, drawing on the typical situation and the range of particular stories possible within it, *enlarges our readings*' (289, my italics).

⁶⁷ I don't have space here to discuss whether we would better call one-to-one mappings between texts as intertextuality or allusion. For judicious discussions, see Lyne (1994), e.g., 187: 'The trouble with the term "allusion" is that it ... encourages us to invoke the "author's intention" to settle any unwelcome facts or difficulties'; and Hinds (1998), e.g., 48: getting rid of the author 'is (or should be) much harder to justify ... in matters involving the close textual explication of particular phrases, lines or paragraphs'. The issue concerning my argument here is rather with the limiting nature of only reading with a specific, one-to-one, unidirectional reference in mind, as in Currie (2016). More nuanced is Thomas Nelson's forthcoming study, whose range of evidence and subtlety of analysis persuasively argues that patterns of allusive signposting can be detected throughout early Greek poetry—a phenomenon that he calls 'indexicality'. It should be noted, though, that he allows for allusive engagement between mythological *traditions* (so Burgess (2006); Bakker (2013)), rather than insist on its operation between isolated, putative *texts* (so Currie (2016)). For a complementary argument that lends greater stress to the heuristic framework of traditional

Kelly himself sees a change in reading strategy occurring at the time of Stesichorus in the generation before Herodotus.⁶⁸ Yet it is worth pondering the extent of any possible change in a written narrative such as Herodotus', and whether aspects of traditional referentiality may have continued to reverberate through it.⁶⁹ I ask this because Herodotus himself seems alert to differences in the epic tradition that he inherits, and aware of the Homeric epics within that tradition as discrete entities. While sceptical about the authorship of the *Epigoni* (4.32), Herodotus rejects outright the attribution of the *Cypria* to Homer (2.117) based on differences in their accounts of Helen's journey to Troy: he notes that, whereas the *Cypria* presents the voyage as a mere three-day crossing, in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Homer demonstrates knowledge of a much wider canvas for Helen's wanderings (2.116).⁷⁰ For the purposes of my argument, it is sufficient merely to note that Herodotus treats the Homeric epics as internally consistent and complete poems.⁷¹ As do his characters—when at 7.161.3 the Athenians quote from

referentiality, see the introduction in Barker–Christensen (2020), in which we offer a pragmatic (others may say inconsistent) approach to using these different concepts for analysing Homer.

⁶⁸ Kelly (2015). Another candidate for a shift in approach is Simonides: on the interplay with Homer in his 'Plataea' elegy, see especially Boedecker and Sider (2001); Rawles (2018); Nelson (2021) 136–9. Much of my discussion here on Herodotus may be pertinent to thinking about the blanket specificity of Simonides' engagement with Homer—(when) is he referring to, and making play with, particular moments in the *Iliad*, say, or how many of his Homeric soundings may be better explained through the framework of traditional referentiality?

⁶⁹ Herodotus between orality and literacy: Thomas (1989) 15–34; cf. above, n. 27. While there have been many insightful studies of the impact of Homer (and oral performance more generally) on Herodotus' composition of the *Histories*, the question of the impact of oral poetics (viz. traditional referentiality) on reading Herodotus has attracted far less attention. Pelling (2019) 59–60 is sceptical that any difference, even if discernible, would be significant. I am less sure: Barker (2021).

⁷⁰ Namely the 'beautiful robes woven by the women of Sidon' in Paris' bedchamber (*Il.* 6.289–92) and the travels of Helen and Menelaus to Egypt (*Od.* 4.227–30, 351–2). See Ford (1997) 103; Currie (2021). Cf. Graziosi (2002) 124 n. 82, 193–5; Pelling (2006a) 77 n. 6; Haywood (above, Ch. 3), with further bibliography (above, pp. 62–7 with n. 15).

⁷¹ Note especially Herodotus' gloss on the *Iliad's* testimony for Helen being in Sidon: 'and nowhere does [Homer] backtrack on himself' (*καὶ οὐδαμῆ ἄλλη ἀνεπόδισε ἑωτόν*, 2.116.2). So Ford (1997) 103: 'This (correct) claim is based on the notion of the *Iliad* as a definite and delimited text quite distinct from other epics.' Cf. Currie (2021) 20–7; Nelson (2021) 122. For Graziosi (2002) 116, Herodotus uses these passages to present Homer as a 'proto-historian'. For Haywood (above, p. 69), it is more of a case of Herodotus displaying 'his own critical acumen as an inquirer'.

Homer's Catalogue of Ships, they do so appealing to the *Iliad* as an authority on the basis of it representing a coherent narrative, and their place (as they see it) in it: 'the poet Homer says that, of all who came to Ilion, [Menetheus] was the best man in ordering and marshalling armies' (cf. *Il.* 2.552).⁷² Within little more than a generation, the lines that follow in Homer's catalogue (linking Salamis to Athens), have become so hotly disputed that the impression is of a stable 'text' already in the form (more or less) as we know it today.⁷³

If Herodotus knew an *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as distinct and distinctive poems, then we should feel reasonably confident about identifying and following up any apparent references to them. But this in turn raises another, more pressing, question: in what ways might his text be engaging with them *as* distinct and distinctive poems, or (or as well as) more generally with epic kinds of referentiality? To sharpen what we mean by Homeric interaction, I turn again to Kelly, this time his 2015 study of Stesichorus. His key parameters for observing, and making use of, Homeric touches relate to 'the level and sustained nature' of the interaction, as well as a demonstration of a 'continuum' in representation.⁷⁴ Both points suggest that

Stesichorus had access to more than just a general knowledge of the poems, almost certainly to a written text, but also that the nature of interaction is closer to the developed intertextuality of a later age: rather than merely showing knowledge of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or invoking

⁷² In appealing to Homer for authority, the Athenians are following the Spartans' lead, whose appeal to Agamemnon—'Surely, he would groan aloud (Ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε), Agamemnon, the son of Pelops, if he heard that Spartiates had been deprived of their leadership by Gelon and the Syracusans' (7.159)—reworks Nestor's own act of ventriloquism (in imagining Peleus' angst) in the *Iliad* (7.124–5). On the *Iliad* intertexts here: Pelling (2006a) 89–90; Grethlein (2006); (2010) 160–73; Bowie (2012) 281–2; Matijašić, above, pp. 9–11, and Haywood, above, pp. 75–8.

⁷³ *Il.* 2.557–8, cited by Aristotle to show how the Athenians used Homer to assert their claim on Salamis (*Rhet.* 1375b26–30): Graziosi (2002) 228–9. While it is arguable whether the poems were already circulating as *written* texts at the time of Herodotus, Graziosi (221, using Nagy (1989) 16) cites evidence from the *Histories* which implies that, however they circulated, they cannot be altered by performing rhapsodes simply to please local tastes: Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sikyon, bans Homeric recitations because the poems celebrate the enemy city of Argos (Hdt. 5.67.1). By 'more or less' I mean to include the minor differences in vocabulary or structure as implied by the ferocity of the dispute over the Athenians inserting two lines; cf. Graziosi (2002) 231.

⁷⁴ Kelly (2015) 39.

Homer as an authority figure, or even alluding to big moments in the poems, Stesichorus seems also to be engaging a larger reading of their themes ... in order to augment the semantic power of his own text. For the first time that we can see, the audience is being encouraged to access large swathes of the poem and its details, and actively to apply that knowledge to the current composition.⁷⁵

What Kelly writes here about Stesichorus I suggest applies equally to Herodotus. Therefore, I propose considering those ‘passages where Homeric “touches” are reasonably uncontroversial, either because they are particularly roistering or because they come in clusters’,⁷⁶ or, additionally, if there is a specific pointer in terms of vocabulary or application.⁷⁷ Significantly, of all the passages in Herodotus where critics have commonly observed Homeric ‘touches’, the most roistering, detailed, and sustained cluster around Leonidas’ last stand at Thermopylae.

From the beginning of Book 7, Herodotus presages the epic conflict between his new Achaeans and Trojans by recalling significant moments from the *Iliad*.⁷⁸ While multiple origins are attributed to the conflict, none of which are necessarily mutually exclusive (as in the *Iliad*’s dissection of the strife between Agamemnon and Achilles), Herodotus traces one cause back to a dream that visits Xerxes urging him to attack Greece (7.12.1); in much the same manner, Homer marks the explicit beginning of Zeus’ plan to honour Achilles by having Zeus send a dream to Agamemnon urging him to attack Troy (*Il.* 2.16–34).⁷⁹ Thereafter follows a series of troop catalogues (7.61–83, 89–99, 202–4), which mirror the famous catalogue of ships later in the same book of the *Iliad* (*Il.* 2.494–759).⁸⁰ In both cases, it is worth noting

⁷⁵ Kelly (2015) 43.

⁷⁶ Pelling (2006a) 77.

⁷⁷ Such as the (re)use of a Homeric *hapax* (see below, n. 87) or, as I suggest in this chapter, the reworking of a striking motif, like that evoked by the unit of utterance τὸν δ’ ἔλυπε ψυχὴ in the form λιποψυχέω. Bakker (2013) 159 similarly describes the possibility of intertextuality within early Greek hexameter epic’s formulaic system: ‘The more restricted an expression [and] the more specific the context in which it is uttered’, the higher its degree of ‘interformulariness’. For a comprehensive anatomisation of markers of allusion in works of early Greek poetry: Nelson (forthcoming).

⁷⁸ Carey (2016) 89; Nicolai–Vannicelli (2019); cf. Foster (2012) 202.

⁷⁹ Carey (2016) 73–5. On the multiple causes of the war and the relationship to the *Iliad*: Pelling (2019) 22–39.

⁸⁰ Carey (2016) 75–8; Nicolai–Vannicelli (2019).

that the focus falls on *Xerxes*—his motivation and the roll call of troops under his command—not on the Greeks. Herodotus’ Greeks do not straightforwardly map on to the Achaeans from the *Iliad*, nor his Persians to Homer’s Trojans.⁸¹ Herodotus’ intertextual engagement with Homer is more complicated, and complicates any simple us-versus-them binary.⁸²

It is important to keep this in mind when we come to the battle of Thermopylae. After marking the time of battle with rather non-specific evocations of battle narratives in the *Iliad*,⁸³ Herodotus deploys more strategically placed references which align his account of Thermopylae to the critical moment in the *Iliad* when Patroclus enters the fray. In particular, it is when Leonidas falls that the Iliadic references—and here we can be confident of targeted intertextuality—come thick and fast, marking a renewed intensity in both fighting *and reading*. This is Herodotus ‘at his most Homeric’.⁸⁴ The battle is a ‘great struggle’ (*ὄθισμὸς ἐγίνετο πολλός*: 7.225 ~ *Il.* 17.274).⁸⁵ Such is the ferocity of the fighting that the bodies fall one on top of one another (7.223.2, 225.1 ~ *Il.* 17.361–2). The Greeks/Achaeans defend the corpse and repel the enemy time and again (four times in Herodotus, 7.225.1, trumping the three in Homer, *Il.* 18.232–3). The Greeks realise that the battle turns to the enemy (7.225.2) as Ajax does in the *Iliad* (17.626–33). Leonidas’ corpse is decapitated (7.238) in a fulfilment of Hector’s wish to do the same to Patroclus (*Il.* 17.126–7, 18.176–6). In the background, resonances between this Spartan *Leonidas* and the lion similes recurrent in the *Iliad* no doubt linger.⁸⁶ At any rate, Herodotus is alert to the lion within. He brings his account of the battle to a resounding climax by picturing ‘the stone *lion*

⁸¹ Unlike, arguably, in Simonides’ Plataea elegy: see above, n. 68. Pelling (2019) 202 catalogues the evidence for the Persian Wars being represented as the new Trojan War.

⁸² E.g., Pelling (1997), nuancing the fundamental studies of Hall (1989); Cartledge (1993).

⁸³ Time of battle: 7.217.2, 219.2 ~ *Il.* 11.1–2; 19.1–2; cf. 8.83.1; 9.47: Pelling (2006a) 92 n. 48. The generic nature of these references already suggests a continued role for using traditional referentiality to think about Herodotus’ use of Homer. I explore this idea in more detail below.

⁸⁴ Longinus 13.3 (above, n. 51). Munson (2001) 175–8; Boedeker (2003) 34–6; Carey (2016) 81–4; and especially Pelling (2006a) 92–8, to whom I owe the references that follow.

⁸⁵ Cf. Pelling (2019) 202–3.

⁸⁶ There is a lion simile in the battle over/for Patroclus: *Il.* 17.61–9 (describing Menelaos). Similarly, in the oracle that Leonidas interprets (Hdt. 7.20.4, which I discuss shortly), lions (as well as bulls) are said to be no match for the ‘Persian invader’ (the ‘grammatically obscure’ *τόν*: Macan (1908) ad loc; cf. How–Wells (1912) ad loc.). The lion Leonidas: Pelling (2006a) 92–3 with n. 48; Carey (2016) 84–5; cf. Pelling (2019) 202–3.

of Leonidas' (ὄκου νῦν ὁ λίθινος λέων ἔστηκε ἐπὶ Λεωνίδῃ, 7.225.2) that marks the spot where Leonidas' Spartans made their desperate last stand. This brief flash-forward to a time after, when these events have been inscribed into stone, anticipates the next step of this narrative, which turns the focus on to the act of memorialisation (I'll come back to this). Even this stone memorial recalls the depiction of Patroklos' death in the *Iliad*: there, Homer describes the stillness of Achilles' (usually swift) horses, in mourning for their lost rider, by comparing them to a grave stele (*Il.* 17.434–5). In terms of the level and sustained nature of the interplay, and indeed continuity of theme—the battle over a fallen warrior—there seems little doubt that an *Iliad* palimpsest detailing the death of Patroclus underlies and underpins Herodotus' depiction of the last moments at Thermopylae.⁸⁷

But to what effect? In her analysis of battle scenes in Homer and Herodotus, Deborah Boedeker has drawn a comparison between vivid depictions of death in the *Iliad*, which serve a memorialisation function that honours all equally, and Herodotus' own more prosaic, down-to-earth accounts, which gloss over detailed battle description in favour of the scrutiny, and in particular the civic evaluation, of those deaths. One exception that proves her rule is precisely Herodotus' description of the death of Leonidas, which, Boedeker argues, 'appropriates the more monologic, heroic poetics of the *Iliad*, focused on the glorious death of an individual'.⁸⁸

It is worth pausing to consider this idea in more detail. At the critical moment at Thermopylae, when the Greeks realise that they have been surrounded, Leonidas dismisses the allies. To explain his motivation, Herodotus turns to the precedent established by epic: this was about *kleos*. 'If he stayed there,' Herodotus writes (7.220.2), 'great **glory** would be left

⁸⁷ Not that Herodotus' engagement with Homer is restricted only to this episode from Book 17 of the *Iliad*. Arguably, the most striking use of a Homeric word, since it's a *hapax* in both Homer and Herodotus, is *περισταδόν*. Used by Homer to describe Antilochus being surrounded by the Trojans (*Il.* 13.551), Herodotus redeploys it to describe the decisive moment when the Greeks are surrounded (7.225.3). Thucydides also uses it, to describe the Athenians being surrounded at Syracuse (7.81.4, again a *hapax*). See Allison (1997) 89–90. Cf. Smith (1900) 74; Foster (2012) 202. For the re-use of *hapax legomena* in the fifth century: Nelson (2021).

⁸⁸ Boedeker (2003) 34. One should note that Boedeker is referring only to the *Iliad*'s representation of death as 'an equalizer of sorts' (33). Still, even allowing for that restricted focus, its heroic poetics are more varied and more complicated: see, e.g., Warwick (2019).

behind (μένοντι δὲ αὐτοῦ κλέος μέγα ἐλείπετο),⁸⁹ and the prosperity of Sparta would not be wiped away (ἐξηλείφετο).⁹⁰ To mark the moment, Herodotus quotes an oracle (in epic hexameter), which prophesies either the sack of Sparta or the death of its king: ‘Recollecting these lines’, Herodotus continues, ‘and wishing to lay down **glory** (κλέος καταθέσθαι) for the Spartans alone’ (220.4),⁹¹ Leonidas sent away the allies. With respect to these lines, Christopher Pelling suggestively argues:

In a microcosm of that proemial interplay of heroes and writer, Leonidas and Herodotus both have their roles in monumentalising that *kleos*, one in doing, the other in describing ... Leonidas and the Spartans are almost writing their own script, carefully ensuring that everything looks right (hair nicely combed for these modern equivalents of the Homeric ‘long-haired Achaeans’, 208.3).⁹²

Kleos, the strong, if not all-powerful, motivating force for the individual in Homer, is here reconfigured as the *kleos* of the group, to be part of a group, one of the Three Hundred Spartans.

This, we should remind ourselves, is Leonidas’ view. Herodotus’ narrative, as ever, is less straightforward, and one may already detect disquieting hints, unsettling any neat and univocal assessment—the fact that Leonidas feels the *need* to orchestrate who stays and who goes, for one thing.⁹³ Above all, there is the *form* of the narrative to consider. John Marincola begins an important article on Thermopylae by describing how Herodotus

⁸⁹ Translating ἐλείπετο as passive, as Pelling (2006) 93: ‘great glory *would be left* for him’. Equally, it could be middle (e.g., Godley (1920): ‘*he would leave behind* a name of great fame’), which arguably better suits Pelling’s argument; the subsequent reference to κλέος καταθέσθαι (220.4) Pelling *does* translate as middle (to ‘lay down the *kleos* of the Spartans’). See below, p. 193 with n. 126.

⁹⁰ The line resonates with Herodotus’ proem, to preserve *kleos* and ensure deeds did not fade (1.*praef.*) and has an ‘almost Gorgianic jingle’: Pelling (2006a) 93 n. 50. It’s a jingle that Macan (1908) *ad loc.* finds ‘not pleasing’.

⁹¹ Reading μούνων (to agree with Σπαρτιητέων), where the manuscripts have μούνον: Baragwanath (2008) 69 n. 39. So Macan (1908) *ad loc.*: ‘[μούνον] agreeing with Λεωνίδην it would give an absurd sense’. I return to this word, and its traditional referentiality, below, pp. 190–4.

⁹² Pelling (2006a) 93–4. Cf. Pelling (2019) 203–4.

⁹³ Pelling (2006a) 95; Carey (2016) 83 n. 31; cf. Baragwanath (2008) 68. The tension between fight and flight is a major concern in Homeric epic and elsewhere in early Greek poetry: Barker–Christensen (2006), esp. 17–26. See further below, pp. 194–6.

has modelled his account on Homer, before immediately pulling himself up: ‘I say “modelled on Homer,” but it is more accurate to say that Herodotus has retained some elements of Homeric battle narrative while doing other things in a very different way’.⁹⁴ One of the most marked differences, as throughout the *Histories*, is his use of the first-person, his inclusion of different voices, and, above all, his inquiry into what has (been said to have) happened.⁹⁵ The process of memorialising Thermopylae, for example, begins even before it reaches its thrilling climax: when Leonidas falls, Herodotus interrupts his narrative to claim that he has ‘learned by inquiry’ (7.224) all the names of the three hundred who fell.⁹⁶ Immediately after recounting the battle’s final throes, Herodotus turns to record who was said to be ‘best’ (*aristos*).⁹⁷ This honour goes to the Spartiate Dieneces, whose laconic sayings make such a light deal of death as to leave behind a ‘memorial’ (*μνημόσυνα*, 227).⁹⁸ Two more Lacedaemonians (brothers) are cited in despatches, before a lone Thespian is mentioned. The trend continues with the catalogue of inscriptions that follow, which retains the (almost) exclusive focus on Sparta (228).⁹⁹ Following their leader’s example, the Spartans dominate (/are seen to be managing?) the rollcall of honours. As Pietro Vannicelli suggests, the Thespians (among others) are in danger of being written out of the story.¹⁰⁰

It is in this context of memorialisation that Herodotus introduces the case of Aristodemus.

⁹⁴ Marincola (2016) 219.

⁹⁵ Marincola (2016) 219–20, 227. Cf. Dewald (1987); Marincola (1987); Boedeker (2003).

⁹⁶ Marincola (2016) 233 argues that, by stressing that he has learned by inquiry all their names, Herodotus performs a ‘historiographical achievement’ to rank on par with the ‘historical achievement’ of the three hundred.

⁹⁷ The contest over who is ‘the best’ (*aristos*) of the Achaeans is a critical dynamic in the *Iliad*: Nagy (1979). It is equally highly charged in Herodotus: see below, §4. I do not mean to suggest that Herodotus’ interplay with Homer is not reflective of lived experience more generally: Tritle (2006) 216 does well to remind us that knowledge of the *Iliad* would have shaped expectations in battle. See also Pelling, above, Ch. 2.

⁹⁸ Another Iliadic touch: Phoenix reminds Achilles that his father, Peleus, had instructed him to teach Achilles to be ‘a speaker of words’ as well as a ‘doer of deeds’ (*Il.* 9.433).

⁹⁹ The first references the four thousand Peloponnesians, the second specifically the Spartans and their laws. The third, though for the seer Megistias, homes in on his loyalty to the leaders of Sparta.

¹⁰⁰ Vannicelli (2007) 317–18 on 7.226–7; cf. Vannicelli (2018) 157.

3. No Time to Die: Aristodemos at Thermopylae

Balancing the reports of praise and evidence of commemoration are accounts of blame. The first records the unenviable fate of Aristodemos. Here I quote the episode in full, since part of my argument concerns its complex structure (7.229–32):¹⁰¹

[229] Δύο δὲ τούτων τῶν τριηκοσίων λέγεται Εὐρυτόν τε καὶ Ἀριστόδημον, παρεὸν αὐτοῖσι ἀμφοτέροισι κοινῶ λόγῳ χρησαμένοισι ἢ ἀποσωθῆναι ὁμοῦ ἐς Σπάρτην, ὡς μεμετιμένοι γε ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου ὑπὸ Λεωνίδεω καὶ κατακέατο ἐν Ἀλπηνοῖσι ὀφθαλμιῶντες ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον, ἢ εἴ γε μὴ ἐβούλοντο νοστήσαι, ἀποθανεῖν ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, παρεὸν σφι τούτων τὰ ἕτερα ποιεῖν οὐκ ἐθέλησαι ὁμοφρονέειν, ἀλλὰ γνώμη διενειχθέντας Εὐρυτόν μὲν πυθόμενον τῶν Περσέων τὴν περίοδον αἰτήσαντά τε τὰ ὄπλα καὶ ἐνδύντα ἄγειν αὐτὸν κελεῦσαι τὸν εἴλωτα ἐς τοὺς μαχομένους, ὅκως δὲ αὐτὸν ἦγαγε, τὸν μὲν ἀγαγόντα οἴχεσθαι φεύγοντα, τὸν δὲ ἐσπεσόντα ἐς τὸν ὄμιλον διαφθαρῆναι, Ἀριστόδημον δὲ λιποψυχέοντα λειφθῆναι.

[2] εἰ μὲν νυν ἢ μούνον Ἀριστόδημον ἀλγήσαντα ἀπονοστήσαι ἐς Σπάρτην ἢ καὶ ὁμοῦ σφῶν ἀμφοτέρων τὴν κομιδὴν γενέσθαι, δοκέειν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἂν σφι Σπαρτιότηας μῆνιν οὐδεμίαν προσθέσθαι· νῦν δὲ τοῦ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπολομένου, τοῦ δὲ τῆς μὲν αὐτῆς ἐχομένου προφάσιος, οὐκ ἐθέλησαντος δὲ ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀναγκαίως σφι ἔχειν μνηῖσαι μεγάλως Ἀριστοδήμῳ.

[230] οἱ μὲν νυν οὕτω σωθῆναι λέγουσι Ἀριστόδημον ἐς Σπάρτην καὶ διὰ πρόφασιν τοιήνδε, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελον πεμφθέντα ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου, ἐξέον αὐτῷ καταλαβεῖν τὴν μάχην γινομένην οὐκ ἐθέλησαι, ἀλλ' ὑπομείναντα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ περιγενέσθαι, τὸν δὲ συνάγγελον αὐτοῦ ἀπικόμενον ἐς τὴν μάχην ἀποθανεῖν.

[231] ἀπονοστήσας δὲ ἐς Λακεδαίμονα ὁ Ἀριστόδημος ὄνειδος τε εἶχε καὶ ἀτιμίην· πάσχω δὲ τοιάδε ἠτίμωτο· οὔτε οἱ πῦρ οὐδεὶς ἔναυε Σπαρτιητέων οὔτε διελέγετο. ὄνειδος τε εἶχε ὁ τρέσας Ἀριστόδημος καλεόμενος.

[232] ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν τῇ ἐν Πλαταιῆσι μάχῃ ἀνέλαβε πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπενειχθεῖσαν αἰτίην.

¹⁰¹ I print the text as in Hude (1908). The more recent OCT by Wilson (2015) incorporates two emendations: at the beginning of 229.2 he reads εἰ μὲν νυν (συνέβη) ἢ μούνον ... (suppl. Richards) and at the beginning of 232 τὴν ἐπενειχθείσαν (οἱ) αἰτίην (suppl. Stein). Neither seems necessary, though it doesn't affect my argument either way.

[229] But of two of the three hundred, Eurytos and Aristodemos, it is said, though it was possible for both of them to have come to an agreement either to be saved together [and return] to Sparta, since they had been let go from the camp by Leonidas and were lying sick at Alpeni with an extreme eye problem, or, if they didn't want to return, to die along with the rest—though it was possible for them to do either of these things, they were not willing to agree, but being divided in opinion Eurytos, when he learned of the Persians' circuit, demanded his armour, put it on, and ordered his helot to lead him to those fighting; and just so the helot led him and then fled, while Eurytos rushed into the crowd and was killed. But Aristodemos with his spirit leaving him was left behind (*Ἀριστόδημον δὲ λιποψυχέοντα λειφθῆναι*).

[2] Now if either Aristodemos alone had suffered many pains and returned to Sparta, or if there was a rescue for both of them, it seems to me that the Spartans would not have imposed any wrath on them. But as it was, [it is said that] when one of them was dead, and the other held on to the same motive, and was not willing to die, they were compelled to be greatly wrathful with Aristodemos.

[230] Some, then, say that it was thus and with such a motive that Aristodemos came safe back to Sparta. According to others he had been sent on a message from the camp, and, though it was possible for him to seize the battle while it was still in progress, he was not willing, but waiting around on the road he survived, while his fellow-messenger arrived back to the battle and died.

[231] When Aristodemos returned to Lacedaemon, he was abused and dishonoured. He suffered dishonour in the following way: no Spartan would light for him fire, nor speak with him. And they held him in abuse, calling him 'the runaway'.

[232] But he made good on the whole charge that was brought against him in the battle at Plataea.

I find this a difficult passage to translate.¹⁰² The whole first paragraph (as I have rendered it above) is one sentence, all in indirect discourse (headlined by *λέγεται*),¹⁰³ with two impersonal neuter participles (*παρεόν*), the second of

¹⁰² The shame is lessened somewhat by the fact that Donald Lateiner uses this very passage to exemplify 'Herodotos' variously paced and limber compositional techniques': Lateiner (2002) 364.

¹⁰³ The bare *λέγεται* foregrounds the issue of focalisation. Cf. Lateiner (2002) 366.

which picks up on and clarifies the point of the first (‘though it was possible for them to do either of these things’),¹⁰⁴ and a series of balanced clauses indicated by μέν and δέ that carefully delineate and unpick the actions and fates of the two Spartans (Εὐρυτον μέν ..., ὅκως δέ [the helot] ..., τὸν μέν [the helot] ..., τὸν δέ [Eurytos] ..., Ἀριστόδημον δέ ...).¹⁰⁵

The second paragraph also lacks a main verb. Its first clause—a contrary to fact condition—is governed by Herodotus expressing his judgement (δοκέειν ἐμοί), in which he speculates that, had there been no difference of opinion and action between the two men, there would have been no repercussions. The second clause—still governed by λέγεται?¹⁰⁶—states the situation ‘as it was’. This paragraph is again structured by balanced clauses (εἰ μέν νυν ..., νῦν δέ τοῦ μέν ..., τοῦ δέ ...), which serve on this occasion to differentiate whether the Spartans had cause to be angry or not (δοκέειν ἐμοί οὐκ ἂν σφί Σπαρτιήτας μῆνιν οὐδεμίαν προσθέσθαι... | ἀναγκαίως σφί ἔχειν μηνῖσαι μεγάλως Ἀριστοδήμῳ).

The third paragraph (7.230) introduces an alternative story (οἱ δέ responding to the resumptive οἱ μέν νυν οὕτω), with its own pairing of Spartans (this time Aristodemos and a nameless fellow messenger—Eurytos again?), further indirect discourse (an implied λέγεται), and another impersonal neuter participle (ἐξεόν). All this builds up to a rather different,

¹⁰⁴ [T]he resumptive repetition of the accusative absolute clauses with παρεόν ... retards the forward momentum and marks the moment of bifurcation: Eurytos to die with glory, Aristodamos to live with shame’: Lateiner (2002) 368.

¹⁰⁵ Lateiner (2002) 367 demonstrates both the intricate structure of, and the subtle process of discrimination in, the λέγεται clause: ‘Herodotos’ first sentence begins with ten plural verbs, participles, and (number-free) infinitives for both Eurytos and Aristodamos that continue until their shared moment of crisis, their “decision-making”. From this point, ‘Herodotos splits their stories deploying eight singular verbs, participles, and infinitives, six for unstoppable Eurytos and but two for unheroic Aristodamos’. Similarly, ‘plural and “collective” nouns, pronouns, and adjectives emphasize at first their common problem and cause’; after they go their separate ways, ‘modifiers are singular and no word is shared’. Finally, ‘adverbs also reinforce initial homogeneity, at first “sharing” or conjunctive terms such as τε καί, ὁμοῦ, ἅμα ... When the hoplites separate, we find heterogeneity: ἀλλά (“but”, here placed on the razor’s edge ...) and, in unusual profusion, Greek markers of antithesis: μέν ... δέ’.

¹⁰⁶ Lateiner (2002) 363 translates: ‘[the Spartans] say it was necessary for them to vent their [communal] vengeful wrath on Aristodamos’. Unfortunately, he doesn’t comment on his addition of ‘the Spartans’ (as represented by the parenthesis), and I have found no help from the commentators either. I come back to the thorny issue of focalisation below, pp. 195–6.

and certainly more clear-cut, depiction of an Aristodemos who was unwilling *to fight* (καταλαβείν τήν μάχην γινομένην οὐκ ἔθελῆσαι, 230), not simply unwilling *to die* (οὐκ ἔθελήσαντος δὲ ἀποθνήσκειν, 229.2). A final clause adds the gloss that he dallied in order to stay alive (ἀλλ' ὑπομείναντα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ περιγενέσθαι, 230), while his comrade returned to battle and died. The searing indictment that he faces when back home follows logically (7.231).

The lengthy sentences; the difficulty of determining focalisation; the carefully balanced clauses; the intense focus on judgement—all this is quite Thucydidean. And, as with so much of Thucydides, particularly his scenes of deliberation, the complexity is quite deliberate. This is a passage that we're supposed to dwell on,¹⁰⁷ to worry about, to try to pick apart, just as the Spartans discriminate Aristodemos from their ranks. We are here far from the rapid and vivid depiction of a rip-roaring glorious 'no surrender' backs-to-the-wall last man stand, and just as far from Leonidas' wish to set down Homeric *kleos* for his Spartans.

Engagement with Homer plays an important role. As we saw in §2, Pelling demonstrates how epic fame (*kleos*) is reconfigured in the Thermopylae narrative to apply to the group at large, thanks largely to Leonidas' management of the battle's final movement. Following on from this, in the passage just quoted (7.229–31) Pelling draws attention to words like 'wrath' (μῆνις), 'insult' (βνείδος), and 'dishonour' (ἀτιμία). As key lexical terms and thematic concepts in the *Iliad*, they have a particular association with Achilles: here, again, Pelling notes, they are transferred to the collective. The Spartans feel wrathful with Aristodemos and, as a result, abuse and dishonour him; in Homer it is Achilles who feels wrath at being dishonoured by Agamemnon, and who hurls abuse at him.¹⁰⁸ 'So'—Pelling writes—'the Homeric themes are there, but indeed *with a difference*: and we should not talk simply of "contrasts", rather of more interesting "interplays" of the worlds of then and now'.¹⁰⁹

Pelling's choice of the plural 'interplays' is instructive. With the possible exception of μῆνις,¹¹⁰ it may serve our reading of the Herodotus passage if

¹⁰⁷ 'Herodotus' careful syntax proves equally expressive for those who tarry to appreciate': Lateiner (2002) 364. He aptly describes how this carefully balanced structure 'steers us through a minefield of possible alternatives' (367). On the agony of deliberating over judgement in Thucydides: Barker (2009) ch. 4.

¹⁰⁸ Pelling (2006a) 95–6; cf. Pelling (2019) 204.

¹⁰⁹ Pelling (2006a) 96.

¹¹⁰ The *Iliad*'s headline of μῆνις (*Il.* 1.1) advertises Achilles' otherworldly anger as the motivating force of the entire epic: Cairns (2003) 31–3.

we think in terms not of a direct intertext with (or allusion to) a specific moment or episode in the *Iliad*, but of the traditional referentiality of the ideas expressed here. Or to be more precise: the traditional referentiality of each phrase and motif as specifically exemplified by their implementation in the *Iliad*. I say this in part because the idea of abuse or dishonour (*ἀτιμία*) is not limited to any one single episode involving Achilles: it is the aggregative nature of the reference that brings to our mind Achilles.¹¹¹ In part, too, it is because these lexical items have a thematic charge in the *Iliad*, in which each new instance recalls previous applications, and invites comparison to Achilles. It is not irrelevant to our understanding of Achilles (and of the *Iliad*), for example, that Thersites abuses Agamemnon (aping Achilles), only to be abused himself (by Odysseus); or that Helen rains abuse down on herself and Paris.¹¹² And the same may be true for Herodotus and for this passage here: that is to say, being willing to listen out for the broader referentiality of these ideas allows us to hear other voices that may have a bearing on our understanding and interpretation of the scene. Intriguingly, the one figure in the *Iliad* other than Achilles on whom abuse and dishonour weight heavily is *Sarpedon*. In a famous passage in the middle of the *Iliad* he articulates the obligations of a leader with the opening line: Γλαῦκε τίη δὴ νῶϊ τετυμῆμεσθα μάλιστα; ('Glaukos, why is it you and I are *honoured* before others?', *Il.* 12.310).¹¹³ Later, as his dying breath leaves him, he calls out to his friend for one last time: 'I will be a thing of shame and a *reproach* (*ὄνειδος*) for you, if the Achaeans strip my armour' (*Il.* 16.498). Sarpedon's words are then repeated by Athena, as she warns Menelaos lest the Trojans strip Patroclus' armour

¹¹¹ Achilles *ἄτιμος* (held in dishonour by Agamemnon, as he sees it): *Il.* 1.171. Other instances only: *Il.* 1.516 (Thetis tells Zeus that she will be the most dishonoured of all the gods, should he not grant her appeal); 16.90 (Achilles warns Patroklos not to fight the Trojans and put him in dishonour); *Od.* 16.431 (Penelope accuses the suitors of dishonouring Odysseus' house); Hes. *Theog.* 395 (Zeus promises all those who had been without honour under Kronos will be honoured by him). Forms of *τιμή* in association with Achilles: 1.59, 278, 353, 356; 9.319, 498, 514, 605, 608, 616; 16.84; 17.92; 23.649 (out of a total of 25 instances in the *Iliad*, and a hexameter corpus total of 74). The verb *τιμάω*: 8 instances related to Achilles (out of a total of 21 in the *Iliad*, 43 in the whole corpus). Instances of *ὄνειδίζω/ὄνειδέα* used of Achilles: *Il.* 1.211, 291; 20.246 (out of a combined total of 13 instances in the *Iliad*, 21 in the whole corpus). In every case the first use is related to Achilles in his strife with Agamemnon.

¹¹² *Il.* 2.222, 251 (Thersites); 3.242 ~ 9.460 (Helen, Phoenix); 3.438 (Paris).

¹¹³ See, e.g., Griffin (1980) 73. For criticism that it provides the 'most lucid statement of the *hero's* role and task' (Redfield (1975) 99, my italics): Haubold (2000) 4–6.

(*Il.* 17.556). The battle over Patroclus' corpse, as we have seen, underpins the last movement of the Thermopylae narrative.

I will come back to these Sarpedon resonances shortly, but, in addition to these words and themes from the *Iliad* that Pelling has ascribed to the Spartans as a group, there is another set of epic terms that cluster around Aristodemos himself, as Herodotus imagines a scenario in which 'only he [Aristodemos] had been in pain and made it home' (μόνον ἀλγήσαντα ἀπονοστήσα, 7.229.2). These terms may again recall the Iliadic Achilles, for whom returning home is on his lips from the start (ἀπονοστήσειν, *Il.* 1.60); who complains about the many 'pains' (ἄλγεα) he has suffered in the war (*Il.* 9.321); and who describes how Agamemnon took a prize from him 'alone of the Achaeans' (ἐμεῦ δ' ἀπὸ μούνου Ἀχαιῶν, 9.335).¹¹⁴ Yet, this last example is a good indication of why it is arguably less helpful, perhaps even misleading, to always think of engagement with Homer in terms of an intertext or allusion to a particular passage in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. I say this because the singularity that μόνος normally indicates refers to being 'alone' in battle, when one is exceptionally vulnerable: this is something that the singularly divine-like Achilles need not worry about.¹¹⁵ Similarly, ἄλγεα are not restricted to Achilles but refer more broadly to the pains a character in epic suffers,¹¹⁶ while ἀπονοστήσειν ironically only ever expresses the desirability of return, never its realisation—with one telling exception: *Odysseus*.¹¹⁷ It may also be the case, then, that Achilles' great (Homeric) epic rival lurks in the background here: Odysseus, the archetypal suffering (ἀλγέω) hero, who returns home (ἀπονοστήω), alone and vulnerable (μόνος). Again, I am not

¹¹⁴ In the same context (his rejection of Agamemnon's offer), he wonders sarcastically whether the Atreidae 'alone of mortals' love their women (ἢ μούνοι φιλέουσ' ἀλόχους μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, *Il.* 9.340).

¹¹⁵ As expressed by a number of heroes in battle: 'It will be chilling if I am caught | alone ...' τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον αἶ κεν ἄλώω | μόνος, 11.405–6. Cf. 11.467; 12.41; 17.94, 472; 20.188; 22.456. It is encapsulated by the *Iliad*'s night-time tale of the two against the one in the so-called Doloneia (*Il.* 10.224–6) and the Odyssean narrator's expressed wonder at how 'one man alone among many' (μόνος ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι) could bring death to so many opponents (*Od.* 22.11–14). See Barker–Christensen (2020) 64–8.

¹¹⁶ ἄλγεα are headlined in the proems of both Homeric epics (*Il.* 1.2; *Od.* 1.4). For a discussion of the traditional referentiality of this word in the two epics, which demonstrate a subtle but important distinction in its application and meaning: Barker–Christensen (2008); (2020) ch.3.

¹¹⁷ *Il.* 8.499 (Hektor); 12.115 (on the Trojans); 17.406 (focalising Achilles); *Od.* 24.471 (on Eupheithes). The exception is *Od.* 13.6, where Alkinoos assures Odysseus that he *will* return: Barker (2009) 111 n. 84.

talking about a specific intertext or allusion—this constellation of concepts never occurs together in any passage of Homer—but rather of the general aggregative resonance of their traditional referentiality as exemplified by the *Odyssey*. Judging whether (or not) we hear the echoes of the Homeric Odysseus (and/or Achilles) in Aristodemos' return from war will inevitably impact on our interpretation of the passage as a whole, especially the Spartans' own ruling on him.¹¹⁸ In the judgement of the historian (*δοκέειν ἐμοί*), if it had been only Aristodemos who suffered pain and made it back home, then the Spartans *would not* have been angry with him.

But Aristodemos isn't alone, even if he is the only one of the two to return, and this brings us back to his former comrade-in-arms, Eurytos. It is because the responses of the two men differ that the Spartans couldn't fail to be angry (according to Herodotus or the unspecified source of the story, *λέγεται*). The epic *μῦθος* serves to bring to our attention the difference, not so much between a Homeric world of the individual and the Herodotean world of the collective,¹¹⁹ as between the ideal of (Spartan) unanimity and the reality on the ground (as Herodotus depicts it).¹²⁰ As we read on, the not-alone Aristodemos is further paired and compared with a nameless messenger¹²¹ (230), a Spartan called Pantites (232), and, finally, the Thebans (233). Each comparison is introduced by a subtle manipulation of *μέν ... δέ* clauses. The first *δέ* introduces a different account that 'others [say]' (*οἱ*, 230) about Aristodemos the messenger, which contrasts to the story of his suffering at Alpeni with Eurytos and subsequent salvation (*οἱ μὲν νυν οὕτω*, 230); heightening the difference is the fact that his co-messenger replays Eurytos, plunging back into the battle to die. The second *δέ* relates to a third story (*λέγεται δέ*, 232) that picks up on the narrator's concluding note on Aristodemos (*ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν*, 231) to introduce *another* messenger also said to have *survived* the battle—*περιγενέσθαι* (232) recalling the description of Aristodemos the messenger at 230. This other survivor of the (not quite)

¹¹⁸ Arguably, the return of an individual is a trope of particular interest to Herodotus: at 5.87, for example, the Athenians acknowledge that 'one *alone* of their men returned safely to Attica', *ἓνα μῶνον τὸν ἀποσωθέντα αὐτῶν ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν γενέσθαι*) after a battle with the Aeginetans. The precarity of being alone is even starker in this case: the wives of his comrades stab him to death with their brooches. I owe this reference to Scarlett Kingsley.

¹¹⁹ Even the *Iliad*, with its focus on war and battle, is no less interested in community: Barker–Christensen (2020) ch. 1; cf. Haubold (2000).

¹²⁰ 'His offence and his punishment only make sense in the context of Thermopylae, where the logic is that of the heroic world, not the real': Ducat (2006) 45.

¹²¹ Unless we're meant to think this is Eurytos again, as per Paradiso (2002) 164 n. 5.

three hundred returns home (νοστήσαντα δὲ τοῦτον ἐς Σπάρτην, 232) like Aristodemos before him (ἀπονοστήσαι ἐς Σπάρτην, 229); like Aristodemos, he also faces dishonour (ὡς ἠτίμωτο, 232; cf. Aristodemos πάσχων δὲ τοιάδε ἠτίμωτο, 231). Only this man who survived to return home kills himself.

Finally (for now), as a further point of comparison to these individual Spartans who somehow let the side down, Herodotus introduces his ultimate Hellenic counterpoints: οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι (233.1). The Thebans have already had their card marked in the initial preparations for battle. After learning about the hand-selected three hundred Spartiates, we are told that, because they were suspected of medising, Leonidas was eager to *single out* the Thebans *alone* of the Greeks for this mission impossible (τούτους σπουδῆν ἐποιήσατο Λεωνίδης μούνοϛ Ἑλλήνωνι παραλαβεῖν, 7.205.3)—that word μούνοϛ again, indicating a different kind of singularity than Leonidas hopes for his Spartans (7.220.4). The Thebans come with their very own Leonidas to boot, *Leontiades* (7.205.2, 223.1). No lion this one—his men run to the Persians with hands held out, as soon as they see them having the best of it, and, Herodotus keenly notes, their leader is the first in line to be branded with the king's marks (στίγματα βασιλῆα, 233.2). Strikingly, Herodotus doesn't let it lie there but ploughs on: 'in a time afterwards' (χρόνῳ μετέπειτα) this man's son will be murdered by the Plataeans, after leading *four* hundred men to seize their town.¹²² The additional line brings us right up to the present day of the historian, to Plataea *again* (compare 231, ἐν τῇ ἐν Πλαταιῆσι μάχῃ), and to another comparison: the Persian War has given way to the Peloponnesian War, when Greeks fought each other, not the Persians, and when Thebans took a stand *alongside* Spartans.¹²³

Thus we have a series of doublets embroiling Aristodemos—Aristodemos and Eurytos, and a nameless messenger, and Pantites, and (collectively) the Thebans—which make singling out the man who returned home as the 'runaway' difficult. It is all the more problematic if we consider the extent to which language and ideas recur during the passage. Attuned as we now are by this point in the narrative to its dense echoes with the *Iliad*, such repetitions may even be felt to operate like epic resonance.¹²⁴ When we read,

¹²² The episode is recounted at Thuc. 2.2.

¹²³ As Lateiner (2002) 370 astutely observes, the 'semi-conclusion (οἱ μὲν νυν οὕτω σωθῆναι λέγουσι, 7.230) offers one closure, but no conclusions stop the stream of history, and, furthermore, closures in Herodotus generally open into a new picture or conflict'.

¹²⁴ While an exhaustive study of μούνοϛ in the *Histories* is beyond the scope of this chapter (it occurs over 160 times in its different declensions), judging from its use in the Thermopylae narrative, it not only retains the sense that we see in Homer—to single out the subject, often

for example, about Eurytos and Aristodemos being ‘divided in opinion’ (*γνώμη διενειχθέντας*, 7.229), we may recall the similar division among the allies when they learn of the Persian encirclement (*ἔσχιζοντο αἱ γνώμαι*, 219), particularly as it is constituted in the eyes of Leonidas (*γνώμη διενειχθέντας*, 220.4).¹²⁵ It is because of the alliance’s precarity that Leonidas sends the allies home—caring for them lest they die, ‘it is said’ (*λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὡς αὐτός σφεας ἀπέπεμψε Λεωνίδης, μὴ ἀπόλωνται κηδόμενος*, 220.1), though Herodotus himself thinks otherwise (*ταύτη καὶ μᾶλλον τὴν γνώμην πλεῖστος εἰμί*, 220.2): it was because Leonidas deemed they were ‘unwilling’ to share in the risk (*οὐκ ἐθέλοντας συνδιακινδυνεύειν*). That perceived unwillingness and what it means might be in our minds when we read that Eurytos and Aristodemos had been similarly ‘unwilling’ to agree (*οὐκ ἐθελῆσαι ὁμοφρονεῖν*, 229). The Spartan pair, whom (after all) Leonidas had ‘let go’ (*μεμετιμένοι*, 229), represent some kind of rerun or mirror image of that moment when Leonidas ‘sends away’ (*ἀπέπεμψε*, 220.1; *ἀποπέμψαι*, 220.4) the allies.

With every repeated phrase or motif, the lion stele set up for Leonidas (225.2) is slowly chipped away at. Though apparently some allies had been preparing ‘to remain there’ with Leonidas (*οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἅμα Λεωνίδη μένειν αὐτοῦ παρεσκευάδατο*, 219.2), Leonidas dismisses them anyway, so that (according to Herodotus) ‘by him remaining there, great glory would be left behind’ (*μένοντι δὲ αὐτοῦ κλέος μέγα ἐλείπετο*, 220.2). Herodotus doesn’t tell us precisely for whom: for the Greeks, the Spartans, or Leonidas himself?¹²⁶ Moreover, though I have just translated this line as passive, as if *kleos* could be something that is left behind simply by virtue of a deed being done, it could equally (or more likely) be a middle construction indicating Leonidas’ voice and agency—‘he would leave behind great glory’.¹²⁷ A further middle (/passive) form swiftly follows: ‘he wished to set down glory for the Spartans alone’ (*καὶ βουλόμενον κλέος καταθέσθαι μούνων Σπαρτιητέων*, 220.4). If it’s Leonidas’ agency in the creation of *kleos* that is being subtly exposed, perhaps

to emphasise vulnerability—but also functions to provide resonant soundings through the narrative, as in Homer.

¹²⁵ Macan (1908) *ad loc.*

¹²⁶ Pelling (2006) 93 specifies Leonidas: ‘great glory would be left for him’. The other translators I have consulted (see above, p. 162 with n. 2) leave the referent ambiguous. de Sélincourt (1954) translates the line indicatively as if a statement of fact: ‘And indeed by remaining at his post he left great glory behind him, and Sparta did not lose her prosperity, as might otherwise have happened.’

¹²⁷ See above, n. 89.

the manuscript reading of *μῶνον* (to agree with Leonidas), though jarring, has value after all, as if he *alone* considered himself able to provide glory for his Spartans.¹²⁸ Be that as it may, the repetition of *μῶνος* so soon afterwards makes for uncomfortable reading. The man who ultimately isn't *μῶνος* (229.2), the man left behind (*λειφθῆναι*, 229.1), Aristodemos, depicts an alternative scenario to the vision (and manufacture) of *kleos* left behind by Leonidas (*ἐλείπετο*, 220.2), one where a warrior returns home from battle unscathed and untested.

The effect is particularly jarring because we have been set up to read what happens at Thermopylae in terms that appeared to brook no disagreement. As mentioned above, preparations for battle are focalised from the perspective of the Persian king, Xerxes, in a continuation of the re-telling of the Trojan War from the perspective of the other.¹²⁹ Crucially, we see Xerxes struggling to make sense of his other, the new 'long-haired Achaeans', with the help of the exiled Spartan king Demaratos to guide him. When Xerxes balks at the idea that the Greeks would dare stand up to his vastly superior numbers, Demaratos replies with reference only to his Spartans, and it is a Spartan reference: Tyrtaios, Demaratos explains, 'doesn't allow them to flee from the battle before any number of men, but **remaining** at their post they must conquer or die (*οὐκ ἔων φεύγειν οὐδὲν πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ἐκ μάχης, ἀλλὰ μένοντας ἐν τῇ τάξει ἐπικρατέειν ἢ ἀπόλλυσθαι*, 7.104.5).¹³⁰ Xerxes, still bemused, laughs at the very idea; he's no longer laughing when his men meet the fierce and resolute resistance.¹³¹ Under Leonidas' leadership, the Spartans perform Tyrtaios' 'fight or die' maxim to the man, a point all the more sharpened when Leonidas sends away the allies—staying to fight (and die) before insurmountable odds will be the privilege of the Spartans and them *alone* (*μῶνοι*).¹³² Then along comes the story of Aristodemos, where disagreement between a pair of Spartans threatens the 'monolithic and monochromatic views of the Spartan mentality and their hoplites' fearsome and fearless repute'.¹³³ His no-show at Thermopylae strikes at the very heart

¹²⁸ See above, n. 91.

¹²⁹ On the Persian focus in Book 7, including the resonances with the *Iliad*, see above, pp. 180–1.

¹³⁰ How–Wells (1912) *ad loc.* note the resonance with Tyrtaios fr. 11.3 *IEG*². See above, p. 165 with nn. 17, 19.

¹³¹ Pelling (2006a) 94.

¹³² Leaving to one side the Thespians (and Thebans): see above, p. 184 with nn. 99–100.

¹³³ Lateiner (2002) 367.

of the Spartan ‘fight or die’ ideology, as established by Tyrtaios, explained by Demaratos, coordinated by Leonidas, and enacted by his comrades. No wonder the Spartans felt compelled to be so angry with him (*ἀναγκαίως σφι ἔχειν μηνῖσαι*, 229.2).¹³⁴

Within this framework, the story of Aristodemos functions as not only a counterpoint to Spartan ‘fight or die’ ideology, but also a variant on a Homeric type-scene: the ‘fight or flight’ episode, in which our protagonists each represent a different choice, Eurytos for the fight, Aristodemos for flight.¹³⁵ Even in Homer, the choice between fighting or fleeing is rarely binary; being in the midst of battle is far more complicated.¹³⁶ So in Herodotus, with the added twist that the roles are reversed: Eurytos doesn’t so much fight as leave (Alpeni); by the same token, Aristodemos doesn’t so much flee as remain left behind. For complicating Demaratos’ ‘fight or die’ message, or its monumentalisation in the battle at Thermopylae, is the fact that Leonidas (according to the first story) sent Eurytos and Aristodemos away from the battle. As Donald Lateiner puts it: ‘One can argue, oppositely [to the received view], that Eurytos’ courage was disobedient to Leonidas’ rational military command and royal order, while Aristodamos’ soldierly obedience met outrageous social ostracism in a community of the obedient’.¹³⁷ By contrast, the second story of the two messengers who take starkly diverging paths—one into battle, one back home—is far more straightforwardly a depiction of fight and flight, and far easier to read in terms that support the Spartan assessment of Aristodemos as ‘the runaway’. Who’s telling the story, as ever in Herodotus, matters to our interpretation of it.¹³⁸

The complex structuring of this passage (especially 7.229); the interplay with Homer (as viewed through the lens of traditional referentiality); the

¹³⁴ Ducat (2006) 36: ‘Why “anger”? I would say that it was basically because Aristodemos reduced the number of the heroes from 300 to 299, which is a much less satisfactory figure since it spoiled Sparta’s claim to uniqueness: here, as elsewhere, the ideal of “zero default” had not been attained. ... It called into question the whole system ... One might also ask whether his conduct did not implicitly pose another question for the Spartans, one that was much more disturbing and which could not be voiced openly: that of knowing whether the strategic choice made by Leonidas was really the best one for the city and for the Greeks’. Once you start asking why...

¹³⁵ Lateiner (2002) 365.

¹³⁶ Barker–Christensen (2006) 17–36.

¹³⁷ Lateiner (2002) 366 n. 13.

¹³⁸ Dewald (1987).

intratextual echoes with the wider Thermopylae narrative; the issue of focalisation—all of these aspects of my analysis bring me back to the problem of the single word with which this inquiry began: *λιποψυχέοντα*. The first point to reconsider is the alternative reading *φιλοψυχέοντα*, whose value for interpreting this passage we are now in a much better position to assess. This emendation has been proposed, we may recall, because of its fit with Spartan ideology. Perhaps it fits rather too well. The reception of Aristodemus back in Sparta (7.231) functions not only to condemn the individual who made it back home but to reaffirm the ‘fight or die’ ideology as expressed by Demaratos and enacted by Aristodemus’ comrades at Thermopylae. Because he failed to abide by this *nomos*, the Spartans rage against him and abuse and dishonour him as ‘a runaway’. The echo of Tyrtaios here is very deliberate, since we are viewing—and judging—Aristodemus through Spartan eyes. Yet, as I have suggested, of the two accounts describing Aristodemus’ absence from battle, it is the *second* of the two (introduced by οὐδέ, 230) that condemns him. Considerably shorter and simpler, this story labels Aristodemus as ‘not willing to fight’ (*ἐξεὸν αὐτῷ καταλαβεῖν τὴν μάχην γινομένην οὐκ ἐθέλησαι*). No nuance here: this version of Aristodemus’ non-appearance clearly justifies Spartan anger with him. By contrast, however, in the first account Aristodemus is said to be ‘not willing to die’ (*οὐκ ἐθέλησαντος δὲ ἀποθνήσκειν*, 229.2). It is but a slight difference, a small slip from not willing to die to not willing to fight, when the Spartan maxim is ‘fight or die’, but critical nonetheless. As we have seen, the first story is not only considerably longer but far more convoluted. For this reason alone, that initial version sits more awkwardly with the brutally stark treatment of Aristodemus that follows the second. But it is also far less likely to be Spartan focalisation, since in this version we are told of Leonidas’ judgement that the two men—and presumably his fighting force of Spartiates at Thermopylae—would be better off if they stayed away.

This *prophasis*, shared by both men,¹³⁹ is their eye condition, which is so severe that they are at their very limits (*ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον*, 7.229.1). As we have seen, Herodotus explains that, had they both chosen to return home they would have had good cause: the problem is that they chose different paths. One path takes six clauses, the other only four words. In one way, this

¹³⁹ His *prophasis* (229.2): an explanatory claim or justification (whether true or false), a triggering cause—Pelling (2019) 8–10 (on Herodotus), 82–4 (on the Hippocratic corpus). Translations which emphasise that Aristodemus makes an ‘excuse’ miss the point that this also applies to Eurytos: they both have the same cause (the ophthalmia).

disparity is a reflection that the former course of action *requires* explanation: how would a blind man make it back to battle anyway? It also has the effect of casting into relief the pathetic outcome: led back into the fighting, Eurytos falls into the crowd—and immediately perishes (τὸν δὲ ἐσπεσόντα ἐς τὸν ὄμιλον διαφθαρῆναι, 7.229.1). Whether this account signifies a display of heroism, or alternatively questions the kind of heroism that would necessitate/encourage an act like this, is hard to say.¹⁴⁰ What is clear is that it is a passive act—a rushing into battle *to be killed*—which compares, somehow, to Aristodemos similarly being left behind.¹⁴¹

Two important conclusions follow. First, we may note the physicality of the experience. As Paradiso had also remarked, the semantic charge of *λιποψυχέω* describes a physical condition and has no ethical or moral implications. The same is true of this account: it is only when Aristodemos gets back home that moral assessment of his condition is imported by the Spartans. Second, the impression created is that it was less important to fight than to be seen to die, as one group, a nice neat and complete three hundred. From this perspective, Pantites killing himself is also his parallel, another useless death in practical terms, but one that serves Spartan ideology.¹⁴² One could say that, simply by not being *φιλοψυχέω*, *λιποψυχέω* is a helpfully more ambiguous word in context.¹⁴³

But I think we can do better. If we hear the epic undertones of *λείπω* + *ψυχή* and understand its traditional referentiality as signifying death, it would further underline the close-to-deathness of this protagonist. Additionally, given the rich and dense interplay with the *Iliad*, there is, I suggest, a case here for specific intertextuality with the moment when Sarpedon's *ψυχή*

¹⁴⁰ Recall the description of Boedeker (2003) (cited above, p. 163). Lateiner (2002) 368 reads the imbalance differently: 'Eurytos receives six clauses occupying five full lines that describe his heroism; wretched Aristodamos, however, obtains only the four final, ponderous words ("imbalanced balance"). One of those leaden words is the *hapax legomenon* *λιποψυχέοντα* ("swooning", or "half-conscious")'. This for me is the one misstep of Lateiner's refreshingly detailed close analysis, and one that jars with his own conclusions.

¹⁴¹ Lateiner (2002) 368 notes how 'their actions even receive homoioteleuton, final rhyme: *διαφθαρῆναι* and *λειφθῆναι*', even though he translates the latter actively.

¹⁴² See below, n. 147 on *μῶνος*.

¹⁴³ *φιλοψυχία* occurs on one other occasion in Herodotus, at 6.29, where Histaios 'showed that he loved his life too well' (*φιλοψυχίην τοιήνδε τινὰ ἀναιρέεται*) by crying out in Persian when he was about to be killed. Ironically, however, this only delays his death by a paragraph, since in the very next section Artaphrenes, fearing lest his rival might escape and again win power at the court, impales his body and sends his head to Darius (6.30). So much for loving life.

leaves him, only for the hero to breathe again. If this is right, then the detail that the two Spartans suffer with a terrible eye infliction gains significance.¹⁴⁴ Hearing in the epic-like conjunction *λιποψυχέω* the moment when Sarpedon suffers the loss of *ψυχή*, we might also recall the description of mist being poured over his eyes, another formula that usually signifies death. The condition of ophthalmia suffered by both Spartans could be seen as an instantiation of this epic death formula. They are that close to death (*ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον*); Eurytos will soon be going blindly to his.

The most interesting aspect is the extent to which *λιποψυχέω* may also bring to mind the thematic trajectory of Sarpedon in the *Iliad*. Immediately after showing the hostile environment that greets Aristodemos on his return to Sparta, Herodotus comments (7.232):

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν τῇ ἐν Πλαταιῆσι μάχῃ ἀνέλαβε πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπενειχθείσαν αἰτίην.

But he made good on the whole charge that was brought against him in the battle at Plataea.

I noted above that the second, simpler and more damning, account of Aristodemos' no-show (7.230) prepares the ground for, and smooths the path to, his absolute denunciation by his fellow Spartans at home. That ground is suddenly cut away from under our feet by Herodotus' judgement.¹⁴⁵ It stands as a bald statement, simply part of the narrative; it's not even expressed as a narratorial comment—a point that, paradoxically, reveals it to be an even greater intervention on the part of the author of this inquiry. Where the Spartan judgement insists on a simple binary image of heroism, Herodotus demands we think again. That more complicated picture is already anticipated by the complex structuring of this account and by the description of Aristodemos as 'losing his spirit' (*λιποψυχέω*)—a compound

¹⁴⁴ I owe this point to Ingela Nilsson. Similarly in his account of Marathon, Herodotus highlights the case of the Athenian Epizelos, fighting bravely when he is suddenly deprived of his sight (*ἄνδρα γινόμενον ἀγαθὸν τῶν ὀμμάτων στερηθῆναι*, 6.117.2). Epizelos tells his own story what happened: a phantom passed him by and killed the man next to him (117.3)—underlining the associations of blindness with death. I owe this reference to Tom Harrison. On the meaning (or not) of ἄιδης as 'unseen' (*ἀειδές*): Plat. *Crat.* 404b.

¹⁴⁵ Lateiner (2002) 370: '7.231 points to a different outcome in the future. His open architecture and forward marker promise a follow-up at Plataiai (7.231; see 9.71)'.

with its roots in epic which recalls the figure of Sarpedon in the *Iliad*, a hero, like Aristodemos, who lives to fight and die another day.

4. You Only Live Twice: Plataea

After his account of Plataea, Herodotus goes through the now familiar accounting of deeds done. A familiar name is accorded pride of place (9.71.2–4):

The best was by far (ἄριστος ἐγένετο μακρῶ) Aristodemos, in my opinion (κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας), he who being the only man of the three hundred who survived Thermopylae was held in abuse and dishonour (ὃς ἐκ Θερμοπυλέων μούνος τῶν τριηκοσίων σωθεὶς εἶχε ὄνειδος καὶ ἀτιμίην). The next after him who were best were Posidonios, Philokyon, and Amompharetos, Spartiates. And yet, in the discussion who was the best of these men, the Spartiates who were present judged that Aristodemos, who wished to die openly (φανερῶς ἀποθανεῖν) because of the blame attaching to him, and in a frenzy left his post (λυσσῶντά τε καὶ ἐκλείποντα τὴν τάξιν), had displayed great deeds (ἔργα ἀποδέξασθαι μεγάλα), whereas Posidonios who did not wish to die (οὐ βουλόμενον ἀποθνήσκειν) was a good man: in this way he was the better (ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἀγαθόν· τοσοῦτω τοῦτον εἶναι ἀμείνω). But these things they may have said also in jealousy. Anyway, these men I've just mentioned, who died in that battle, all of them, except Aristodemos, were honoured. But Aristodemos, who wished to die because of the cause mentioned before, was not honoured (οὐκ ἐτιμήθη).

Even the fact that Aristodemos was fighting at Plataea should make us question how absolute his social exclusion had been.¹⁴⁶ Herodotus explicitly recalls that earlier judgement here: Aristodemos, the only man—μούνος again—of the three hundred who survived Thermopylae and who was held in abuse and dishonour for his pains. It is again his singularity that will be at issue,¹⁴⁷ a running sore to the Spartans, whose self-projection of a society

¹⁴⁶ Ducat (2006) 36.

¹⁴⁷ As Flower and Marincola (2002) *ad loc.* point out, labelling Aristodemos the 'sole' survivor of Thermopylae sits awkwardly with the story of Pantites (7.232); cf. Marincola (2016) 229.

ruled by *nomos* leaves no room for individual action in battle.¹⁴⁸

In part this is what makes using epic models problematic. Heroic endeavour, such as we see in Homer, may be grounded in collective action,¹⁴⁹ but it is the individual hero who features. While the Spartans concede that Aristodemos had a claim to be one of the best, they complain that he fought in a frenzy (*λυσσῶντα*).¹⁵⁰ What is an expression of a warrior's terrifying prowess on the battlefield at Troy¹⁵¹ becomes another stick with which the Spartans beat the one who steps out of line. Where before Aristodemos had been left behind (*λειφθῆναι*), here he (over) asserts his agency and leaves his post (*ἐκλείποντα τὴν τάξιν*), as if he's still fighting the battle at Thermopylae, when the Spartans step outside their fortifications in their final glorious fight to the death (7.223.3).¹⁵² When Demaratos had promised that the Spartans will stay in their posts (*μένοντας ἐν τῇ τάξει*, 7.104.5; cf. Leonidas at 220.2), it was with 'winning or dying' (*ἐπικρατέειν ἢ ἀπόλλυσθαι*) in mind. Aristodemos finally accomplishes both: leaving his post is now the sticking point.

It is all the more striking after a battle in which the two Spartan commanders, Pausanias and Amompharetos, fall out on this very issue. In disbelief that a (Spartan) general could ever countenance retreat, Amompharetos **remains** at his post (*περιείχετο αὐτοῦ μένοντας μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν τάξιν*, 9.57.1). The division in Spartan ranks throws the Greeks' strategic withdrawal into disarray; sensing their chance the Persians attack—and the Greeks win a famous victory. The picture that the Spartans present in their judgement of Aristodemos is again wide of the mark, and not only in their insistence on an ideology that the events on the ground hardly bear out. The Spartans rank a certain Posidonios more worthy than Aristodemos because this man 'didn't wish to die' (*οὐ βουλόμενον ἀποθνήσκειν*). This made him a 'good man' and 'in this way he was the better' (*ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἀγαθόν*·

¹⁴⁸ Hdt. 7.104.4. A few paragraphs prior, Demaratos explicitly sets the Spartans apart: he will speak about them *alone* of all Greeks (*ἀλλὰ περὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μόνων*, 7.102.2), just before he asserts their commitment to fighting no matter the odds.

¹⁴⁹ See above, n. 119.

¹⁵⁰ Flower–Marincola (2002) *ad loc.* note, 'Such behaviour cannot be tolerated in Sparta, where discipline and order are necessary for victory'. Boedeker (2003) 26 glosses Aristodemos here as 'madman', which misses the Homeric resonance.

¹⁵¹ Both Hector (*Il.* 9.239, 305) and Achilles (21.542) are described as 'raging' (*λύσσα*)—the only instances in the extant hexameter corpus. Ducat (2006) 37 suggestively compares Aristodemos to 'a Diomedes or a Tydeus'.

¹⁵² Pelling (2006a) 96.

τοσοῦτω τοῦτον εἶναι ἀμείνω). No disagreement is brooked again. And yet ‘not willing to die’ is the exact charge that was levelled at Aristodemos for surviving Thermopylae.¹⁵³ The Spartan assumption of what makes a good man is made a question in Herodotus’ account. Only Aristodemos wasn’t honoured, Herodotus sharply notes.¹⁵⁴ Yet in his eyes,¹⁵⁵ Aristodemos was the best (ἄριστος), displaying great deeds (ἔργα ἀποδέξασθαι μεγάλα)¹⁵⁶ to rank alongside Achilles (or Odysseus) in the final reckoning.

*

The subject of this chapter has been a single contested word. I have explored its semantic range and used it to think about broader questions of Herodotus’ interplay with Homer. Where many of the Homeric touches in Herodotus can be put down to, and more productively used, as examples of traditional referentiality or, at least, non-specific resonances with the *Iliad*, the presence of the *hapax* λιποψυχέω¹⁵⁷ in our manuscripts suggests a prosaic reworking of the poetic formula ‘his spirit left him’, and a specific intertext with the moment when this utterance is applied to Sarpedon’s spirit leaving him as he loses consciousness.

¹⁵³ Similarly, the Spartan complaint that Aristodemos ‘wished to die openly’ (*φανερῶς*) recalls the proof that Herodotus cites for Leonidas stage managing *kleos*: he sent away the seer Megistes *φανερῶς* (7.221).

¹⁵⁴ Lateiner (2002) 369: ‘the Spartan ideological mind-set cannot accommodate or comprehend either his alleged cowardice at Thermopylai or his later, stellar valor at Plataiai’.

¹⁵⁵ Paul Cartledge reminds me that Herodotus uses the ‘royal we’—‘in our opinion’ (*κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας*)—to emphasise his judgement. On the differences in judgement between the historian and the Spartans: Ducat (2006) 36.

¹⁵⁶ An echo of Herodotus’ opening statement, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεῖα γένηται (1.praef.): Lateiner (2002) 372.

¹⁵⁷ Intriguingly, a manuscript variant at Hdt. 1.86.3, where Croesus is on the pyre, reads λιποψυχήη: Wilson (2015) 11–12. All editions of the text use ἡσυχίης: Croesus, remembering Solon’s wise words on human fortune, ‘heaved a deep sigh, groaned aloud *after a long silence* (ἐκ πολλῆς ἡσυχίης) three times the name “Solon”’. Whether we prefer ἡσυχίης or λιποψυχίης doesn’t affect my argument in this chapter: what is important is the fact that the application of λιποψυχήη here would work in a similar way to the case of Aristodemos (and Sarpedon): a figure on the point of death seems to breathe his last—but is spared to play an important role in the narrative, as Cyrus’ (ahistorical) wise advisor. Pelling (2006c) 156–7 poses the question what end for Croesus the reader of Herodotus might have been expecting.

This is important because so much of the preceding battle narrative had appeared to be working to a Spartan script, as Christopher Pelling has suggested, in which Homeric resonances bear out Leonidas' hopes for Spartan *kleos*. In the aftermath, as Herodotus brings to the fore the memorialisation of the battle, he also turns the focus on the act of memorialisation itself. In many ways, his account of Aristodemus is typical, incorporating different *logoi* and providing narratorial judgement: that's the job of a historian as he is defining it. At the same time, however, this passage makes for a particularly challenging read: his careful framing draws attention to the difficulty of judgement, even as the Spartans issue their extreme judgement on Aristodemus. And yet the narrator's sting-in-the-tale punchline, that this man proved himself at Plataea, is an invitation, a demand even, to read more carefully, and to read to the end.¹⁵⁸ Hearing an intertextual resonance with Sarpedon helps prepare for this shift, and in turn shows how difficult it is (for the Spartans) to control the poetics of memorialisation or live up to the straitjacket of ideology.¹⁵⁹ In short, this passage helps educate us as historians to be alert not only to what happened, but why it's important.

Thinking with a single world has also helped to shed light on Herodotus' engagement with Homer. It has shown that being more precise about what we mean helps us appreciate the nature of that engagement. Using the idea of traditional referentiality, even if limited by the extant hexameter corpus, can help us better understand the customary meaning of a unit of utterance and be alert to its application in Homer's epics. More often than not, this chapter has found that Herodotus' Homeric turns draw on the cumulative nature of a phrase or motif's traditional referentiality in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and not a specific citation of any particular instance. In turn, such an approach throws into relief those moments when a specific moment in a specific text *is* targeted: these cases can be better described and understood as intertextuality, in which the semantics of the target text continue to reverberate in the host text. As a narrative on the cusp of the medial shift

¹⁵⁸ Reading to the end: Cartledge and Greenwood (2002) 351; Greenwood (2007) 145; cf. Barker (2006).

¹⁵⁹ Such attempts to control memorialisation aren't limited to the Spartans: in claiming the right to hold the prestigious rank in the battle of Plataea, the Athenians refer to Marathon, in which, they claim, they *alone* fought off the Persian forces (*μῶνοι Ἑλλήνων δὴ μωνομαχῆσαντες τῷ Πέρσῃ*, 9.27.5). The narrative had suggested a different scenario (Hdt. 6.108.1). 'The Athenians clearly look to epicise the battle of Marathon:' Haywood (above, p. 80).

from performance poetry to a written text, it is perhaps no surprise that both ways of ‘reading’ are present in the *Histories*, working together to provide nuance and depth to Herodotus’ reworking of epic in prose.

As a final indication of the presence, and importance, of *λιποψυχέω* in Herodotus, it is worthwhile briefly reflecting on the tradition that Herodotus establishes. For it can hardly be coincidental that *λιποψυχέω* keeps reoccurring as a *hapax* in later historians, in the same context (a Spartan or military setting), with the same connotations *mutatis mutandis*. Xenophon, for example, recounts how the Spartan leader Agesilaos ‘lost his spirit’ (*ἐλιποψύχησε*) after a Syracusan surgeon operated on his ankle. Though not a fatal wound, he is out of action for the rest of the summer and throughout the winter.¹⁶⁰ Pausanias narrates the story of the Messenian king Euphaes, who in battle with the Spartans lost consciousness (*λιποψυχήσαντα*) due to his wounds, and died not many days later (*ἡμέραις δὲ οὐ πολλαῖς ἀποθνήσκει*).¹⁶¹ In Arrian, Alexander loses consciousness twice, so badly wounded (and so great a hero) is he.¹⁶² Arguably most striking of all is Thucydides (4.11.4, 12.1, 14.2):

Brasidas was most conspicuous of all (*πάντων δὲ φανερότατος*) ... In trying to land he was knocked back by the Athenians, and after receiving many wounds **fainted away** (*ἐλιποψύχησε*), and, as he fell into the forward part of the ship, his shield slipped off into the sea. ... At the sight of [their ships being hauled away] and **suffering in pain** (*περιαλοῦντες τῷ πάθει*) since their comrades were being cut off on the island, the Lacedaemonians on the shore rushed to help.¹⁶³

In this passage there is no doubting the heroic credentials of the Spartan warrior.¹⁶⁴ Brasidas is accorded full Homeric honours, with an epic sounding

¹⁶⁰ ‘Then however [flow of blood] stopped’, Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.58. The emphasis here on an immediate limit to the extent of the loss of consciousness owes much to the ‘Hippocratic’ context of an operation. Even so, Agesilaos’ recovery is lengthy.

¹⁶¹ Paus. 4.10.3–4.

¹⁶² Arr. *Anab.* 6.10.2 (*λειποψυχία*), 11.2 (*ὥστε λειποψυχῆσαι αὐθις, λειποψυχία*). After describing Alexander’s recovery from the second loss of consciousness, Arrian launches into a tirade against those who have falsely reported on this event. This narratorial intervention, coupled with the repetition of *λειποψυχία*, serves to mark out Alexander as the greatest of heroes in this tradition, and Arrian himself as the best historian.

¹⁶³ A passage famous in antiquity: cf. D.S. 12.62.4; Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 347B.

¹⁶⁴ Hornblower (1996) ad loc. 4.12 notes that Brasidas is not your average Spartan.

superlative (‘the most conspicuous—*φανερώτατος*—of all’), while his men collectively suffer like an Achilles or Odysseus (*περιαλοῦντες τῷ πάθει*).¹⁶⁵ It is all the more interesting, then, that Brasidas is described as ‘losing his spirit’ (*ἐλιποψύχησε*), as he falls down into the prow of the ship and his shield slips into the sea. That shield is taken by the Athenians and set up as a trophy to mark their victory. As for Brasidas: nothing more is said; to all intents and purposes, he appears to have suffered a fatal loss of consciousness.¹⁶⁶ Until, that is, some fifty-eight chapters later, when all of a sudden we hear of him preparing an army for Thrace (4.70). Ultimately, he dies after storming Thracian Amphipolis (Thuc. 5.10) in an action that will condemn his Athenian rival to a life of writing history in exile. Like Aristodemos and Sarpedon before him, Brasidas is saved to die another day.¹⁶⁷ If my analysis of *λιποψυχέω* is right, then the irony of using a word that had described the shameful Aristodemos to describe the new Leonidas at (Thermo)Pylos appears to have been too great an opportunity for Thucydides to miss.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ Brasidas’ *aristeia*: Howie (1992) 438; cf. Hornblower (1996) 38–61; Rhodes (1998) 215.

¹⁶⁶ Hornblower (1996) 46: ‘The word for “faints” is found here only in Thucydides. The word is *ἐλιποψύχησε*: and this is a Homeric expression and notion for swooning, though more normally if your psyche leaves you, you are dead. But it is certainly the expression for a Homeric swoon’—citing the example of Sarpedon.

¹⁶⁷ Brasidas is wounded (again), rescued from the battle by his comrades, and taken back to the city ‘barely still breathing’ (*ἔτι ἔμπνονν*, 5.10.11)—a distant echo of Sarpedon, again? His final breath comes after learning of his victory.

¹⁶⁸ (Thermo)Pylos: Stadter (2012) 46–8; cf. Foster (2012).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Editions, Commentaries and Translations of Herodotus*

- Bowie, A. M., ed. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Carey, H., trans. (1847–9) *Herodotus: A New and Literal Version from the Text of Bæhr* (London).
- Flower, M. and J. Marincola, edd. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Godley, A. D., ed. and trans. (1920) *Herodotus: The Histories*, 4 vols (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1921–4); online version of 7.229 at <https://scaife.perseus.org/reader/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0016.tlg001.perseus-eng2:7.229/>.
- Holland, T., trans. (2013) *Herodotus: The Histories* (London).
- How, W. W. and J. Wells (1912) *A Commentary on Herodotus*², 2 vols (Oxford).
- Hude, C. (1927) *Herodoti Historiae: Libri V-IX*³ (Oxford).
- Macan, R. W. (1908) *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth, & Ninth Books*, 3 vols (London).
- Macaulay, G. C., trans. (1890) *The History of Herodotus* (London).
- Purvis, A. L., trans. (2007) *The Landmark Herodotus: The Histories*, ed. R. B. Strassler (New York).
- Rawlinson, G. (1858–60) *The History of Herodotus* (London).
- de Sélincourt, A., trans. (1954) *Herodotus: The Histories* (Harmondsworth).
- Waterfield, R., trans. (1998) *Herodotus: The Histories* (Oxford).
- Wilson, N. G. (2015) *Herodoti Historiae: Libri V-IX* (Oxford).

2. *Other Scholarship*

- Allison, J. (1997) *Word and Concept in Thucydides* (Atlanta).
- Bakker, E. J. (1997) *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca).
- (2013) *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- , I. J. F. de Jong and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).
- Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Barker, E. T. E. (2006) 'Paging the Oracle: Interpretation, Identity, and Performance in Herodotus' *History*', *G&R* 58: 1–28.
- (2009) *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography, and Tragedy*. (Oxford).

- (2011) ‘The *Iliad*’s Big Swoon: a Case of Innovation Within the Epic Tradition’, *Trends in Classics* 3: 1–17.
- (2021) ‘On Space, Place, and Form in Herodotus’ *Histories*’, *Histos* 15: 88–130.
- and J. P. Christensen (2006) ‘Flight Club: the New Archilochus and Its Resonance with Homeric Epic’, *MD* 57: 9–41.
- (2008) ‘Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems’, *LICS* 7.2: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/lics/>.
- (2020) *Homer’s Thebes: Epic Rivalries and the Appropriation of Mythical Pasts* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Boedeker, D. (2001) ‘Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea’, in Boedeker–Sider (2001) 120–34.
- (2002) ‘Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 97–116.
- (2003) ‘Pedestrian Fatalities: the Prosaics of Death in Herodotus’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 17–36.
- and D. Sider, edd. (2001) *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (New York and Oxford).
- Bowie, A. M. (2012) ‘Mythology and the Expedition of Xerxes’, in E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker, edd., *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford) 269–86.
- Burgess, J. S. (2006) ‘Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference’, *Oral Tradition* 21: 148–89.
- Cairns, D. L. (2003) ‘Ethics, Ethology, Terminology: Iliadic Anger and the Cross-Cultural Study of Emotion’, in S. Braund and G. W. Most, edd., *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (*JCLS* 32; Cambridge) 11–49.
- Carey, C. (2016) ‘Homer and Epic in Herodotus’ Book 7’, in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamamou, edd., *Homeric Reception across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–89.
- Cartledge, P. A. (1993) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Other* (Oxford).
- and E. Greenwood (2002) ‘Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 351–71.
- Clarke, M. (1999) *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer: A Study of Words and Myths* (Oxford).
- Craik, E. M. (2015) *The ‘Hippocratic’ Corpus: Content and Context* (London).
- Currie, B. G. F. (2016) *Homer’s Allusive Art* (Oxford).
- (2021) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Supplement 13; Oxford, Edmonton, and Tallahassee).

- Demont, P. (2018) 'Herodotus on Death and Disease', in E. Bowie, ed., *Herodotus: Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston) 175–96.
- Dewald, C. (1987) 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa* 20: 147–70.
- and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Ducat, J. (2005) 'Aristodémos le trembleur', *Ktèma* 30: 205–16.
- (2006) 'The Spartan "Tremblers"', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell, edd., *Sparta and War* (Swansea) 1–55.
- Foley, J. M. (1991) *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington).
- (1997) 'Oral Tradition and Its Implications', in I. Morris and B. Powell, edd., *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden) 146–73.
- (1999) *Homer's Traditional Art* (Philadelphia).
- Ford, A. (1997) 'The Inland Ship: Problems in the Performance and Reception of Homeric Epic', in E. J. Bakker and A. Kahane, edd., *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance and the Epic Text* (Washington) 83–109.
- Foster, E. (2012) 'Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background', in Foster–Lateiner 184–214.
- and D. Lateiner, edd. (2012) *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Fowler, D. (2000) *Roman Constructions* (Oxford).
- Goldhill, S. D. (2002) *The Invention of Prose* (G&R New Surveys in the Classics, no. 32; Oxford).
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer* (Cambridge).
- and J. Haubold (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).
- Greenwood, E. (2007) 'Bridging the Narrative (5.23–7)', in Irwin–Greenwood (2007) 128–45.
- Grethlein, J. (2006) 'The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: the Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153–63', *AJPh* 127: 485–509.
- (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- (2014) 'The Emergence of Herodotus', *Histos* 8: 1–24; first published as 'Die Ursprünge der Historien Herodots', in W. Ax, ed., *Memoria Rerum Veterum: Neue Beiträge zur antiken Historiographie und Alten Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1990) 51–82.
- Griffiths, A. (2006) 'Stories and Storytelling' in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 130–44.

- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Haubold, J. (2000) *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation* (Cambridge).
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hornblower, S. (1996) *A Commentary on Thucydides, vol. 2: Books IV–V.24* (Oxford).
- Howie, J. G. (1992) ‘Ἡ ἀριστεία ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμηροῦ ἕως τοῦ Ξενοφώντα’, *Parnassos* 34: 425–88.
- Hunter, R. (2004) ‘Homer and Greek Literature’, in R. L. Fowler, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge) 235–53.
- Irwin, E. (2007) ‘“What’s in a Name?” and Exploring the Comparable: Onomastics, Ethnography and *Kratos* in Thrace (5.1–2 and 3–10)’, in Irwin–Greenwood (2007) 41–87.
- and E. Greenwood, edd. (2007) *Reading Herodotus: a Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus’ Histories* (Cambridge).
- Isager, S. (1998) ‘The Pride of Halicarnassus: *Editio princeps* of an Inscription from Salmakis’, *ZPE* 123: 1–23.
- Kelly, A. D. (2015) ‘Stesichorus’ Homer’, in P. J. Finglass and A. D. Kelly, edd., *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge) 21–44.
- (2020) ‘With, or Without, Homer: Hearing the Background in Sappho’, in P. J. Finglass, A. Rengakos, and B. Zimmerman, edd., *More than Homer Knew: Studies on Homer and his Ancient Commentators in Honour of Franco Montanari* (Berlin) 269–92.
- Kirk, G. S. (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 2: Books 5–8* (Cambridge).
- Kurke, L. (2011) *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose* (Princeton).
- Lateiner, D. (2002) ‘The Style of Herodotus: a Case Study (7.229)’, *CW* 95: 363–71.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1994) ‘Vergil’s *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality: Catullus 66.39–40 and Other Examples’, *G&R* 41: 187–204.
- Marincola, J. (1987) ‘Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator’s Presence’, *Arethusa* 20: 121–37.
- (2006) ‘Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past’, in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 13–28.
- (2007) ‘Odysseus and the Historians’, *SyllClass* 18: 1–79; partially repr. in R. V. Munson, ed., *Herodotus, vol. 2: Herodotus and the World* (Oxford, 2013) 109–32.
- (2016) ‘The Historian as Hero: Herodotus and the 300 at Thermopylae’, *TAPhA* 146: 219–36.

- Morrison, J. V. (1999) 'Homeric Darkness: Patterns and Manipulation of Death Scenes in the *Iliad*', *Hermes* 127: 138–43.
- Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).
- Murnaghan, S. (2021) 'Homer', in C. Baron, ed., *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*, 3 vols (Hoboken, N. J.) II.702–3.
- Nagy, G. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore and London).
- (1989) 'Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry', in G. A. Kennedy, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 1: *Classical Criticism* (Cambridge) 1–77.
- Nelson, T. J. (2021) 'Repeating the Unrepeated: Allusions to Homeric *Hapax Legomena* in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry', in D. Beck, ed. *Repetition, Communication, and Meaning in the Ancient World* (Leiden) 119–57.
- (forthcoming) *Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Cambridge)
- Nicolai, R. and P. Vannicelli (2019) 'Il consiglio, il sogno, il catalogo: Iliade II, i Persiani di Eschilo, Erodoto VII', *SemRom* 26: 201–26.
- Paradiso, A (2002) 'Hdt. VII 229 φιλοψυχέοντα?', *QS* 28: 163–9.
- Pelling, C. (1997) 'East is East and West is West—or are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus', *Histos* 1: 51–66.
- (2006a) 'Homer and Herodotus', in M. I. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, edd., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2006b) 'Speech and Narrative', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 103–21.
- (2006c) 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian *Logos*', *ClAnt* 25: 141–77.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- (2020) 'Homer and the Question Why', in C. Constantakopoulou and M. Fragoulaki, edd., *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (*Histos* Supplement 11; Newcastle) 1–35.
- Rawles, R. (2018) *Simonides the Poet: Intertextuality and Reception* (Cambridge).
- Redfield, J. M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago).
- Rhodes, P. J. (1998) *Thucydides History IV.1–V.24* (Warminster).
- Rood, T. (1998) 'Thucydides and his Predecessors', *Histos* 2: 230–67.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in Foster–Lateiner (2012) 13–38.
- Smith, C. E. (1900) 'Traces of Epic Uses in Thucydides', *TAPhA* 31: 69–81.

- Smyth, H. W. (1956) *Greek Grammar*, revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Snell, B. (1953) *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought* (Oxford).
- Stadter, P. (2012) ‘Thucydides as “Reader” of Herodotus’, in Foster–Lateiner (2012) 39–66.
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg); repr. in id., *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, vol. 2 (Hildesheim and New York, 1982), 1057–97.
- Sullivan, S. D. (1988) ‘A Multi-Faceted Term: *Psychē* in Homer, the *Homeric Hymns*, and Hesiod’, *SIFC* 6: 151–80.
- van Thiel, H., ed. (2014) *Scholia D in Iliadem: Proecdosis Aucta et Correctior* (Cologne): <https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/5586/1/vanthiel.pdf>.
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- Tribulato, O. (2015) *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds: Their Diachronic Development Within the Greek Compound System* (Berlin).
- Tritle, L. (2006) ‘Warfare in Herodotus’, in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 209–23.
- Vannicelli, P. (2007) ‘To Each His Own: Simonides and Herodotus on Thermopylae’, in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford) II.315–21.
- (2018) ‘I nomi dei Trecento Spartiati alle Termopili’, in F. Camia, L. del Monaco, M. Nocita, edd., *Munus Letitiae: Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini* (Rome) 155–65.
- Warwick, C. (2019) ‘The Maternal Warrior: Gender and *Kleos* in the *Iliad*’, *AJPh* 140: 1–28.
- Wilson, N. G. (2015) *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus* (Oxford).

TRUTH, FICTION, AND AUTHORITY IN HERODOTUS' BOOK 8*

Giulia Donelli

This paper explores Herodotus' reception and exploitation of poetic frames of truth and fiction in Book 8 of the *Histories*.¹ Homeric influences operating on the level of diction, content, and narrative *topoi* have been identified repeatedly in the last four books of his oeuvre.² A convincing analogy has also been drawn in scholarship between Odysseus on the one hand, and both Herodotus³ and Themistocles⁴ on the other. It is within this broader framework that I seek to devote attention to a not yet fully explored case of poetic intertextuality found at the outset of Book 8. It is my hope to show that unravelling this case more explicitly will enrich our appreciation and understanding of Herodotus' narrative of the sea battles.

* I am grateful to the faculty and students at the VIU Advanced Seminar in the Humanities 2015–16 for their comments on an earlier version of this work, and especially to Willy Cingano and Giambattista D'Alessio for their guidance. I have profited greatly from the feedback I received on a much developed version of the paper at the Workshop 'Herodotus and Homer: A Reappraisal' held in Newcastle in 2019. My special thanks go to Ivan Matijašić for his generous help and advice. I also wish to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Histos* for their constructive criticism. The responsibility for all the arguments presented in the paper is solely my own.

¹ I follow scholarly convention and refer to the second Artemisium *logos* and the Salamis *logos* as Book 8, even though the subdivision of Herodotus' work in nine books is obviously not the author's (see, e.g., Hornblower (2013) 1–2). This account is after all a coherent narrative unit: see Herodotus' own words at Hdt. 7.139ff., and Asheri–Vannicelli (2003) 9–11.

² Cf., e.g., Brown (1983) 27; Masaracchia (1977) 9–10 and 12; Flower–Marincola (2002) 4f.; Irwin (2011) 397, 404 and 408; Marincola (2018).

³ Marincola (2007).

⁴ See, e.g., Asheri–Vannicelli (2003) 19; A. M. Bowie (2007) 144–5; Marincola (2006) 20, after Dewald (1985); Pelling, above, pp. 41, 51–2.

Early in the account of the second Artemisium *logos*, and of the Salamis *logos*, Herodotus refers to the feat of the diver Scyllias, who is said (λέγεται, 8.8.3) to have covered a distance of eighty stadia underwater when defecting from the Persian to the Greek side. Herodotus rejects the story as implausible, arguing that the diver in fact made use of a boat to cross the strait from Aphetae to Artemisium. In dismissing the story, he provides his own, prose version of a well-known poetic statement:⁵

λέγεται μὲν νυν καὶ ἄλλα ψευδέσι ἕκελα περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, τὰ δὲ μετεξέτερα ἀληθέα· περὶ μέντοι τούτου γνώμη μοι ἀποδεδέχθω πλοῖω μιν ἀπικέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ Ἄρτεμίσιον.

This is not the only implausible tale that is told about Scyllias (although there are some true stories too), but, as far as this incident is concerned, I hereby state that in my opinion he went to Artemisium by boat.⁶

Closely comparable though syntactically different lines are attested in Hesiodic, Homeric, and Theognidean poetry.⁷ In what follows, I propose to assess the relevance of this spectrum of tradition to Herodotus' version of the statement: what is the quality and extent of his legacy to poetic frames of truth and fiction?

I shall argue that although *prima facie* applied to a specific context, the statement could be interpreted as relevant to the ensuing narrative of Artemisium and Salamis more broadly. This narrative in fact addresses in a particularly pointed way the issues involved in getting to the truth: a remarkable series of episodes showcases deception, false or potentially ambiguous stories, ambivalent characters, and manipulation of visual and acoustic evidence.

The representation of sight and hearing as subject to manipulation, and thus unreliable tools for the interpretation of historical events, has implications for the epistemological grounds of Herodotus' own 'methodology', as

⁵ The adjective ἕκελος is poetic and rare in prose; for a discussion of words from the same semantic field in Herodotus see Zelnick-Abramovitz (2007) 64–7.

⁶ All translations are by Waterfield (1998).

⁷ Hes. *Th.* 27–8: ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, | ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι; Hom. *Od.* 19.203: ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα; Thgn. 713: οὐδ' εἰ ψεύδεα μὲν ποιῶς ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα. Cf. below, §4.

outlined elsewhere in the *Histories*: it amounts, potentially, to an implicit challenging of *ᾄψις* and *ἀκοή*. If set against the reshaping of this poetic statement, however, it could be interpreted as part of a broader rhetorical strategy, aimed at reinforcing Herodotus' authority and persuasiveness (*πιθανότης*),⁸ by making his *γνώμη* emerge as a most valuable principle to assess the truth of transmitted *logoi*.

In order to make this case, I start by surveying two programmatic passages, out of many scattered throughout the *Histories*, that exemplify the methodological framework of Herodotus' historical research. I then focus on the quality of the narrative of Artemisium and Salamis more specifically, and on the 'poetic' statement found at its outset. Since the line is attested in the poetry of both Hesiod and Homer, I review some of the passages where Herodotus engages openly with them. Finally, I explore the possible implications of this statement against the background of the preceding poetic and prose tradition, and its relevance to Book 8 more broadly.

i. Herodotus' 'Method': *ᾄψις*, *γνώμη*, *ἱστορίη*, and *ἀκοή*

Herodotus is notoriously an extremely intrusive narrator,⁹ who intervenes repeatedly with methodological remarks in different sections of his work. Although his historical method is not a consistent one, at least by modern standards, his references to his own activity of *ἱστορίη* still reveal a complex of analytical procedures.¹⁰

Besides the obvious case of the proem,¹¹ the Egyptian *logos* undoubtedly stands out for its richness in programmatic statements.¹² Within it Herodotus refers to his criteria of *ᾄψις*, *γνώμη*, *ἱστορίη* and *ἀκοή* (2.99.1):

⁸ On intertextuality as enhancing the persuasiveness of a narrative, see Pelling, above, p. 46

⁹ Dewald (1987). On 'meta-historiē' in Herodotus see Luraghi (2006).

¹⁰ Asheri (2005) xxxvii.

¹¹ On the nature of programmatic statements as 'first bids, ones that can be renounced as the work goes on', with special reference to the proem, see Pelling (2018) 199.

¹² Herodotus' authorial persona in the Egyptian *logos* is characterised by a strong polemical stance towards tradition and towards his predecessors: Homer, of course, but Hecataeus too, who in this *logos* is mentioned once (2.143.1–4), and only to be criticised (cf. Lloyd (1989) 21). Elsewhere, Hecataeus is portrayed in a much more positive light (5.36, 125–6; 6.137). See, e.g., Vannicelli (2001) 211 and Cartledge–Greenwood (2002) 354f. On Herodotus' 'loquacity in talking about his job' in Book 2, see Luraghi (2009) 443.

μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψις τε ἐμὴ καὶ γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσά ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον· προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψις.

So far my account of Egypt has been dictated by my own observation, judgement and investigation, but from now on I will be relating Egyptian accounts, supplemented by what I personally saw.

As seen by Lloyd, ὄψις here is highlighted as the principal source for the narrative up to this point,¹³ followed by γνώμη and ἱστορίη. The former is employed in contexts where Herodotus tries to establish the truthfulness of reported traditions on the grounds of data that he is able to assess,¹⁴ while ἱστορίη denotes the inquiries, the questions raised by the investigation of hearsay.¹⁵ An implication of the statement in 2.99.1 is therefore that, for the ensuing narrative, Herodotus' stance on the information gathered through ἀκοή will inevitably be more passive.¹⁶

An understanding of sight (ὄψις) as reinforcing the reliability of the narrative emerges elsewhere in the *Histories*, most obviously in Herodotus' emphatic references to the eyewitness quality (αὐτόπτης) of his own or his informants' account.¹⁷

In the exchange with Gyges in Book 1, Candaules contends that 'ears are less trustworthy than eyes' (1.8.2: ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἔοντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν).¹⁸ Indeed, the lesser trustworthiness of hearing also

¹³ See Lloyd (1989) xviii, after von Fritz (1967) 158. Lloyd *ibid.* quotes examples for how, within the Egyptian *logos*, ὄψις is often used to support Herodotus' arguments for accepting or rejecting traditions.

¹⁴ The employment of the 'technique' of γνώμη is often signalled by the occurrence of verbs like δοκέω: cf. Lloyd (1989) xviii and e.g. Hdt. 2.2; 2.43; 2.50–6.

¹⁵ See Lloyd (1989) xix; Nesselrath (2017) 183–4; and Nikolaiu-Arabatzi (2018) 224–8 for a recent analysis of ἱστορίη and ἱστορέειν.

¹⁶ Lloyd (1989) xix.

¹⁷ See esp. Hdt. 2.29, 131.1, with Nesselrath (2017) 192; 3.115; 4.16. On Herodotus' use of 'claims about the visibility of what he describes [...] to substantiate his arguments' and his use of terminology suggesting that for him 'the visual is associated with the acquisition of knowledge' see Harman (2018) 272, after Thomas (2000) 190–212, 221–8, 249–69. Similarly, Clay (2007) 236; Katz Anhalt (2008) 277. On autopsy in Greek historiography, see Nenci (1955) esp. 30–1 and Schepens (1980).

¹⁸ On the tale of Candaules and Gyges, see e.g. Katz Anhalt (2008); Nesselrath (2017) 185; A. M. Bowie (2018) 25–8; Harman (2018) 273–4, and Pelling, above, pp. 47–8. Contrast

finds other parallels in the oeuvre: Herodotus explicitly expresses scepticism against it on at least another occasion (2.123.1), and yet forcefully asserts his duty to preserve reported traditions. In a famous passage from Book 7 he maintains that if necessity coerces him to report 'what is said', it does not, however, bind him to believe it (7.152.3):¹⁹

ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασι
ὀφείλω (καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα τὸν λόγον).

I am obliged to record the things I am told, but I am certainly not required to believe them—this remark may be taken to apply to the whole of my account.

Herodotus seems here to distance himself from his own narrative when based on τὰ λεγόμενα. His γνώμη thus emerges, implicitly, as autonomous from transmitted traditions, and as a prominent tool of evaluation of the information gathered through ἀκοή.

And yet, it is not only the reliability of hearsay that can be challenged in the *Histories*: as I explore below, ὄψις too can be represented as subject to misinterpretation or distortion.²⁰

Therefore, although ὄψις, γνώμη, and ἱστορίη should ideally be combined to produce a most accurate account,²¹ as Herodotus states in 2.99.1, it is γνώμη, the autonomous assessment and interpretation of what is seen and heard, that emerges, implicitly, as the ultimate tool of evaluation of the information collected by the historian.

The importance of γνώμη comes to the fore at the beginning of Herodotus' narrative of Artemisium and Salamis, through a statement that, I propose to argue, has broader implications on the narrative than its immediate context of occurrence might suggest. A number of passages from this narrative in particular seem in fact to challenge and problematise ἀκοή, but also and especially ὄψις, as valuable principles for the interpretation of historical events.

Xerxes' statement at Hdt. 7.39: εὖ νυν τόδ' ἐξέπιστασο, ὡς ἐν τοῖσι ὡσὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἰκέει ὁ θυμός, κτλ.

¹⁹ On this passage, see most recently Pelling (2018) 203–5.

²⁰ See my survey of examples from Book 8 below and Nesselrath (2017) 194–5.

²¹ Nesselrath (2017) 184.

2. Problematising Truth in Book 8 of the *Histories*

The elusiveness and partiality of human knowledge are recurrent themes in the *Histories*, fundamental to Herodotus' construction of historical meaning throughout the oeuvre, and obviously at home in the context of a war narrative.

Yet Book 8 in particular is characterised by a searching approach to the problem of attaining historical truth. The narrative presents us with characters who, despite being eyewitnesses, are deceived in what they see (8.87–8); characters who do not trust the words of eyewitnesses who are in fact reporting the truth (8.79–82); or characters manipulating visual and acoustic evidence to their own advantage (8.24–5). Clandestine meetings instigated by Themistocles, held behind the backs of the rest of the Greeks, run through the *logos* like a *fil rouge* (8.4–5, 57–8, 75, 79–80, 110);²² different episodes of deception and stratagems are told (8.27–8); false or potentially ambiguous stories (8.54–5)²³ are recounted, to be sometimes rejected by Herodotus (8.118–20), sometimes left to the audience's judgement.

Herodotus' representation of characters engaged in investigations akin to his own activity of *ἱστορίη* is a matter that has of course already attracted scholarly attention. It has been observed how several kingly figures are portrayed in the narrative as inquirers who display linguistic, geographical, or ethnographical interests comparable to Herodotus' own,²⁴ and how some episodes, including two from Book 8 in particular (8.87 and 8.90), draw into focus reflections on 'the nature of historical recording and judgement'.²⁵ But beyond allowing Herodotus to thematise the issues involved in historiographical practice, several incidents in Book 8 seem in fact to undermine the grounds of two of his historiographical criteria, namely sight and hearing.

To begin with sight (*ὄψις*), it emerges as a deceptive tool for the anticipation and evaluation of historical events at the very outset of the narrative on Artemisium. In *seeing* the limited size of the Greek fleet in

²² A. M. Bowie (2007) 93.

²³ See A. M. Bowie (2007) 141 on the story of 'the new shoot from Athena's olive tree' as 'an instructive and ambiguous one'.

²⁴ Christ (1994).

²⁵ A. M. Bowie (2009) 174. See also Grethlein (2009).

comparison to the size of their own, the Persians assume that they shall win an easy victory (8.10.1):²⁶

ὄρέοντες δέ σφεας οἷ τε ἄλλοι στρατιῶται οἱ Ξέρξεω καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπιπλέοντας νηυσὶ ὀλίγησι, πάγχυ σφι μανίην ἐπενείκοντες ἀνήγον καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰς νέας, ἐλπίσαντές σφεας εὐπετέως αἰρήσειν, οἰκότα κάρτα ἐλπίσαντες, τὰς μὲν γε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄρέοντες ὀλίγας νέας, τὰς δὲ ἑωυτῶν πλήθει τε πολλαπλησίας καὶ ἄμεινον πλωούσας. καταφρονήσαντες ταῦτα ἐκυκλοῦντο αὐτοὺς ἐς μέσον.

When Xerxes' troops and their commanders **saw** the small number of Greeks ships bearing down on them, they were certain that the Greeks must have gone mad. They too put to sea, expecting an easy victory—not an unreasonable hope, since they could **see** that their ships far outnumbered the Greeks' and were more manoeuvrable too. And so they confidently set about encircling the Greek fleet.

The ensuing events, however, prove them wrong (8.15.1):

τρίτη δὲ ἡμέρη δεινόν τι ποιησάμενοι οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων νέας οὕτω σφι ὀλίγας λυμαινέσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ Ξέρξεω δειμαίνοντες οὐκ ἀνέμειναν ἔτι τοὺς Ἑλληνας μάχης ἄρξαι, ἀλλὰ παρασκευασάμενοι κατὰ μέσον ἡμέρης ἀνήγον τὰς νέας.

The Persian commanders were angry at the harm done them by such a small number of ships, and they were also afraid of how Xerxes would react, so on the third day they stopped waiting for the Greeks to initiate the fighting and instead, at midday, when their preparations were complete, they put to sea.

The Persians incorrectly interpret the visual evidence available to them in the here and now, and thus respond by making inappropriate practical decisions.

When it comes to reconstructing the 'truth' of past historical events, the Persians' ability to make sense of visual evidence proves equally inadequate: the account of their tour of the battlefield at Thermopylae, which follows shortly after in the narrative, also problematises *ὄψις*. The scene has been

²⁶ Cf. also Nesselrath (2017) 193.

aptly and yet quite unsuccessfully manipulated by Xerxes to make it such that the totality of casualties on the Persian side would not be seen by the sailors, and the Persian dead would thus appear to be far less numerous than the Greek ones (8.24.1):

ἐνθαῦτα δὲ τούτων ἐόντων, Ξέρξης ἐτοιμασάμενος τὰ περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἔπεμπε εἰς τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κήρυκα. προετοιμάσατο δὲ τάδε· ὅσοι τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἐωυτοῦ ἦσαν νεκροὶ ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι (ἦσαν δὲ καὶ δύο μυριάδες), ὑπολιπόμενος τούτων ὡς χιλίους, τοὺς λοιποὺς τάφρους ὀρυξάμενος ἔθαψε, φυλλάδα τε ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ γῆν ἐπαμησάμενος, **ἵνα μὴ ὀφθείησαν** ὑπὸ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατοῦ.

While they were there a man arrived with a message from Xerxes for the fleet. Now Xerxes had made some prior arrangements as regards the bodies of the men from his army who had died at Thermopylae. About twenty thousand men had fallen there, but he left about a thousand of the corpses and buried the rest in mass graves, which he covered with earth and leaves **to disguise them** from the fleet.

Indeed, the sailors do realise that the picture has been manipulated, but they are still wrong in assuming that the dead there lying are only Spartans and Thespians, while they are actually *looking* at helots too (8.25.1–2):

πάντες δὲ ἠπιστέατο τοὺς κειμένους εἶναι πάντας Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ Θεσπιάας, **ὀρέοντες** καὶ τοὺς εἴλωτας. οὐ μὲν οὐδ' ἐλάνθανε τοὺς διαβεβηκότας Ξέρξης ταῦτα πρήξας περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐωυτοῦ, κτλ.

Everyone was convinced that all the enemy corpses lying there were Lacedaemonians and Thespians, but in fact **they were also seeing** helots. None of the men who had come over from Euboea were taken in by Xerxes' ridiculous ploy with the bodies of his men, etc.

In the immediately ensuing story, narrated in flashback, ὄψις again proves untrustworthy as an epistemological tool for assessing the situation at hand and coping with it accordingly. The Thessalians react with horror *at the sight* of those who are in fact nothing but Phocians covered in chalk, and mistakenly assume that their enemy is some kind of a *τέρας* instead (8.27.4):

τούτους ὧν αἶ τε φυλακαὶ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν πρῶται ἰδοῦσαι ἐφοβήθησαν, δόξασαι ἀλλοῖόν τι εἶναι τέρας, κτλ.

First the Thessalian sentries and then the main army became terrified at **the sight of** the Phocians, and thought they were seeing something supernatural and ominous, etc.

The case of Artemisia's deeds in the course of the sea-battle at Salamis perhaps most pointedly thematises the deceptiveness and elusiveness of sight as a valuable tool for the interpretation of unfolding historical events. The scene is inserted in the wider context of Xerxes' *watching* (θεήσασθαι, 8.69 and 86) from a hill what he (mistakenly) anticipates will be a decisive victory at sea.²⁷ First, Artemisia's exploits are utterly misinterpreted, to her own advantage, by the captain of the Attic ship who is chasing her (8.87.2–4):

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐς θόρυβον πολλὸν ἀπίκετο τὰ βασιλέος πρήγματα, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἢ νηὺς ἢ Ἀρτεμισίης ἐδιώκετο ὑπὸ νεὸς Ἀττικῆς· καὶ ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσα διαφυγεῖν (ἔμπροσθε γὰρ αὐτῆς ἦσαν ἄλλαι νέες φίλιαι, ἢ δὲ αὐτῆς πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων μάλιστα ἐτύγχανε εὐουσα), ἔδοξέ οἱ τόδε ποιῆσαι, τὸ καὶ συνήνεικε ποιησάσῃ· διωκομένη γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς φέρουσα ἐνέβαλε νηὶ φιλίῃ ἀνδρῶν τε Καλυνδέων καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιπλέοντος τοῦ Καλυνδέων βασιλέος Δαμασιθύμου. [3] Εἰ μὲν <νυν> καὶ τι νεῖκος πρὸς αὐτόν <οἱ> ἐγεγόνεε ἔτι περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἑόντων, οὐ μέντοι <ἔγωγε> ἔχω γε εἰπεῖν, οὔτε εἰ ἐκ προνοίης αὐτὰ ἐποίησε, οὔτε εἰ συνεκύρησε ἢ τῶν Καλυνδέων κατὰ τύχην παραπεσοῦσα νηὺς. [4] ὡς δὲ ἐνέβαλέ τε καὶ κατέδυσε, εὐτυχίῃ χρησαμένη διπλὰ ἑωυτὴν ἀγαθὰ ἐργάσατο· ὅ τε γὰρ τῆς Ἀττικῆς νεὸς τριήραρχος ὡς εἶδέ μιν ἐμβάλλουσαν νηὶ ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων, νομίσας τὴν νέα τὴν Ἀρτεμισίης ἢ Ἑλληνίδα εἶναι ἢ αὐτομολέειν ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ αὐτοῖσι ἀμύνειν, ἀποστρέψας πρὸς ἄλλας ἐτράπετο.

It so happened that in the midst of the general confusion of the Persian fleet, Artemisia's ship was being chased by one from Attica. She found it impossible to escape, because the way ahead was blocked by friendly ships, and hostile ships were particularly close to hers, so she decided on

²⁷ On the 'theatricality' of this scene, see Katz Anhalt (2008) 272–3. Harman (2018) 276 remarks on the 'self-important way in which Xerxes views', which contributes to the 'ironic punch of the narrative'. On Xerxes' role as spectator in other scenes of the *Histories*, see Harman (2018) 277 n. 19.

a plan which in fact did her a lot of good. With the Attic ship close astern, she bore down on and rammed one of the ships from her own side, which was crewed by men from Calynda and had on board Damasithymus, the king of Calynda. Now, I cannot say whether she and Damasithymus had fallen out while they were based at the Hellespont, or whether this action of hers was premeditated, or whether the Calyndian ship just happened to be in the way at the time. In any case, she found that by ramming it and sinking it she created for herself a double piece of good fortune. In the first place, when the captain of the Attic ship **saw** her ramming an enemy vessel, he assumed that Artemisia's ship was either Greek, or was a defector from the Persians fighting on his side, so he changed course and turned to attack the other ships.

Then, the Persian king's entourage, and in fact Xerxes himself, equally mistakenly construe Artemisia's deeds (8.88.2):²⁸

λέγεται γὰρ βασιλέα **θηεύμενον** μαθεῖν τὴν νέα ἐμβάλλουσαν, καὶ δὴ τινα εἰπεῖν τῶν παρεόντων· “Δέσποτα, **ὄρα**ς Ἀρτεμισίην ὡς εὖ ἀγωνίζεται καὶ νέα τῶν πολεμίων κατέδυσε;” καὶ τὸν ἐπειρέσθαι εἰ ἀληθέως ἐστὶ Ἀρτεμισίης τὸ ἔργον, καὶ τοὺς φάναι, σαφέως τὸ ἐπίσημον τῆς νεὸς ἐπισταμένους· τὴν δὲ διαφθαρεῖσαν ἠπιστέατο εἶναι πολεμίην.

It is reported that as Xerxes was watching the battle he **noticed** her ship ramming the other vessel, and one of his entourage said, ‘Master, **can you see** how well Artemisia is fighting? Look, she has sunk an enemy ship!’ Xerxes asked if it was really Artemisia, and they confirmed it was, because they could recognize the insignia on her ship, and therefore assumed that the ship she had destroyed was one of the enemy's.

Visual evidence is thus repeatedly represented as deceptive, or easy to distort, in the narrative of Book 8.²⁹

To a lesser extent, the reliability of *ἀκοή* is also implicitly challenged in episodes that involve the manipulation or misinterpretation of what is heard or reported. A relevant incident comes in Themistocles' appropriation of

²⁸ On how in this context ‘Xerxes’ failure to get the facts straight throws into relief the accuracy of Herodotus’ account’ see Grethlein (2009) 208–9.

²⁹ For other examples of distortion of visual evidence in the *Histories* see Nesselrath (2017) 194–5.

what were in fact Mnesiphilus' thoughts and words to persuade Eurybiades not to sail away from Salamis (8.58.2):³⁰

ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς παριζόμενος οἱ καταλέγει ἐκεῖνά τε πάντα τὰ ἤκουσε Μνησιφίλου, ἑωυτοῦ ποιούμενος, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ προστιθείς.

So Themistocles sat down and **recounted Mnesiphilus' arguments as if they were his own**, and added some new points as well.³¹

Indeed, it is not factual truth that is at stake here: Mnesiphilus' words are nothing but a warning about (however likely) *potential* outcomes. Yet emphasis is placed on how easily and deliberately Themistocles plagiarises what he has in fact heard from someone else (πάντα τὰ ἤκουσε Μνησιφίλου, ἑωυτοῦ ποιούμενος), manipulating it to his own advantage.

His exchange with Aristides in 8.79–83 then contextually challenges the reliability of both ἀκοή and ὄψις. Aristides comes as an eyewitness (αὐτόπτης) to inform Themistocles that the Greeks are being surrounded by the Persians (8.79.4):

‘ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτόπτης τοι λέγω γενόμενος ὅτι νῦν οὐδ’ ἦν θέλωσι Κορίνθιοί τε καὶ αὐτὸς Εὐρυβιάδης οἰοί τε ἔσσονται ἐκπλῶσαι· περιεχόμεθα γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων κύκλω. ἀλλ’ ἐσελθὼν σφι ταῦτα σήμερον.’

‘I can assure you of that, because **I’ve seen the reason for myself**. Neither the Corinthians nor Eurybiades will be able to sail away from here, because we are surrounded by the enemy. You’d better go back into the meeting and tell them the news.’

Themistocles, aware that the rest of the Greeks would not trust him, encourages Aristides to report the news himself (8.80). The Greeks, however, still refuse to believe the news, even though they come from an actual eyewitness (8.81):

ταῦτα ἔλεγε παρελθὼν ὁ Ἀριστείδης, φάμενος ἐξ Αἰγίνης τε ἤκειν καὶ μόγισ διεκπλῶσαι λαθὼν τοὺς ἐπορμόντας· περιέχεσθαι γὰρ πᾶν τὸ

³⁰ See A. M. Bowie (2007) 144–5 for an understanding of this scene as entertaining ‘an intratextual relation with the assembly in *Iliad* 2’, and Pelling, above, pp. 51–2.

³¹ Translation adapted from Waterfield (1998).

στρατόπεδον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν τῶν Ξέρξεω παραρτέεσθαι τε συνεβούλευε ὡς ἀλεξήσομένους. καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἶπας μετεστήκεε, τῶν δὲ αὐτῆς ἐγένετο λόγων ἀμφισβασίη· οἱ γὰρ πλείονες τῶν στρατηγῶν οὐκ ἐπίθοντο τὰ ἔσαγγελθέντα.

So Aristides went in to the Greek commanders. He told them that the Greek navy was entirely surrounded by Xerxes' fleet—so much that **on his way from Aegina** he had only just managed to slip past the enemy blockade—and he advised them to get ready to face an attack. Afterwards, he left the meeting. Then the arguments began all over again, because most of the commanders **did not believe the news**.

Ultimately, they are persuaded only by the arrival of a ship bringing 'the whole truth' (8.82.1).

ἀπιστεόντων δὲ τούτων ἦκε τριήρης ἀνδρῶν Τηνίων αὐτομολέουσα ... ἣ περ δὴ ἔφερε τὴν ἀληθείην πᾶσαν.

Just then, **while they were still inclined to disbelieve** Aristides' report, a crew of Tenian deserters [...] brought their trireme into Salamis. They were able to give the Greeks **a complete and accurate account** of the situation.

The representation of characters either utterly misled by sight and hearing in their interpretation of the unfolding historical events, or unwilling to trust the sight and hearing of others, problematises two of the grounds upon which Herodotus constructs the authority of his account throughout the *Histories*.

The characterisation of some prominent figures as conspicuously ambiguous also contributes to the conjuring of an atmosphere of deception and ambivalence. Themistocles is of course bribed as much as he bribes (8.5), and acts 'with a view to two results' (8.22.3: ἐπ' ἀμφότερα νοέων). Artemisia, as seen above, kills two birds with one stone in the course of the sea-battle (8.87.4: εὐτυχίῃ χρησαμένη διπλὰ ἑωυτὴν ἀγαθὰ ἐργάσατο). The speech that Alexander of Macedon delivers to the Athenians is a spiralling masterpiece of double-talk rhetoric (8.140).³²

³² On the complexity and ambiguity of Alexander, see Vannicelli (2013) 68.

Herodotus' narrative almost subliminally elicits a rejection of the senses as valuable epistemological tools by representing their ineffectiveness in the context of historical events. While some single, outstanding characters take advantage of such a state of things, almost everyone else in the narrative is more or less helpless in the face of the partiality of human perception. Not Herodotus, of course: it is precisely his status as authoritative narrator that enables him to represent and highlight such helplessness in the first place.³³

In what follows, I shall suggest that Herodotus' reworking of a poetic statement that thematises the distinction between lies and truth is aimed at enhancing his authorial authority at the outset of Book 8. Such enhancement might in fact be all the more needed at this specific point in the narrative: for not only does Herodotus' account of Artemisium and Salamis draw attention to the difficulties involved in attaining the truth, but this account itself was arguably only one of many competing accounts claiming to represent truthfully recent historical events.

3. Hesiod and Homer in the *Histories*

As mentioned above, Herodotus' statement in 8.8.3 finds parallels in the poetry of Hesiod, Homer, and Theognis. The former two are explicitly named in the *Histories*: a short detour into these explicit references can shed light on Herodotus' stance towards them, and provide a background to his reshaping of the line attested in the output of both.

Hesiod is introduced only twice, always in association with Homer. On the first occasion, Herodotus remarks on their role in the making of the Greek *theogoniē* (2.53.2):

ἔνθεν δὲ ἐγένετο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε δὴ αἰεὶ ἦσαν πάντες, ὁκοῖοί τε
τινες τὰ εἶδεα, οὐκ ἠπιστέατο μέχρι οὗ πρώην τε καὶ χθὲς ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ.
Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὅμηρον ἠλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μέο
πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες
θεογονίην Ἑλλήσι καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμὰς τε καὶ

³³ See Thomas (2018) 267 on how 'the false stories connected with the Persian Wars which Herodotus tells in order to refute them make it intriguingly clear that Herodotus was alert to "false stories" about any period, showing his judgement as an impartial historian and narrator'. On how some Herodotean tales thematise 'the unreliability of visual perception' and thereby 'address a tension in Herodotus' own methodology between the use of visual evidence to corroborate historiographical assertions and the difficulty of interpreting such evidence correctly', see Katz Anhalt (2008) 277.

τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἶδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες. οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γενέσθαι ὕστερον, ἔμοιγε δοκέειν, ἐγένοντο.

However, it was only yesterday or the day before, so to speak, that the Greeks came to know the provenance of each of the gods, and whether they have all existed for ever, and what they each look like. After all, I think that Hesiod and Homer lived no more than four hundred years before my time, and they were the ones who created the gods' family trees for the Greek world, gave them their names, assigned them their honours and areas of expertise, and told us what they looked like. Any poets who are supposed to have lived before Homer and Hesiod actually came after them, in my opinion. Of the last two opinions, the first is the view of the priestesses at Dodona, but the second—the bit about Hesiod and Homer—is my own opinion.

The poets are here held up as founding authorities for the Greeks' beliefs.³⁴ In emphasising how recent Greek religious traditions are in comparison to Egyptian ones, Herodotus takes the opportunity to express his opinion on Hesiod's and Homer's chronology. His dating can be seen as bearing a programmatic value: by placing Homer 'midway' between the Trojan War and his own time, Herodotus seems to undertake 'a careful balancing act between distance and appropriation'.³⁵ Homer is the closest extant source to the heroic past,³⁶ but still not so close to it as to be taken as fully reliable.

When naming both poets again in Book 4, Herodotus comments on their references to the Hyperboreans (4.32.1):

Ἵπερβορέων δὲ πέρι ἀνθρώπων οὔτε τι Σκύθαι λέγουσι οὐδὲν οὔτε τινὲς ἄλλοι τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων, εἰ μὴ ἄρα Ἴσσηδόνες. ὡς δ' ἐγὼ δοκέω, οὐδ' οὗτοι λέγουσι οὐδέν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ἂν καὶ Σκύθαι, ὡς περὶ τῶν μουνοφθάλμων λέγουσι. ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδω μὲν ἐστὶ περὶ Ἵπερβορέων

³⁴ Cf., for Homer, Hdt. 2.116–20, discussed by Haywood, above, pp. 62–72. See Nagy (1990) 215 on Hdt. 2.53.2; and most recently Currie (2021) 47–56.

³⁵ Graziosi (2002) 117–18.

³⁶ Similarly, Kim (2010) 23 on Thucydides' remarks on the dating of Homer (cf. 1.3.3: τεκμηριοὶ δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος· πολλῶν γὰρ ὕστερον ἔτι καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν γενόμενος κτλ.), less precise than Herodotus' and yet more explicitly programmatic.

εἰρημμένα, ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ὀμήρω ἐν Ἐπιγόνουσι, εἰ δὴ τῷ ἔόντι γε Ὀμηρος ταῦτα τὰ ἔπεα ἐποίησε.

None of the tribes living there, including the Scythians, have anything to say about the Hyperboreans. Perhaps the Issedones do, but I do not think so, because if they did the Scythians would have stories about them too, just as they do about the one-eyed people. Hesiod, however, has mentioned the Hyperboreans, and so has Homer in the *Epigoni* (if indeed Homer really is the author of this poem).

Here Herodotus is drawing a contrast between what the poets maintain and what can be inferred through investigation: this passage can therefore be seen as also bearing programmatic implications, in as much as a difference in terms of methodology between the poets and the historiographer emerges.

Homer is mentioned independently too: on occasion, he figures (not unambiguously) as an authoritative model (2.113–20) and source (4.29) for the historiographer or for characters in his narrative (7.161.3).³⁷ Elsewhere, and more interestingly for my present purposes, references to his authority can spark discussions on matters of literary criticism.³⁸ These occur either in the form of remarks concerning the generic difference standing between Herodotus' own work and method and the Homeric epic tradition (2.23, 113–20), or in the form of authorship discussions (2.113–20 and 4.32, quoted above).

Two references to Homer in particular seem to have implications on a programmatic and methodological level.³⁹ When dealing with the flooding of the Nile,⁴⁰ Herodotus briefly touches on the river Ocean, dismissing it as

³⁷ Cf. Matijašić, above, p. 10; Pelling, above, pp. 48–9; Haywood, above, p. 76.

³⁸ On evidence for the emergence of literary criticism in Herodotus, see Grintser (2019) and most recently Currie (2021).

³⁹ I do not address here the issue of Herodotus' reference to Ὀμήρεια ἔπεα in Hdt. 5.67: see Cingano (1985) for discussion and more recently (and briefly) Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015) 11–2. Cf. Matijašić, above, p. 7.

⁴⁰ See Lloyd (1989) *ad loc.* for this theory being 'that of Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1 F 302) ... who may have owed something to Euthymenes of Massilia (*FGrHist* 645 F 1(5))'; on Herodotus' rejection of a 'conception of the Oceanus ... based on an older, cosmologically grounded worldview' see Bichler (2018) 140; on how this discussion is 'impressive in its logic even if it reaches the wrong conclusion' see Pelling (2018) 203.

non-existent and attributing the invention of its name and its introduction into poetry ‘to Homer or some older poet’ (2.23):⁴¹

ὁ δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ λέξας ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνερείκας οὐκ ἔχει
ἔλεγχον· οὐ γάρ τινα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὀκεανὸν ἑόντα, Ὅμηρον δὲ ἢ
τινα τῶν πρότερον γενομένων ποιητέων δοκέω τοῦνομα εὐρόντα ἐς ποίησιν
ἔσεινείκασθαι.

It is impossible to argue against the person who spoke about the Ocean, because the tale is based on something which is obscure and dubious. I do not know of the existence of any River Ocean, and I think that Homer or one of the other poets from past times invented the name and introduced it into his poetry.

Herodotus’ intended targets here are, arguably, prose competitors in the first place:⁴² he polemicalises against the idea of making use of the river Ocean, a poetic invention, to explain something about the real world. Yet Homer too is implicitly targeted, for his poetic invention is set against Herodotus’ own method, obviously to the advantage of the latter.⁴³ The contrast drawn between the level of Herodotus’ own, ‘sure knowledge’ (ἔγωγε οἶδα), and what must remain ἀφανές,⁴⁴ and the statement that it is impossible to prove or disprove (οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον) one who relies on ‘data’ extrapolated from Homeric poetry, point to the marking of a generic difference between Herodotus and Homer.

A comparable difference on the methodological and generic level then emerges in the long excursus on Helen’s stay in Egypt during the Trojan War (2.113–20),⁴⁵ where Herodotus famously reports a version of the ‘Helen Story’ different from that of the *Iliad*.⁴⁶ He presents it as the result of his own

⁴¹ Lloyd (2010) 251 quotes, as *comparanda* to this kind of sceptical expressions, Solon fr. 29 W² (πολλὰ ψεύδονται αἰδοί) and Pind. *Ol.* 1.28–9: ἦ θαύματα πολλά, καὶ πού τι καὶ βροτῶν φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις | ἔξαπατῶντι μῦθοι.

⁴² On Herodotus’ criticism of Ionian geographers see also Hdt. 4.8 and 4.36, with Corcella (2001) 253 and 262–3. In Hdt. 3.115, Herodotus speaks of the river Eridanus as some poet’s invention, cf. Verdin (1977) 62.

⁴³ E.g. Verdin (1977) 62; Grethlein (2010) 156.

⁴⁴ Marcozzi–Sinatra–Vannicelli (1994) 164 n. 5.

⁴⁵ Kim (2010) 30. See de Jong (2012) for a narratological analysis of this set of passages.

⁴⁶ See my discussion in Donelli (2016) 12–8.

activity of *ἱστορίη*, and as more authoritative and reliable than the Homeric one on the grounds of the authority and the antiquity of the informants (Egyptian priests who claim as their source the eyewitness Menelaus),⁴⁷ and the implausibility of the canonical Homeric narrative (2.120.2–4), which is questioned on the basis of a detailed argument from probability.⁴⁸

Besides questioning Homer's reliability and presenting his own version of the events as, precisely, methodologically and historically more reliable, however, Herodotus contextually defends the poet. He claims that Homer actually knew the 'true' version of the story but decided to stick to his epic poetic purposes;⁴⁹ Herodotus thereby builds his argument on a striking acknowledgement of the different degrees of 'suitability' of a story to a given literary genre, according to a criterion that was later to become fundamental in literary criticism.⁵⁰

When engaging explicitly with Hesiod, and, especially, Homer, Herodotus appears therefore to be engaging in methodological and programmatic matters; it is against this background that I shall analyse Homeric and Hesiodic intertextuality in 8.8.3.

4. Poetic (and Prose) Intertextuality

I turn now to a more detailed analysis of the poetic occurrences of the statement echoed by Herodotus in 8.8.3.

In the *Odyssey*, the line figures in the context of Odysseus' meeting with Penelope in Book 19,⁵¹ in the form of a narrator's comment on Odysseus' 'Cretan lies' (19.203):

ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα.

⁴⁷ Kim (2010) 32.

⁴⁸ Cf. Kim (2010) 32. See Nicolai (2012) esp. 637–8, for a comparison between Herodotus' arguments and oratorical techniques in the *argumentatio*.

⁴⁹ Pindar too emphasises Homer's ability to distort the truth, e.g. *Nem.* 7.20ff.

⁵⁰ Cf., e.g., Verdin (1977) 61; Boedeker (2000) 105; Graziosi (2002) 113–18; Grintser (2018) 161–6. On generic 'suitability' or 'appropriateness' see Ford (2002) 13–22; on the Latin equivalent of τὸ πρέπον, i.e., *decorum*, in ancient literary criticism, especially Horace's *Ars Poetica*, see, e.g., Russell (2006). For a different interpretation of the meaning of εὐπρεπής in Hdt. 2.116.1, see Currie (2021) 15–20.

⁵¹ On how Odysseus' encounter with Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.124–7) foreshadows this meeting, see Buongiovanni (2011) 9–15.

Thus he made the many falsehoods of his tale seem like the truth.⁵²

The linguistic and syntactical interpretation of this line is problematic, and has been sparking scholarly debate since antiquity.⁵³ Notwithstanding these difficulties, the authorial stance displayed here bears comparison to Herodotus' own at the outset of Book 8: just as in the *Odyssey* the narrator alerts the audience to the deliberate falsehood of the stories told by one of his characters to another,⁵⁴ so does Herodotus highlight for his audience the falsehood of some of the stories circulating about Scyllias (8.8.3). Homeric intertextuality thus increases the persuasiveness and immediacy of his authorial stance by summoning up an earlier, authoritative authorial stance.⁵⁵ As seen above, Herodotus' explicit references to Homer can, on occasion, be programmatic in nature. More implicit Homeric echoes can also indeed occur in emphatically programmatic contexts, for one, the proem to the *Histories* (1.5.3–4), which is famously reminiscent of the proem to the *Odyssey* (1.3–4).⁵⁶ Homeric intertextuality in 8.8.3 might thus support

⁵² Translation by A. T. Murray (1919).

⁵³ In particular, the meaning of ἴσκει has been the object of discussion since antiquity (Russo (1985) 236): the verb is understood either as equivalent to εἴκαζε, ὁμοίου, or as equivalent to ἔλεγε. The verb occurs in the latter meaning in Hellenistic poetry, though this use might in fact reflect a mistaken reading of *Od.* 22.31 (Russo (1985) 237. West (1966) 163 compares Hom. *Od.* 19.203 and Hes. *Th.* 27, finding the former 'the less satisfactory of the two as Greek, and the less firmly integrated in its context', since 'if ἴσκει is meant in the proper sense 'assimilate', then ὁμοῖα is superfluous, and if it bears the secondary sense 'speak', then λέγων is superfluous'. More recent commentators (e.g., Russo (1985) 236–7; Rutherford (1992) 165–6 take ἴσκει as a form from εἴσκω, 'to make like' (LSJ s.v. εἴσκω), on the grounds of its other occurrences in Homeric poetry (*Il.* 11.799; 16.41; *Od.* 4.279; 22.31).

⁵⁴ E.g. Buongiovanni (2011) 11; Rutherford (1992) 165, who remarks on how 'the hero's persuasive falsehoods associate him with the art of the poet'.

⁵⁵ Pelling, above, p. 41.

⁵⁶ Interestingly, an echo from the proem to the *Odyssey* (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, | πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν) occurs in Book 19 too, some thirty lines before the narrator's comment on Odysseus' Cretan lies analysed here (19.170). The shared context of occurrence, in Book 19 of the *Odyssey*, of lines echoed by Herodotus in 1.5.3–4 and 8.8.3 respectively, might suggest the programmatic nature of the latter statement. When explicitly taking issue with Homer in a passage that is sometimes (in my opinion, unnecessarily) considered spurious (2.116–17), Herodotus can surely refer to sections from a same book of the *Odyssey* (4.227–30 and 351–2) that, at least in our version of the poem, are separated by a larger number of intervening lines (124) than is the case here. However, the question remains how many readers or listeners, if any, would have managed

the case for an understanding of this authorial statement as also bearing implications on a methodological level for the ensuing narrative, beyond its specific context of occurrence.

In Hesiodic poetry, the line is uttered by the Muses in the proem to the *Theogony* (22–8):⁵⁷

αἶ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδὴν,
 ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο.
 τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον,
 Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο·
 'ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
 ἴδμεν ψεῦδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
 ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρῦσασθαι'.

One time, they taught Hesiod beautiful song
 while he was pasturing lambs under holy Helicon.
 And this speech the goddesses spoke first of all to me,
 the Olympian Muses, the daughters of aegis-holding Zeus:
 'Field-dwelling shepherds, ignoble disgraces, mere bellies:
 we know how to say many false things similar to genuine ones,
 but we know, when we wish, how to proclaim true things'.⁵⁸

The interpretation of this passage is much debated in scholarship, though general consensus has it that Hesiod is here contrasting epic 'falsehoods'⁵⁹ to his poetry, presented as inspired by the Muses.⁶⁰ In the immediately following lines (29–34), Hesiod receives from them a sceptre, a 'divine voice'

to realise this. For arguments in support of the authenticity of Hdt. 2.116–17, see most recently Currie (2021) 10–13.

⁵⁷ We might recall here that Hesiod is on one occasion (2.53.2) mentioned in the *Histories* precisely for his role in the making of the Greeks' 'theogony', cf. above, §3.

⁵⁸ Translation by Most (2018).

⁵⁹ These epic 'falsehoods' have been understood in scholarship either in general terms (e.g., Rutherford (1992) 165; P. Murray (1981) 91, or specifically as *Od.* 19.203 (e.g., Bertelli (2001) 80; Arrighetti (2006) 7–11; Buongiovanni (2011), esp. 14–5, who further connects both passages with *Od.* 14.124–7, cf. above, n. 40). For a detailed discussion see Pucci (2007) 60–9 and (2009) 42–3; Tsagalis (2009) 133–5; Ricciardelli (2018) 106–8, with further bibliography.

⁶⁰ Note, with P. Murray (1981) 91, that while Hesiod's Muses contrast true to false knowledge, the Homeric Muses grant knowledge as opposed to ignorance.

(*αὐδὴν θέσπιν*), and instructions to sing of the future, the past, and the eternal gods.⁶¹

The goddesses play a comparable epistemological role in Homeric poetry (*Il.* 2.485–486):

*ὕμεις γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν·*

for you are goddesses and are present and know all things,
but we hear only a rumour and know nothing.⁶²

The decisive line here runs between *ἀκοή* and *ᾄψις*,⁶³ with knowledge attaching unproblematically to the latter. For Herodotus, instead, both criteria are compromised, and the Muses' prerogative in vouching for the truth shifts emphatically to his own *γνώμη* (8.8.3):⁶⁴

*λέγεται μὲν νυν καὶ ἄλλα ψευδέσι ἴκελα περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, τὰ δὲ
μετεξέτερα ἀληθέα· περὶ μέντοι τούτου γνώμη μοι ἀποδεδέχθω πλοῖω μιν
ἀπικέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ Ἄρτεμισιον.*

This is not the only implausible tale that is told about Scyllias (although there are some true stories too), but, as far as this incident is concerned, I hereby state that in my opinion he went to Artemisium by boat.

While Hesiod's Muses declare their ability to say plausible things in addition to true things,⁶⁵ Herodotus remarks on the implausibility of the stories circulating about Scyllias: his formulation provides the 'converse of the

⁶¹ For an interpretation of this description of the Muses' tasks as representing 'the combined role of poetry and historiography' see Zelnick-Abramovitz (2007) 58.

⁶² Translation by A. T. Murray (1925).

⁶³ Graziosi-Haubold (2005) 44ff. and (2010) 1–8.

⁶⁴ Cf. Masaracchia (1977) 161.

⁶⁵ On *ἐπίμοισιν ὁμοῖα* as meaning 'plausible', see West (1966) 163. Ricciardelli (2018) 108, after Krisher (1965) 163 and 166ff. and Rudhardt (1996) 29–31, understands *ἔτυμος* as indicating a fact that has actually happened, and *ἀληθής* as etymologically indicating a fact that is true because unforgotten, actually happened and transmitted. *Contra* Tsagalis (2009) 133ff., who understands *ἔτυμα* as truths that pertain to the real world, and *ἀληθέα* as eternal truths: he finds support for this hypothesis in the different verbs governing the accusatives, i.e., *λέγειν* and *γηρύσασθαι*.

Hesiodic sense'.⁶⁶ 'Converse' Hesiodic intertextuality enables him to appropriate the poetic statement and to claim for his *γνώμη* the epistemological authority to discern historical truth from falsehood. This stance, I suggest, is called for by the challenge to the epistemological reliability of *ᾄσις* and *ἀκοή* 'staged' within the narrative of the sea battles.

In Theognis' poetry, the statement occurs in a set of lines that is syntactically problematic (699–718):

πλήθει δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀρετὴ μία γίνεται ἥδε,
 πλουτεῖν τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐδὲν ἄρ' ἦν ὄφελος, 700
 οὐδ' εἰ σωφροσύνην μὲν ἔχουσ' Ῥαδαμάνθυος αὐτοῦ,
 πλείονα δ' εἰδείης Σισύφου Αἰολίδεω,
 ὅσπερ καὶ ἐξ Αἰδέω πολυϋδρίησιν ἀνήλθεν
 πείσας Περσεφόνην αἰμυλλίοισι λόγοις,
 ἥτε βροτοῖς παρέχει λήθην βλάπτουσα νόοιο— 705
 ἄλλος δ' οὐπω τις τοῦτο γ' ἐπεφράσατο,
 ὄντινα δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφικαλύψῃ,
 ἔλθῃ δ' ἐς σκιερὸν χῶρον ἀποφθιμένων,
 κυανέας τε πύλας παραμείψεται, αἵτε θανόντων
 ψυχὰς εἴργουσιν καίπερ ἀναινομένας· 710
 ἀλλ' ἄρα κάκειθεν πάλιν ἦλυθε Σίσυφος ἥρωσ
 ἐς φάος ἡελίου σφῆσι πολυφροσύναις—
 οὐδ' εἰ ψεύδεα μὲν ποιοῖς ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
 γλώσσαν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν Νέστορος ἀντιθέου,
 ὠκύτερος δ' εἴησθα πόδας ταχεῶν Ἀρπυιῶν 715
 καὶ παίδων Βορέω, τῶν ἄφαρ εἰσὶ πόδες.
 ἀλλὰ χρὴ πάντας γνώμην ταύτην καταθέσθαι,
 ὡς πλοῦτος πλείστην πᾶσιν ἔχει δύναμιν.

For the majority of people this alone is best: wealth. Nothing else after all is of use, not even if you have the good judgement of Rhadamanthys himself or know more than Sisyphus, son of Aeolus, who by his wits came up even from Hades, after persuading with wily words Persephone who impairs the mind of mortals and brings them forgetfulness. No one else has ever yet contrived this, once death's dark cloud has enveloped him and he has come to the shadowy place of the dead and passed the black gates which hold back the souls of the dead, for all their protestations. But

⁶⁶ West (1966) 163.

even from there the hero Sisyphus returned to the light of the sun by his cleverness. (Nothing else is of use), not even if you compose lies that are like the truth, with the eloquent tongue of godlike Nestor, and were faster of foot than the swift Harpies and the fleet-footed sons of Boreas. No, everyone should store up this thought, that for all people wealth has the greatest power.⁶⁷

As observed by Ferrari, the ‘*ductus*’⁶⁸ of the passage, modelled on Tyrtaeus’ fr. 12 W², and characterised by *οὐδ’ εἰ* in anaphora, is first expanded in two relative clauses (703–5), then brought back to Sisyphus via *ἀλλά* (711), then eventually abruptly resumed (*οὐδ’ εἰ* 713), with no apparent logical or syntactical continuity between lines 712 and 713. Ferrari understands these syntactical difficulties as more likely related to the extemporaneous nature of the poetry⁶⁹ than to interpolation.

If this interpretation is accepted, the broader context of the occurrence of the line strongly suggests its intertextual relevance to Herodotus’ version of the statement. For in the *Histories*, the story of the diver Scyllias happens to be framed by a series of episodes of bribery and corruption (8.4–5) that corroborate the very *γνώμη* Theognis advises everyone to store up (717–18): that the only drive to human action is, in fact, money.

Indeed, different listeners or readers pick up different intertextualities, beyond the author’s control:⁷⁰ yet each of these poetic antecedents involves authorial self-references that draw attention to the author’s privileged access to, or knowledge of, truth as opposed to falsehood.

This poetic line had already been adopted in a prose programmatic context: the proem to Hecataeus’ *Genealogies* (fr. 1 Fowler) has been

⁶⁷ Translation by Gerber (1999).

⁶⁸ Ferrari (1989) 190 n. 4; see also *ibid.* 191 n. 10, and Henderson (1983) on the long digression on Sisyphus (lines 702–12).

⁶⁹ Ferrari (1989) 190 n. 4 quotes as a *comparandum* Achilles’ reply to Odysseus in *Il.* 9.379ff., which presents a similar structure, with *οὐδ’ εἰ* in anaphora, and similar digressions expanding on the main train of thought. On Theognis’ lines, see also Colesanti (2011) 21 n. 61.

⁷⁰ Pelling, above, pp. 44–5.

convincingly interpreted⁷¹ as 'interfering' both with Homeric poetry (*Il.* 7.76),⁷² and with the same passage from the *Theogony* seen above:

Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν.

Hecataeus the Milesian speaks as follows: I write down these things as they seem to me to be true, for the tales of the Greeks are many and ridiculous, as they seem to me.⁷³

Unlike Hesiod, however, Hecataeus relies on 'no external authority'⁷⁴ to support the truthfulness of his claims: as Fowler remarks, the Muses of Homer and Hesiod 'have been replaced by the personal opinion of the writer'.⁷⁵ They seem indeed to have met a comparable fate in Herodotus' *Histories* too. Just as Hecataeus targets the unreliability of the *logoi* of the Greeks, so Herodotus expresses scepticism towards what is reported about Scyllias (*λέγεται*), thereby challenging the reliability of *ἀκοή*. Just as Hecataeus places emphasis 'on the relation between opinion (*δοκεῖ*) and truth (*ἀληθέα*)', thereby making his personal judgement (*δόξα*), 'the only truth standard',⁷⁶ so does Herodotus assert as such the authority of his *γνώμη*. And yet, if Hecataeus is taking 'a critical attitude towards tradition ... a step further'⁷⁷ than Hesiod is, Herodotus is taking it to the next level still. His appropriation of this poetic programmatic statement is in fact applied not to the Greek mythic tradition, but to a different subject matter entirely: history, and quite recent history at that.

⁷¹ Cf., e.g., Jacoby (1912) 2738; Pearson (1939) 97–89; Bertelli (2001) 81 after Calame (1986) 81; Corcella (1996); Porciani (1997).

⁷² Hom. *Il.* 7.76: ὧδε δὲ *μυθέομαι*, Ζεὺς δ' ἄμι' ἐπιμάρτυρος ἔστω. According to Bertelli (2001) 80, this use of *μυθέομαι* is 'the *only* precedent' [italics original] to Hecataeus' formulation. But the verb occurs also, remarkably, in Eumaeus' words to Odysseus in *Od.* 14.124–5, where emphasis is placed on how 'wandering men' (*ἄνδρες ἀλήται*) lie and do not want to tell (*μυθήσασθαι*) the truth (*ἀληθέα*).

⁷³ Translation by Bertelli (2001) 80.

⁷⁴ Bertelli (2001) 81.

⁷⁵ Fowler (2013) 678.

⁷⁶ Bertelli (2001) 81.

⁷⁷ Bertelli (2001) 82.

5. Conclusions

At the outset of Book 8, Herodotus posits his *γνώμη* as a prominent tool of evaluation of historical truth by reworking a statement that, in both poetic and prose contexts, had served the purpose of emphasising the narrator's privileged status in discerning truth from falsehood. He thereby claims for himself an authority sitting somewhere between traditional poetic forms of authority and the developing prose ones.

It is generally and rightly pointed out in scholarship⁷⁸ that Herodotus shares with the early medical writers the emphasis on the senses as reliable epistemological tools. I have ventured to suggest, however, that in his narrative of Artemisium and Salamis he seems to challenge, at least implicitly, their reliability. After all, early medical writers too refer to the intelligence (*διανοίη*) needed to discriminate true from false statements.⁷⁹ Yet Herodotus' resort to the *poetic* tradition at the opening of a narrative that goes on to highlight, precisely, the epistemological unreliability of the senses draws him perhaps closer to pre-Socratic philosophers than to early medical writers.

The philosophers and Herodotus make claims about their own personal insight and intellectual grasp: Heraclitus, in his prose—which is yet somewhat 'poetic' in its being riddling, oracular-like—speaks of eyes and ears as 'bad witnesses' (22 B 107 D-K), and presents the deep structure of reality as a riddle or sign which he is able to crack, while ordinary people are just puzzled by it (22 B 1 D-K). In his poem, Parmenides also questions the senses,⁸⁰ and, despite using the language of divine inspiration, also seems to claim to have the personal *logos* by which he can test the 'strife-encompassed refutation'⁸¹ (*πολύδηρις ἔλεγχος*) presented to him by the goddess (28 B 7.3–5 D-K).⁸² Democritus, 'in stark contrast to the medical writers',⁸³ sets the senses in opposition to 'genuine knowledge' (*γνησίη γνώμη*, 68 B 11 D-K).

⁷⁸ Cf., e.g., Lateiner (1986); Thomas (1993) and (2000); Demont (2018); Pelling (2018).

⁷⁹ See Lateiner (1986) 6 on the author of *On Regimen* 1.26–7, 2.14, 48 and 41; Clements (2014) 129–31.

⁸⁰ Lami (1991) 280 n. 32; Clements (2014) 116.

⁸¹ Translation by Kirk–Raven–Schofield (1983) 248.

⁸² For discussion of possible intertextual relationships between Parmenides' poem and both Homeric and Hesiodic poetry (including *Th.* 27–8), see Buongiovanni (2011) 15–20, with further bibliography.

⁸³ Clements (2014) 131.

The alternative itself, available to the Presocratics, between prose and poetry as viable strategies of communication attests to a persisting perception of the tension between prose and poetic forms and formulations as key to authoritative intellectual expression. Prose developed only after centuries of reliance on verse for the dissemination, through performance, of authoritative public speech: no matter whether through appropriation or rejection, implicitly or explicitly, poetic authority had still to be negotiated by early prose writers.⁸⁴

As to the question why Herodotus challenges his own methodology and resorts to a poetic-like authority at this particular point in the narrative, my tentative answer is twofold. First, the oral traditions he was drawing on for his account of the Persian Wars had arguably already given an epic-like or elegiac-like shape to the events: Simonides' Artemisium, Salamis, and Plataea elegies (fr. 1–4, 6–9, and 10–18 *W*², respectively) in fact strongly suggest this. Discussing ὄψις and ἀκοή in relationship to γνώμη in terms that resonate with poetic language and diction would have been, perhaps, an almost natural choice. Secondly, the increasingly greater closeness in time of the events reported arguably implied a plurality of competing versions of events, each purporting to be 'the truth'.⁸⁵ To establish the authority and persuasiveness of his version, Herodotus resorted to the authoritative voice par excellence in the competitive, traditionalist, and performative context of Greek σοφία: the poet's voice.

⁸⁴ On Herodotus' engagement with the lyric and epic tradition see Donelli (2021).

⁸⁵ On how, paradoxically, greater difficulties might be met in trying to ascertain the recent past as opposed to the distant past, see Thomas (2018) 265 and 267.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrighetti, G. (2006) *Poesia, poetiche e storia nella riflessione dei Greci* (Pisa).
- Asheri, D. (2005) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro I, La Lidia e la Persia*⁷ (Milan).
- Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*, ed. by O. Murray and A. Moreno (Oxford).
- Asheri, D. and P. Vannicelli, edd. (2003) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VIII, La vittoria di Temistocle* (Milan).
- Baragwanath, E. and M. de Bakker, edd. (2012) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Bertelli, L. (2001) ‘Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography’, in Luraghi (2001) 67–94.
- Bichler, R. (2018) ‘Herodotus the Geographer’, in E. Bowie (2018) 139–55.
- Boedeker, D. (2000) ‘Herodotus’ Genre(s)’, in M. Depew and D. Obbink, edd., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society* (Cambridge, Mass. and London) 97–114.
- Bowie, A. M. (2018) ‘Herodotus the Story-teller’, in E. Bowie (2018) 25–36. ———, ed. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Bowie, E., ed. (2018) *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston).
- Brown, T. S. (1983) ‘Herodotus’ Views on Athletics’, *AncW* 7: 17–29.
- Buongiovanni, M. (2011) ‘Eumeo e l’ingannevole Odisseo: la poetica della verità fra Esiodo e Parmenide’, in M. Tulli, ed., *L’autore pensoso: un seminario per Graziano Arrighetti sulla coscienza letteraria dei Greci* (Pisa and Rome) 9–23.
- Calame, C. (1986) *Le Récit en Grèce ancienne: énonciations et représentation de poètes* (Paris).
- Cartledge, P. and E. Greenwood (2002) ‘Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity’ in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd., *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne) 351–71.
- Christ, M. R. (1994) ‘Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry’, *ClAnt* 13: 167–202.
- Cingano, E. (1985) ‘Clistene di Sicione, Erodoto e i poemi del ciclo tebano’, *QUCC* 49: 31–40.
- Clay, J. S. (2007) ‘Homer’s Trojan Theater’, *TAPhA* 137: 233–52.
- Clements, A. (2014) ‘The Senses in Philosophy and Science: Five Conceptions from Heraclitus to Plato’, in T. Toner, ed., *A Cultural History of the Senses in Antiquity* (London) 115–38.
- Colesanti, G. (2011) *Questioni Teognidee: la genesi simposiale di un corpus di elegie* (Rome).

- Corcella, A. (1996) “‘Ecateo di Mileto così dice’”, *QS* 43: 295–301.
 — (2001) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro IV, La Lidia e la Scizia*³ (Milan).
- Currie, B. (2021) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Supplement 13; Oxford, Edmonton, and Tallahassee).
- Demont, P. (2018) ‘Herodotus on Health and Disease’ in E. Bowie (2018) 175–96.
- Dewald, C. (1985) ‘Practical Knowledge and the Historian’s Role in Herodotus and Thucydides’, in M. H. Jameson, ed., *The Greek Historians: Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga, Cal.) 47–63.
 — (1987) ‘Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus’ *Histories*’, in D. Boedeker, ed., *Herodotus and the Invention of History, Arethusa* 20: 147–70.
 — and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Donelli, G. (2016) ‘Herodotus and Greek Lyric Poetry’, in V. Liotsakis and S. Farrington, edd., *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography* (Berlin and New York) 11–36.
 — (2021) ‘Herodotus, the Old Sappho and the Newest Sappho’, *Lexis* 39: 13–34.
- Fantuzzi, M., and C. Tsagalis (2015) ‘Introduction: Kyklos, the Epic Cycle and Cyclic poetry’, in id., edd., *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception. A Companion* (Cambridge) 1–42.
- Ferrari, F., ed. (1989) *Teognide: Elegie* (Milan).
- Flower, M. A. and J. Marincola, edd. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Ford, A. (2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Fowler, R. L. (2013) *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 1 (Oxford).
- von Fritz, K. (1967) *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung, I: Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides*, 2 vols (Berlin).
- Gerber, D. E., ed. (1999) *Greek Elegiac Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).
 — and J. Haubold (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).
 —, edd. (2010) *Homer: Iliad Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein, J. (2009) ‘How Not to Do History. Xerxes in Herodotus’ *Histories*’, *AJPh* 130: 195–218.
 — (2010) *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).

- Grintser, N. P. (2018) ‘Herodotus as a Literary Critic’, in E. Bowie (2018) 157–74.
- Harman, R. (2018) ‘Metahistory and the Visual in Herodotus and Thucydides’, in A. Kampakoglou and A. Novokhatko, edd., *Gaze, Vision and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature* (Berlin, Munich, and Boston) 271–88.
- Henderson, W. J. (1983) ‘Theognis 702–12: the Sisyphus-exemplum’, *QUCC* 15: 83–90.
- Hornblower, S., ed. (2013) *Herodotus: Histories Book V* (Cambridge).
- Irwin, E. (2011) ‘Herodotus on Aeginetan Identity’, in D. Fearn, ed., *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford) 373–425.
- Jacoby, F. (1912) ‘Hekataios von Milet’, *RE* VII.2: 2667–750.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2012) ‘The Helen Logos and Herodotus’ Fingerprint’, in Baragwanath–de Bakker (2012) 127–42.
- Katz Anhalt, E. (2008) ‘Seeing is Believing: Four Women on Display in Herodotus’ *Histories*’, *NECN* 35: 269–80.
- Kim, L. (2010) *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, edd. (1983) *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (Cambridge).
- Krisher, T. (1965) ‘ΕΤΥΜΟΣ und ΑΛΗΘΗΣ’, *Philologus* 109: 161–73.
- Lami, A. (1991) *I Presocratici: testimonianze e frammenti da Talete a Empedocle* (Milan).
- Lateiner, D. (1986) ‘The Empirical Element in the Methods of Early Greek Medical Writers and Herodotus: A Shared Epistemological Response’, *Antichthon* 20: 1–20.
- Lloyd, A. B. (2007) ‘Book II’ in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 219–378.
— (1989) *Erodoto: Le Storie, Libro II* (Milan).
- Luraghi, N. (2006) ‘Meta-historiē: Genre and Method in Herodotus’ *Histories*’, in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 76–91.
— (2009) ‘The Importance of Being λόγιος’, *CW* 102: 439–56.
—, ed. (2001) *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Marcozzi, D., M. Sinatra, and P. Vannicelli (1994) ‘Tra epica e storiografia: il “Catalogo delle navi”’, *SMEA* 33: 163–174.
- Marincola, J. (2006) ‘Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past’, in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 13–28.
— (2007) ‘Odysseus and the Historians’, *SyllClass* 18: 1–79; partially repr. in R. V. Munson, ed., *Herodotus*, vol. 2: *Herodotus and the World* (Oxford, 2013) 109–132.

- (2018) 'Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus', in E. Bowie (2018) 3–24.
- Masaracchia, A., ed. (1977) *Erodoto, La Battaglia di Salamina: Libro VIII delle Storie* (Milan).
- Montanari, F., A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, edd. (2009) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden and Boston).
- Most, G., ed. (2018) *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Murray, A. T. (1919) *Homer: The Odyssey* (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- (1925) *Homer: The Iliad* (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- Murray, P. (1981) 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101: 87–100.
- Nagy, G. (1990). *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).
- Nenci, G. (1955) 'Il motivo dell'autopsia nella storiografia greca', *SCO* 3: 14–46.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2017) 'Opsis bei Herodot: ein Beitrag zu Anspruch und Zuverlässigkeit antiker Historiographie', in Chr. Landmesser and R. Zimmermann, edd., *Text und Geschichte: Geschichtswissenschaftliche und Literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum Faktizitäts-Fiktionalitäts-Geflecht in antiken Texten* (Leipzig) 183–202.
- Nicolai, R. (2012) 'Erodoto e la tragedia di Troia (2.112–20)' in G. Bastianini, W. Lapini, and M. Tulli, edd., *Harmonia: scritti di filologia classica in onore di Angelo Casanova* (Florence) 633–49.
- Nicolaiu-Arabatzi, S. (2018) 'ἱστορέειν and θωμάζειν: Scientific Terms and Signs of Unity in Herodotus' *Histories*', in E. Bowie (2018) 223–41.
- Pearson, L. (1939) *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford).
- Pelling, C. (2018) 'Causes in Competition: Herodotus and Hippocratics', in E. Bowie (2018) 199–222.
- Porciani, L. (1997) *La forma proemiale: storiografia e pubblico nel mondo antico* (Pisa).
- Pucci, P. (2007) *Inno alle Muse (Esiodo, Teogonia, 1–115)* (Pisa and Rome).
- (2009) 'The Poetry of the Theogony', in Montanari–Rengakos–Tsagalis (2009) 37–70.
- Ricciardelli, G., ed. (2018) *Esiodo: Teogonia* (Milan).
- Rudhardt, J. (1996) 'Le préambule de la *Théogonie*: la vocation du poète. Le langage des Muses', in F. Blaise, P. Judet de La Combe, and Ph. Rousseau, edd., *Le métier du mythe: lectures d'Hésiode* (Cahiers de Philologie, publiés par le Centre de Recherche Philologique de l'Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III, XVI; Lille) 25–39.

- Russell, D. A. (2006) “Ars Poetica”, in A. Laird, ed., *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford) 225–45.
- Russo, J. (1985) *Omero: Odissea, Volume 5: Libri XVII–XX* (Milan).
- Rutherford, R. B., ed. (1992) *Homer: Odyssey Books XIX and XX* (Cambridge).
- Schepens, G. (1980) *L'autopsie dans le méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels).
- Thomas, R. (1993) ‘Performance and Written Publication in Herodotus and the Sophistic Generation’, in W. Kullmann and J. Althoff, edd., *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (Tübingen) 225–44.
- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- (2018) ‘Truth and Authority in Herodotus’ Narrative: False Stories and True Stories’, in E. Bowie (2018) 265–84.
- Tsagalis, C. (2009) ‘Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus’, in Montanari–Rengakos–Tsagalis (2009) 131–77.
- Vannicelli, P. (2001) ‘Herodotus’ Egypt and the Foundation of Universal History’, in Luraghi (2001) 211–40.
- (2013) *Resistenza e intesa: studi sulle guerre persiane in Erodoto* (Bari).
- Verdin, H. (1977) ‘Les remarques critiques d’Hérodote et de Thucydide sur la poésie en tant que source historique’, T. Reekmans and W. I. G. M. Peremans, edd., *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in Honorem W. Peremans Septuagenarii Editae* (Leuven) 53–76.
- Waterfield, R., trans. (1998) *Herodotus: The Histories* (Oxford).
- West, M. L., ed. (1966) *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford).
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. (2007) ‘Lies Resembling Truth: On the Beginnings of Greek Historiography’, in G. Herman and I. Shatzman, edd., *Greeks Between East and West: Essays in Memory of David Asheri* (Jerusalem) 45–74.

THE HOMERICNESS OF
HERODOTUS' LANGUAGE
(WITH A CASE STUDY OF -ÉEIN AORIST
INFINITIVES IN THE *HISTORIES*)*

Olga Tribulato

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the role that language played or may have played in the ancients' widespread practice of equating Herodotus with Homer. Ancient and modern scholars alike have often noted the Homeric character of Herodotus' word choice and turns of phrase, as well as his frequent recourse to Homeric allusions or citations. Despite this evident but often elusive Homericness, it is very difficult to tell whether Herodotus deliberately made his language resemble that of Homer in terms of phonology and morphology. The text that has reached us is replete with epic-Ionic features, but it is debated whether they are original at all, or whether they depend on ancient editorial interventions aimed at making Herodotus' Ionic resemble that of Homer. This last hypothesis has been popular in modern scholarship, but must come to terms with the almost complete silence of ancient sources on the linguistic fabric of Herodotus' Homericness: we simply do not know how this stylistic feature may have been perceived in antiquity (§2). The vagueness of the ancient rhetorical and stylistic assessments of Herodotus has had a profound impact also on the way modern scholars have approached the language of the *Histories* (§3), its transmission in papyri and medieval manuscripts, and hence its rendering in modern critical editions (§4). A balanced conclusion on this very complex question is to assume that Herodotus did use some Homeric features on

* I wish to thank Ivan Matijašić for his invitation to contribute to this project, and Lucia Prauscello and Aldo Corcella for their comments on an earlier draft of this piece. Unless otherwise stated, Herodotus' text is quoted by book, paragraph and line number from the edition of Wilson (2015b).

purpose, and that the initial epic character of his diction was later enhanced by editors through the insertion of other epic features and pseudo-Ionisms, in a way not too dissimilar to what happened in the transmission of other dialectal authors. Historical and rhetorical sources do not give us any information on the rationale behind this assumed transformation of Herodotus' text, but a look at the literary and linguistic trends of the post-Classical age may offer new insights. The last section of this paper applies this method of interpretation to one of the most questionable Homeric features in Herodotus' text: uncontracted present and aorist infinitives in *-έειν*. While it is likely that these features are not original (though we will never know for sure), it is possible that they penetrated Herodotus' text in a less chaotic and haphazard way than scholars have been willing to admit.

2. The Ancient Take on Homer and Herodotus: Does it Entail Clear Linguistic Arguments?

The comparison between Herodotus and Homer—which modern interpreters somehow often reduce to the definition of Herodotus as *ὀμηρικώτατος* given in *On the Sublime* (13.3)—makes its first appearance in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Before the late first century BCE we find no attempt to equate the two authors, and certainly no detailed comparative discussion of their stylistic features.¹ In the vast majority of sources that treat both authors together, the comparison is based on a number of criteria: similarities in the structure of their works; their recourse to fables (and hence their trustworthiness) and ability as narrators; their choice of words (particularly poetic vocabulary); and their talent in entertaining the audience.²

The last three criteria appear frequently in rhetorical sources, and treatments of Herodotus' style in relation to Homer's should be viewed against the background of the broader discussions on the difference between, and relative merits of, poetry and prose. In *Poet.* 1451b Aristotle declares that the difference between the two genres does not consist in their metrical or ametrical form: to prove his point, he chooses precisely Herodotus, whose work 'would be no less a history in verse than in prose'. This point is taken

¹ It may be noted in this respect that in [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 12, whatever the date of the treatise, Herodotus is opposed to Homer: he is a representative of the 'broken-up style' (*διηρημένη λέξις*), whereas Homer represents the 'periodic style' (*κατεστραμμένη λέξις*).

² All these motifs are discussed in Priestley (2014) 187–219.

up again by Strabo in Book 1 of the *Geography*, much of which is devoted to defending Homer from those—especially Eratosthenes—who considered him unreliable (Str. 1.2.3–40). Discussing Homer's value, Strabo in 1.2.6 addresses the question of whether a poet can be considered a valuable rhetorical model. He answers positively, stating that poetry and prose are just different genres, but that poetry is more preeminent, as is shown by the fact that the early prose writers imitated its language, while dropping the metre (Str. 1.2.6):

... ὁ πῆζος λόγος, ὃ γε κατεσκευασμένος, μίμημα τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ἐστὶ. πρῶτιστα γὰρ ἢ ποιητικὴ κατασκευὴ παρήλθεν εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εὐδοκίμησεν· εἶτα ἐκείνην μιμούμενοι, λύσαντες τὸ μέτρον, τὰλλα δὲ φυλάξαντες τὰ ποιητικά, συνέγραψαν οἱ περὶ Κάδμον καὶ Φερεκύδη καὶ Ἑκαταῖον.

... But prose—I mean artistic prose—is, I may say, an imitation of poetic discourse; for poetry, as an art, first came upon the scene and was first to win approval. Then came Cadmos, Pherecydes, Hecataeus, and their followers, with prose writings in which they imitated the poetic art, abandoning the use of metre but in other respects preserving the quality of poetry (transl. Jones).

This chapter of the *Geography* helps us to immediately grasp the recurrent characteristic of these ancient theories: their complete indeterminacy. Strabo does not further clarify the features which define 'the quality of poetry' (τὰ ποιητικά) in prose, i.e., whether it resides in the lexicon, or in the 'rhythm' of sentences, or else in given elements related to dialect, morphology, and word-formation. Such vagueness emerges even more strongly once we turn to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, perhaps our most authoritative source on the comparison between Homer and Herodotus. A case in point is the famous passage of *On Thucydides* praising Herodotus for his 'poetic' style, based on a stylistic *ποικιλία* to which Dionysius also refers in *Pomp.* 3.11 (see further below):

οὗτος [Herodotus] δὲ κατὰ <τε> τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν μακρῶ δὴ τινι τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο, καὶ παρεσκεύασε τῇ κρατίστη ποιήσει τὴν πῆζην φράσιν ὁμοίαν γενέσθαι πειθοῦς τε καὶ χαρίτων καὶ τῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἠκούσης ἡδονῆς ἔνεκα (*Thuc.* 23).

[Herodotus] was far superior to the rest in his choice of words, his composition, and his varied use of figures of speech; and he made his prose style resemble the finest poetry by its persuasiveness, its charm and its utterly delightful effect (transl. Usher, slightly adapted).

The three qualities for which Herodotus receives praise from Dionysius remain ill-defined.³ Neither is it clear whether Herodotus' *ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνομάτων* is close to epic vocabulary,⁴ nor do we get a definition of his poetic style that goes beyond an impressionistic description of its 'delightful effect'. Dionysius compares Herodotus and Homer in other treatises, where he elevates both as models of *σύνθεσις* (*Comp.* 3.25–6), stylistic *μεσότης* (*Comp.* 24.21–8) and pleasurableness (*Pomp.* 3.11).⁵ All these judgements rely on generic descriptions of style, not language: and it is telling that when Dionysius quotes passages from Herodotus he translates them into Attic.⁶ In the two passages where Dionysius mentions the Ionic dialect as a defining feature of Herodotus' prose Homer is tellingly absent: the other point of comparison is Thucydides, because Dionysius' discussion concerns historiographical models, not language *per se*.⁷ Thus in the *Letter to Pompeius Geminus* (3.16) both historians receive praise for writing in the purest form of their respective dialects, Ionic and Attic (*Pomp.* 3.16):

πρώτη τῶν ἀρετῶν γένοιτ' ἄν, ἧς χωρὶς οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν περὶ τοὺς λόγους ὄφελός τι, ἢ καθαρὰ τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα σφίζουσα διάλεκτος. ταύτην ἀκριβοῦσιν ἀμφοτέρου· Ἡρόδοτός τε γὰρ τῆς Ἰάδος ἄριστος κανὼν Θουκυδίδης τε τῆς Ἀτθίδος.

³ Modern discussions of this passage do not improve its vagueness: see, e.g., Grube (1974) 79 and Priestley (2014) 197. To state it with Grube (1974) 80, the ancient critics 'say very little on the essential nature and qualities of the [historiographical] genre, even of the author they are discussing'.

⁴ In this respect [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 112 is more precise, when he critically remarks that Herodotus transposes poetic words into prose (*μετάθεσις*, not *μίμησις*); on the passage, see Matijašić (2018) 164–5.

⁵ The motif of Herodotus' pleasurableness and sweetness is discussed by Pernot (1995) and Priestley (2014) 197–209.

⁶ Corcella (2018) 206.

⁷ On Dionysius' treatment of Herodotus and Thucydides as historiographical models, see Matijašić (2018) 73–8.

We may regard as the supreme virtue that without which no other literary quality is of any use—language that is pure in its vocabulary and preserves the Greek idiom. Both writers meet these requirements exactly: **Herodotus is the perfect model of the Ionic dialect, and Thucydides of the Attic** (transl. Usher).

One may choose to interpret these short statements as evidence that Dionysius detects a special connection between poetry and the use of Ionic, and hence that he considers both the poets and Herodotus pleasurable because they use this dialect. However, although the connection is explicit in later sources, especially in Hermogenes,⁸ it is important to note that nowhere does Dionysius tell his readers that Herodotus is like Homer because they use the same dialect.

The more detailed theorisation of Hermogenes (late second century CE) does not bring an improvement in linguistic precision. Differently from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Hermogenes credits Herodotus not with a pure Ionic dialect, but with a mixed language that the rhetorician sees as a marker of the poetic character of Herodotean prose (*Id.* p. 411 Rabe):

Ἐκαταῶλος δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος, παρ' οὗ δὴ μάλιστα ὠφέληται ὁ Ἡρόδοτος, καθαρὸς μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ σαφής, ἐν δὲ τισι καὶ ἡδὺς οὐ μετρίως· τῇ διαλέκτῳ δὲ ἀκράτῳ Ἰάδι καὶ οὐ μεμιγμένῳ χρησάμενος οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον ποικίλῃ, ἥττον ἐστὶν ἕνεκά γε τῆς λέξεως ποιητικός.

Hecataeus of Miletus, from whom Herodotus learned much, is pure and clear, and in some passages also quite charming. He uses a pure, unmixed Ionic dialect, **unlike the mixed variety that Herodotus uses**, and this makes his diction less poetic (transl. Wooten).

Interestingly, in *On Types of Style* Hermogenes uses *διάλεκτος* to refer to (dialectal) language only in four passages, all of which are discussions of

⁸ The pleasurable and poetic quality of Ionic is often recalled in rhetorical and grammatical sources: cf., e.g., Himer. *Or.* 60.15 Colonna: ἰωνικὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ πολλὴ λύρα καὶ ἰατρικὴ καὶ ποίησις; Hdn. *Περὶ παθῶν* (ex *Etyim. Magn.*), *GG* 3.2 361.11–12 Lentz on the dual *συνοχωκότε* or Choer. *Proleg. in Theodos. canon. verb.* 40.9, 12–13 Hilgard (on imperfects such as *τύπτσκεν*). I discuss the 'character' of Ionic in Tribulato (2019). Some later sources have a negative view of Herodotus' pleasurable quality, which they associate with his untrustworthiness as a historian: see, e.g., the classic Plut. *Her. mal.* 874B, with recent discussion in Priestley (2014) 213–16 and Kirkland (2019) 504–6.

Ionic. The other relevant passage occurs earlier in the same treatise. Here Hermogenes explains that Ionic is poetic by nature, although some poets may choose to combine it with features taken from other dialects (*Id.* p. 336 Rabe):⁹

λέξεις δὲ γλυκεῖα ἢ τε τῆς ἀφελείας ἰδία παρὰ τὴν καθαρὰν ῥηθεῖσαν εἶναι καὶ ἔτι ἢ ποιητικῆ. ταύτη τοι καὶ Ἡρόδοτος τῆς γλυκύτητος μάλιστα πεφροντικῶς ἐχρήσατο μὲν καὶ μεθόδοις καὶ ἐννοίαις, αἷσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐχαρακτηρίζομεν τὴν γλυκύτητα, λέξει τε ἐκάστη ἰδία τῆς ἀφελείας πολλαχοῦ, ὡσπερ ἐλέγομεν, ἐκείθεν δὲ μάλιστα διαρκῆ ἔσχε τὴν γλυκύτητα, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴν εὐθὺς τὴν διάλεκτον ποιητικῶς προείλετο εἰπεῖν· ἢ γὰρ Ἴας οὐσα ποιητικῆ φύσει ἐστὶν ἠδεῖα. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλων διαλέκτων ἐχρήσατό τισι λέξεσιν, οὐδὲν τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ὅμηρος καὶ Ἡσίοδος καὶ ἄλλοι οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν ποιητῶν ἐχρήσαντο μὲν καὶ ἄλλαις τισὶ λέξεσιν ἐτέρων διαλέκτων, τὸ πλείστον μὴν ἰάζουσι, καὶ ἐστὶν ἢ Ἴας ὅπερ ἔφην ποιητικῆ πως, διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἠδεῖα.

The style that produces sweetness is the same as the one that is characteristic of simplicity, which is similar to the pure style, and one that is poetical. Herodotus, who was particularly concerned with sweetness, used both the approaches to produce it and the thoughts that, in our opinion, are characteristic of it, and each style that is peculiar to simplicity, as we have already said. One reason the sweetness in his work is so remarkable is that he chose to use a dialect that is poetical. **The Ionic dialect, since it is associated with poetry, naturally gives a lot of pleasure. It doesn't really matter whether he also uses some words from other dialects, since Homer and Hesiod and quite a few other poets do the same thing. But they generally use Ionic. And Ionic, as I said, has a poetic flavor, and because of that it is pleasing** (transl. Wooten).

The sources discussed so far show that the ancient comparison between Herodotus and Homer entails reflections on style, and sometimes annotations on word choice, but very rarely a discussion of the differences and similarities between their languages. To our eyes, descriptions of Herodotus' dialect are never precise, because they lack the kind of phono-

⁹ On this passage see also Priestley (2014) 202–3.

morphological information which is typical of a modern linguistic assessment. As H. W. Smyth put it over a century ago,

The grammarians rarely, the rhetoricians never, busied themselves with any possibility of difference between the idiom of the soil and that of Ionic prose literature ... The nature of the inflections, the character of word forms, fail to trouble Hermogenes when he sets Hekataios off against Herodotos, or characterizes the poetical nature of the latter's diction.¹⁰

These baffling testimonies have not eased the work of modern interpreters, who face very complicated and interrelated issues: the fact that the transmitted text of Herodotus mixes Ionic with epic, Attic, pseudo-Ionic, and even Doric features; the diverging assessments of Herodotus' dialect in ancient sources; and the vagueness of their descriptions. Dionysius' judgement has lent authority to modern corrections of Herodotus' transmitted text, which have aimed to make it more authentically Ionic. On the other hand, more conservative approaches to the text have privileged Hermogenes' theory that Herodotus wrote in a mixed form of Ionic,¹¹ claiming that the perception of Herodotus as a purely Ionic author is a product of the Byzantine age. However, one need also recall that while Byzantine scholarship usually processes and simplifies the information provided by ancient rhetorical and linguistic exegesis, it seldom introduces original variations: that Herodotus was singled out as a model-author for Ionic must be a consequence of earlier grammatical practice.¹²

The issue at stake is not simply whether we should consider Dionysius more trustworthy than Hermogenes or vice-versa, but underpins larger interpretative questions. Their different judgements may simply be a matter of labels, reflecting the different purposes of their works. Dionysius may thus

¹⁰ Smyth (1894) 82.

¹¹ See, e.g., Thumb–Scherer (1959) 236, Priestley (2014) 203, and the review in §3 below.

¹² An example is provided by the fragments of a grammatical or dialectological treatise transmitted on papyrus by *PSI* 1609 (second century CE, *ed. pr.* Luiselli (2013)), where the Ionic genitive ending in *-εω* is exemplified with two examples (*Πέρσεω* and *Ξέρξεω*) which are likely to have a Herodotean background. The extraordinary fact is that the simple rules listed in the papyrus are almost verbatim renderings of rules that are common in late-Byzantine dialectology, which advises us against drawing neat conclusions about the supposedly more 'sophisticated' character of ancient grammar compared to its Byzantine counterparts; see further Tribulato (2019) 366–7.

be content with merely calling Herodotus an Ionic author because his aim is to define the historical canon and hence his focus is on distinguishing the Ionic Herodotus from the Attic Thucydides. Hermogenes, instead, may be more inclined to highlight the *ποικιλία* of Herodotus' Ionic because his focus is on what makes style poetic. Alternatively, Hermogenes' and Dionysius' diverging views could be indicators that the *perception* of Herodotus' language evolved over the centuries, with later scholars such as Hermogenes becoming more aware of the literary fabric of his diction and his difference from other Ionic authors. Or, with a more radical approach, these diverging assessments could serve as a basis to speculate that Dionysius had access to a Herodotean text in which Ionic was not so mixed as in the text Hermogenes read: i.e., as has been suggested by Wolfgang Aly, that there were different contemporary *recensiones* of Herodotus,¹³ or that the text circulating in the late second century CE had been infected by more non-Ionic features than the text circulating earlier, perhaps as a result of specific editorial and exegetical practices in this period.¹⁴ The last scenario is particularly difficult to assess because we know very little about the ancients' exegetical activity on Herodotus' text, and nothing at all about any kind of editorial work before the Imperial age. *P.Amherst* 12 shows that Aristarchus worked on Herodotus, but it is questionable that he also produced an edition.¹⁵ The grammarians Hellanicus, Philemon, and Alexander of Cotiaecum dealt with various features of the text, but they do not prove the existence of any proper exegesis.¹⁶ In the light of these ancient interpretations, the next section looks at the way they have influenced modern Herodotean scholarship, crossing paths with dialectology, epigraphy, and textual philology: the aim is to highlight some recurrent trends that have shaped editorial practice and hence the way modern readers of the *Histories* perceive Herodotus' language.

¹³ See Aly (1909) 593–4.

¹⁴ See Galligani (2001) and Lightfoot (2003) 98: 'the texts of Herodotus available in the second century were already full of such pseudo-Ionisms and epicisms, overlaid over whatever *poetic* form Herodotus himself had preferred' (my emphasis).

¹⁵ For the papyrus, see Paap (1948) 37–40. It is uncertain whether this work was a continuous commentary or rather a selective collection of notes on points of interest: on the issue, see Montana (2012), who proposes new readings for column II, and the overviews in Priestley (2014) 223–9 and Matijašić (2018) 150–1. Scholars tend to agree that Aristarchus cannot be credited with an edition of the text, but see Hemmerdinger (1981) 20, 154 for an opposite view.

¹⁶ For details about these testimonies see Jacoby (1913) 514–5 and Wilson (2015a) xxi.

3. Modern Approaches to Herodotus' Language

All modern scholars agree that the dialectal confusion that reigns in Herodotus' text cannot be authentic. However, it is extremely difficult if not impossible to draw a neat line between securely authentic features, possible dialectal variants adopted by Herodotus himself to create a literary language purportedly different from any spoken dialect, and later intrusions due to ancient editorial practices. Consequently, the Herodotean text and its mixed language have received competing and often radically opposite interpretations in modern scholarship.

The idea that, by and large, the dialectal *mélange* of Herodotus' language is authentic was relatively popular in 19th-century scholarship. Influential works which endorsed it include Ferdinand Bredow's treatise on Herodotus' dialect (1846), Heinrich Stein's edition of the *Histories* (1869–71), and Wilhelm von Christ's history of Greek literature (1898).¹⁷ The last maintained that Herodotus grafted some non-epichoric elements onto his East Ionic dialect in order to imitate epic poetry as well as other literary genres, e.g., tragedy. To be sure, none of these scholars was so naïve as to take the manuscript tradition at face value. They all recognised that certain epic, Attic, or pseudo-Ionic features arose in the course of textual transmission, but explained these later alterations by the hypothesis that Herodotus' language had been composite from the start.¹⁸

In the same period, another interpretative approach sought an answer not in the historian's stylistic craft, but in the early transmission of his text. In two contributions devoted to the vocalism of Herodotus' dialect, Reinhold Merzdorf criticised those scholars, including Stein, who considered the

¹⁷ Cf. Bredow (1846) 4–5; Stein (1869–71) I.xlviii–xlix, who admits some epic features as original; Christ (1898) 333 with n. 1. The idea, however, can be traced back to at least 1838, when the Italian scholar Amedeo Peyron published a pamphlet comparing the Greek dialects (i.e., literary languages) with Dante's diction. Peyron maintained that Herodotus, in order to ennoble his prose, created a form of 'ionico illustre' (the expression is a calque on Dante's theorisation of a *volgare illustre* ('illustrious vernacular') in his treatise *De vulgari eloquentia*) by using Homer's Ionic as a basis and mixing it with more recent Ionic features and with Doric (Peyron (1838) 60–1). All these and later theories that Herodotus created his own *Kunstsprache* use Hermogenes (cf. above, §2) as evidence that this interpretation was already ancient.

¹⁸ See, e.g., Bredow (1846) 43–4, and his subsequent list of altered forms, *ibid.* 44–88; Stein (1869–71) I.xlix.

mixture of Ionic and Doric an authentic feature of the historian's language.¹⁹ Merzdorf defended the necessity of tackling each grammatical and editorial problem in its own right, because not all the fluctuations could have the same origin. For instance, while he criticised Stein's acceptance of typically epic uncontracted and 'distended' forms such as *κομῶσι* for *κομῶσι*,²⁰ he also made a case for accepting uncontracted verbal forms in *-εε-* against the evidence of Ionic inscriptions, proposing that Herodotus adopted these elements of 'older Ionic' to make his diction more elegant than the 'vulgar language' of everyday communication.²¹

The 19th century saw a steady flow of contributions (mostly published in Germany) dealing with elements of Herodotus' language, though not all of them specifically addressed the issue of its origin and authenticity.²² Because of important and fast-paced advances in the fields of epigraphy, dialectology, and textual criticism in this period, the study of Herodotus' language often transcended the boundaries of Herodotean scholarship *stricto sensu* and was encompassed within broader investigations. Two milestones in this respect are Friedrich Bechtel's *Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts* (1887)—a 'Vorarbeit' which would later feed into the third volume of his *magnum opus*, *Die griechischen Dialekte* (1924)—and the grammar of Ionic by H. W. Smyth (1894). Bechtel's earlier work was the first complete collection of Ionic inscriptions provided with a linguistic commentary and considerably eased the work of scholars who were interested in comparing Herodotus' usage with inscriptions from Ionia.²³ In the later work, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, Bechtel endorsed the idea that Herodotus wrote in the Ionic dialect of Samos, which

¹⁹ Merzdorf (1875); (1876); see especially Merzdorf (1875) 127–9. Cf. too the review of his work by Fritsch (1876) 105.

²⁰ Merzdorf (1875) 130.

²¹ Merzdorf (1875) 147.

²² Other works of this period which address the issue of Herodotus' language though not specifically that of its origin are Struve (1828–30), who deals with pronouns, nouns in *-εὐς*, and the spelling of *θαῦμα*; Lhardy (1844–46), on the augment and contract verbs; Dindorf (1844) i–xlvii, who provides a grammar of the dialect aimed at explaining the textual choices of his critical edition; Abicht (1859), who deals with verbs in *-έω*; and Meyer (1868), Spreer (1874), and Norén (1876), who all address contract verbs, and sometimes compare Herodotus' usage with Homer's.

²³ It may be recalled that at that time there was not yet a dialectological treatise on Ionic, since Ahrens' *De Graecae linguae dialectis* (1843) had not covered Ionic and Hoffmann's *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange* (published 1891–98), Bechtel's *Die griechischen Dialekte* (published 1921–4) and the relevant volumes of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* were yet to come.

he heightened in direct speeches and other parts through the use of epic 'words and forms'.²⁴ However, Bechtel also denounced the usefulness of Herodotus' text for a dialectological description of Ionic, acknowledging that '[ancient] scholars worked on making Herodotus' language comply with Homer's'.²⁵ One of the examples he chose to exemplify the kinds of problems linguists face were vocalic hiatuses and their radically different treatment in inscriptions and Herodotus.

The dialectological focus of Smyth's book, whose ambition was to write the 'missing volume' (on Ionic) of Ahrens' *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, explains not only Smyth's appreciation of Bechtel's *Inschriften*, but also his criticism of previous accounts of Herodotus' dialect, *in primis* Bredow's, which was seen to 'rest upon incomplete and defective collations of the MSS'.²⁶ Smyth does not deny that a number of epic features may be authentic in Herodotus—indeed, in this more pronounced epic flavour may consist, in Smyth's opinion, the difference between early Ionic prose and Herodotus—but overall he is convinced that Herodotus did not make 'constant use of Homeric forms as such' and that 'save in passages that bear the unmistakable stamp of deliberate recurrence to epic formulae, the system of phonology and inflection is that of the soil'.²⁷ On the whole, Smyth championed a balanced approach, acknowledging that not everything in Herodotus' dialect may be 'epichoric' Ionic but that nevertheless this need not constitute proof that the historian devised a highly mixed *Kunstsprache* from the start. Like Merzdorf before him, Smyth does not subscribe to a linguistic interpretation of Hermogenes' passage on Herodotus' *ποικιλία*, preferring a stylistic reading.

Faith in the possibility of reaching an approximation of Herodotus' original language based on inscriptions pervades other works with a dialectological focus. A case in point is Albert Thumb's *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* (1909), later reworked by Scherer, where the testimony of

²⁴ Bechtel (1924) 10. He gives a list of passages influenced by Homer, *ibid.* 19.

²⁵ Bechtel (1924) 11.

²⁶ Smyth (1894) x. For the comparison between Herodotus and the Ionic logographers, see *ibid.* 89: '[t]here seem to be certain indications making for the conclusion that the language of the earliest logographers was in closer touch with the idiom of the soil than that of Herodotus'.

²⁷ Smyth (1894) x and 90 respectively. See too *ibid.* 97–8. This interpretation is closely followed in Miller (2013), on which see below, p. 253.

inscriptions is used to solve some discrepancies in the text.²⁸ Other contributions of this period examined Herodotus' text with a more philological methodology. The most influential, in fact, are not specifically studies on Herodotus but bear the stamp of two outstanding authorities: Diels and Wilamowitz. Hermann Diels, an expert on Ionic fragmentary literature, advanced the hypothesis (which later became standard, also thanks to endorsement of Jacoby in his foundational 1913 *RE* article) that Herodotus' text must have become corrupt not in the Imperial age, but already around the fourth century BCE because of the transition from the late-archaic writing system to the Classical alphabet.²⁹ In the same years, Wilamowitz too attributed the pseudo-Ionic veneer of the text to a combination of fallacious *metacharactērismos* and philological activity, the latter aimed at restoring a form of 'authentic' language based on ancient ideas of what Classical Ionic should look like. According to Wilamowitz, by the Imperial age this activity of correction and *diorthōsis* produced the 'horribly devastated' text transmitted by manuscripts, with *monstra* such as uncontracted *δοκέει* and *κέεται* or analogical forms such as the accusative *δεσπότεα* (for *δεσπότην*) and the masculine genitives *αυτέων*, *τουτέων* for *αυτῶν*, *τούτων*.³⁰

In the twentieth century there continued to be a sharp focus on the *Textgeschichte* of Herodotus, which informed interpretations of his language. Yet it would be incorrect to conclude that the idea of the *mélange* as a conscious authorial choice had been abandoned. We find it used, to different purposes and with different nuances, both in contributions specifically dealing with Herodotus' language and style—such as Aly (1927),³¹

²⁸ Cf. Thumb–Scherer (1959) 238. Another work which compared Herodotus with inscriptions is the *Thesaurus* by Favre (1914). I am grateful to Aldo Corcella for this reference.

²⁹ Diels expressed this belief in a footnote in a contribution dealing with pseudo-Pythagorean writings: see Diels (1890) 456 n. 13. For the early history of the Herodotean text see the overview below, §4.

³⁰ Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1884) 315. He assumed that second-century CE scholars already dealt with a text which had been edited in an earlier age, probably around 200 BCE: see also Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1904) 640. His idea was approved by Jacoby (1913) 518 (on whom see below, §4), and Hartmann (1932) 92–4, who also attributed most of the epic forms in Herodotus to ancient philological practice, which created a 'Phantasiedialekt' that modern editors ought to correct following Ionic inscriptions (Hartmann (1932) 107, 109). On the extent of the hyper-Ionicisation of Herodotus' text, see also Galligani (2001).

³¹ Aly (1927) 92 explains phono-morphological variations in certain sets of words as evidence of the 'insatiable receptivity' with which Herodotus absorbed expressions from various dialects and languages.

Hoffmann's *Die griechischen Dialekte*,³² and the *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* by Hoffmann and Scherer³³—and in non-linguistic studies: *in primis* Jacoby's *RE* article;³⁴ Meillet's *Aperçu*,³⁵ and Hemmerdinger's volume on Herodotus' textual transmission.³⁶ This view is still upheld in Miller (2013), a recent volume addressing the linguistic fabric of Greek literary languages. Heavily drawing on Smyth (1894), Miller defines Herodotus' language as a 'variety of literary Milesian', a 'high style' which does not correspond to 'the contemporary spoken language' and which yet, save for the lexicon, 'resembles epic only in clear imitations'.³⁷

An attempt to combine the two interpretative approaches reviewed in this section was put forward in Rosén (1962), a grammar of Herodotus' language which formed the basis for his later edition of the *Histories* (see below, §4 for this work). Its underlying hypothesis is that much of the linguistic variation transmitted by the manuscripts is authentic and paralleled in inscriptions. Rosén dismisses the theory of a later 'Homerisierung' of Herodotus' text as based on biased arguments.³⁸ However, he also departs from previous scholarship in that he proposes that Herodotus' highly composite language is not an artificial *Kunstsprache*, but his personal reproduction (an 'idiolect') of the dialect(s) spoken around Halicarnassus in his time.³⁹ Rosén's grammar is no easy reading, because of its idiosyncratic theories, technical terminology,

³² He firmly believed that Herodotus used epic features to heighten his diction: see Hoffmann (1898) 185–6.

³³ Hoffmann–Scherer (1969) 130–1.

³⁴ See Jacoby (1913) 519: '[w]as für den Stil gilt ..., gilt auch für die Sprache. Für ein solches Werk genügt das einfache Ionisch, dessen sich das tägliche Leben und die milesische Wissenschaft von vor 50 Jahren in ihren knappen Aufzeichnungen bediente, nicht. *Da bedarf es einer Kunstsprache*' (my emphasis). See too Mansour (2009) 203–4, discussed further below.

³⁵ Cf. Meillet (1920) 161: 'L'ouvrage a passé par les mains des copistes sans doute en grande partie athéniens ou du moins de langue attique; des éditeurs ont dû travailler à y rétablir le type ionien; et l'on ignore dans quelle mesure ces philologues antiques ont procédé suivant des principes a priori et dans quelle mesure ils s'appuyaient sur de vieux exemplaires vraiment ioniens' (he then goes on to list some elements that find a parallel in Homer). Other interpretations in this direction are Untersteiner (1948) 17–8; Pasquali (1952) 315, who concludes that Herodotus wrote in a very composite language that may not have complied with 'pure' Ionic; McNeal (1983) 119–20 and (1989) 556.

³⁶ See Hemmerdinger (1981) 173–4.

³⁷ Miller (2013) 169, 170, and 171 respectively.

³⁸ Rosén (1962) 244–5. Cf. criticism in Galligani (1995) 88.

³⁹ Rosén (1962) 248. McNeal (1989) approves of this view.

and confusing presentation of data, and has met with ample criticism.⁴⁰ One point that Rosén makes, however, is useful to summarise the diverse approaches that the topic of Homeric language in Herodotus has elicited in the scholarship reviewed so far. As mentioned in §2, Rosén denies that the ancients really equated Herodotus with Homer on a linguistic basis. He rightly recalls that *On the Sublime*—a treatise on style, not on language—compares the two authors as regards vocabulary and flow (*vâμα*), not phonomorphology.⁴¹

Rosén's *caveat* reflects well the later developments of scholarship. The detailed grammatical methodology of 19th-century investigations has gradually given way to 'linguistic' approaches which examine the Homeric fabric of the *Histories* more from a stylistic, lexical, narratological, and rhetorical point of view than from a strictly formal one. These new approaches have broken much ground in the understanding of the 'Iliadic' or 'Odyssean' development of the *Histories*' narrative, their use of catalogues, *Ringkomposition* and direct speeches, the shape of the *prooimion* and its Homeric resonances, and specific allusions or imitations in lexicon and imagery.⁴² The increasing attention towards the role of orality in Herodotus' compositional technique—a topic which does not concern language only—has also brought back an interest in certain features of the (poetic) lexicon as markers of orality.⁴³

Among the recent contributions that have addressed the stylistic devices which bring the *Histories* close to epic, a special place is held by those which

⁴⁰ See, for instance, Whatelet (1962) 416, Collinge (1963) 717, and Schmitt (1967) 177, all critical of Rosén's approach to the Greek verb.

⁴¹ Rosén (1962) 233. The point had already been made, though in different terms, by Norden (1915) 40–1, who argued that Herodotus had intentionally imitated Homer, and by Pasquali (1952) 315–6, who admitted that many epicisms may be considered suspicious, but concluded that some other epicisms (such as unaugmented aorists and typically Homeric iterative verbs) must be genuine.

⁴² The bibliography on Herodotus' literary technique and its debt towards epic (and not just Homer) is now vast. Starting from classic references such as Jacoby (1913) 502–4, Schick (1953), Huber (1965), and Strasburger (1972), works published roughly in the last thirty years include Giraudeau (1984), Calame (1986), Nagy (1987), de Jong (1999), Rengakos (2001), Boedeker (2002), Griffiths (2006) 135–6, Marincola (2006), Papadopoulou-Belmehdi (2006), Pelling (2006a) and (2006b), and Berruecos Frank (2015). Many other recent works on Herodotus deal with Homer only in passing (e.g., Zali (2014)).

⁴³ On orality in Herodotus, see, e.g., Bakker (1997) 119–22, Thomas (2000) 257–69, Slings (2002), Rösler (2002) 85–8, and Boedeker (2002). Some of the contributions cited in the previous footnote also deal with oral strategies. An older classic is Lang (1984).

re-propose, in a new methodological light, the old (and never quite extinct) theory that entire sequences of the *Histories* hint at poetic rhythm, or indeed that they consciously adopt it.⁴⁴ Mansour, for instance, concludes that dactylic or anapaestic rhythms are part of the poetic elements (ranging from 'phonopoétismes' such as alliterations to lexical and syntactic features) which Herodotus consciously adopts to enhance the Homericness of his style, and which speak in favour of the essentially oral character of his prose.⁴⁵ Differently, Kazanskaya, building on remarks made by Simon Hornblower,⁴⁶ champions a more cautious approach, which distinguishes between almost *verbatim* citations and 'archaic' turns of phrase which could have a wider background than Homer and belong to the literary and cultural milieu in which Herodotus wrote his work. I shall return to these approaches in the last part of the paper, where I discuss the paths through which *-έειν* infinitives may have spread in the language of the *Histories*.

It is now time to pause and take stock of this overview of scholarship on Herodotus' language and its relationship with Homer. The presence of epic or epic-looking elements in Herodotus is an undeniable fact. What is equally indubitable is that Herodotus' text is closer to epic language than to fifth-century Ionic inscriptions. The approaches to this state of affairs diverge. On the one hand, several scholars have defended much of what is transmitted by the manuscripts, endorsing a view of Herodotus' dialect as conscious linguistic *mélange*. On the other hand, other scholars have more strongly advocated the idea that our Herodotean text is heavily interpolated and that this process of linguistic variation arose at some point in the long transmission path of the *Histories*. Those who subscribe to this second view face the problem of deciding which features are unoriginal, and how they should be corrected. Thus, any assessment of a given phonological, morphological or even lexical and syntactic feature in Herodotus—especially when one is interested in its presumed 'Homeric' character—must take account not only of the history of the text, but also of the ways in which it has been edited in modern times.

⁴⁴ For earlier theories in this respect, see Hemmerdinger (1981) 170–1: 'la prose d'Hérodote était chantée Si Hérodote puise simultanément dans 3 morphologies, c'est pour pouvoir donner à sa prose des rythmes dactyliques, anapestiques, spondaiques. D'où sa noblesse et son caractère poétique'.

⁴⁵ Mansour (2009) 15. See also Mansour (2007) for a shorter study.

⁴⁶ Kazanskaya (2013); Hornblower (1994) 66–7.

4. Herodotus' Language between Textual Transmission and Modern Editorial Practices

The *Histories* have been transmitted by medieval manuscripts and papyri. The medieval tradition is split into the 'Florentine' family, the most authoritative witness of which is cod. Laur. Plut. 70.3 (A), a very good early tenth-century copy, perhaps the best; and the 'Roman' family, the main exemplar of which is cod. Vat. gr. 2369 (D), another good tenth-century copy, later than A.⁴⁷ The *c.* 40 surviving papyri span a period of five centuries, from the first century CE and to the fifth/sixth century CE, with Book 1 being the best represented. With the possible, but controversial, exception of P.Duke 756 + P.Mil.Vogl. 1358 (MP³ 474.110), dated to the second/first century BCE by Soldati, there are no papyri from the Ptolemaic period.⁴⁸

The relationship between the two manuscript families, and between them and the papyri has been a matter of ongoing debate.⁴⁹ Before the third edition of Hude's OCT (see below), critical editions tended to lend more weight to the Florentine family because cod. Vat. gr. 2369 (D) had not been completely collated yet.⁵⁰ In the classic account of Aly (1909) the Florentine family is considered to descend from an ancient 'scholarly' *recensio* possibly produced by Aristarchus.⁵¹ Aly maintained that the Roman family, in contrast, represented a second-century CE *recensio* going back to a pre-Alexandrian *vulgata*, intended for school use and heavily interspersed with

⁴⁷ The latter has been newly studied by Cantore (2013).

⁴⁸ Soldati (2005). The most recent survey is that of S. R. West (2011); see also Bandiera (1997). Another batch of Herodotean papyri is forthcoming in *P.Oxy.*

⁴⁹ See Pasquali (1952) 310. Although outdated, Pasquali's account of the intricate problems affecting the textual transmission of Herodotus (*ibid.* 306–18) is still a very lucid introductory overview. Other classic and more recent discussions of the transmission are Aly (1909), Colonna (1940), Paap (1948), Hemmerdinger (1981), Wilson (2015a), the prefaces in Hude (1927), Legrand (1932–54), Rosén (1987–97), Asheri (1988), Wilson (2015b), and Corcella's note on the text he edits for the Fondazione Valla Herodotus (the latest in Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 6–16). In these accounts views often vary substantially: suffice it to mention that Hemmerdinger (1981) goes as far as to reconstruct 'l'autographe perdu d'Aristarque', while Wilson (2015b) ix–x refrains from giving a *stemma codicum* (in Wilson (2015a) xiii he entertains the idea that the two families may go back to an early Byzantine archetype reporting variant readings).

⁵⁰ See Hemmerdinger (1981) 122–3.

⁵¹ Aly (1909) 591–3. Cf. Jacoby (1913) 516–7.

pseudo-Ionic features following handbooks which taught writers of the Imperial age the basics of the Ionic dialect.⁵² Aly was already criticised by Jacoby, who followed Wilamowitz in attributing many of the epicising and hyper-Ionic forms to a combination of wrong *metacharactērismos*, Hellenistic uncertainty over Ionic correctness, and early Alexandrian interventions on the copies which reached the Hellenistic libraries.⁵³ During the twentieth century there was a gradual rehabilitation of the value of the Roman family, which is the source of many variants accepted in the text of Legrand, Rosén, and Wilson (on which see below).

Papyrological evidence shows that 'already in the Imperial period Herodotus' text was infected with epicism, hyperionisms, and Atticisms'.⁵⁴ The conclusion is that many of the linguistic tendencies witnessed in the medieval tradition go back to much older habits, though the lack of perfect agreement between manuscripts and papyri shows that the division into two families post-dates the fourth century CE and leads to the somewhat surprising conclusion that there existed more than one ancient edition and that consequently the transmission of the text was rather fluid.⁵⁵ This makes it difficult to reconstruct or imagine both an ancient archetype of the text and the language which it employed, which explains why the same artificial linguistic feature may elicit very different assessments. In what follows I exemplify this issue by considering the case study of forms such as *Ξέρξεα* and how they are treated in the major critical editions, starting from Stein (1869–71).⁵⁶

Despite having been published in the later nineteenth century, Stein's edition is still an important text chiefly because of its rich apparatus, which is more complete than the negative one in Hude's later OCT edition. Based on the knowledge of Herodotean manuscripts available at the time, Stein reconstructed an archetype of the *Histories*, presumed to be the ancestor of the whole tradition.⁵⁷ Since Stein believed Herodotus to have written in a

⁵² Aly (1909) 593–4, with criticism in Jacoby (1913) 517.

⁵³ Jacoby (1913) 518.

⁵⁴ S. R. West ap. Bowie (2007) 32.

⁵⁵ Jacoby (1913) 515.

⁵⁶ I refrain from considering the earlier editions by Dindorf (1844), Bekker (1845), and Abicht (1869), which were superseded by Stein's. The first two editors have played a great role in the elimination of pseudo-Ionic forms in Herodotus' vulgate.

⁵⁷ Stein (1869–71) I.xxxix–xliv.

dialectal *mélange*, he retained those variants which he considered authentic and not due to later scribal interference.

Because it resorts to fewer normalising emendations, Stein's edition appears to be more conservative than those by Hude and Legrand; at the same time, Stein's belief that the *mélange* was largely authentic makes him less cautious an interpreter of the evidence than his successors. Let us take as an example the case of alternative first-declension accusative masculine forms in *-ην/-εα*, such as *Ξέρξηην* and *Ξέρξηεα*.⁵⁸ The former is the regular accusative of first-declension names in *-ης*, while the latter is a secondary formation analogical on third-declension names such as *Σωκράτης* (whose accusative is *Σωκράτεα* in Ionic). The analogical *Ξέρξηεα* is attested only once by all principal testimonies (at 7.4), and is then reported in various other instances as a variant reading of *Ξέρξηην*, especially in the manuscripts of the Roman family. Stein accepts *Ξέρξηεα* 7 times,⁵⁹ while in all other instances he opts for *Ξέρξηην*, even when some manuscripts have *Ξέρξηεα*. The dialectological sketch which Stein offers in the Introduction to the edition explains the rationale behind these choices: he believes that both accusatives in *-ην* and in *-εα* are authentic.⁶⁰

Is *Ξέρξηεα* really an ancient, perhaps original, reading or is it the result of a later modification of the text? We may recall here that both Diels and Wilamowitz antedated the introduction of hyper-Ionic features to the Hellenistic age, but nothing prevents us from believing that the instances of *Ξέρξηεα* go back to a much later time. Papyri are of little help, since they transmit none of the passages in which the accusative of Xerxes' name occurs. The other forms for which we have alternative forms of the accusative routinely end in *-ην* in the papyri, but we have one instance of *Γύγεα* at 1.8.2 in *P.Oxy.* 48.3372 (first/second century CE); this reading has not made its way into the new edition by Wilson (2015b), on which see below.⁶¹ The textual evidence is thus overwhelmingly in favour of *-ην*. It is

⁵⁸ Apart from personal names such as *Ξέρξης*, *Ἄρταξέρξης*, and *Γύγης*, accusatives in *-εα* are attested for *δεσπότης*, *κυβερνήτης*, and *ἀκινάκης*. They are more common in manuscripts of the Roman family, but by no means limited to them (see Legrand (1942) 218).

⁵⁹ At 4.43.17 (against the testimony of ABCd), at 7.4.9 (where this reading is unanimously attested by all manuscripts), 7.27.3 (against the testimony of ABd), at 7.139.16 (following PRz, whose testimony he usually discards), at 7.151.7, 7.151.9 and 7.152.3 (always against R; in two cases the name is actually *Ἄρτοξέρξης*).

⁶⁰ Stein (1869–71) I.lxxiii.

⁶¹ Before the publication of the substantial new batch of Herodotean papyri in vol. 48 of *P.Oxy.*, scholars assumed that no accusative in *-εα* was attested in the papyri: see Paap (1948)

fair to say, however, that if an *-εα* accusative should crop up in a newly published Ionic inscription, our perception of the artificiality and late character of *-εα* accusatives would considerably change. As a parallel, we may consider the case of the plural forms of *γη*, 'earth', which in Herodotus have a stem in *γε-*. These forms were once thought to be artificial, but after the publication of a late-archaic lead tablet from Himera (*SEG* 47.1431) we now have evidence the *γε-* stem was also extended to the singular in some 'real' Ionic varieties. Although Himera's dialect is Euboean (West Ionic) and Herodotus hailed from East Ionic Halicarnassus, the presence of the genitive *γέης* in the colonial world confirms that what we find in Herodotus (whatever is actual origin) may not necessarily be 'bad' Greek.⁶²

Let us now turn to the OCT critical edition by Karl Hude, first published in 1906 and revised two other times (the third edition, published in 1927, has remained the reference one), which immediately distinguished itself from previous editions for its economical apparatus. Hude constituted his text granting more weight to the testimony of the Florentine family, but he also took the Roman family into account because of its great number of better readings, often coinciding with the testimony of grammarians.⁶³ Like Stein, at 4.43 Hude accepts *Ξέρξεα* of the Roman family against *Ξέρξην* of the Florentine; he also accepts this 'Ionic' form at 7.4 (no annotation in apparatus) but, contrary to Stein, discards this reading at 7.27, where he prefers *Ξέρξην* of the Roman family, at 7.139, against the testimony of the very same Roman family, and again at 7.151 and 7.152.⁶⁴

The next important edition of Herodotus in the twentieth century is the ten-volume edition of Philippe-Ernest Legrand for the Collection Budé, begun in 1932 and reprinted at several stages, which also remains the standard translation and commentary in French. Legrand firmly believed that both manuscripts and papyri went back to the same ancient edition, from which he thought they diverged in a negligible way, mostly because of

91, Untersteiner (1948) 83–4, and Thumb–Scherer (1959) 270. This belief is reiterated in more recent works as well, e.g., Mansour (2009) 179.

⁶² Another example discussed in the literature is the variant *πρήγμα* for *πρήγμα*, which Schulze (1926), followed by Pasquali (1952) 311, defends on the basis of epigraphic evidence.

⁶³ Hude (1927) viii–ix.

⁶⁴ I quote the third edition (Hude (1927)), which shows the same choices as the first (Hude (1908)). The lines in these paragraphs are sometimes different from those in Stein's edition: I have not indicated them to avoid confusion.

copyists' errors.⁶⁵ Although Legrand notes the higher reliability of the Florentine family, he defends an 'eclectic' approach to his *constitutio textus*, which leads him to privilege sometimes one family and sometimes the other whenever a certain reading seems preferable to him.⁶⁶ Concerning matters of morphology and dialect, Legrand declares his despair at reaching a trustworthy representation of the original text.⁶⁷ He tends to 'unify' doublets, but admits that he may not have been consistent throughout.⁶⁸ He mostly prefers to keep (older) Ionic forms such as uncontracted verbs, and restores them even in places where the best *testimonia* or indeed the consensus of all manuscripts have a different reading.⁶⁹

Concerning $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\eta\nu/\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$, Legrand assumes that forms in $-\epsilon\alpha$ 'ont, à un moment donné, fait partie de la langue parlée', but the absence of any such form from the papyri known to him leads him to conclude that they did not belong to the original Ionic layer of Herodotus' language and were only introduced into the text by 'des copistes ioniens ... par negligence'.⁷⁰ The consequence of this reasoning is that he always corrects $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ to $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\eta\nu$, even at 7.4 where, as noted, $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ is actually transmitted by *all* manuscripts. Legrand thus contradicts the criterion that he applies elsewhere for other features, where morphological variation is preserved and readings follow the majority of testimonies.

Rosén's edition, published in two volumes in 1987 and 1997, marks a stark difference from all previous texts. Based on the linguistic principles set out in the grammar (Rosén (1962)) and, from a philological point of view, on Stein's method,⁷¹ this edition tends to preserve the high variation represented in the manuscripts rather than normalise it on the basis of a preconceived idea of Herodotus' language. Editorial interventions are scanty if compared to the heavily normalising re-writing of 'deviant' forms carried out by other editors. Despite this seemingly 'descriptive' approach, Rosén's

⁶⁵ See Legrand (1942) 186: '[m]anuscripts et papyri semblent dériver tous, pour ce qui concerne le fond du texte, d'une même recension, d'une même édition antique, qui, dès les premiers siècles de notre ère, devait être la plus répandue; ils n'en sont, si je puis employer une expression moderne, que des "tirages" plus ou moins exacts et plus ou moins soignés'.

⁶⁶ Legrand (1942) 191.

⁶⁷ Legrand (1942) 195.

⁶⁸ Legrand (1942) 200–1.

⁶⁹ Legrand (1942) 201–4.

⁷⁰ Quotations from Legrand (1942) 219–20.

⁷¹ Cf. McNeal (1989) 555.

work is in fact the final product of a very personal *interpretation* of linguistic and compositional matters based on a strict (albeit idiosyncratic) set of theoretical premises. Following from his idea that Herodotus' language was eclectic from the start, Rosén may adopt the majority variant of a certain feature against the choice he has just made for the same feature in another passage of the text.⁷² For instance, he keeps both $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ and $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\eta\nu$, working from the assumption that they both existed in Ionic. He goes out of his way to explain that the alternation between the two forms in the manuscripts is not haphazard, but depends on 'regular' rules of syntactic *sandhi*: simply put (Rosén's list of rules is much more complex), Herodotus used $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\eta\nu$ before a word beginning with a vowel and $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ before a word beginning with a consonant.⁷³

Rosén's text, therefore, represents Herodotus' language according to a set of standards which he believes to be genuinely Herodotean, as opposed to the inevitable later alterations.⁷⁴ This method has met with severe criticism, for reasons lucidly explained by Corcella.⁷⁵ However, Rosén's otherwise unorthodox edition has an indubitable advantage: it provides readers with a rich apparatus on the basis of which they can judge manuscript readings for themselves (though errors abound).⁷⁶ This proves invaluable when one is interested in the treatment of a given feature across the whole manuscript tradition,⁷⁷ something which is usually impossible to assess through the apparatus of most of the other editions, with the exception of some of the volumes of the Valla Herodotus. I refrain here from discussing the textual choices made in the Valla Herodotus because the volumes have been edited by different scholars;⁷⁸ I will consider specific points of interest

⁷² See McNeal (1989) 559 for examples and the ratio of Rosén's choices.

⁷³ His reasoning is actually more complicated and involves an amount of special pleading: see Rosén (1962) 69–74, and particularly the last two pages on $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\eta\varsigma$. On the inconsistent application of these criteria to the edition, see Corcella (1989) 245–6.

⁷⁴ Cf. Rosén (1987–97) I.v.

⁷⁵ Corcella (1989) and (1998).

⁷⁶ Cf. Rosén (1987–97) I.xxiv. It should be noted that Rosén does not appear to have personally collated all manuscripts, which means that his apparatus is often erroneous: see Corcella (1989) for many examples.

⁷⁷ He thus often reports the readings of Humanistic manuscripts, such as M and Q (see the next section for examples). Rosén is much less dutiful in reporting variants in papyri: cf. McNeal (1989) 561.

⁷⁸ The Valla Herodotus begins with the edition of Book 1 by Asheri (1988); the latest addition is Book 7 by Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017).

when dealing with $\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ infinitives in the next section.

Compared to Rosén’s hypertrophic apparatus, the new OCT edition of the *Histories* by Wilson (2015b), which follows Hude’s but contains fundamental new conjectures, may seem too spare to some users, though it is now indispensable because of its up-to-date and more trustworthy use of papyri. Wilson’s textual choices often restore ‘correct’ Ionic forms, based on the assumption that ‘in matters of dialect manuscripts are unreliable’.⁷⁹ However, there is no section, in either the Introduction to the edition or in the accompanying volume of *Herodotea*, which defines the dialect with more precision. Wilson also mentions that Herodotus’ language may have entailed variation from the start, either because of Herodotus’ ‘change of mind over time’ or of ‘free variation in Ionic’, and he is inclined to dismiss the idea that variations are owed to ancient editorial activity since ‘specific evidence of the alleged activity was not found’—but he essentially takes no sides.⁸⁰ Concerning $\text{Ξ}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ accusatives, Wilson admits them into his edition in only two cases: at 4.43.19 and at 7.4.2. In neither case does he tell his readers where this minority reading is attested and the two cases are not the same: at 7.4 $\text{Ξ}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\xi\epsilon\alpha$ is the only transmitted reading (as noted by other editors: see above), but at 4.43 it is not. In general, it seems that Wilson prefers accusatives in $\text{-}\eta\nu$ to those in $\text{-}\epsilon\alpha$, even when the latter form is supported by a more ancient testimony: see the case of the above-mentioned $\text{Γ}\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ of 1.8.2, where Wilson prefers the reading $\text{Γ}\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\eta\nu$ of A and the whole Roman family against $\text{Γ}\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ of *P.Oxy.* 3372.⁸¹

This overview of modern editions has provided a basis for assessing an interesting case-study, the treatment of thematic infinitives in $\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Herodotus’ text. In approaching these suspiciously inauthentic features, we should pay attention to the fact that despite the many advances in epigraphy and philology, every edition of the *Histories* remains not only a modern interpretation of the textual transmission (*ça va sans dire*), but the ‘child’ of a given editor’s preconceived idea about Herodotus’ Ionic. The guiding principle in these editorial choices is not always the actual variant readings in manuscripts, since these show alternative treatments of the same

⁷⁹ Wilson (2015b) vi.

⁸⁰ Wilson (2015b) vi.

⁸¹ Both the edition (Wilson (2015b)) and the accompanying volume of *Herodotea* (Wilson (2015a)) are succinct in their elucidation of Wilson’s views of the relationship between testimonies: Wilson also refrains from providing a *stemma codicum*. On these aspects see the review by Stronk (2017).

phonological and morphological element, and often within the same word (i.e., one gets both contracted and uncontracted verbs, and both *φιλεῖν* and *φιλέειν*), but an abstract idea of correctness which is sometimes based on epigraphic evidence, as already advocated, e.g., by Bechtel,⁸² and sometimes on *ad hoc* rules.⁸³ The case-study provided in the next section is a practical example of how those interested in assessing the textual evidence for a certain linguistic phenomenon cannot only work with Wilson's (or Hude's) edition, but need to consult Rosén (because of his richer apparatus, if not for the solidity of his text) and double-check this evidence against Stein, Legrand, and the Fondazione Valla edition.

5. *-έειν* Infinitives in Herodotus and their Linguistic Background

Infinitives in *-έειν* are part of the large number of uncontracted forms transmitted in Herodotus' text, among which those from presents in *-έω* are especially common: consider for instance *φείδεο* for *φείδου*, *καλομένας* for *καλουμένας*, or *έφόρεε* for *έφόρει*. Contractions and the lack of them (vocalic hiatus) represent one of the thorniest linguistic issues that Herodotean scholars face when comparing Herodotus' manuscripts and papyri with Ionic inscriptions. *As a rule* (the emphasis is necessary here: see below) Herodotus' text has uncontracted *-εο-* or *-ευ-*. The latter is an orthographic rendering regularly attested in Ionic inscriptions from about the fourth century BCE, but sporadically evidenced also in earlier epigraphic texts.⁸⁴ Considering that epigraphic practice is conservative, it is not impossible that Herodotus really used forms in *-ευ-*, reflecting an earlier uncontracted stage as /εο/. Critical editions are unanimous in leaving such sequences uncontracted in *-έω* verbs, even when manuscripts may witness contracted *-ου-*. In

⁸² Bechtel (1924) 10–11.

⁸³ As in the case of Rosén (1962) and (1987–97). On the dangers of this method, see A. Corcella ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 1–6.

⁸⁴ The modern treatment of this graphic rendering has crossed paths with Homeric philology, since *-ευ-* appears in the oldest copies of Homer. The question of whether this writing may represent an authentic phonological reality in Homer need not concern us here: for appraisals of this problem, readers can consult M. L. West (1998) 104, who considers it a mere graphic element, with no linguistic reality in the later phases of the Homeric epics (see also West (2001) 164); and the opposite view presented (in my opinion convincingly) by Passa (2001), namely that some instances of *-ευ-* in the Homeric text must be ancient. Passa (2001) 391–2, 410 also collects evidence for the use of *-ευ-* in Ionic inscriptions before the fourth century BCE.

other words, all editors work from the assumption that forms with hiatus are original and must be restored in place of contracted ones, considered to be trivialisations. All of them also keep some forms with *-ευ-* (e.g., *ποιούμενα* at 1.61.12 for *ποιεόμενα*, or *ἄνευμένοισι* at 1.165.2 for *ἄνεομένοισι* in Wilson's edition), side by side with forms with *-εο-* (e.g., the participle *καλεομένας* in 1.165.2 Wilson).

-εε- too is *mostly* left uncontracted in Herodotus' manuscripts. Here however the divergence from papyri and inscriptions is more pronounced. Papyri have many contracted forms (which may still be considered later trivialisations based on Attic or koine contract verbs), and no late-archaic or Classical inscription from Ionia has forms with uncontracted *-εε-* (an exception being, of course, epigrams: their diction imitates poetic, and especially epic, language). The treatment of *-εε-* in Herodotus may thus be explained in both the scenarios discussed above, §3, namely:

(1) Herodotus' original language could have complied with Ionic inscriptions: hence, uncontracted *-εε-* must have been introduced by ancient editors and copyists.⁸⁵

(2) Alternatively, many (or even all) instances of uncontracted *-εε-* could have been used by Herodotus to give his language a more archaic flavour: in this perspective, the contracted forms in *-ει-* attested in papyri and manuscripts could be trivialisations.⁸⁶

In both scenarios, the impression is that ancient editors or Herodotus himself adopted uncontracted *-εε-* to comply with its treatment in Homer. Modern critical editions, on their part, have a higher number of uncontracted *-εε-* forms than contracted *-ει-*.⁸⁷

Uncontracted infinitives in *-έειν* are of two types. In the present infinitive of *-έω* verbs, *-έειν* represents a regular stage, preceding the final contraction: thus, *φορέειν* derives from **phore-ēn*, a form in which the /e/ of the root has

⁸⁵ This view is endorsed, among others, by Bredow (1846) 319–20 and Bechtel (1924) 12.

⁸⁶ See, e.g., Merzdorf (1875) 147. Hemmerdinger thinks that uncontracted forms (as well as other linguistic features) are original and depend on the fact that Herodotus' text was originally *sung* (my emphasis): cf. Hemmerdinger (1981) 170.

⁸⁷ Generalisations are always dangerous when it comes to the complex topic of contractions (or the lack thereof) in the Homeric text, a topic which takes up thirty pages in Chantraine's *Grammaire Homérique*. Concerning *-έω* verbs, see Chantraine (1958) 39: 'Lorsque les deux ε en contact se trouvaient au temps faible les deux graphies contracte et non contracte sont admises par la métrique' (e.g., in the vulgate imperfects are usually uncontracted, but imperatives are usually contracted: this may be due to the graphic modernisation of the text).

not yet contracted with the /ē/ (written with the 'spurious diphthong' ει) deriving from the encounter between the thematic vowel and the inherited thematic infinitive ending (i.e., *-e-en* < *-e-hen*, a stage witnessed by Mycenaean, < **-e-sen*).⁸⁸ Present infinitives in *-έειν* are amply attested in the Homeric language.

The second type of *-έειν* infinitives are aorist formations such as *βαλέειν*. These are Homeric as well, but do not represent an original stage of the language. The starting point of the thematic aorist infinitive of *βάλλω* is the trisyllabic form **bal-e-hen* (from **bal-e-sen*), which regularly yields *βαλεῖν* after contraction: in *βαλέειν* there is one more syllable and hence the form is linguistically artificial. The rise of these *-έειν* aorist infinitives in the Homeric language has received different interpretations. Since all these forms occur either before a consonant or before a caesura, an older view maintained that they arose from the wrong *metacharacterismos* of archaic writings such as *BAΛEEN*, supposedly representing the original uncontracted stage of the aorist infinitive (i.e., *βαλέειν* + consonant). This interpretation was later abandoned. According to Pierre Chantraine, *-έειν* aorist infinitives were modelled on the present infinitives of *-έω* verbs: since, e.g., *φορέω* regularly had both *φορεῖν* and *φορέειν*, *βαλεῖν* was accompanied by an artificial form, i.e., *βαλέειν*.⁸⁹ However, Alexander Nikolaev rightly notes that '[i]t is unclear why thematic aorists should have been modelled precisely on the contract verbs in *-έε/ο-*, given the lack of any special paradigmatic connection between these two classes of forms'. He therefore proposes that the analogy was triggered by another class of verbs, the infinitives of asigmatic 'liquid futures' such as *ἔρεῖν/ἔρέειν*, 'which likewise had active infinitives both in contracted *-εῖν* and uncontracted *-έειν*'.⁹⁰

Nikolaev situates the creation of these analogical aorist infinitives in the last phases of the Homeric epics, when Ionic bards developed them to replace, in certain metrical environments, old Aeolic infinitives in *-έμεν* (e.g., *βαλέμεν*), themselves probably covering for older uncontracted forms (**βαλέειν*): this was possible when infinitives with the shape (C)ṼC-έμεν, like *βαλέμεν*, occurred before a consonant and therefore had an anapaestic shape which could be covered by the new analogical *-έειν*.⁹¹ An important

⁸⁸ On the early history of the Greek thematic infinitive ending, see García Ramón (1977).

⁸⁹ Chantraine (1958) 493.

⁹⁰ Nikolaev (2013) 82.

⁹¹ For the linguistic details of this process, see Nikolaev (2013) 83–5.

point that Nikolavev has contributed to stressing is that such aorist infinitives in *-έειν* were never part of epichoric Ionic. This is shown not only by the fact that they are never found in Ionic inscriptions (or in inscriptions in other dialects, save for some late poetic usages which will be tackled in §6 below), but also by their absence in Hesiod, who ‘did not have access to the poetic tradition where the thematic aorist infinitives in *-έειν* were available as substitutes for contracted (and therefore unmetrical) Ionic forms in *-εἶν*’.⁹²

Having clarified the Homeric background of both types of infinitives in *-έειν*, let us go back to Herodotus. The textual tradition has *-έειν* for both the present infinitives of *-έω* verbs and a number of thematic aorist infinitives. Medieval manuscripts tend to have more present infinitives in *-έειν* than aorist forms, where the contracted (and regular) ending *-εἶν* is far more common. As already noted by Paap,⁹³ the papyri comply with this distribution: uncontracted *present* infinitives in *-έειν* are amply attested in the papyrological tradition, but we also get at least two aorist forms as well (see below for these). In general, modern editors keep present infinitives such as *φοπέειν* uncontracted, complying with their treatment of other *-εε*-sequences, but tend to discard aorist infinitives in *-έειν*, no matter what the manuscripts and papyri attest to individual forms.⁹⁴ This, however, makes life difficult for those who are interested in the minutiae of linguistic details since the real situation in manuscripts and papyri is not systematically acknowledged in the apparatus of these editions.

We can get an idea of the situation by considering how the thematic aorist infinitives of Herodotus Book 1 are treated in the five major current editions: Wilson (= *TLG*), Hude (1927), Legrand (1932), Rosén (1987), and Asheri (1988). There are 69 thematic aorist infinitives in Book 1. Most of them are transmitted in their regular contracted form (e.g., *βαλεῖν*) and all editors

⁹² Nikolaev (2013) 86. Cf. Porro (2014) 148 for a critique.

⁹³ Paap (1948) 86–7: ‘Permulti iam, inter quos Wilamowitzius invenitur, formis, quae *εε* vel *εε* praebent, in codicibus fere traditis fiduciam negarunt. Titulis Ioniis poetisque contrahere solentibus et Herodotum sic fecisse putant. Sed nunc papyri nobis servatae— eae quoque, quae ante aetatem Antoninorum linguam antiquam amantem scriptae sunt— scripturam codicum confirmant. *Igitur antiquis temporibus hanc ortam esse constat*’ (my emphasis).

⁹⁴ Apart from Dindorf (1844) xxv, who makes a case for preserving most of the *-έειν* forms, and Rosén (1962) 156, who accepts them as ‘allomorphs’ of those in *-εἶν*, most scholars and editors have rejected these aorist infinitives: see, e.g., Bredow (1846) 324; Merzdorf (1875) 154; Fritsch (1876) 107; Rosén (1987–97) I.ix; Legrand (1942) 202; Corcella ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 16.

except Rosén always choose this form, even in the case of those infinitives for which there is evidence of variation in the manuscripts. These are:

- (1) **ἀποφυγεῖν at 1.1.18 Wilson.** Transmitted by all main manuscripts except A; accepted by Wilson, Hude, and Legrand; Rosén and Asheri print ἀποφυγέειν of A.
- (2) **διαφυγεῖν at 1.10.1 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors except Rosén and Asheri, who print διαφυγέειν. This variant is transmitted by all main manuscripts (see apparatus in Hude and Legrand).
- (3) **περιδέειν at 1.24.14 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that cod. M has περιδέειν.⁹⁵
- (4) **ιδεῖν at 1.32.8 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that codd. MQ have ιδέειν.
- (5) **παθεῖν at 1.32.8 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that codd. MQ have παθέειν.
- (6) **ἐπισχέειν at 1.32.37 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that codd. MQ have ἐπισχέειν.
- (7) **έλειν at 1.36.9 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors except Asheri, who prints έλέειν of the codices. The apparatus of the other editions registers the presence of the variant έλέειν in different ways (Wilson and Legrand: 'codd.'; Hude: 'L'; Rosén: 'A').
- (8) **συνεξελεῖν at 1.36.17 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that the variant συνεξελέειν is attested in C.
- (9) **έκμαθεῖν at 1.73.12 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that codd. MQ have εκμαθέειν.
- (10) **συνδραμεῖν at 1.87.7 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that cod. M has συνδραμέειν.
- (11) **ἀποφυγεῖν at 1.91.3 Wilson.** Wilson, Hude and Legrand print ἀποφυγεῖν but note the presence of the variant ἀποφυγέειν in codd. Rosén and Asheri print ἀποφυγέειν as found in the manuscripts.
- (12) **διαλαβεῖν at 1.114.12 Wilson.** Accepted by all editors. Rosén is the only one to note that διαλαβέειν is transmitted by cod. M.

⁹⁵ Here and elsewhere Rosén registers the variants of the later codices M (16th century) and Q (end of 15th century), which were the basis for the Aldine *editio princeps* (cf. Mondrain (1995)). These manuscripts report readings which are otherwise unknown to the rest of the tradition: they could be later unsystematic innovations, though it is not impossible that some of them originated in antiquity.

Book 1 is the best represented in the papyri, but none of the published ones has preserved the lines in which the twelve infinitives for which there is evidence of variation occur. It may perhaps seem otiose to check the amount of variation that characterises a morphological class unanimously defined as artificial and often transmitted only as *variae lectiones* in minor manuscripts, but this exercise is useful for pinpointing the factors behind the presence of *-έειν* aorist infinitives in Herodotus' text. According to Legrand, they were introduced by 'absent-minded copyists' and must always be corrected.⁹⁶ This approach stands in contradiction to his acceptance of other uncontracted *-εε-* forms, which he defends because of their frequency in both manuscripts and papyri and because he cannot rule out that these uncontracted forms 'ne remonte pas à Hérodote lui-même'.⁹⁷ Why can the same not be applied to *-έειν* infinitives? These too were features of the Homeric language which ancient editors (or, in principle, Herodotus himself) could have introduced into the text according to a precise reasoning. The comparatively smaller number of *-έειν* infinitives in relation to those in *-εῖν* may be due to linguistic normalisation in later (i.e., Byzantine) stages of the text. At first sight, the meagre papyrological evidence weighs in favour of 'normal' *-εῖν* forms. However, as I propose below, the distribution follows a morphological rationale that reinforces the suspicion that at least *some* aorist *-έειν* infinitives may have already been present in Herodotus' ancient text.

A better look at the available evidence allows us to see that a morphological criterion could have guided the variation in aorist infinitive endings and that this may still be quite well represented in the manuscripts. The aorist infinitives of Book 1 for which the manuscripts transmit variants in *-έειν* mostly derive from thematic aorists which have the shape (C)ṼC: (-)φυγεῖν, ἰδεῖν, παθεῖν, (-)έλεῖν, (-)μαθεῖν, (-)δραμεῖν. In other words, most of these forms comply with the epic conditions for the creation of *-έειν* aorist infinitives: a root with a short syllable which, attached to *-έειν*, forms an anapaest and can be accommodated across two hexametric feet. Of the attested 12 variants in *-έειν* of Book 1, 6 have exactly this shape: ἰδέειν, παθέειν, ἐλέειν, συνεξέλεειν, ἐκμαθέειν, and συνδραμέειν (notice that the compounded forms, too, could fit the hexameter). The impression,

⁹⁶ '[L]es forms en *-έειν* que les manuscrits des deux familles présentent ça et là ont été calquées par des copistes distraits sur les infinitifs présents non contractés des verbes en *-έω*; elles sont à corriger': Legrand (1942) 204.

⁹⁷ Legrand (1942) 202.

therefore, is that whoever inserted these infinitives into the text did so by applying the criteria which he observed at work in the Homeric language.

Of course, it may be objected that the 6 other infinitives (*ἀποφυγέειν* repeated twice, *διαφυγέειν*, *περιδέειν*, *ἐπισχέειν*, and *διαλαβέειν*) do not have a shape that would fit the hexameter; moreover, the verbs *ἀποφεύγω*, *διαφεύγω*, and *διαλαμβάνω* (in whatever tense) are never found in the Homeric epics. These 6 forms, however, cease to look like an exception once we realise that, except for *ἐπισχέειν*, their uncompounded base verbs all produce aorist infinitives in *-έειν* which have the required shape and are attested in both Homer and Herodotus, namely *φυγέειν*, *ιδέειν*, and *λαβέειν*. A counter-proof that this principle is at play in the opposition between aorist infinitives in *-εῖν* and in *-έειν* is the fact that the 9 instances of *ἐλθεῖν* in Book 1 never have the variant *ἐλθέειν* in the manuscripts, because its cretic prosody is incompatible with the hexameter.⁹⁸ A further check on Books 2 and 3 confirms that *ἐλθεῖν* never occurs as *ἐλθέειν*.

The evidence collected so far suggests that the distribution of *-έειν* infinitives in the tradition of Herodotus' text is not at all casual: not only does it depend on the comparison between Herodotus' language and Homer's, but the criteria governing the use of *-έειν* infinitives in Homer are also reinforced in the Herodotean tradition.⁹⁹ Scholarship has neglected this fact. For instance, neither Bredow nor Merzdorf,¹⁰⁰ who diligently produced a catalogue of *-έειν* aorist infinitives transmitted by manuscripts, noticed that they tend to be of the 'anapaestic' type or, in the case of preverbed forms that would be unmetrical in the hexameter, that they are still compounded forms of 'anapaestic' infinitives. For his part, Rosén in his edition strangely states: 'ignoro, qua ratione vel ex historia vel e structura linguae illud *βαλέειν* explicari possit'.¹⁰¹ As far as I can tell, Smyth is the only one to note that 'all of these forms are Homeric, though the prepositions do not always agree'¹⁰²

⁹⁸ The only forms used by Homer are *ἐλθέμεν* and *ἐλθεῖν*: see Porro (2014) 153.

⁹⁹ A similar criterion would be at play in the treatment of other verbal forms (e.g., *ὀρέωντες*) discussed by Galligani (2001) 27–35 as concerns cod. Laur. Conv. Suppr. 207 (C), forms which she attributes to ancient editors, not Byzantine copyists.

¹⁰⁰ Bredow (1846) 324–7; Merzdorf (1875) 154.

¹⁰¹ Rosén (1987–97) I.ix.

¹⁰² Smyth (1894) 499. Smyth's statement refers to the forms 'in which there is absolute consensus' in the manuscript tradition, namely *βαλέειν* (with compounds *συμβαλέειν*, *ἀποβαλέειν*, *ὑπερβαλέειν*), *έλέειν*, *ἀποθανέειν*, *ιδέειν*, *παθέειν*, *πεσέειν* (with compounds *συμπεσέειν*, *μεταπεσέειν*), *φαγέειν*, *ἀποφυγέειν*, *διαφυγέειν*: see Smyth (1894) 499 n. 3.

and that ‘Hdt. is never made guilty of an attempt to create an *ἐλθέειν, an *εἰπέειν, or an *ἀγαγέειν, forms which could not find admission into the hexameter’.¹⁰³ His conclusion is that these infinitives are ‘a signal instance of the effort to render poetical the diction of the historian’ perpetrated by ‘pseudo-Ionicizing grammarians and scribes’.

Is it possible to lend more plausibility to this interpretation? In §2 above, we saw that the evidence for this pseudo-Ionicising activity on Herodotus’ text is non-existent, if not completely lacking. A first answer could come from the papyri, which unfortunately do not transmit those passages of Book 1 where we have evidence of variation between -εῖν and -έειν. In two other cases, we have papyrological evidence for aorist infinitives in -εῖν which do *not* have -έειν variants in the manuscripts. εἰπεῖν of 1.199.15 Wilson is also reported in *P.Ross.Georg.* 1.15 (third century CE): here the lack of any variant *εἰπέειν confirms the hypothesis that only (C)VC stems received the ending -έειν. However, according to this rationale we would expect *P.Mil.Vogl.* inv. 1212 (second/third century CE) to have λαβέειν at 1.187.12, but the papyrus has λαβεῖν.

The results are slightly more encouraging when we turn to papyri transmitting other books of the *Histories*, though the evidence is limited. We have one case of an anapaestic βαλέειν (Hdt. 2.111.8 Wilson) in *P.Oxy.* 3376, fr. 25–7, col. ii.32, a ‘tall imposing roll’ in a ‘well-written hand’ (second century CE),¹⁰⁴ and three cases of infinitives in -εῖν which would not scan, were they to use the ending -έειν:

- (1) παρελθεῖν of Hdt. 3.72.11 Wilson, transmitted in *P.Oxy.* 1619, col. 37.446, one of the oldest Herodotean papyri (end first/beg. second century CE), written in a fine hand and showing evidence of ‘considerable revision’;¹⁰⁵
- (2) συναγαγεῖν of Hdt. 2.111.16 Wilson, transmitted in *P.Oxy.* 3376, fr. 28, col. i.6 (second century CE);
- (3) ἐπισχεῖν of Hdt. 8.5.2 Wilson, transmitted in *P.Oxy.* 3383, col. ii.2 (second/third century CE).¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Smyth (1894) 499–500.

¹⁰⁴ See the description by M. Chambers in *P.Oxy.* 48.3376.

¹⁰⁵ See Grenfell’s and Hunt’s introduction to *P.Oxy.* 13.1609.

¹⁰⁶ I have checked all the Herodotean papyri currently listed in MP³. Most of them do not transmit passages where a thematic aorist active infinitive is used. *P.Ryl.* 1.55 does not preserve the part of 2.107.2 where μαθεῖν occurs; in *P.Oslo* inv. 1487 the infinitive ἀποθανεῖν is in lacuna.

Four forms perhaps are not enough to conclude that the papyrological tradition already followed the distribution posited above. It is telling, however, that no counter-example is to be found except for *λαβεῖν* in *P.Mil. Vogl.* inv. 1212. It is also noteworthy that the reading *βαλέειν* of *P.Oxy.* 3376 is paralleled unanimously by the medieval manuscripts.

The interpretation that we can advance on the basis of the evidence reviewed so far is not without discrepancies, but reveals that an overarching principle is at work in the distribution of variants or the lack of them. It seems that, by and large, both manuscripts and papyri tend to associate (C)ṼC stems (with Ṽ indicating a *long syllable* rather than only a long vowel), such as *ἐλθ-*, *εἶπ-*, *βλαστ-* and *περισπ-*, to infinitives in *-εῖν*.¹⁰⁷ There are no *-έειν* infinitives from these stems. An opposite tendency seems to be at work with (C)ṼC stems such as *ἐλ-*, *μαθ-*, *φυγ-*: they mostly receive variants in *-έειν*. In both cases, the resulting infinitive form would fit into a hexametric line. As noted, a very telling fact is that the exceptions to this distribution all concern compound forms of (C)ṼC stems. Although *ἀναλαβέειν*, *ἀποφυγέειν*, *διαλαβέειν*, *διαταμέειν*, *ἐξευρέειν*, *ἐπισχέειν*, *μεταβαλέειν*, *συμβαλέειν*, and *συνδραμέειν* would *not* fit the hexameter, they are still compounded forms of anapaestic *simplicia* which do fit the hexameter. If we posit that there existed a general rule that required one to attach *-έειν* to (C)ṼC stems, we can see why some of their compounds may have received this treatment too.

This 'poetic' treatment of thematic aorist infinitives is usually attributed to the intervention of ancient editors. However, within the scenario of Herodotus writing in an elaborate literary language, it is not a priori impossible that he used these infinitives himself. Given that we will never be able to prove this last hypothesis, it may not be idle to speculate further on the linguistic and extra-linguistic motivations that may have influenced the ancient editors in their treatment of thematic aorist infinitives. My personal hunch is that this characterisation of the text must have started early on and that the second-century CE *P.Oxy.* 3376, with its *βαλέειν*, represents not the *beginning* of this trend, but its *consolidation*. The background behind this editorial practice may be contextualised by turning to another type of evidence which has never been tackled to assess this question: metrical inscriptions. Granted that aorist infinitives in *-έειν* are literary artificial creations and hence absent from prose inscriptions, a re-assessment of their

¹⁰⁷ In producing these lists I have relied on the data collected in Bredow (1846) 324–7. Spot-checks on the apparatus in Rosén's edition confirm that Bredow's data are sound.

use in inscribed epigrams vis-à-vis the literary tradition offers some useful insights for the interpretation of their presence in Herodotus' text as well.

6. -έειν Aorist Infinitives in Inscriptions and Post-Classical Literature

A search for -έειν infinitives (both present and aorist) in the PHI database shows that such infinitives are completely absent from *all* types of inscriptional texts until about the middle of the fourth century BCE. As one would expect, given the poetic pedigree of both the uncontracted present infinitives and the artificial aorist forms, infinitives in -έειν all occur in poetic texts, mostly funerary epigrams. Present infinitives in -έειν first occur around the mid-fourth century BCE: the first attestation is ἐλεεῖν 'to mourn' in *SEG* 35.708, a funerary epigram from Amphipolis; they have about 16 attestations in total until the late-antique period.

The interesting fact is the date-range of the attestations of the aorist infinitives. The first known example, παθέειν, occurs in the so-called Delian aretology of Sarapis (*IG* XI.4 1299), an inscription in both prose and hexameters composed towards the end of the third century BCE to celebrate the history of this Egyptian cult at Delos.¹⁰⁸ The hexametric part (ll. 30–94) consists in a hymn to Sarapis composed by one Maiistas. As one would expect, its language is heavily influenced by the Homeric *Kunstsprache* and at the beginning of line 69 (ἦ τί χροῖ παθέειν) παθέειν occupies the same metrical position as in *Il.* 17.32 (= 20.198).

The second example occurs in a public funerary epigram from Thera for a priest of Apollon Carneios, Admetos Theokleidas (*IG* XII.3 868, l. 8), which can be dated to the late second century or early first century BCE based on other inscriptions mentioning the same person. The language of the epigram is not particularly Homeric, which shows that -έειν aorist infinitives had slowly become acceptable in metrical inscriptions even outside an epicising context.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ Engelmann (1975). For the dating, see now Moyer (2008) 102.

¹⁰⁹ The epigram, preceded by a prose text in Doric, runs as follows: οὐ μόνον εὐχοῦμεν Λακεδαιμόνος ἐκ βασιλῆων | ξυνὰ δὲ Θετταλῆς ἐκ προγόνων γενόμεν, | σάξω δ' Ἀδμήτου κατ' ἴσον κλέος ὡς ὄνομ' εὐχῶ. | εἰ δὲ δύω λείποντα τριηκοστοῦ ἔτεός με | Θεουκλείδα πατρός νόσφισε Μοῖρ' ὀλοή, | τετλάτω ὡς Πηλεὺς ὡς προπάτωρ [τ]ε Φέρης· | οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄρ[κε]σιν ἔσχεν· ἐπεὶ πάντως ἂν ὑπέστη | δις θανέειν [αὐ]τὸς [ζῶ]ντ' ἐ[μ<έ>] λειπόμενος.

The number of -έειν aorist infinitives starkly increases in Imperial poetry on stone. εἰσιδέειν occurs in *ISmyrna* 549, a funerary epigram for a woman named Paula dated to between the first and the second centuries CE.¹¹⁰ The epigram is not the best example of Greek poetry, but this adds to the impression that these artificial infinitives had become common trade even for less skilled local poets.

The next attestation, again of ἰδέειν, occurs in line 13 of a late second-century CE funerary epigram in eleven elegiacs from Pamphylia, mourning Konon who died away from home.¹¹¹ This carefully composed epigram, detailing the places to which Konon travelled before meeting an untimely death, employs all the typical features of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, such as πτόλιιν (l. 1), the participles with *diektasis* γελώσαν (l. 3) and εἰσορόων (l. 16), the unaugmented aorists δέξατο (l. 8), θῆκεν (l. 12), προσπτύξατο (l. 15) and ἄνυσσα (l. 17), the Ionic genitive singular ἡγεμονῆος (l. 11), and accusative plural γονῆας (l. 13) to mention only the most notable. In l. 13 the infinitive ἰδέειν occurs within what is probably an allusion to an Odyssean passage, whose emphatic repetition of πρὶν it imitates: ... ὁ δ' ἀρπάκτης, πρὶν χρόνον ἐκτελέσαι, | πρὶν πάτρην ἰδέειν με τὸ δεύτερον ἠδὲ γονῆας, | ἤρπασεν ... (cf. *Od.* 4.475–7: οὐ γάρ τοι πρὶν μοῖρα φίλους τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι | οἶκον

¹¹⁰ A later date, to the mid-second century CE, was proposed by Keil: see *ISmyrna*, p. 253. The text runs as follows: τέκνον ἐμὸν Παῦλα, φθινύθω δακρύοις σε βοῶσα / τοῖά τις ἀλκῶν παῖδας ὀδυρομένη. | κωφαὶ δ' ἀνταχοῦσι πέτραι καὶ τύνβος ἀπεχθής, | ὅς τὸν ἐμῶν τοκετῶν ἔσβεσεν ἠέλιον. | αἰεὶ δ' ὡς Νειόβη πέτρην δάκρυ πᾶσιν ὀρῶμαι | ἀνθρώποις ἀχέων πένθος ἔχουσα μόνη. | ὦ τάφε καὶ δαίμων, μικρὸν μέθες ἰς φάος ἔλθειν | παῖδαν ἐμὴν Παῦλαν, δοῖς δέ μοι εἰσιδέειν. | οὐ σοι Φερσεφόνη τόδε μέμψεται οὐδέ τις Ἄδῃ | ἦν τόσον †ANTHISEΣ† παῖδα ἐμὴν κατ' ὄναρ. In line 8 the engraver incised the 'normal' infinitive ΕΙΣΙΔΕΙΝ, but metre clearly requires εἰσιδέειν.

¹¹¹ Ed. Bean/Mitford 1970, no. 49: Βηρυτὸν τὸ πάροιθεν ὅτε πτόλιιν ἦλθον ἐς ἐ[σθλήν] | Ῥωμαϊκῆς μούσης εἵνεκα καὶ νομίμων, | ἐλπωρῆν γελώσαν ἔχων καὶ δαίμονα πικρό[ν], | οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ πάτρην ἦλυθον ἡμετέρην. | ἀλλὰ με πρῶτον ἔδεκτο δικασπολίησι μέλοντα | ἄστῃ Παλαιστίνης ὄρχαμος ἀμφιέπων. | κείθεν δ' Ἀντιόχοιο φίλη πόλις, ἐκ δέ μ' ἐκείνης | Βειθυνῶν ἀγαθὴ δέξατο μητρόπολις. ἔνθεν ἐμὸν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν | Κέρτος ὀμηλικῆς πολλὸν ἀγασσάμενος | συνκάθεδρον Θήβης Νειλώιδος ἡγεμονῆος | θῆκεν. ὁ δ' ἀρπάκτης, πρὶν χρόνον ἐκτελέσαι, | πρὶν πάτρην ἰδέειν με τὸ δεύτερον ἠδὲ γονῆας, | ἤρπασεν ἐξαπίνης εἰς Ἀχέροντ' Αἰδῆς. | τηλ[όθε(?) δ'] ἐρχόμενός(?) με πατῆρ προσπτύξατο χερσί, | νεκρὸν ἐπὶ ξεινῆς κείμενον εἰσορόων. | ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς Νειλὸν τε μέγαν καὶ πόντον ἄνυσσα, | ἀντὶ γάμων στοναχῶν τοῦτον ἔχει<ν>(?) με τάφο[ν]. | μήτηρ δ' αὐτ' ὀδύνησι πεπαρμένη ἐν χθονὶ κίτα· | κείμε δ' ὡδε Κόνων ἀνὴρ Μούσησι μεμηλώς, | ψυχὴν ἐς μακάρων νῆσσον ἔχων ἀγαθὴν. | ἀλλὰ, πάτερ Τρώϊλε, μὴ τόσσον ὀδύρεο· καὶ γὰρ ἄριστοι | παῖδες ἐπουρανίων ἦλυθον εἰς Αἶδην.

ἐϋκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν | πρίν γ' ὄτ' ἂν Αἰγύπτιοιο, διπετέος ποταμοῖο ...).

A similar rhetorical construction, with a repetition of *πρίν*, characterises the two lines of *IGBulg V 5930*, a third-century CE funerary epigram for a mother and her small son from Nicopolis *ad Nestum*, which features the artificial infinitives *εἰσιδέειν* and *παθέειν*.¹¹² The epigram employs several typically epic phono-morphological elements: lack of contractions and omission of the augment, genitives such as ἔο (l. 2) and ἐμείο (l. 6), the form οὔνομα (l. 6), etc.

The later attestations of thematic infinitives in *-έειν* amount to eleven forms, almost all in funerary epigrams. Apart from the verbs which already occur in earlier epigrams, later inscriptions also contain *ἐκφυγέειν* (*TAM V.2 840*, Lydia, 253/254 CE) and *ἐκμαθέειν* (Marek, *Kat. Pompeiopolis 29*, undated): the latter shows that this artificial ending could be paired with verbs that have no epic pedigree (the first attestation of *ἐκμανθάνω* is in Herodotus).¹¹³

It is likely that the increasing use of *-έειν* aorist infinitives in Greek epigrammatic language depends on trends which had arisen in other literary milieus already in the Hellenistic period. As mentioned in the preceding section, despite being a Homeric feature, these infinitives are prominently *not* common in poetic language outside the Homeric epics. They never feature in Hesiod, being confined to the pseudo-Hesiodic poems.¹¹⁴ They later resurface in Hellenistic hexameter poetry, with the first examples in

¹¹² δέρκεο σῆμα, φέριστε, καὶ εἴρεο τίς κάμε τοῦτο. | Ἐρμογένης ποθέων με, χαριζόμενος δ' ἔο παιδί | Θέκλιμ εὐπλοκάμ<ω> γ' ἦν ἤρπασε Μοῖρα κραταιή | πρίν γάμον εἰσιδέειν, πρίν ἀνέρι λέκτρα συνάψαι, | πρίν ψυχὴν παθέειν τι, ἀκήρατος ἐς θεὸν ἦλθεν. | εἰ δὲ θέλεις καὶ ἐμείο καὶ υἱέος οὔνομ' ἀκοῦσαι, | κλῶθι, φίλος· τέκε[ο]ς Δημοσθίνεος λάσιον κῆρ, | αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Ματρῶνα, πόλις δέ μοι ἔπλετο Νίκη, | κέλμαι δ' ἐνθ[άδ'] ἔγωγε σὺν υἱεί παιδί τέτ[αρτ]ος.

¹¹³ The other seven attestations are: (1) *θανέειν*: *IScM III 148*, funerary epigram from Kallatis, Scythia Minor, third/fourth century CE; (2) *θανέειν*: *IC I xviii 177*, funerary epigram, Lyttos, third century CE (cf. *SEG 15.566[1]*); (3) *παθέειν*: *Milet VI.3 1403*, very fragmentary epigram, Miletus, fourth/fifth century CE; (4) *παθέειν*: Bernand, *Inscr. Métr.* 61, funerary epigram, Hermopolis Parva (?), Egypt, fourth/fifth century CE; (5) *εἰσιδέειν*, *θανέειν*: *MAMA V R 28*, funerary epigram from Nakokleia, Phrygia, undated; (6) *θανέειν*: *MAMA V Lists I(i)*, 182.85, funerary epigram from Dorylaion, Phrygia, undated; (7) *εἰσιδέειν*: *TAM II 913*, fragmentary epigram, Lycia, undated.

¹¹⁴ See Nikolaev (2013) 85–6. The forms in the pseudo-Hesiodic poems amount to eight (*ibid.* 87).

Callimachus,¹¹⁵ followed by Apollonius Rhodius and Pseudo-Theocritus.¹¹⁶ The distribution of *-έειν* aorist infinitives in these three *corpora* vis-à-vis that in Aratus and Nicander, who have *none*, suggests that we may be dealing with a specific trend in Hellenistic hexameter poetry that includes compositions close to Homer in subject-matter, but excludes 'didactic' poems.

If we zoom forward onto the Imperial age, we witness a very different situation: *-έειν* aorist infinitives are much more common. Oppian is so fond of these forms that he uses them sixteen times, against only one instance of a present infinitive (*φορέειν* at 5.505). Dionysius Periegetes too confines *-έειν* to thematic aorists. The evidence from prose texts is unfortunately less useful. Modern editions of Hippocrates, Megasthenes and other authors associated with Ionic prose routinely print *-έειν* for present infinitives of *-έω*, but mostly *-έιν* for aorist thematic forms. To assess to what extent this faithfully reflects the textual tradition is beyond the scope of this paper, but *-έειν* aorist infinitives are definitely attested as *variae lectiones* in many manuscripts, in a similar way to what we observe in the tradition of Herodotus' text.¹¹⁷ A telling fact is that the text of Lucian's *On the Syrian Goddess* has at least two securely transmitted aorist infinitives: *λαθέειν* (21) and *παθέειν* (25). In principle we cannot be certain that these infinitives go back to Lucian himself, but their authenticity is very likely. Discussing the matter, Lightfoot identifies two factors that may account for Lucian's use of such epicising traits: on the one hand, 'the frequent lack of differentiation between epic and Ionic prose', on the other hand 'the fact that the texts of Herodotus available in the second century were already full of such pseudo-Ionisms and epicisms, overlaid on whatever poetic forms Herodotus himself had preferred'.¹¹⁸ She therefore agrees with those scholars who rule out the possibility that *-έειν* aorist infinitives may be authentic in Herodotus.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ *Hec. fr.* 326 Pfeiffer = 77 Hollis (*αἴθ' ὄφελος θανέειν κτλ.*: the infinitive, accepted by all editors, is a correction of R. Bentley); *Dian.* 63 (*οὐτ' ἄντην ιδέειν κτλ.*); and *Del.* 135 (*έμβαλέειν δίνησιν κτλ.*), all Homeric forms.

¹¹⁶ Apollonius has 22 forms, not all of them Homeric (e.g., *καμέειν*, *σημανέειν*, *ἀνασχεθέειν*), against only 4 present infinitives. In the Theocritean corpus aorist infinitives of this kind are only attested in the spurious *Idyll* 25, which employs epic language (*εισιδέειν*: l. 44; *ιδέειν*: ll. 184 and 222).

¹¹⁷ See Porro (2014) 145 n. 2.

¹¹⁸ Lightfoot (2003) 98.

¹¹⁹ Lightfoot (2003) 139–42 also shows how in this treatise Lucian sides with Aretaeus in the treatment of both contract verbs and aorist infinitives, but not with other Ionicising texts such as the pseudo-Herodotean *Vita Homeri* or Arrian's *Indica*.

Both the epigraphic and literary evidence reviewed in this section show that *-έειν* aorist infinitives were a ‘trendy’ feature of epicising poetic language as well as Ionicising prose of the Imperial period, but that their use outside strictly epic hexameter poetry had already begun in the early Hellenistic period. All of this does not prove beyond all reasonable doubt that Herodotus’ text acquired its *-έειν* aorist infinitives in the Imperial age, but it certainly proves that in this period they received special attention as Ionic (and not just epic) features; it also suggests that *-έειν* aorist infinitives *could* have entered Herodotus’ text already in the Hellenistic age.

The evidence from the *variae lectiones* in medieval manuscripts, paired with the meagre evidence from papyri, shows that the vast majority of *-έειν* aorist infinitives which first entered Herodotus’ text preserved the prosodic pattern allowed in hexametric poetry. A final point that I wish to discuss concerns precisely the question of metrical sequences in Herodotus’ text. Hermogenes makes a statement on this point, which has greatly influenced modern scholarship (*Id.* p. 408 Rabe):

οἱ γὰρ πλείστοι τῶν ῥυθμῶν αὐτῷ κατὰ τε τὰς συνθήκας καὶ κατὰ τὰς βάσεις δακτυλικοί τε εἰσι καὶ ἀναπαιστικοὶ σπονδειακοὶ τε καὶ ὄλως σεμνοί.

Most of his rhythms, which are created by the word order and the clausulae, are dactylic and anapaestic and spondaic and, generally speaking, solemn (transl. Wooten).

As we saw in §3, the idea that Herodotus purposely used metrical patterns in his prose has been entertained by several scholars. For example, Hemmerdinger maintains that the text was actually sung,¹²⁰ while Mansour positively concludes that

Hérodote ne connaît peut-être pas les rythmes habituels de la prose classique, reposant notamment sur des clausules spécifiques; mais il fait en revanche un large emploi de clausules dactyliques, ainsi que d’ouvertures de phrase et, plus largement, de séquences entières revêtant cette forme rythmique, et ce à tous les niveaux discursifs et narratifs de son oeuvre.¹²¹

¹²⁰ Hemmerdinger (1981) 171.

¹²¹ Mansour (2009) 448.

However, if we look at the contexts in which *-έειν* aorist infinitives occur as *variae lectiones* we realise that their ideally suitable metrical shape almost *never* fits a hexametric (and hence, 'epic') sequence. Going back to the infinitives of Book 1 (see above, §5), these comprise 6 non-metrical forms which contain a cretic (*ἀποφυγέειν* twice, *διαφυγέειν*, *περιδέειν*, *ἐπισχέειν*, *διαλαβέειν*) and 6 forms with an anapaestic shape, 3 of which (*ιδέειν*, *έλέειν*, *συνδραμέειν*) do not occur in prosodic contexts which may form a hexameter or part of it.¹²² We are left with two examples which, with some good will, *could* be seen to make up a dactylic sequence. The *varia lectio παθέειν* of 1.32.8 Wilson, which occurs after the sequence *πολλά δέ καί*, produces the second half of a pentameter (*πολλά δέ καί παθέειν*). However, the first part of the sentence (*ἐν γάρ τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ πολλά μὲν ἔστι ιδεῖν/ιδέειν τὰ μή τις ἐθέλει*) does not yield a meaningful metrical pattern. The *varia lectio συνεξελέειν* of 1.36.17, part of the sentence *καί διακελεύσομαι τοῖσι ἰούσι εἶναι ὡς προθυμοτάτοισι συνεξελεῖν ὑμῖν τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χώρας*, could be said to form a sequence of three dactyls with the preceding and following words (*προθυμοτάτοισι συνεξελέειν ὑμῖν*), but it is hard to see the point of the dactylic rhythm in this context.

The impression, therefore, is that these *-έειν* infinitives were not inserted (be it by ancient scholars, Byzantine copyists, or perhaps Herodotus himself) to specifically imitate epic prosody. This validates an observation that Simon Hornblower makes in passing, namely that 'it is a noticeable feature of such [epic] echoes that they often avoid perfect metricality'.¹²³

The origin of *-έειν* aorist infinitives in Herodotus remains uncertain. On balance, it seems safer to assume that they are not originally Herodotean. However, they certainly represent an important feature through which Herodotus' text could hint at epic style, broadly understood. They prove the extent of Homer's influence on Herodotus' language and its ancient

¹²² The passages are: *τὰς μὲν δὴ πλεῦνας τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποφυγέειν*, τὴν δὲ Ἰοῦν σὺν ἄλλῃσι ἀρπασθῆναι (1.1); ὁ μὲν δὴ ὡς οὐκ ἐδύνατο *διαφυγέειν*, ἦν ἐτοιμός (1.10); ἀπειληθέντα δὲ τὸν Ἀρίονα ἐς ἀπορίην παραιτήσασθαι, ἐπειδὴ σφί οὕτω δοκέοι, *περιδέειν* αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ σκευῇ πάσῃ στάντα ἐν τοῖσι ἐδωλίοισι αἰεῖσαι· αἰέσας δὲ ὑπεδέκετο ἑωυτὸν (1.24); πρὶν δ' ἂν τελευτήσῃ, *ἐπισχέειν* μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὄλβιον, ἀλλ' εὐτυχέα (1.32); κατεργάσεσθαι τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατά ἐστι *ἀποφυγέειν* καὶ θεῶ (1.91); ἐκέλευε αὐτὸν τοὺς ἄλλους παῖδας *διαλαβέειν*, πιθομένων δὲ τῶν παίδων ὁ Κῦρος τὸν παῖδα τρηχέως κάρτα περιέσπε μαστιγέων (1.114); ὄκη γὰρ ἰθύσειε στρατεύεσθαι Κῦρος, ἀμήχανον ἦν ἐκείνο τὸ ἔθνος *διαφυγέειν* (1.204).

¹²³ Hornblower (1994) 67.

reception, but they also help us to define its borders, since they do not seem to have been used to make the text *prosodically* more poetic. Perhaps editors should give these *variae lectiones* more credit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

- Bernand, *Inscr. Métr.* É. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des Grecs en Égypte* (Paris 1969).
- ICI M. Guarducci, ed., *Inscriptiones Creticae, vol. 1: Tituli Cretae mediae praeter Gortynios* (Rome 1935).
- IG XI.4 P. Roussel, ed., *Inscriptiones Graecae XI: Inscriptiones Deli, Fasc. 4* (Berlin 1914).
- IG XII.3 F. Hiller von Gaertringen, ed., *Inscriptiones Graecae, XII: Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, Fasc. 4: Inscriptiones Symes, Teutlussae, Teli, Nisyri, Astypalaeae, Anaphes, Therae et Therasiae, Pholegandri, Meli, Cimoli* (Berlin 1898).
- IGBulg V G. Mihailov, ed., *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae, vol. 5: Inscriptiones novae, addenda et corrigenda* (Sofia 1997).
- IScM III A. Avram, ed., *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae, vol. 3: Callatis et territorium* (Bucharest 2000).
- ISmyrna G. Petzl, ed., *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, vol. 23: Die Inschriften von Smyrna. Teil I: Grabinschriften, postume Ehrungen, Grabepigramme* (Bonn 1982).
- MAMA V C. W. M. Cox, A. Cameron, edd., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, vol. 5: Monuments from Dorylaeum et Nacolea* (Manchester 1937).
- MAMA V Lists C. W. M. Cox and A. Cameron, 'Epigraphic Bibliography and Concordance of the Dorylaeum-Nacolea Area', in C. W. M. Cox and A. Cameron, edd., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, vol. 5: Monuments from Dorylaeum et Nacolea* (Manchester 1937) 177–88.
- Marek, *Kat. Pompeiopolis* C. Marek, 'Katalog der Inschriften von Pompeiopolis', in id., ed., *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Tübingen 1993) 135–55.

- Milet* VI.3 P. Herrmann, W. Günther, N. Ehrhardt, edd., *Inschriften von Milet, vol. 3: Inschriften n. 1020–1580* (Berlin and New York 2006).
- TAM* II E. Kalinka, ed., *Tituli Asiae Minoris, vol. 2: Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. 3 fasc. (Vienna 1920–44).
- TAM* V.2 P. Herrmann, ed., *Tituli Asiae Minoris, vol. 5.2: Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti: Regio septentrionalis ad occidentem vergens* (Vienna 1989).

*

- Abicht, K. (1859) *Quaestionum de dialecto Herodotea specimen primum* (Diss., Göttingen).
- (1869) *Herodoti Historiae* (Leipzig).
- Aly, W. (1909) ‘Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte Herodots’, *RhM* 64: 591–600.
- (1927) ‘Herodots Sprache’, *Glotta* 15: 84–117.
- Asheri, D., ed. (1988) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Introduzione generale, Libro I, La Lidia e la Persia* (Milan).
- Bakker, E. J. (1997) *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca and London).
- , I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).
- Bandiera, A. (1997) ‘Per un bilancio della tradizione papiracea delle *Storie* di Erodoto’, *Akten des 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (Stuttgart and Leipzig) 49–56.
- Bean, G. E. and T. B. Mitford (1970) *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968* (Vienna).
- Bechtel, F. (1887) *Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts* (Göttingen).
- (1924) *Die griechischen Dialekte, vol. 3: Der ionische Dialekt* (Berlin).
- Bekker, I. (1845) *Herodoti De bello Persico libri novem* (Berlin).
- Berruecos Frank, B. (2015) ‘Heródoto ὁμηρικώτατος. La transformación del léxico homérico en las “Historias” de Heródoto’, *Nova Tellus* 32: 115–71.
- Boedeker, D. (2002) ‘Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus’, in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 97–116.
- Bowie, A. M. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Bredow, F. J. C. (1846) *Quaestionum criticarum de dialecto Herodotea libri quattuor* (Leipzig).
- Calame, C. (1986) ‘La prose d’Hérodote: discours historique ou récit poétique?’, in id., *Le récit en Grèce ancienne* (Paris) 111–37.

- Cantore, R. (2013) *Per la storia del testo di Erodoto: studi sulla famiglia Romana* (Bologna).
- Chantraine, P. (1958) *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. 1: *Phonétique et morphologie* (Paris).
- Christ, W. von (1898) *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf der Zeit Justinians*³ (Munich).
- Collinge, N. E. (1963) 'Review of Rosén (1962)', *Gnomon* 35: 717–18.
- Colonna, A. (1940) 'Tradizione manoscritta e critica congetturale in Erodoto', *Athenaeum* 18: 11–25.
- Corcella, A. (1989) 'Su di una nuova edizione di Erodoto', *RFIC* 117: 235–51.
- (1998) 'Review of Rosén (1997)', *RFIC* 126: 76–85.
- (2018) 'Review of J. Priestley and V. Zali, ed., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston, 2016)', *ExClass* 22: 201–12.
- Dewald, C. and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Diels, H. (1890) 'Ein gefälschtes Pythagorasbuch', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 3: 451–72; repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, ed. W. Burkert (Hildesheim, 1969) 266–87.
- Dindorf, W. (1844) *Herodoti Halicarnassensis Historiarum libri IX* (Paris).
- Engelmann, H. (1975) *The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis* (Leiden).
- Favre, C. (1914) *Thesaurus verborum quae in titulis Ionicis leguntur cum Herodoteo sermone comparatus* (Heidelberg).
- Fritsch, A. (1876) 'Review of Merzdorf (1875)', *Jahrbuch für klassische Philologie* 22: 105–11.
- Galligani, L. (2001) 'Il Laurenziano Conventi Soppressi 207 di Erodoto e le sue particolarità linguistiche', *Bollettino dei classici* ser. 3a, 22: 27–93.
- García Ramón, J. L. (1977) 'Le prétendu infinitif "occidental" du type ἔχεν vis-à-vis du mycénien *e-ke-e'*', *Minos* 16: 179–206.
- Giraudeau, M. (1984) 'L'héritage épique chez Hérodote', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 1984: 4–13.
- Griffiths, A. (2006) 'Stories and Story-Telling in the *Histories*', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 130–44.
- Grube, G. M. A. (1974) 'Greek Historians and Greek Critics', *Phoenix* 28: 73–80.
- Hartmann, F. (1932) 'Über die Grundlagen für die Beurteilung von Herodots Dialekt', *ZVS* 60: 89–113.
- Hemmerdinger, B. (1981) *Les manuscrits d'Hérodote et la critique verbale* (Genoa).

- Hoffmann, O. (1898) *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihren historischen Zusammenhänge*, vol. 3: *Der ionische Dialekt* (Göttingen).
- and A. Scherer (1969) *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache: bis zu Ausgang der klassischen Zeit*⁴ (Berlin).
- Hornblower, S. (1994) 'Introduction', in id., ed., *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 1–72
- Huber, L. (1965) 'Herodots Homerverständnis', in H. Flashar and K. Gaiser, edd., *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt* (Pfullingen) 29–52.
- Hude, K. (1908) *Herodoti Historiae*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- (1927) *Herodoti Historiae*³, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Jacoby, F. (1913) 'Herodotos', *RE Suppl.* II: 205–520.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1999) 'Aspects narratologiques des *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 19: 217–75.
- Kazanskaya, M. (2013) 'Les expressions homériques dans les *Histoires* d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 34: 161–72.
- Kirkland, N. B. (2019) 'The Character of Tradition in Plutarch's *On the Malice of Herodotus*', *AJPh* 140: 477–511
- Lang, M. (1984) *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Legrand, Ph.-E. (1932–54) *Hérodote: Histoires*, 11 vols (Paris).
- (1932) *Hérodote: Histoires*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- (1942) *Hérodote: Introduction* (Paris).
- Lhardy, H. (1844–46) *Quaestionum de dialecto Herodoti capita I et II* (Berlin).
- Lightfoot, J. L., ed. (2003) *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford).
- Luiselli, R. (2013) 'Frammento sul dialetto ionico', in G. Bastianini, F. Maltomini, and F. Messeri, edd., *Papiri della Società Italiana, Volume sedicesimo (PSI XVI)* (Florence) 106–19.
- Mansour, K. (2007) 'Séquences dactyliques dans la prose d'Hérodote: Hexamètres, homérismes, formules', in R. Blanc and M. Dupraz, edd., *Procédés synchroniques de la langue poétique en grec et en latin* (Brussels) 151–62.
- (2009) *Poétismes et poétique de la prose d'Hérodote: étude linguistique et philologique* (Diss., Paris).
- Marincola, J. (2006) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 13–28.
- Matijašić, I. (2018) *Shaping the Canons of Ancient Greek Historiography: Imitation, Classicism, and Literary Criticism* (Berlin and Boston).
- McNeal, R. A. (1983), 'On Editing Herodotus', *L'Antiquité classique* 52: 110–29.
- (1989) 'Rosén's Herodotus (Review of Rosén 1962)', *Klio* 71: 555–70.

- Meillet, A. (1920) *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*² (Paris).
- Merzdorf, R. (1875) 'Quaestiones grammaticae de dialecto Herodotea concursu modo admissio modo evitato', in G. Curtius, ed., *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* (= *Curtius Studien*), vol. 8 (Leipzig) 127–222.
- (1876) 'Vokalverkürzung vor Vocalen und quantitative Metathesis im Ionischen', in G. Curtius and K. Brugmann, edd., *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* (= *Curtius Studien*), vol. 9 (Leipzig) 201–44.
- Meyer, L. (1868) *Über die Contraction der Verba auf -ow bei Herodot* (Nordhausen).
- Miller, D. G. (2013) *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors: Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer, with Notes on Lyric and Herodotus* (Berlin and Boston).
- Mondrain, B. (1995) 'Un nouveau manuscrit d'Hérodote: le modèle de l'impression aldine', *Scriptorium* 49: 263–73.
- Montana, F. (2012) 'Nuova luce su P.Amh. II 12, Col. I (*hypomnema* di Aristarco al libro I di Erodoto)', *ZPE* 180: 72–6.
- Moyer, I. S. (2008) 'Notes on Re-reading the Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis (*IG* XI.4 1299)', *ZPE* 166: 101–7.
- Nagy, G. (1987) 'Herodotus the Logios', *Arethusa* 20: 175–84.
- Nikolaev, A. (2013) 'The Aorist Infinitives in -έειν in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry', *JHS* 133: 81–92.
- Norden, E. (1915) *Die antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*³, 2 vols (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Norén, E. E. (1876) *De contractione verborum in -εω exeuntium apud Herodotum commentatio* (Diss. Uppsala).
- Paap, A. H. R. E. (1948) *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis* (Leiden).
- Papadopoulou-Belmehdi, I. N. (2006) 'Hésiode, Homère, Hérodote: Forme catalogique et classifications génériques', *Kernos* 19: 79–95.
- Pasquali, G. (1952) *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*² (Florence).
- Passa, E. (2001) 'L'antichità della grafia EY per EO, EOY nell'epica: a proposito di una recente edizione dell'*Iliade*', *RFIC* 129: 385–417.
- Pelling, C. (2006a) '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* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2006b) 'Speech and Narrative', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 103–21.
- Pernot, L. (1995) "'Le plus panégyrique des historiens'", *Ktèma* 20: 125–36.
- Peyron, A. (1838) *Origine dei tre illustri dialetti greci paragonata con quella dell'eloquio illustre italiano* (Turin).

- Porro, A. (2014) 'Ancora sugli infiniti aoristi in -έειν', *Aevum Antiquum* N.S. 14: 145–71.
- Priestley, J. (2014) *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories* (Oxford).
- Rengakos, A. (2001) 'Epic Narrative Technique in Herodotus' *Histories*', *SemRom* 4: 253–70.
- (2006) 'Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos, edd., *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire*, Entretiens Hardt 52; Vandœuvres–Genève) 183–209.
- Rosén, H. B. (1962) *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der Herodoteischen Sprachform* (Heidelberg).
- (1987–97) *Herodotus: Historiae*, 2 vols (Leipzig).
- Rösler, W. (2002) 'The *Histories* and Writing', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 79–94.
- Schick, C. (1956) 'Appunti per una storia della prosa greca 3: la lingua di Erodoto', *Atti dei Lincei. Memorie della classe di scienze morali*, s. 8, 7: 345–95.
- Schmitt, R. (1967) 'Review of Rosén (1962)', *Kratylos* 22: 176–8.
- Schulze, W. (1926) 'Grammatisches aus der Herodot-Überlieferung', in *Festschrift für Paul Kretschmer. Beiträge zur griechischen und lateinischen Sprachforschung* (Vienna and New York) 217–23; repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften*², ed. W. Wissmann (Göttingen, 1966) 409–14.
- Slings, S. R. (2002) 'Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 53–77.
- Smyth, H. W. (1894) *The Sounds and Inflection of the Greek Dialects: Ionic* (Oxford).
- Soldati, A. (2005) 'Due frammenti di un unico rotolo? P.Duke inv. 756 e P.Mil. Vogl. inv. 1358 (Herodotus IV 144.2–145.1 e 147.4–5)', *BASP* 42: 101–6.
- Spreer, E. L. (1874) *De verbis contractis apud Herodotum* (Stettin).
- Stein, H. (1869–71) *Herodoti Historiae*², 2 vols (Berlin).
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg); repr. in id., *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, vol. 2 (Hildesheim and New York, 1982), 1057–97.
- Stronk, J. P. (2017) 'Review of Wilson (2015a) and Wilson (2015b)', *ExClass* 21: 263–7.
- Struve, K. L. (1828–1830) *Quaestionum de dialecto Herodoti specimina III* (Königsberg).
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).

- Thumb, A. (1909) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg).
- and A. Scherer (1959) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte²* (Heidelberg).
- Tribulato, O. (2019) 'Lingue letterarie e dialetti nell'esegesi antica', in A. Willi, ed., *Formes et fonctions des langues littéraires en Grèce ancienne* (Entretiens Hardt 65; Vandœuvres–Genève) 359–96.
- Untersteiner, M. (1948) *La lingua di Erodoto* (Bari).
- Vannicelli, P., A. Corcella, and G. Nenci, edd. (2017) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VII, Serse e Leonida* (Milan).
- West, M. L. (1998) 'The Textual Criticism and Editing of Homer', in G. W. Most, ed., *Editing Texts—Texte edieren* (Göttingen) 94–110.
- (2001) *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig).
- West, S. R. (2011) 'The Papyri of Herodotus', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, edd., *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford) 69–83.
- Whatelet, P. (1962) 'Review of Rosén (1962)', *L'Antiquité Classique* 31: 415–7.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1884) *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin).
- (1904) 'Satzungen einer milesischen Sängergilde', *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1904: 619–40.
- Wilson, N. G. (2015a) *Herodotea* (Oxford).
- , ed. (2015b) *Herodoti Historiae*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Zali, V. (2014) *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus' Histories with Special Attention to Books 5–9* (Leiden and Boston).

POET AND HISTORIAN: THE IMPACT OF HOMER IN HERODOTUS' *HISTORIES**

Christopher J. Tuplin

This volume is devoted to the relationship between Herodotus and Homer. Since it is obvious that Herodotus refers to Homer and self-evidently reasonable to feel that the entire Herodotean enterprise has a Homeric quality, it is not easy to address the topic without fairly rapidly starting to engage in quite detailed commentary on Herodotus' text, and this is exemplified by the other essays that appear in the present publication. The essays by Barker and Donelli offer new implicit intertextual connections between Homer and Herodotus, while that by Fragoulaki comments on an absent intertext or an intertext that consists in absence. Tribulato deals with what turns out to be the elusive issue of the version of Ionian dialect found in (the manuscripts of) Homer and Herodotus—a different sort of implicit intertextual relationship between the two writers. Harrison considers Herodotus' remarks on the role of Homer (and Hesiod) in creating the familiar image of Greek gods, while Haywood examines the wider category of which those remarks are an example (i.e., explicit Herodotean allusions to Homer). All of these essays have methodological elements, of course, but only that by Pelling comes close to making methodological comment a central focus. And yet it would perhaps be misleading to characterise it too strongly in such epistemologically heavy terms. What it does is pose a series of practical questions about the manner and significance of (allusive) intertextuality, and these are as much the analytical result of the practice of intertext-searching as a road map or model for that enterprise: the discussion is persistently open-ended and non-prescriptive, and the conclusion looks forward to the rest of the volume for answers. So, here too, illumination of

* Ivan Matijašić was kind enough to invite me to provide some closing remarks at the end of the Newcastle conference, but the notes I made for that purpose went missing shortly afterwards, and there is therefore no recoverable intertextual connection between those remarks and the present chapter. Translations in what follows are my own.

the Homer–Herodotus relationship comes precisely from examining the details of Herodotus text.

The present essay is resolutely in the same tradition. I start in §§1–2 with some comments on ancient responses to the relationship between Homer and Herodotus (something also touched on by Tribulato) and on Herodotus’ explicit references to Homer (the topic of Harrison and Haywood), but the bulk of the essay (§3) deals with allusive intertexts (like Barker, Donelli, Fragoulaki and Tribulato). In this section I have attempted to bring within a single expository framework a wide variety of such intertexts—some relatively visible in the existing literature (including other parts of this volume), some less so or not all.¹ §4 attempts a summary.

1. Ancient Reception

The Homeric character of Herodotus’ *Histories* is a topic that engaged the interest of some ancient literary critics and grammarians, and it is proper to consider what they made of it. But their comments turn out to be of limited value.

1. There is nothing unique about Herodotus’ Homeric quality. One can readily assemble a dozen other authors who are sometimes spoken of as having Homeric qualities. Were some more Homeric than others? Well, Pseudo-Longinus famously calls Herodotus ‘Ὀμηρικώτατος, but he does so in a question: was Herodotus alone ‘Ὀμηρικώτατος? The answer is no: one must also consider Stesichorus, Archilochus, and, above all, Plato. So although the question attests a view that Herodotus was very Homeric, its answer attests that not everyone thought that he was exceptionally so. And in laying particular stress on Plato Pseudo-Longinus was not alone. For Cassius Longinus (fr. 15 Prickard (Excerpta 9)) wrote that Plato was ‘the first who excelled in transferring Homeric grandeur (ὄγκος) to prose’ (ὁ πρῶτος ἄριστα πρὸς τὴν πέζην λέξει τὸν Ὀμηρικὸν ὄγκον μετενεγκών)—which may mean that all earlier Ὀμηρικοί such as Herodotus were simply less successfully Homeric, and certainly means that none of them could self-evidently claim to be the best at being Homeric.

¹ My survey will certainly have missed items that are already in the literature, not least because this essay was entirely produced during the Covid-19 pandemic and with only patchy access to publications not available digitally: the digital reach of the University of Liverpool library is good, but not all-embracing.

2. The reasons for assigning Homeric quality to Herodotus or other authors are of rather a general nature, when they exist at all.

Having insisted upon the point, Pseudo-Longinus actually provides no precise explanation of what it was that made Plato so specially Homeric. In the preceding lines Plato exemplifies the road to sublimity through imitation of (indeed inspiration by) earlier prose and poetic writers. Elsewhere the author speaks of Plato's ὄγκος καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς σεμνότης (12.3), says that he is clever at σχήματα (though sometimes uses them inappositely, 29.1), and puts him alongside other top writers (Homer, Demosthenes, and others unnamed) as one whose faults are tiny in comparison with their virtues (36). There is no clear demonstration that these virtues are Homeric. In 13, the Homeric borrowings that Ammonius listed are unexemplified, and we are merely told that competition with Homer benefitted Plato's philosophic dogmas and conferred a poetic quality. Archilochus is an author who can blaze with unruly brilliance and divine inspiration but also fall flat (33.5): he is thus better than the poets who write impeccably—a characteristic he shares with Homer (who makes mistakes: 33.4). So perhaps being Homeric simply means being an exceptionally good writer—in fact, one capable of the sublime? It is, after all, to Homer, Plato, and Demosthenes that the aspirational writer should look as models for the sublime (14), and Herodotus is, of course, capable of that quality (18.2), though Pseudo-Longinus generally cites him for use of specific (and entirely normal) stylistic tropes that are normally done well despite some lapses of judgement²—another great author with occasional faults.

Meanwhile to say Herodotus is a prose Homer (Salmacis inscription: *SEG* 48.1330) or Sappho a female one (*Anthologia Palatina* 1.65) or Sophocles the Homer of Tragedy (Diog. Laert. 4.3) tells us nothing. To say Homer and Archilochus are the best poets, but write different sorts of poetry also tells us nothing (Dio Chrys. 33.11; Philostr. *VS* 6.620 is no better). To associate Stesichorus, Alcaeus, Sophocles, Herodotus, Demosthenes, Democritus, Plato and Aristotle with Homer because of shared stylistic μεσότης (D.H. *Comp.* 24) is to speak very generally, to declare Herodotus and Plato the best imitators of Homer's μικτὴ ἁρμονία (half way between ἀύστηρὰ and ἡδέϊα ἁρμονία) and cite Herodotus 7.8 (Xerxes' speech proposing the war against Greece) as an example is only slightly better (D.H. *Dem.* 41). More detailed

² Herodotus can make poor choices of words ([Long.] *Subl.* 4.7, 43.1) but he is cited for good examples of rhetorical questions (18.2), word order (22.1–2), vividness (26.2: saying 'you go to ...', not 'one goes to ...'), periphrasis (28.3), expressively vulgar vocabulary (31.2), and hyperbole (38.4–5).

are the propositions that Thucydides imitated Homer in *οἰκονομία*, choice of vocabulary, *ἡ περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν ἀκρίβεια*, force, beauty, and speedy narrative (Marcel. *Vit. Thuc.* 35) and that Sophocles achieved Homeric charm through character-drawing, variation, and skilful use of *ἐπινοήματα* (*Vit. Soph.*)—yet almost too detailed, since in the end these passages simply say that the authors were globally stylistically similar. More modestly Empedocles was Homeric in diction (especially metaphor and poetic usage) (Arist. *Poet.* fr. 70 = Diog. Laert. 8.57) and Hippocrates in producing clear expression of thought through use of ordinary language (Erotian 31.1).

In many of these cases, of course, a fuller and more nuanced scholarship *may* underlie the surviving banal summaries. But, when we are looking at fully preserved original texts and at comments specifically about Herodotus (as with Dionysius), things are not much different. We are told that Herodotus ‘wished to provide variety within his text, being an emulator of Homer’ (*ποικίλην ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τὴν γραφὴν Ὀμήρου ζηλωτῆς γενόμενος*, D.H. *Pomp.* 3), something he (like Plato and Demosthenes: Homer is not mentioned here) did in terms of periods, clauses, rhythms, figures, and accents (*Comp.* 19), that Herodotus (who is attractive and beautiful: *Comp.* 9) excelled in choice of words, in *σύνθεσις*, and variety of *σχηματίσματα*, and made prose resemble *τῇ κρατίστη ποιήσει* (which might include Homer, though that is not said) on account of persuasiveness, charm, and extreme pleasure (*Thuc.* 23), and that Homer and Herodotus share an ability to make simple vocabulary effective by correct *σύνθεσις* (*Comp.* 3, and cf. 12).

We thus have a rather bland overall message: Herodotus avoids monotony and obscurity, puts text together nicely, and produces something persuasive, charming, and pleasant to read that has something of the quality of poetry³—and in this he is Homeric. As before there is the feeling that being a Homeric writer is simply being a good writer and that the judgements on display here are more to do with the special canonical status of Homer in Greek literary history than with the distinctive characteristics of Herodotus or any of the other putatively Homeric authors. The ancient commentators do not, of course, think all of their putatively Homeric authors are interchangeable: the *ὄγκος* of Plato and force-of-nature quality of Archilochus (both implicitly or explicitly Homeric in Pseudo-Longinus

³ Cf. Heracleodorus, F 10 (Herodotus produced a *ποίημα* because his work is enchanting to hear) and Hermog. *Id.* 2.4.15 (Ionic has a poetic flavour, and Herodotus’ use of it—albeit in mixed form—gives ‘sweetness’). Amidst all the praise of Herodotus there is something almost refreshing about Aristotle’s judgment that *λέξις εἰρομένη* is ugly (*ἀηδής*): Arist. *Rh.* 1409a27–31.

and Cassius Longinus) are not features of Herodotus and, indeed, feel rather inconsistent with the blanket association of Homeric authors with *μεσότης* in Dionysius. But the real problem is this. Most of us would surely say that, among all the authors canvassed here, the one who provides a reading experience most obviously like Homer is Herodotus: but this is something that the ancient commentators entirely fail to convey.

One further observation. The Homeric qualities under discussion in the ancient literary critical tradition are to do with style rather than content. A rare specific exception is the claim in Heraclitus, *Allegoriae* 18.1 that Plato took aspects of his description of the parts of the soul 'as it were from the spring of Homeric epic': so, for example, the hypocardiac position of the *thumos* comes from *Od.* 20.17, though quite what it has to do with Odysseus' words (*τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη*) is not immediately apparent. The general perception that both Homer and Herodotus told lies must also count as a comment about content—a topic I shall not pursue here.⁴ Rather I stress that there is no sign of a perception among ancient commentators of the sort of allusive intertextuality that modern commentators take for granted. Perhaps they were just acting in the spirit of Aristotle's criticism of Homeric scholars, who see minor similarities but overlook important ones (*Arist. Metaphys.* 1093a27), and so ignored things they considered trivial compared with the business of rhetorical pedagogy that is the real basis of ancient literary criticism. But unless we are completely deluding ourselves in this matter, we have to say that their reactions to the Homeric Herodotus are seriously deficient.

2. Explicit Reference to Homer and the Trojan War

Ancient commentators surely did notice that Herodotus sometimes cites Homer (and even makes in-text characters do so), and it is a phenomenon we have to assess, even if they appear uninterested. This might be approached from various perspectives, but the salient thing here is how Herodotus judged Homer in relation to the enterprise he himself was engaged in. The principal issue is the inter-relation of truth, lies, and rational utility. Since ancient commentators did remark on Homer's lies, this is a topic that has some overlap with their concerns.

⁴ But note that some saw that it was not all lies: Strabo 1.2.9–10, 17 (citing Polybius).

Homer found the name Ocean and introduced it into poetry (*ποίησις*: 2.23).⁵ But Ocean is something for which there is no evidence (4.8), which is laughable (4.36), and which cannot be used in discussion of the origins of the Nile: anyone (e.g., Hecataeus?) who explains the Nile in terms of Ocean ‘has linked his tale to obscurity and cannot be refuted’ (*ἐς ἀφανές τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκας οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον*: 2.23). Whether or not Ocean actually exists (in this passage Herodotus merely affirms that he does not know that it does), it cannot be deployed in geographical speculation. In this case, then, Homer is not cogent evidence for the existence of Ocean and what he says cannot, therefore, be used in rational debate.

But this is a unique example. For the most part Homer is a perfectly usable resource for rational argument. This is even so (in a rather special sense) when he positively lies about the past. The claim that Helen was at Troy is untrue and implausible, and only adopted because judged more seemly for epic poetry (2.112–30).⁶ But the discussion of this matter, which is unlike anything else in *Histories*, does supply Herodotus with an excellent object with which to display rational analysis, if also (at the end) moral comment.⁷ More normally, Homeric material is a tool to use on other subject matter. Sometimes what Homer says is presumed to be true, as with the information about Libyan sheep (4.29; cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.85) from which Herodotus draws an inference about Scythia.⁸ Sometimes it is affirmed to be

⁵ Herodotus says ‘Homer or one of the earlier (*πρότερον γενομένων*) poets’. But for Herodotus there are no poets before Homer. Ocean is in Homer and Hesiod who are jointly the first poets. *Ποίησις* (for poetry) recurs at 2.82, in reference apparently to Hes. *Op.* 765–828. Heraclitus attacked Hesiod’s scheme of days (Plut. *Cam.* 19), saying all days are the same, but Herodotus expresses no view and it is not clear that being in *poiēsis* is *eo ipso* damning. For the disconnect between name and substantive existence cf. immediately below (gods, Eridanus).

⁶ *Εὐπρεπής* has overtones of niceness of appearance, so seemly or decent, not just suitable? Compare 2.47.3: a *logos* that it is not *εὐπρεπής* to report—ethically, not just intellectually, wrong. The story may be more attractive (Marincola (2006) 22), but can one translate *ἐς τὴν ἐποποιίην εὐπρεπής* (Hdt. 2.116.3) in that way?

⁷ Unlike anything in Herodotus: E. Bowie (2018a) 55. For other comments on this passage see Haywood, above, pp. 61–72 and Donelli, above, pp. 226–7. A comprehensive discussion of the Helen passage (2.116–7) and of that about the gods mentioned below (2.53) now appears in Currie (2021).

⁸ Matijašić (above, p. 8) compares Thucydides citing Homer’s Ἑλληνες. — The fecundity of Libyan sheep is thematically linked with the Helen–Menelaus–Egypt topic. It is as if it is something that stuck in Herodotus’ mind when reading what Homer said about Homeric heroes in Egypt in pursuit of the argument in 2.113–20.

true: that Paris went to Sidon (2.116; cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.289–92) is validated by the Egyptian priests' information about Helen. Sometimes truth is marked as uncertain: the deaths of Priam's sons can be used in an argument about Helen's absence (2.120.3), even though the fact is qualified with *εἰ χρή τι τοῖσι ἐποποιοῖσι χρεώμενον λέγειν*.⁹ Sometime truth is immaterial. This is relatively banally the case in 2.117 or 4.29: in the former a passage in *Cypria* is cited that proves the author is not Homer (so Herodotus believes Homer is self-consistent),¹⁰ in the latter the fact that Homer (in *Epigonoι*) and Hesiod mention the Hyperboreans is an indication of their existence (even though the attribution of *Epigonoι* is queried),¹¹ but nothing more specific is said about the Hyperboreans that could raise issues of truth or falsehood.¹² More interesting is 2.53, the famous passage about Homer, Hesiod, and the gods.¹³ But it is only more interesting because the subject matter is more important. The fundamental situation is the same. Homer and Hesiod made a *θεογονίη* for the Greeks,¹⁴ gave the gods *ἑπωνυμῖαι*, distributed their *τιμαί* and *τέχνη*

⁹ The *epopoioi* must include Homer (in whom, at least rhetorically, all fifty died: *Il.* 24.493–502). The comment is not a response to perceived tension between using Homer's information and a whole element of his Trojan War story (Helen's presence at Troy) being false, merely a small display of judiciousness in a discourse about sceptical reading of sources. (The same trick occurs in 7.20 on the numbers of the Trojan War expedition *kata ta legomena*.)

¹⁰ Not a view shared by all readers.

¹¹ Their report is stronger evidence than the silence of Scythians and Issedonians. Herodotus is not worried that Hyperborean is a patently Greek name, presumably created by a Greek source: contrast the Eridanus (see below, n. 14). Yet in both cases there is ancillary evidence from the actual arrival of material objects from far-off places.

¹² Is the post-Trojan Wars birth of Pan (2.145) deduced from the *absence* of reference to him in Homer?

¹³ See Harrison, above, pp. 91–103; Haywood, above, pp. 72–4.

¹⁴ What is the force of *ποίησαντες θεογονίην*? In 3.115.2 the name of Eridanus is Greek, not barbarian, *ὑπὸ ποιητέω δέ τινος ποιηθέν* and this casts doubt on (*κατηγορέει*) claims that there is an Eridanus that flows into the northern sea. The name is created by a Greek poet and is not reliable evidence that the thing exists, because the Greek poet may have created it for no good reason. (In the same way when Homer 'found' the name Ocean, there was no guarantee that whoever originally made it did it for good reason.) But the uncertainty is not inherent in the verb *ποιεῖν*. Nor is being in *ποίησις* inherently a proof of untruth (see above, n. 5). Nothing else about the terminology here demands that Homer and Hesiod just randomly invented their data out of thin air. The gods are already there, so to say, with names imported from Egypt (and used by Pelasgians). Homer and Hesiod provide further information about them, potentially because they have inspired knowledge—which is *prima facie* what Hesiod says at the start of *Theogony*.

and indicated their *εἰδέα*. Whether or not the information they provided was true, Herodotus knows that many people take it to be true (and not only in literary contexts) and, for the purposes of his chronological and developmental analysis, that is sufficient to make the information relevant.¹⁵ It is the presence of the information in the poetic texts and its relationship to later behaviour that matters. This neither demands nor precludes that it is true,¹⁶ but either way Homer (and Hesiod) can inform rational discussion.

Herodotus' assumption that Homer provides processable information is shared by characters within his text. Sometimes such characters find the information unpalatable (Cleisthenes of Sicyon's attitude to Homer's praise of Argives)¹⁷ or profess to find it irrelevant (the Athenians at 9.28). But both they and others assume that Homer (and the wider Trojan War tradition) can have contemporary impact,¹⁸ whether they are alluding to Homer's text as text¹⁹ or adducing the information that he or other epic poets provided.²⁰ Most of these cases figure in the discussion of allusive intertextuality later in this essay²¹—inevitably since those characters who do name Homer provide a context for those who do not, and those who do not are certainly engaging in an intertextual activity of some sort in their own name and/or as figures manipulated by the author. When information is involved, the presumption of the in-text characters is evidently that the information is true or will be accepted by others as true.²²

¹⁵ The same principle applies to use of the Trojan War as a chronological marker to establish that Greece is young compared with Egypt (2.145). The combination of 2.53 and 2.145 places Homer 400 years after the Trojan War. See Haywood, above, pp. 73–4, and below, p. 347.

¹⁶ Harrison, above, p. 93, rightly argues that 2.53 does not require Herodotus to be adopting a radically sceptical view about traditional Greek religion.

¹⁷ 5.67. Hornblower (2013) 200 is surely right that Homer is in question here.

¹⁸ The Cleisthenes passage specifically thematises the impact of (rhapsodic) performance.

¹⁹ E.g., 6.11 and 7.159 (see below, pp. 333, 337).

²⁰ Pelling, above, pp. 45, 48, notes the distinction. The Athenian ambassadors in 7.161 do both. Deployment of other Homeric or Trojan War cycle information: 1.3–4; 5.65, 67, 94; 7.43, 171; 9.26–8, 116. A special subset is the assertion of epic-era origins by ethnic groups in 4.191 and 5.13 (and cf. 5.122 and 7.91 for similar Herodotean assertions about the post-Trojan War diaspora). An interesting by-product is 6.52: the Spartans, 'agreeing with no poet' claim Aristodemus (not his sons) brought Spartans to Sparta. Poets are natural historical sources.

²¹ See below, pp. 300, 304, 306, 307–8, 315, 324, 333–4, 337–8, 344, 366.

²² The Athenians set aside Trojan War evidence as less relevant than Marathon, not necessarily less true. On this see below, p. 340. Their position is analogous to that of

Is Herodotus' position on the matter theoretically distinct? Herodotus himself does not think truth necessarily matters (see above) when one is deploying Homer, so he cannot rationally think that his in-text characters think otherwise: they might deploy Homer's facts thinking them not true if they think that doing so will work. But in choosing to report that someone deployed Homer in a political argument, he also opens up an intertextual proposition for his reader. How does the issue of truth-value play in that context?

One might say that Herodotus is seeking to contextualise the in-text situation by trading on the status of the Homeric text rather than on the truth of its contents. That is a distinction that is perhaps in principle *à propos*. The case of Archidice (see below, pp. 316–17) suggests this, since it involves an intertext with the Helen of *Il.* 6.356–8 who, according to Herodotus in 2.113–120, did not actually exist. So an intertext can exist with what is mere epic-genre story-telling. But it is a rather playful piece of intertextuality (albeit on a relatively serious topic), and one could maintain that Helen's non-existence is part of the joke.²³ What about other cases? What exactly is Herodotus trying to do by creating an evocation of Homer through an in-text character—or indeed in any context? Is there (sometimes) a claim that our take on something that happens in the time-frame of *Histories* is affected by the fact that something similar happened earlier? That would require the truth value of the Homeric item to be comparable with that of the more recent one, and be part of a strategy for justifying the *accuracy* of the story in *Histories* (and therefore the status of *Histories* itself). Or is it just that the more recent event is more interesting/special because it realises or riffs on what was previously a story (true or not) in a culturally high-status source? That is indifferent on truth value, and is part of a strategy for justifying the *importance* of the story in *Histories* (and therefore, again, the status of *Histories* itself).

But in the end how much does accuracy actually matter? As we shall see, the opening of *Histories* thematises what the historian (claims he) knows as against what Persians say emerges from stories about a more distant past, but he also assimilates himself to Odysseus (which may make one wonder about some of the newer stories) and does not affirm that the old stories are not true, only that he does not have a certain grasp on them. Moreover, he

Herodotus in 1.1–5: he prefers what he *knows* to be a start of injustice over instances that are historiographically more vulnerable (but not affirmed to be false). See variously Flower–Marincola (2002) 156; Haywood, above, pp. 79–80.

²³ And perhaps her wish in the *Iliad* passage that she could not be *αοίδιμος* has some impact on the idea of not really being at Troy in the first place?

only affirms that he knows Croesus was the first source of harm. He makes no general programmatic statement about searching for historical truth as we might see it.

So the answer may be that accuracy is negotiable and that, from Herodotus' point of view, intertexting with Homer is not predicated on Homer being imagined as providing an entirely truthful report about the past. That would be in line with the cases where in-text persons appeal explicitly to Homer or Trojan Wars, and there is no reason to imagine that when such persons engage in allusive intertextuality the presuppositions are any different.

In short: Herodotus knows perfectly well that the stories and information found in Homer (and other epic poets) may not be true, that other people quite possibly share this knowledge (even if he can identify examples that most people have not noticed), and that neither he nor they need necessarily worry about this fact when using Homer to construct an argument. Homer is there and it is perfectly fair to deploy him. Whether it is always prudent to do so is (as we shall see) another matter.

3. Allusive Intertextuality

3.1. Homer at the Start of *Histories*

The opening of *Histories* makes clear allusions to Homer. There is a structural analogy in the way that both Herodotus and Homer begin with prefatory lines which pose a question about causes of strife that are answered immediately at the start of the main text; and there is a lexical connection in the wish to prevent human activities from being ἀκλεᾶ: κλέος is a Homeric concept that is only evoked in deliberately limited contexts in Herodotus (see below) and clearly carries a special charge. Moreover, the work is Herodotus' ἀπόδεξις and the deeds that are not to be ἀκλεᾶ are τὰ μὲν Ἑλλῆσι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα. There is an overlap between author and subject and an implicit claim to κλέος for the author.²⁴ There is no such explicit claim by Homer in the *Iliad* proem, and Homer is generally an invisible entity by comparison with the ever-present Herodotean *ego*. But *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do contain some incitements to reflect upon the potential fame of Homer,²⁵ and we are entitled to see the implicit incitement to think about Herodotus' fame in that light.

²⁴ This is true whatever one makes of the subtleties in Nagy (1987).

²⁵ De Jong (2006): some arguments are not quite logically compelling but the overall contention seems sustainable.

But the more we see *apodexis* in terms of the competitive performance culture of fifth-century intellectuals, the more we realise that Herodotus' fame may not only be a Homeric issue. And this is not the only un-Homeric element in 1.0–1.²⁶ The cause of strife does not lie with the gods in Herodotus (even though Herodotus does not in general write about a world from which gods are absent), the *Iliad* proem itself has nothing about *kleos* (rather it highlights suffering and death), while Herodotus' proem also speaks of human actions not being τῶ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα (non-Homeric language²⁷), refers to Greeks and barbarians (in the *Iliad* opening it is just the Achaeans' sufferings that are highlighted: elsewhere, of course, it is another matter), speaks of *erga* whose ambit will turn out to be quite wide (and not purely martial), and, of course, has no Muse,²⁸ only human *historiē* carried out by the proudly and un-Homerically named Herodotus of Halicarnassus—which is why the authorial *ego* is so much more on show.²⁹ If *aklea* and the 'what was the cause/the cause was' structure do evoke Homer, the effect is nonetheless to mark distance and claim distinctive status for Herodotus as author. The conflict (*eris*) highlighted in the *Iliad* proemium resulted (via the working out of that *eris* in the actions of Achilles and others) in the *Iliad*, which also preserves the κλέος ἄφθιτον of the likes of Achilles. The cause of Greek–barbarian warfare highlighted in the *Histories* proem resulted (via the working out of that conflict in the actions of very many people) in *Histories*, which also preserves the *kleos* of the *erga* of men. But though these are parallel enterprises and indeed connected ones (since some people think the events of the *Iliad* are part of the cause of the events of the *Histories*), they are also distinct ones.

A couple of pages further on, Homer reappears in a clear echo of the opening of *Odyssey*—clearer even than the echo of *Iliad* 1.1–7 in Hdt. 1.0–1, since a precise phrase is reproduced (1.5.3). As he passes through the cities of

²⁶ I use 1.0 to refer to the proem, whose separation from the book-chapter scheme is as irritating as the insistence that a speech can only occupy a single numbered chapter (Hornblower (2013) 2).

²⁷ Nagy argued that it was semantically equivalent. Moles (1999) 51 mooted an image from the non-epic world of inscriptions (cf. Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 8), but preferred the idea of families dying out (cf. Moles (2007) 267), which *is* an epic possibility.

²⁸ That the books came to be named after Muses is ironic: see Matijašić, above, p. 4.

²⁹ 1,086 times according to Dewald (1987), albeit often to create alternative voices to the narrator's.

men, Herodotus is an actual and virtual traveller like Odysseus (who both travels and produces narration of travel) and perhaps shares his fame.

But as before, there is difference: Herodotus does not suffer pains (*ἀλγέα*) or fail to preserve his *hetairoi*.³⁰ Instead the *peripeteiai* of the hero are displaced onto the historian's subject matter³¹—and the displacement claims an important status for the topic: his knowledge of the mutability of *ἀνθρωπίνη εὐδαιμονία* means his Odyssean traverse of cities covers *σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄσπεα*. His journey is arguably more wide-ranging (for all that Odysseus saw the cities of many men) and his experience is more structured. The fact that he knows about human happiness both corresponds to and differs from Odysseus' knowledge of *πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ... νόον*, and one might sense that his journey ('journey') transcends that of Odysseus. The importance of the theme is visible in the fact that it has already been trailed in 1.1–4: when Io was stolen, Argos was the leading city of Greece—still true in the *Iliad* (where the Greeks are often Ἀργεῖοι) but not true in Herodotus' time, even if Argos had not become as negligible as Mycenae (an ancillary point that might strike some readers, given Thucydides' highlighting of it). And this links with what may be seen as another distinction between Herodotus and Homer (and Odysseus): although cities change status in the Homeric world (Troy anyway) and the contrast between earlier and current heroic generations is a Nestorian trope, Herodotus arguably lays claim to a longer chronological and historical perspective than occurs in the Homeric world. (Nestor, after all, recalls a world that was in his own lifetime.)

Another question then arises. Odysseus is a slippery character (*πολύτροπον* is foregrounded in *Odyssey* 1.1) and knows how to tell plausible lies.³² Does this have a bearing on our reaction to Herodotus-Odysseus? Should we expect him not always to be straightforward—perhaps to tell us things that are not really true without providing direct markers of scepticism? One's attention is certainly drawn to the fact that no part of 1.0–5 explicitly thematises truth-telling.³³ Reporting true things may seem implicit in the insistence on what *he knows* about the first harmer-of-Greeks and on the

³⁰ The stories of political activity and exile in the biographical tradition are precisely *not* in *Histories*.

³¹ Marincola (2007) 38.

³² And 8.8.3 is a sign Herodotus is aware of this (below pp. 306–7), should we need one.

³³ Another thing not overtly thematised is the provision of pleasure. But that is perhaps implicit in the posture of being a poet, for poets do enchant (*Od.* 1.337), and there is pleasure in tales of suffering, at least when it is over (*Od.* 4.100–3, 594–8; 15.398–401; 23.306–9).

preservation of the fame of human *erga*. But 'what I know' is a solipsistic version of 'truth' and the analogy between Herodotus' fame-preserving enterprise and Homer does raise questions about truth even aside from the Odyssean angle. Both ancient and modern readers have considered Homer a liar or an unreliable narrator,³⁴ and Herodotus himself (2.112–20) identifies a big untruth in the *Iliad*. Later Herodotus will explicitly say that his reporting something does not entail his belief that it is true, and his deployment of explicitly identified Homeric material makes no assumptions about truth (above, §2). Odysseus told lies to disguise himself, to entertain (but also instruct) the Phaeacians, and for sheer devilment (Laertes: *Od.* 24.235–314), Homer picked versions of the past for genre suitability. So what is Herodotus' motivation in this area? The question is left open, but we realise that the reasons for *apodexis* and *historiē* stated in 1.0 may not exhaustively explain what Herodotus is up to.³⁵ But there is another more positive angle too. Odysseus' mendacity is an aspect of his problem-solving capacity: that is important in *Odyssey* 1.1–10, where it stands in contrast to the hero's eventual failure to save his *hetairoi* or secure a good *nostos*—even the 'versatile' Odysseus was worsted. How does this play in Herodotus? If Herodotus will tell tales, is his unravelling of evidence and application of *gnōmē* actually also supposed to be Odyssean?³⁶

Herodotus, then, is *alter Homerus* and *alter Odysseus*. He is a poet who is not a poet (or, as 1.1–5 might be said to show, a *logios* who is not a *logios*—at least not one like other *logioi*³⁷) but who claims authority to do the sort of things Homer did on a different (and human) basis—and perhaps the fame that Homer earned by it. He is a traveller who displaces the personal experience of reversal from himself onto the story he tells. He both associates and detaches himself from Odysseus: his text-Odysseus travels intelligently through an extraordinary range of men, his understanding of *eudaimoniē* resembles and extends Odysseus' understanding of the *noos* of men—and truth may be what he chooses to assert that it is. At a first reading of *Histories* 1.0–1.5 one cannot imagine all the places, real and metaphorical, the work is going to go to, but intertextual Homeric links have been used to frame

³⁴ Arist. *Poet.* 1460a18–19; Pind. *Nem.* 7.21–3; Baragwanath (2007) 48, 51; Irwin (2014).

³⁵ Baragwanath's perception that Herodotus particularly follows the manner of Homeric in-text narrators rather than the primary narrator (Baragwanath (2008) 49–51), and is always inclined to indicate non-omniscience, is worth reflecting on here.

³⁶ For another question provoked by 1.5.3–4 (*nostos*) see below, pp. 303–4, 309–10.

³⁷ Contrast Nagy (1987). Pindar (*Pyth.* 1.92–4; *Nem.* 6.28–30, 45–7) effectively makes *aidoi* and *logioi* parallel: Herodotus transcends both.

important programmatic points and offer the reader a prospectus that will be validated in the books that follow.

3.2. Preliminaries to an Extended Search

Those books in turn contain many more examples of allusive intertextuality. Before turning to them, some preliminary observations.

1. We are interested in things that go beyond the general Homerisation implicit in the contents of 1.0 and 1.5.3–4. One can expect Homeric flavour almost anywhere; the question is where this phenomenon acquires greater substance. One is looking for things that do something more (reinforcing, dissonant, question-provoking, or whatever) than simply feed the default linguistic and compositional quasi-Homeric nature of the enterprise—and one is looking for things that it is reasonable to think the author meant or hoped that we would see.³⁸ But it is difficult to decide *a priori* whether, e.g., verbal things that are a little special, perhaps because they involve *hapax legomena*, are likely to be significant markers in themselves, and investigation suggests that some are and some are not—though the latter may still occur in contexts that have other intertextual markers. It is certainly true that intertexts can be created by different sorts of feature. It is also true that the theoretically separate questions (is there any intertext? if so, what does it signify?) are not always separable in practice, and that the role of consonance and dissonance in making an intertext work can be quite variable.

2. When an intertext consists solely in the use of Homeric language, there may be no distance between target and receiving text, and the effect is simply to colour the receiving text. But that need not be the case even with language-based cases, because the language may evoke a particular Homeric context and there will necessarily be some distance between that context and the receiving context; and that principle will apply to all intertextual cases that, for whatever reason, evoke the content of Homeric text(s). The force of the intertext in such cases (the majority) depends on how the distance between the two contexts plays to the reader. It may reinforce how we would otherwise read the receiving text (accentuating the message of the text or

³⁸ On that issue see Pelling, above, p. 43. Matijašić, above, p. 15, defines intertexts as ‘verbal echoes, metrical sounding, similarities of subject matter, parallels in narrative structures and so on, that an author employs to *intentionally* evoke another passage or series of passage from a previous author, without however involving explicit references’ (my italics). Among important broader features of the interaction between Homer and Herodotean historiography not directly explored here are the concern with causation (Pelling 2020a) and the prevalence of *oratio recta*.

simply adding colour or grandeur) or it may disrupt that reading (e.g., by problematising the message or creating a mismatch between epic colour or grandeur and the receiving context) or it may do a bit of both.³⁹ The effects (and scale) of reinforcement or (especially) disruption and the mechanism by which they are achieved may come in various forms (they may, e.g., focus rather narrowly on the target and receiving passages or involve wider contexts in one or other author), but one should perhaps avoid over-analysing or over-categorising the process as something existing in its own right: each case should in the first instance be seen on its own merits, even though there may also be an intratextual relationship between different cases that is of importance.

3. Homeric colour, whether relatively intense because of a specific allusion or intertext, or generic because of the overall flavour of epic narrative, co-exists with un-Homeric manner. 7.219–22 has a strong quasi-Homeric assertion about Leonidas and *kleos* at its heart (see below, pp. 315–6, 354) but it is written as a discussion of which version about the departure of non-Spartans from Thermopylae one should believe. That has little or no resonance with Homeric manner.⁴⁰ The passage is an exemplary amalgamation of analytical historian and epic poet. This sort of thing goes on all the time.

4. The Homeric allusions of 1.0 and 1.5.3–4 are in the historian's voice. But elsewhere intertexting sometimes occurs in the voice of in-text characters, and sometimes at least in circumstances in which allusion to a Homeric text is something we can imagine the in-text character actually doing.⁴¹ We have seen that the validity of allusive intertexting is not

³⁹ The importance of dissonance is noted by Harrison, above, p. 96.

⁴⁰ Homer does not quote sources or openly wrestle with their divergence. Hom. *Od.* 12.389–90, where Odysseus quotes a specific source (Calypso told me this having heard it from Hermes), is unusual: passages such as *Il.* 4.374–5, 6.151, 9.524, *Od.* 3.211–3, 4.200–2 (in-text characters alluding to anonymous *on dit* sources) are not really the same. (E. Bowie (2018a) 66 thinks other poetic narrators had source citation on the rather uncertain strength of Mimnermus, fr. 14 *IEG*²: *τοῖον ἐμ<έο> προτέρων πεύθομαι.*) Of course Herodotus mostly tells his story as unmediatedly as does Homer, though he is certainly not an omniscient narrator (cf. Baragwanath (2007) 49–51).

⁴¹ Any Greek might theoretically riff on Homer. Did Herodotus want us to imagine any particular ones doing it deliberately? That he did is necessary in the special case of the Greek name for Masistius (below, p. 324). One might judge it fairly certain with Syagrus (below, p. 337), likely with Hippias (below, p. 344), plausible with Dionysius (below, pp. 333–4) and (perhaps) Socles (below, pp. 341–3), and possible for the Athenians in Books 8 and 9 (above, p. 334), the Spartans in Book 8 (n. 149), Pausanias (below, pp. 361–2), and the Coan woman (below, pp. 360–1). It will not be true with Histiaeus, where Herodotus is also playing

undermined *in se* by doubts about Homeric truthfulness (see §2). But might it be problematised by the way in which it is done? If in-text characters offer intertexts that are self-undermining (i.e., have unintentional implications), and especially if it is historically plausible that the in-text character might have alluded to Homer, does that raise doubts about the practice in general or the historian's practice in particular? Does Herodotus want us not just to enjoy the intertexts he creates in his own voice but also to worry about them? Is the practice of intertexting (not just the content of some intertexts) intrinsically dissonant? Do we assume that the historian at least always knows how to intertext without creating unintentional dissonances? Or do we recall that the *alter Odysseus* of 1.5.3–4 may not be a wholly straightforward traveller through the sea of text? The unpredictability of intertextuality is more specifically illustrated by the next point.

5. The opening of *Histories* inscribes a Trojan War/Persian War comparison into the work: the Persian War (as an event) is a continuation of the Trojan War, with Persians as Trojans fighting Greeks as Achaeans, and the idea recurs at 7.43 and 9.116–20 (in the latter case prefigured in 7.33). And the Persian War (as narrative) is insistently given an allure of the Trojan War (as narrative) by the various explicit and implicit connections that exist between Herodotus' text and Homer. It is moreover clear that deployment of the analogy reflects something found in fifth-century public discourse. Two questions arise.

First, what is the comparative stature of the two wars? 7.20 (on the size of forces involved) is the closest approach to an explicit comparison, but it is anything but clearly stated, and indeed seems to shy away from the issue. Implicitly the sheer geographical extent of 7.61–99 probably more than compensates and makes the new Trojan War much grander. For Herodotus' stature as a historian, of course, the Trojan War is only part of the issue. The opening pages of *Histories* present an author who embraces both *Iliad* and

intratextual games (below, pp. 335–6). Thersander's report of conversation with a Persian is tricky: is the intertext plain enough *in se* for us to judge that Thersander is using Homer to give weight to his report? I suspect not: this is Herodotus constructing a Homeric scene out of Thersander's information: see below, pp. 312–3, 355, 362. And we should probably not even ask whether the Persian was supposed to be deliberately alluding to Homer. That *is* a question we might at least ask about other non-Greek figures, but there is no reason to answer it affirmatively. Mardonius doubtless knew of Sparta's reputation, but it is Herodotus who makes him use the significant word *kleos* and I cannot see it mattered to the historian that we might imagine Mardonius actually used it (below, p. 357), and that surely applies elsewhere as well. — The distinction between narrator and in-text character is noted by Pelling, above, pp. 45, 48.

Odyssey—and it is plain fact that *Histories* is not *only* a treatment of the new Trojan War, even if its *ostensible* range is not War and Aftermath, as in the two Homeric poems, but Background and War. But the *real* range is a more complicated question, and the combination of 5.97.3 and 6.98 (see below, pp. 346–7) arguably shows that Herodotus claims the new Trojan War to be greater (and longer-lasting) than the old, just as Thucydides claimed the Peloponnesian War to be greater than both the Trojan and Persian Wars.⁴²

But, second, is comparing the two wars a valid or sensible activity? There are grounds for uncertainty.

The fact that Persians are represented as using the analogy does not in itself damage its validity for Greeks. It is true that their use is not marked very positively⁴³ and that their right retrospectively to lay claim to pre-Persian Asia and a duty to avenge its sufferings is weak compared with the Greeks' right retrospectively to lay claim to pre-modern Greece and a right to resist Asian aggression. But if the Persians choose to cast themselves as losers (and perpetrators of injustice), that in fact tends to reinforce Greek entitlement to use the analogy to cast themselves as winners (and victims of injustice). But there are other counter-indications.

(a) Many victorious Achaeans suffered difficult or disastrous *nostoi*. If the opening of *Histories* marks Herodotus' text as both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the reader cannot ignore this perspective. The most visible bad *nostos* within the *Histories* story-line is that of Xerxes, one that is marked by murderous intra-familial relationships and distantly at least calls Agamemnon to mind (thus inverting the expected Persian-Trojan pairing: on this see immediately below). But the future difficulties of Pausanias and Themistocles are evoked too (5.32; 8.109), and Herodotus invites the reader to think of the longer term politico-military fall-out of the events of 480–79, sometimes in passages that involve Homeric intertexts. But, if the entire troubled post-Trojan War era (which involved bad inverted-*nostoi* for surviving Trojans as well) is undifferentiatedly called to mind by the Trojan War/Persian War assimilation,

⁴² Both authors generally regard any past, present, and future they deal with as in a single *spatium historicum*, though Herodotus might subdivide the past in terms of the accuracy with which things can be known (2.154), and his general time-frame is longer than Homer's, if mostly closer to him than in his view Homer's subject matter was to Homer. The first Dorian incursion into Asia (3.44–48, 56) is not a counter-indication (*pace* Meissner (2004) 226), since Herodotus need not regard Homeric Spartans as Dorians. (Vannicelli (1993) 29 argues that the proto-Dorians are Homeric Hellenes.)

⁴³ Artayctes is sexually corrupt, Xerxes' gambit did not work, and Herodotus side-lines the Persian view of the causative relevance of Helen for Persian attacks on Greece. And see below, p. 315 for Persian hypocrisy in this matter.

that means that the self-congratulatory equation of Persian War and Trojan War has unwelcome consequences and may be of questionable wisdom.

(b) If supposed Persian allusions to the Trojan War are not enthusiastically endorsed by the historian (n. 43), there are also in-text Greek allusions that raise questions: see below, pp. 337–40 on the Gelon Embassy and the Tegean-Athenian debate.

(c) There are implicit intertexts that cast Greeks as Trojans and Persians as Greeks: 1.88; 3.14; 5.97.3; 6.70, 113–14; 7.238; 9.70, 99.3. If the merit of the assimilation consists in its marking Greeks as winners and Persians as losers, any disturbance of that relationship seems unsettling, at least from a Greek perspective. The fact that the Greeks destroyed Troy and think they can lay claim to places like Sigeium on that basis (whereas the Persians at the time of writing have no stake there) hardly means that Greeks are simply entitled at will to be Trojans as well as Achaeans. In the light of the argument above, it seems rather clear that such cases invite us to question the good sense of the assimilation.⁴⁴

6. Finally, we should acknowledge that searching for Homer can induce tunnel-vision. Other intertextual targets *were* available.⁴⁵ They may indeed already be present in 1.0 and 1.5. The historian as display-artist is in competition with other performance intellectuals; and the historian as traveller probably intertexts in ways we cannot see so clearly with other authors who represent the travel-enquiry-knowledge nexus, e.g., Parmenides, Democritus, and specially Hecataeus.⁴⁶ Herodotus conjures up a diverse Hellenic world (involving numerous *poleis*, great and small)—a virtual description of the Greek *oecumene*—and he does the same for the barbarian world. *Histories* is, one might say, an encapsulation or evocation of the whole *oecumene* that joins the descriptive enterprise of Hecataean *periplous*-literature with the narrative enterprise of Homer.

But non-Homeric intertexts can also be found in more modest forms. A choice example is 1.187.2. The message on Nitocris' tomb said that a later

⁴⁴ See below pp. 337–40, 345–8, 351, 354–5, 356–60, 361–2, 368–9.

⁴⁵ E.g., non-Homeric epic (Carey (2016); below, n. 180), Stesimbrotus (Pelling (2016); (2020b) 92, 96), pre-Socratics (Harrison, above, pp. 94–7, 98, 101–2), epinician poetry—for fame is a Pindaric thing (and *kleos* a Pindaric word) and 1.0 could be channelling *Nemean* 6—and tragedy (notably Aeschylus' *Persians*). Stesichorus surely lurks in 2.112–30 (above, p. 292) and Bacchylides perhaps in 1.86–8. For Archilochus see below, n. 144.

⁴⁶ Ἄνῆρ πολυπλανῆς (*FGrHist* 1 T 12), and himself a Homeriser: Hornblower (1994) 13. See Marincola (2006) 26. Hecataeus may be an unspoken intertext in the passage on Ocean (above, p. 292).

Babylonian king could remove the gold it contained if short of money, but must not do so unless the shortage was really dire: οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον. It duly remained ἀκίνητος until Darius became king. The tag οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον takes us to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (750), a warning that twelve-month and twelve-year-old children should not sit on ἀκινήτοισι (i.e., tombs or the like). This is Herodotus (not Nitocris) playing a little game, and it is a game that has an intratextual pay-off. Darius twice ends a speech οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον during the events that led to his becoming king (3.71.2, 82.5). So Nitocris speaks like Hesiod, and Darius speaks like Nitocris—and these are the only four occurrences of οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον (apart from a citation of the Hesiod passage) until the time of Lucian, so we are not dealing with casual coincidence. And the point? The upshot of the Nitocris story is that Darius broke into the tomb and found no money but only another message calling him ἄπληστος χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδής. His use of the tag recalls this episode (in the past in the text, though still to come in real time) and surely colours the reader's reaction to Darius' keenness to murder Smerdis and espouse monarchy: eliminating a usurper without delay and maintaining ancestral custom may be his asserted motives, but there is something else too—something concordant with what we discover very shortly after his elevation to the throne, namely that the Persians called him 'retailer' (κάπηλος: 3.89).

3.3. Opening Themes Pursued Elsewhere

So non-Homeric intertexts can be fun.⁴⁷ But our business is with Homeric ones. We return to the search for significant Homeric allusions beyond the confines of the opening of *Histories*. A good place to start is with themes already present in 1.0–5.

Methodological statements

Two passages belong under this heading.

1. The first is 5.65.5. Having recounted the fall of the Athenian tyranny, Herodotus turns to what happened between then and the arrival of Aristagoras. He will record ὅσα δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἔρξαν ἢ ἔπαθον ἀξιόχρεα ἀπηγήσιος, thus echoing *Odyssey* 8.490, where Demodocus is praised for recording ὅσσ' ἔρξαν τ' ἔπαθόν τε καὶ ὅσσ' ἐμόγησαν Ἀχαιοί—a reference to the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles.⁴⁸ The historian thus reminds us that,

⁴⁷ For fun in Homeric intertexts see below, pp. 364–5.

⁴⁸ Hornblower (2013) 194.

like Demodocus, he is *alter Homerus*, and uses the reminder to mark a new era of Athenian freedom that will lead (*via* the energising effects of *isēgoria* in 78) to Sparta's failure to reinstall Hippias, the embroiling of Athens and Persia, and Aristagoras. Hippias' return to Sigeium in 5.93–4 closes a loop with the first exile to Sigeium in 5.64. The passage is a sort of new preface for a long patch of text that is rich in significant Homeric intertexts (see below, pp. 341–8) and to a degree for the whole second half of *Histories*,⁴⁹ and the intertext is thus used (in intratext with 1.0) to mark an important historical and literary-structural point. That the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles lurks in the background is not inappropriate to the inter-Hellenic strife that will ensue.

2. The second is 8.8.3–4, identified and discussed by Donelli elsewhere in this volume. Her view is that the passage (1) evokes celebrated poetic texts about the true and the false-but-like-truth,⁵⁰ (2) asserts *gnōmē* as a criterion for distinguishing the two, and (3) acts as a programmatic statement ahead of a number of episodes problematising what is seen and what is actual.

Each of the intertexts is distinct. In Homer Odysseus is straightforwardly a liar. Some of the stories about Scyllias were of similar character (stories told by an Odysseus) and Odysseus did some heroic swimming at times. So Scyllias is a quasi-Odysseus figure. (I return to this below.) Theognis makes the cleverness that dresses lies up as truth a boon that is still not as valuable as money. Donelli notes a general thematic link with references to money and bribes in the opening part of Herodotus' Book 8. (Scyllias' acquisition of *khṛēmata* from the Pelion shipwrecks may be noted in particular.) Meanwhile in Hesiod the issue is the poet's authority. Hesiod pictures the Muses as capable both of lying and truth,⁵¹ though he presumably thinks they have picked him as a channel for the truth. In Homer the Muses know the truth because they were present whereas mortals only hear rumour and know nothing (*Il.* 2.485–6). At the start of *Histories* the Muses are replaced by *historiē* and the historian affirms what *he* knows. In the present passage *gnōmē* either replaces the Muses as a source of truth or permits the historian to

⁴⁹ This fits with Hornblower's view of the relationship of Book 5 to Book 1 (Hornblower (2013) 4–9).

⁵⁰ Hom. *Od.* 19.203 (Odysseus ἴσκει ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα); Hes. *Theog.* 22–8; Thgn. 699–718. D.H. *Lys.* 18 uses *Od.* 19.203 as a description of Lysias' skill in producing convincing narratives. The *Odyssey* passage was much cited in antiquity and is much discussed in modern literature, as is the Hesiod one.

⁵¹ Which is doubtless why some things in a poem may be false: though Homer's lies about Helen (2.112–30) are apparently conscious and deliberate.

adjudicate between truth and falsehood, both of which *could* be the product of the Muses. In any case the passage re-affirms that we are in a Muse-free world in which, *pace* Homer, mortals (especially Herodotus) can have some control over rumour. That can stand as an important message in its own right—but Donelli's position is that Herodotus chooses to re-assert the human historian's authority just here because specious falsehoods are going to start appearing and we are to notice the author's (Odyssean?) skill in manoeuvring his way through them.

Perhaps the series starts sooner than Donelli observes. Herodotus does not say that Scyllias told the story about swimming from Aphetæ, but it is hard to imagine that he is *not* the source. But if we are dealing with an Odyssean liar, we have to reassess the other information he brings about a storm off Magnesia and the despatch of a squadron to circumnavigate Euboea. There are potentially interesting complications here. Were reports about the storm accurate? Herodotus says the Greeks at Artemisium thought the Persian fleet did not look as if it had been battered (8.4). Was there really a circumnavigating squadron? Moderns have often been sceptical. (It disappeared in another convenient storm.) Scyllias had (allegedly) rescued lots of goods after the storm—but also purloined some for himself. Odysseus would have done no less, one may feel, but should we trust anything he says? The fact that there were also true stories associated with Scyllias does not entirely eliminate the doubt. Herodotus explicitly applies critical *gnōmē* to Scyllias' swimming feat. Perhaps the intertextual echoes implicitly criticise his other reports.

Programmatic Themes

Four themes call for attention here.

1. *The role of women in historical causation.* In 1.1–5 Herodotus sets aside explanation of Greek-barbarian conflict in terms of the theft of women. But the theme is partly revived in the story of Candaules' wife. There are two distinct types of intertext here, one involving structure as well as content, the other just content. The first (in two forms) makes her a quasi-Homeric start both to the story and to the text of *Histories*, one that preserves the importance of sex as a driver for historical events but also, by offering a female victim who has powerful agency (though no name), marks the difference between Homeric epic and the 'modern' world of Herodotus.⁵²

⁵² (1) Candaules' wife's initiatory role in the history of the Mermnad kingdom (Gyges' usurpation is a start that is closed by Croesus' fall in a fated loop: so Candaules' wife marks

The second exploits a famous Homeric story (again involving sex) to give the Mermnad dynasty an epic Charter Myth in which (once again) Candaules' wife has a degree of direct agency lacking to the queen in the original story.⁵³ It thus reinforces the effect of the first intertextual connection: the prefatory material of 1.0–5 establishes *Histories* as a work for which Homer will be important: Candaules' wife provides a powerful example of this (and of the dissonant way in which it will sometimes work) at the outset of the main text.

2. *Wandering and eudaimoniē*. Candaules' wife underscores the Iliadic perspective of 1.0–5. The Odyssean one is underscored by the meeting of Croesus with Solon, a wanderer who speaks about *eudaimoniē*. The intertextual and intratextual strands that this sets off are quite complicated.

In the first instance we have an analogy between Solon in Lydia and Odysseus in Phaeacia.⁵⁴ Solon is treated less well than Odysseus: Odysseus' story earns him return home with treasure, Solon's story earns him dismissal without treasure (and no return home). Phaeacia is one of the points at which the long-suffering Odysseus for once prospers (albeit precisely by rehearsing his sufferings), whereas in Lydia the Solonian Odysseus fails to prosper by telling stories of good fortune, albeit stories whose dark shadow is that prosperity may only come with death. The episode thus underlines the programmatic observation of the Herodotean Odysseus in 1.5.3–4—an observation that transmutes the sufferings of the Homeric Odysseus into a theme of (broadly) political history for *Histories*, the changeable *eudaimoniē* of

an important moment in the greater scheme of things) apes Helen's initiatory role (and earlier that of the other rape-victims) in the history of the Trojan War—a structural parallel invited by 1.1–5 which has rehearsed the epic analogies. (2) Candaules' wife's initiatory role in the (main) text of *Histories* and its explanation of strife between Greek and barbarian apes Briseis' role as the cause of Achilles' wrath and so of the *Iliad*—a structural parallel invited by the structural analogy between 1.0–5 and the opening of *Iliad*. In both cases Candaules' wife is a sex-object but with great agency compared with Io or Helen. *Histories* has many agent-women (Hazewindus (2004)), and she is a marker for a different world: see Pelling (2006) 85.

⁵³ *Il.* 6.145–211: Proetus (told falsely of a sexual attack on Anteia by Bellerophon) is offered a 'Kill him or die yourself' choice by Anteia (the guilty inventor of the false accusation). Candaules' wife has been the innocent object of actual sexual attack and offers the unwilling attacker the same choice (kill Candaules or die). Proetus takes the kill option (though executes it in a roundabout and unsuccessful way, and Bellerophon ends up sharing half a kingdom), Gyges does so also, carries it through, and ends up as king. This time the parallel is not structural but one of content.

⁵⁴ Moles (1996) 265.

the cities of men—and evokes questions about *nostos* and final destinations.

Both of these themes can be pursued further.

2.1 The *nostos* theme is already implicit in the opening of *Histories*. Quite apart from the fact that the Trojan War cannot be evoked without prompting thought about *nostoi* (see above, pp. 303–4), Herodotus cannot be Odysseus without the question of his *nostos* arising. Odysseus travels, gets home and puts things there back as they should be. Does Herodotus do that in any sense? Does the journey that is the text end in that sort of closure for the traveller-historian? Is the disorder begun by Croesus (which is the starting point of the text-journey) brought to resolution? At first sight, the answer is at best yes-and-no. In these terms there is no clear *nostos*-closure.

Another approach is to broaden the discussion. As wanderer, Herodotus has three notable metanarrative pairs, Arion, Solon, and Democedes, the first two of whom come very close together in his text, and realise the *nostos* issue in Herodotus' Odyssean identity soon after the work's opening. Two are said to excel at what they do. Solon by contrast is one of many *sophistai* who came to Croesus and is not explicitly praised as such, but perhaps his exceptionality is taken for granted. In any event it seems fair to say that, if these figures are Herodotean avatars, Herodotus is claiming status for himself. (That is pertinent to the theme of author's *kleos* lurking in the proem and in the assimilation to Odysseus: above, pp. 296–300.) All three are encountered in connection with autocratic courts. Professionally speaking, Arion corresponds to Herodotus the *aidos* (*qua* Homer imitator), Democedes to Herodotus the Hippocratic,⁵⁵ and Solon to Herodotus the *sophistēs* and moraliser. Arion is a voluntary profit-seeking wanderer who has a remarkable *nostos* to his working base (not his home). Democedes is a voluntary and then involuntary profit-seeking wanderer who secures a true *nostos* to his actual home town. Solon is a voluntary/involuntary non-profit-seeking wanderer who has no narrated *nostos*—a fact underlined by the Odysseus–Phaeacia intertext. Solon is Herodotus' closest metanarrative pair (because of the intratext with 1.5.3–4, because Solon is the one who is not professionally implicated in an autocratic court, and because Herodotus is actually more *sophistēs* than singer or doctor), so this fact is important. One could say that Arion is an early first run of the *nostos* question which certainly has resonance with the opening of *Histories* (Arion is poet like Homer and traveller like Odysseus so embraces both Herodotus' characters). But his successful *nostos* is trumped by the Solon story with its blatant intratext to

⁵⁵ Thomas (2000); Pelling (2018).

1.5.3–4 (Herodotus is *particularly* Solonian) and absence of *nostos*. But later we have Democedes, who makes a successful home run from an autocratic court in the context of a voyage of investigation—so he is also a very Herodotean figure (see below, pp. 317–18). Perhaps the message here is that *historiē* can bring you home. But perhaps the message *overall* is still that successful *nostos* is unpredictable: Democedes was very lucky.

Two further observations can be made. John Moles detected a larger setting for the Solon–Croesus episode. Lydia resembles Athens as a destination of *sophistai*, and Athens may also resemble Lydia–Phaeacia in being vulnerable to blinkered and self-satisfied enjoyment of prosperity: Alcinous foresees a possible disaster which indeed comes to pass, but Croesus still has no inkling of what will happen to Lydia even after Solon’s remarks and the fate of his son. The Athens–Lydia link does not depend on there also being a Lydia–Phaeacia link, but that link provides another example of disaster—and (importantly) it is a fundamental change that may cut the Phaeacians off from the sea: for it is Phaeacia that adds the maritime perspective that is lacking in the story of Lydia (Croesus is not a thalassocrat) and enhances the analogy with Athens. If the reader’s mind is carried beyond the end of *Histories*, then we are into the proleptic strand of Herodotus’ text in which (see above, pp. 303–4) the difficult *nostoi* and inverted-*nostoi* of Trojan War survivors provide a dark intertextual commentary on contemporary Greece.⁵⁶

But if we stick with the actual text of *Histories* there may be another sort of answer. Almost the last thing Herodotus says is that Persia is *λυπρή*.⁵⁷ The word is a *hapax* in Herodotus and in Homer (*Od.* 13.243), where it describes what Ithaca is *not*. Ithaca is also *τρηχεῖα* (as is Persia) and not *εὐρεῖα*, unlike (one imagines) the comfortable *πεδιάς* that the Persians foreswore and so presumably like Persia in this respect as well. It is a land that produces remarkable (*ἀθέσφατος*) corn and wine in plenty, but Odysseus at least is proof that it is not a soft enough land to produce soft men. So (being *ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος*: *Od.* 9.27) it is a land that, *pace* Cyrus in 9.122, can produce *καρπὸν θωμιαστόν* (cf. *ἀθέσφατον*) and *ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί*. *Histories* thus ends with an allusive comparison between Persia and Ithaca. But why? A way of

⁵⁶ Cf. Friedman (2006) for whom Herodotus senses a disjunction between 480/79 when some degree of Hellenic cohesion existed and the time of composition when it did not (or, if it partially did, it was in the tyrant city’s rule of an imperial space), thus accentuating the absence of *nostos* and an abiding nostalgia.

⁵⁷ Noted without comment in Flower–Marincola (2002) 314 and Asheri (2006) 344.

underscoring how deeply Persia was home to Persians and the importance of Cyrus' advice? A way of acknowledging that Persia *did* produce *ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί*? A way of asserting that Greece was better at doing so in relatively benign circumstances? A way of asserting that Persian conditions were not quite as unbenign as Cyrus pretends? All these ideas can be in play. But perhaps it also functions as a *sphragis*-like allusion to the homeland of Herodotus' avatar, Odysseus. In one sense, at least, the wandering text *has* reached home.⁵⁸

2.2 The *eudaimoniē* theme of 1.5.3–4 and the Solon–Croesus episode have further ramifications in *Histories* that are marked by Homeric intertexts, but ones drawn from *Iliad* rather than *Odyssey*. Four passages come into question, best treated in two pairs: (a) 7.45–7, 9.16, and (b) 1.88, 3.14.

Shortly after Xerxes visits Troy,⁵⁹ he and Artabanus have a famous conversation about the shortness and painfulness of human life, in which contentment is so fragile that everyone sometimes wishes to be dead (7.45–7). This clearly echoes the theme established in 1.5.3–4 and continued in the story of Croesus, in both cases with some Homeric colour (notably in the Solon–Croesus episode, but also the Adrestus–Atys story: see below, pp. 340–1). Moreover Artabanus tells Xerxes to heed the *παλαιὸν ἔπος* about ends (7.51.3), using a Homeric turn of phrase (*ἐς θυμὸν ὦν βαλεῖν*)⁶⁰ but also echoing Solon: he does so banally and inappropriately (Solon was making a point about human happiness, whereas Artabanus applies it to the question of Ionian loyalty to Persia) but that piece of characterisation (Artabanus' last hurrah as a consistently sententious speaker) does not prevent an intratextual echo of Solon's more profound point.⁶¹ There is a skein of interconnections here, and some find another specifically Homeric one. The spectacle of the Persian enemy displaying a sense of human frailty has been thought to recall the meeting of Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* 24, in which both acknowledge a dark future, fixed by the gods and ineluctable: it is as though Xerxes and

⁵⁸ I forebear to discuss how this theme relates to Herodotus' alleged exile and eventual settlement at Thurii.

⁵⁹ Cf. Matijašić, above, p. 13.

⁶⁰ Cf. Matijašić, above, p. 26.

⁶¹ The same turn of phrase is used by Artemisia in another disparaging comment about Xerxes' subjects ('good masters have bad slaves': 8.68γ.1): 'this august phrase introduces her coda on Xerxes' excellence' (A. M. Bowie (2007) 158). Perhaps there is an intratextual link here, but it is modest—and even more so when the phrase is used of a Persian soldier at Sardis (1.84).—*Μεμνεῶμεθα* (7.47.1) might be another tiny bit of Homeric colour (Stein adduced *Od.* 14.168–9).

Artabanus momentarily reach out to the enemy Greek reader as Achilles and Priam momentarily reach out to one another.⁶² We are at an important moment in the story,⁶³ and Herodotus has marked it with a conversation ranging over philosophical, strategic, and practical issues. An evocation of the pause in hostilities in *Iliad* 24 (and an invitation to a moment of empathy with the invader) would not be inappropriate and its presence is made more likely by the fact that a similar thing will happen before the final battle on Greek soil.

This is another famous passage. Thersander and an unnamed Persian dine together before Plataea, and the Persian weeps at the prospect that few of his fellows will survive the battle to come—something well known to many but spoken of by none because it has been fixed by god and cannot be changed (9.16). The scene is intratextually linked both with the Demaratus–Dicaeus conversation before Salamis (8.65)⁶⁴ and with the Artabanus–Xerxes conversation: Xerxes notes that everyone in the army will be dead in 100 years, the Persian says much of the army will be dead tomorrow; and while Artabanus does not profess to *know* the expedition will fail (whereas the Persian does know the battle will be lost), his gloomy strategic analysis is unrefuted. The foreboding of the unnamed Persian is the foreboding of Xerxes and Artabanus, and the intratextual link takes us back to Croesus–Solon and 1.5.3–4. But the scene is also a variant on Homeric guest-reception tropes (dine first, then ask questions), contains Homeric words or turns of phrase,⁶⁵ and, like 7.45–7, can resonate with the Achilles–Priam meeting of *Iliad* 24. The Persian weeps because one cannot change a known (deadly) future if the gods have decreed it; Achilles says mourning is pointless as it changes nothing (Zeus doles out good and evil from jars, and sorrow is always part of the mix) and both Priam and he are going to die. Thersander

⁶² Cf. Gould (1989) 134.

⁶³ Xerxes is about formally to start the war on Greece by leaving Asia and about to swap an ignored Persian adviser for an ignored Greek one in the shape of Demaratus—who presumably joined the expedition around about now from his home in the Caicus valley.

⁶⁴ There will be an unavoidable Persian defeat, and a voice from τὸ θεῖον proves it, just as at Plataea there will be a Persian defeat ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ and Persians are bound by ἀναγκαίη. At Salamis Dicaeus is not to say a word on pain of death, at Plataea there is no point in speaking (nobody wants to believe those who speak reliable things).

⁶⁵ See Flower–Marincola (2002) 130, 132 on μετέναι πολλά τῶν δακρύων (16.3; cf. δάκρυον ἦκε χαμᾶζε (*Od.* 16.191; cf. 23.33)), ὀδύνη (16.5; *hapax* here in Herodotus), ἀναγκαίη ἐνδεδέμενοι (*Il.* 2.111) and ἐχθίστη (*Il.* 1.176, etc.). ἀναγκαίη ἐνδεῖν also occurs in the Candaules' wife story (1.11.3), another Homeric intertext (above, pp. 307–8).

did not die, of course, and about the Persian we do not know (though it is implicit: it makes him a grander and more tragic figure); only the Persian weeps, whereas both Achilles and Priam do so, his weeping is caused by the unchangeability of future but is not something that should be banished because it cannot change the future, and the Persian and Greek are not enemies (even if some would think they ought to be), so they do not perfectly map on to Achilles and Priam. But differences notwithstanding, the resonance *is* undoubtedly there. Moreover, although in both Herodotus passages there is only explicit reference to the death of Persians, the scene in *Iliad* 24 looks beyond the end of the poem to disaster and death for both Achaean and Trojan, and the intertext should be understood as a sombre one for Greeks as well as Persians.⁶⁶

The *Iliad* 24 scene is also evoked twice more. One occasion is in itself rather slight. When Croesus has been miraculously saved, Cyrus and those with him look upon the Lydian king with wonder just as Achilles and *his* companions marvel at the sight of Priam who has miraculously appeared in their midst (1.88). The existence of other allusions to the Achilles–Priam meeting (not least the one still to come in Book 3: see below) makes this a more convincing allusion than it might otherwise seem. The intertext (as often) involves both similarity and difference. Enemies find common ground in both cases (Pelling (2006) 86), there is a miraculous element, and the actuality or prospect of the fall of a great kingdom is a shared setting. But Croesus' amicable relation with Cyrus has a future (and the miracle and the wonder it evokes is substantively instrumental in that), whereas that of Achilles and Priam does not (and the miracle—Priam making it past Achilles' security detail like a fugitive murderer—is instrumental only in creating a meeting).⁶⁷ The sense that Cyrus and Croesus may one day end up suffering or dead is not strongly evoked (though anything involving Croesus is charged with the idea of changeable fortune), but the intertext perhaps gives an extra emotional charge to the moment, and it certainly accentuates the fact that the outcome of defeat is quite good for Croesus—indeed surprisingly good, especially for readers who think they know that

⁶⁶ Herodotus insists that Thersander told the story *before* Plataea happened and that he (Herodotus) heard it from Thersander, presumably very much later. But that is an assertion about truth-value and there is no special reason to attribute the Homeric colour to Thersander (either in 479 or in later retellings) rather than to the historian, especially as its force is much tied up with links elsewhere in *Histories*, not only those just mentioned but also 1.88 and 3.14. See above, n. 41.

⁶⁷ On fugitive murderers cf. below, pp. 340–1.

Croesus did not survive the Persian conquest.⁶⁸ If *eudaimoniē* is vulnerable, it is also unpredictable: Croesus' fate exemplifies both characteristics, and the contrast between text and intertext serves to underline the point.

Another defeated king does not fare so well. The Egyptian Psammenitus is stoical at the enslavement of girls and at his own son's execution, but breaks down on seeing an elderly man begging. This, he explains to Cambyses (and Croesus), is because the suffering of a prosperous man (*ἐκ πολλῶν τε καὶ εὐδαιμόνων*) reduced to penury 'on the threshold of old age' is a piteous sight (3.14). The tag appears thrice in Homer, including at *Il.* 24.486 where Priam uses it in calling to mind the wretchedness of Achilles' father Peleus.⁶⁹ The points of contact with *Iliad* are divided between two figures in Herodotus, Psammenitus (who loses a son, like Priam and Peleus, but is himself relatively young) and the anonymous Egyptian (who is in a poor state on the eve of old age like Peleus), and, in pitying the man on the eve of old age, Psammenitus is channelling Priam's sense of solidarity with Peleus. (Peleus' son is still alive, but only for the moment.) But a common element is Priam, and Psammenitus' temporary survival and later death parallel Priam's survival in *Iliad* 24 and later death (see below). In these terms Cambyses and Croesus, who are moved by the story, resemble Achilles (and, appropriately, Cambyses had killed Psammenitus' son) and, since we are outside the wall of Memphis, the Egyptian capital becomes a sort of parallel for Troy.

From that one might go on to the *cherchez la femme* causation for Cambyses attacking Egypt (3.1–2: shades of 1.1–4?) and the bad *nostos* that Cambyses was going to have (3.61–6) and see the whole Persian attack on Egypt as a quasi-Trojan War.⁷⁰ The fall of Egypt *is* the end of an ancient and great kingdom, as was that of Troy. That in turn leads in two directions. (1) The fall of Egypt matches the fall of Lydia—and the presence of Croesus ensures that we recall this and the faint intertextual link with *Iliad* 24 in 1.88, in which Cyrus also becomes Achilles. (2) According to the Persian *logioi* Persia attacked Greece as flagbearer for Troy. But in Lydia and Egypt it turns out

⁶⁸ See West (2003) 418–27.

⁶⁹ *Il.* 22.60 rehearses the sufferings of old Priam up to death in an attempt to stop Hector fighting Achilles. *Od.* 15.348 speaks of the extreme unhappiness of Laertes on the threshold of old age. These parallels probably also contribute to the impact of use of the phrase.

⁷⁰ Could one even note the transgressive killing of the Apis bull—shades of Iphigeneia or Polyxena (though they are not Homeric stories) or even the Cattle of Helios (see below, p. 330)—and indeed Cambyses' Achilles-like mistreatment of Amasis' corpse (cf. below, pp. 355, 361)?

that they were busy destroying Troy themselves. We have here an example of the reversal of polarity in Persian War/Trojan War analogies already mentioned above (pp. 302–4), in this case drawing attention to Persian hypocrisy.

Meanwhile the intertext has another effect, which is to underline the difference between the fates of Psammenitus and Priam: Psammenitus (who showed pity for the impoverished Egyptian) later turned against the person who pitied him and was (one may feel justly) killed, whereas Priam (who showed pity for his enemy's father) did not but was later (one may feel unjustly, and certainly piteously) killed—and by his pitier's son, though admittedly not in Homer.⁷¹ Formally it is Psammenitus who deploys the intertext and retrospectively his doing so seems rather inappropriate. Here too there is perhaps a warning against facile comparisons.

That said, nobody could deny that both the fall of Lydia and Egypt and the Persian defeat in Greece exemplify human *eudaimoniē* failing to stay in the same place (1.5.4), and for the historian to mark them with allusions to one of the most affecting passages in Homer is to accord such events a solemn status that befits their historical importance.⁷² It also binds Persia's successes under Cyrus and Cambyses together with her failure under Xerxes and points up the contrast between them.

3. *Fame*. Two topics arise here.

3.1 Herodotus' aim is that the great and wonderful works of Greeks and barbarian should not become *aklea*. Presumably *Histories* achieves this, but the word *kleos* and its cognates are for the most part conspicuously absent and, when they do appear, it is almost always associated with the Spartans. Leonidas remained at Thermopylae to ensure *kleos* for himself and for the Spartans (and—in another link to the theme just discussed—to avoid the wiping out of Spartan *eudaimoniē*), Mardonius tauntingly contrasts Spartan behaviour at Plataea with what is to be expected *κατὰ κλέος*, and Pausanias won *κλέος* ... *μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν* for saving Greece (outdoing even Leonidas).⁷³ Less positively, Cleomenes' attack on Athens led to the infamous dissolution of his own army (5.77): *ἀκλεῶς* is not only, as Hornblower (2013) 222 remarks, a strong word for a very unusual event, but

⁷¹ Psammenitus plays out the full Homeric analogy when he need not have done, a fact underlined by the intratextual link with Croesus.

⁷² Asheri (2007) 412 notes the general parallel with Hdt. 1.86–90, but not the intertextual aspects. For those see Pelling (2006) 87–9; Haywood, above, p. 61.

⁷³ 7.220; 9.48.3, 78.2 (cf. 8.114).

precisely the right strong word because it denies the distinctively Spartan achievement of good kings. (It also comes conjoined with another Homerism: the episode was, as Herodotus says, the fourth Dorian attack on Athens, and readers of Homer know that the fourth attack is one in which the attacker always fails.⁷⁴ Herodotus marks the moment carefully as another stage in the upsurge of post-tyrannical Athens.)⁷⁵

But there is one more (indirect) appearance of κλέος in Herodotus. Rhodopis, we are told, was so κλεινή that all Greeks had heard of her, while Archidice was also αοίδιμος even if less περιλεσχήμεντος than Rhodopis (2.135). There are some remarkable words here. Αοίδιμος is a near-*hapax* in Herodotus⁷⁶ and *hapax* in Homer, where it appears in an iconic passage—the complaint of Helen that the gods have fixed things so she and Hector will be αοίδιμοι to later generations (*Il.* 6.356–8). Αοίδιμος also occurs in Homeric Hymns, Stesichorus, and Pindar (including the opening line of the Athens poem), but it is not unreasonable to think the Iliadic passage (about a beautiful woman) specially pertinent. Κλεινή is a Herodotean *hapax* and unknown in Homer: but given the resonances of κλέος for both authors, the application of κλεινός to a courtesan is striking. Περιλεσχήμεντος is a *hapax* in Greek texts until two entries in Hesychius and then some late Byzantine uses (all ultimately derived from Herodotus). Archidice is variously the subject of song and (lewd?) comment in men’s meeting places, but Rhodopis has epic κλέος, as well as other poetic connections: she was manumitted by Sappho’s brother, and presumably figured in what Sappho wrote about him. She also made an unparalleled ποίημα, viz. the μνημέλον consisting in a pile of spits at Delphi. Ποίημα never means poem in Herodotus (1.25.2; 4.5.2; 7.84), but, if the joke is not quite direct, it is hard to feel that it is not there. Why does Herodotus do this with Rhodopis and Archidice? I suggest that he is provoked to it by the absurd Greek idea that one of the pyramids was

⁷⁴ In *Il.* 5.438, 16.705, and 20.447 the fourth attack results in Apollo intervening and forcing the Greek attacker to desist (in two cases spiriting the target away or hiding him in mist). In *Il.* 16.786 Patroclus’ fourth attack results in his death at Apollo’s hands. In *Il.* 22.208, as Achilles chases Hector past the Scamander for the fourth time (slightly different from the fourth-attack formula), Hector’s fate is decided by Zeus. Henderson (2007) 308 notes the trope of the fourth attack without pursuing the point fully. See also below, n. 171.

⁷⁵ On that pattern see below, pp. 341–8.

⁷⁶ The only other use of αοίδιμος in Herodotus is the statement that Linus is αοίδιμος in Phoenicia, Cyprus, and elsewhere (2.79), though with different names in different places (Maneros in Egypt)—piquant in terms of the theme of preserved fame: preservation is poor if you cannot even get the name right.

built by Rhodopis.⁷⁷ He identifies Rhodopis' true memorial (the Delphi spits: unparalleled but not a pyramid) but then playfully makes her (and Archidice for good measure) into quasi-epic heroines as his own version of an extravagant misrepresentation of the women. And there is perhaps a further undertone. Helen represents being *αοίδιμος* as the undesirable by-product of divine ordinance. Perhaps being a *hetaira* is not entirely a good way of becoming famous, even if Rhodopis at least shows every sign of having relished her fame. Moreover, as Herodotus' purpose is to ensure that the *erga* of mankind are not *aklea* and his work opens with women as sex-objects, Rhodopis and Archidice have some larger pertinence.⁷⁸ Herodotus perhaps relished the chance to draw playful attention to the peculiarities of fame and of people's reaction to it. Only Spartans achieve *kleos* in Herodotus, but one courtesan can be *kleinē* like a warrior and another *αοιδιμος* like the woman who caused the Trojan War.

3.2 Next, the historian's fame, a theme already hinted at in 1.0 (and with a Homeric perspective). It is well known that there is an intratextual connection in Herodotus between the historian and certain in-text characters who engage in or organise investigation of a sort not categorically very different from the ones he engages in. These in-text performers of *historiē* (though not necessarily described with that term) include: (a) Solon, Hecataeus, and other geographers; (b) Egyptian priests; (c) various rulers; (d) Pythius who understands his wealth *ἀτρεκέως* (a very Herodotean word); and perhaps (e) Socles who effects change by deploying historical narrative based on experience that gives rise to correct *gnōmē* (5.92a.2).⁷⁹ Solon and Herodotus sing from a similar ethical song sheet (instability of *eudaimoniē*), while other professional investigators are apt to be regarded with disdain:

⁷⁷ For a speculative explanation of the association of small pyramids with prostitutes see Quack (2013).

⁷⁸ E. Bowie (2018a) 57.

⁷⁹ For the theme see Christ (1994); Demont (2009). The *histor-* root occurs in the following passages: 1.0, 24.7 (Periander about Arion), 56.1, 2 (Croesus asking who are most powerful Greeks), 61.2 (Pisistratus' mother-in-law about sex life), 122.1 (Cyrus' real parents about his survival); 2.19.3, 29.1, 34.1 (Herodotus' enquiries about Nile), 44.5 (Herodotus about Heracles), 99.1 (Herodotus about Egypt), 113.1, 118.1 (Herodotus about Helen), 119.3 (Egyptian priests about the Menelaus story); 3.50.3 (Periander questioning Lycophron, presumably about his silence), 51.1 (Periander asking his elder son what Procles had said), 77.2–3 (eunuch officials questioning Darius and his companions); 4.192.3 (Herodotus about animals in Libya); 7.96.1 (giving commanders' name not necessary for *historiē*), 195 (Greeks interrogating prisoners). Note the interesting contrast in 1.119.3 between what one knows by *ιστορίη* and events in one's own environment that one knows *ἀτρεκέως*.

professional rivalry is an issue. Non-professional investigators are often rulers or politically effective non-rulers (Socles), though Pythius is just very rich—and a warning story about not making too much out of knowledge? So Herodotus the investigator is analogous to a positive model like Solon, better than some other examples (like Hecataeus), and appropriates the power-status of rulers—as he appropriates or outdoes Solon and geographers.

What is remarkable is that this intratextual relationship also has an intertextual aspect. For there are people within the Homeric text who do what Homer does—the professionals Phemius and Demodocus, and the non-professionals Odysseus (narrating his travels), Achilles (*Il.* 9.186–91, singing *κλέα ἀνδρῶν*) or indeed Helen weaving a picture of the war (*Il.* 3.125–8). Bards are the professional tool by which *κλέα ἀνδρῶν* are disseminated: they are crucial to the world-view of the ruling class of the Homeric world—though what they do *can* be done by members of that class themselves. Homer performs the same professional task for those individuals, but (actually) in a different world in which these particular people no longer exist and perhaps their whole class and environment does not either. He is preserver of enduring time-transcending fame (*κλέος ἄφθιτον*). And perhaps he partakes of the *kleos* that his in-text analogues can acquire.⁸⁰ The purpose of the in-text character/author analogy is to make claims for the poet (Homer) that the poet does not explicitly make for himself—including perhaps that the profession of poet still exists even though everything else about the world has changed: i.e., it is not just that the individual poet may lay claim to *kleos* but *also* that the profession he represents can claim an immortality that others can only have if the poet confers it. In other words, the poet (Homer) gets the better of the heroes he sings about. That a hero like Achilles will perform as a bard tends to underline the status of the bard (whether then or now); and, while Achilles may play at being a bard, the bard intrinsically appropriates the status of Achilles. So the in-text poets reinforce the status of Homer as poet, just as the in-text investigators reinforce the status of Herodotus as investigator.

Is the significance of Herodotus' use of in-text investigators to raise his own status increased by the fact that he is doing something that Homer did by using in-text poets? That is, in observing the analogy are we seeing not merely something that might have suggested to Herodotus the idea of having in-text investigators but also something that should be appreciated as another aspect of Herodotus as Homeric author? The answer is, I think, yes.

⁸⁰ Cf. de Jong (2006).

The Homeric example makes the poet as such more powerful than the heroes of the past: he controls their fame both in reporting it and (as a class) in having a longevity that they do not and effectively appropriating their status. Herodotus' aim in creating a *historiē*-related version of this Homeric gambit is to generalise the implications of the analogy between Herodotus himself and investigative rulers beyond specific investigative analogies into a claim for the profession of investigator: the investigative Homer-Odysseus appropriates and excels the status of the people he writes about. Homer's use of in-text poets elevates the status of the real poet into an exclusive category. Merely by casting himself as investigator-Homer Herodotus already potentially taps into that claim; but, by creating his own version of the author/in-text poet analogy, Herodotus both underlines the analogy between himself and the poet and enriches its content: the historian-ruler analogy rather cunningly *realises* the poet-ruler analogy that is implicit in Homer's construction of the poet. This is a genuine intertextual act: there is already a historian-ruler analogy which gives Herodotus a particular sort of status, but the existence of a similar analogy in Homer underlines the analogy's existence and increases its force. The Homer intertext gives extra value to what is already a status-enhancing intratext.⁸¹

4. *Ethnography*. As a new Odysseus Herodotus traverses cities, small and great. The primary stress in 1.5.3–4 is on variability of *eudaimoniē* and status, but the Homeric intertext means we cannot neglect 'knowing the mind of many men', something Odysseus achieved *inter alia* by travelling in some rather strange places. That Herodotus' ethnographic discourse is part of

⁸¹ In this spirit one might also ponder whether the presence of in-text characters in Herodotus who allude to or intertext with Homer is itself an intertext with anything in Homer. In-text figures in Homer certainly allude explicitly to events outside the main narrative as do those in Herodotus and the richness of the digressive texture of *Histories* (whether it be a reference to epic-era events or those of the historical era lying outside the main narrative thread and whether it be done by Herodotus or by in-text figures) is in very broad terms reminiscent of Homer—in fact part of the general Homeric quality of the *Histories* and of Herodotus' posture as *alter Homerus*. But pursuing anything more specific than that is tricky. For example, that there might be an intertext between Herodotus' practice and the existence of in-text figures in Homer who intertext allusively with other texts (Pelling, above, p. 55), though not an impossible proposition, threatens a *mise en abîme* which I prefer to avoid. Perhaps in any case one should acknowledge—even insist—that the peculiar status of Homer in the literary world where Herodotus worked is precisely something that nothing had in the literary world in which Homer worked. For Herodotus, Homer and Hesiod are the beginning: there is nothing before them at all and nothing above them except the Muses. But it must be conceded that intertextual connections between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* might be a fruitful line of enquiry.

what answers to this is hardly controversial, and the relationship is largely at a rather general level.

Something more specific is suggested in Elizabeth Irwin's study of the Ethiopian *logos* in Book 3. This argues that (a) there is an intertext with the Odyssean Cyclops, (b) it reverses the moral polarities of the original, and (c) it does so not to say anything about Cambyses and Ethiopia but to suggest that Odysseus' Cyclops narrative misrepresents a truth that would be more like the truth about Cambyses and the Ethiopians. So this is in the first instance an intertext about how to read Homer, not Herodotus; and, since the exercise is analogous to Herodotus' explicit critique of Homer in 2.112–30, it might be seen as parallel to the problematisation of Homer's Trojan War as a discursive analogy for modern conditions (see above, pp. 302–4 and below, pp. 337–40, 345–8, 351–2, 354–5, 356–60, 361–2, 368–9). But Irwin is primarily concerned with a different discursive analogy, that between the Cyclops island and Sicily: undermining the Homeric view of the former is supposed to problematise its (putative) use as a justification for making the latter the target of Athenian imperial ambitions.⁸²

But perhaps one can stay closer to Herodotus and recover something from the intertext that bears on Cambyses. The unenlightened outsider who encounters distant places that have *uncivilised* characteristics but assert a claim to the moral high ground may be inclined to accentuate and demonise those characteristics. Odysseus' account of the unsocialised, if idyllic, pastoralism of the Cyclops on an island that seems to cry out for proper (Greek) occupation perhaps follows that script. But, if the parallel is noted,⁸³ the reader may feel it enriches our understanding of Cambyses' mind-set. Cambyses' entanglement with Ethiopia involves both the inclination to appropriate what belongs to others and sheer curiosity. If one does not read Odysseus' story as an untrue travesty (as Irwin would have it) but takes it more at face value, it validates Cambyses to the extent that Odysseus is a

⁸² Irwin (2014). The claim that Homer knew the *whole* of the alternative story about Paris, Helen, Menelaus, and Egypt *à la* Euripides additionally leads Irwin to propose that the explicit critique in 2.112–30 (above, p. 292) also implicitly attacks Menelaus for Greek crimes against innocent foreign environments and provides another critique of Athenian imperialism targeting distant places—relevant because the imperial targets might include non-Greeks, e.g., Carthaginians. (De Jong (2012), by contrast, reckons that, although Herodotus attributes the alternative story to Egyptian priests and implies its existence since the time of the Trojan expedition, it is so fundamentally imprinted with Herodotean intellectual and narrative characteristics that it must largely be a Herodotean confection and so cannot have been known to Homer.)

⁸³ The Odyssean echo in the Ethiopian king's bow-stringing test (Hdt. 3.21–2) may help.

validating figure but warns of coming disaster: Odysseus' curiosity ('I wanted to see the owner') and appetitive tendency ('I wanted to get gifts from him') are exactly what causes the trouble. Both Odysseus and Cambyses barely escape, the former having lost comrades (who are eaten), the latter soldiers (who eat one another).

Suspicion about the truth of Odysseus' tales (already noted as a necessary concomitant of the comparison of historian and Homeric hero: above, pp. 298–9) characterises another reaction to Herodotean ethnography, John Marincola's reading of Book 2.⁸⁴ Even in a serially digressive author, Book 2 does stand out as a self-contained discourse heavily marked by the voice of authorial *ego*, and the suggestion that—with *Odyssey* 9–12 in mind—we might read it as an attention-grabbing *epideixis* containing some real oddities for any Greek audience (e.g., Menelaus/Helen/Egypt reported by Egyptian priests), some (deliberate?) inconsistencies or trigger-warnings, and (in general) an account that is as poetic as it is analytical, is at least heuristically illuminating. Of course, not all ethnography in Homer is in the voice of the mendacious Odysseus,⁸⁵ so ethnography in Herodotus is not necessarily unreliable and the historian does generally distance himself from the more outlandish wonders:⁸⁶ but even Menelaus mixes apparently down-to-earth narrative with the tall tale about the mastering of Proteus, so one can never be quite sure.

But there is also another and larger perspective (and not only for Book 2). This is not just about Herodotus reading and responding to Homer. The ethnographic element of the Herodotean enterprise is at home in a social, intellectual, and literary culture for which *Odyssey* (in particular) is a fundamental point of reference with its presentation of various forms of the Other and its engagement with those forms on the part of Greek protagonists. So there is a real analogy between Odysseus and Herodotus, and the Greek consumers of Herodotus were not only trained to notice it but had their own role in such an analogy. Not everyone could or did write Herodotus, but he emerges in a society aware of identity issues and one of the constitutive components of that awareness is the cultural authority of Homeric epic and its reciprocal relationship with actual contacts with the

⁸⁴ Marincola (2007) 51–67. Elements of the argument could also extend to Book 1 on Babylonia or Book 4 on Scythia.

⁸⁵ Marincola's list includes items in the putatively unproblematised voice of Eumaeus, Athena (*Od.* 13.242: though she *is* pretending to be someone else), Menelaus, and the narrator (on Phaeacia): Marincola (2007) 68–9.

⁸⁶ Fehling (1989) 96–104.

outside world. In this context there is an intertextuality that transcends the personal choice of the historian. And perhaps not only in this context: could Herodotus have conceived *Histories* at all without the narrative model of Homeric epic?⁸⁷

3.4. Further Categories

The examples discussed so far are related in one way or another to themes highlighted in the opening pages of *Histories*. I move now to cases of which this is not (or not so obviously) true.

Compositional Types

As a narrative about war and political conflict (often of a personalised sort),⁸⁸ contextualised in a wide geographical and chronological canvas, and with an end that is not quite an end,⁸⁹ *Histories* has a very generalised literary relationship to *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is also conceived on a comparably large scale: the Homeric poems taken together are only about 7% longer than Herodotus. And although the discursive variety between, e.g., the opening half of Book 2 and the narrative parts of *Histories* is far greater than anything in Homer, the generally Homeric effect is reinforced by various narrative tropes and by such features as *oratio recta*, annotatory or explanatory digression, ring-composition, non-linear chronological arrangement, explicit or implicit foreshadowing, repetition, and multiple (including internal) focalisation. But the compositional component most obviously redolent of Homer, while not being in detail significantly Homerised, is the catalogue.

There are ten catalogues in Herodotus, mostly of troops (6.8; 7.60–99, 202–4; 8.1, 42–8, 72–3; 9.28–30, 31–2),⁹⁰ of which the Persian catalogue is much the grandest. It resembles Homeric catalogues in the consistent provision of names of commanders and numbers of ships. (The latter also occurs in other Herodotean catalogues, and those for Thermopylae and Plataea provide numbers of soldiers—which does not happen in Homer—but contingent-commanders are patchily named elsewhere.) Moreover there are 29 contingents in Homer and 29 *ethnos*-contingents (and commanders) in

⁸⁷ Cultural authority: Skinner (2018) 216–22. Narrative model: Romm (1998) 13–18; Boedeker (2002) 109; Rutherford (2012) 34; Haywood, above, pp. 82–3.

⁸⁸ See Raaflaub (2002) 180 for the political aspect of Homer.

⁸⁹ Rutherford (2012) 31–2.

⁹⁰ The others are of Persian *nomoi* (3.90–6) and Agariste's suitors (6.127).

Herodotus, and the 1207 ships of the Persian fleet amusingly outbids Homer's fleet tally by just one ship—though that case is confused by the fact that 1207 is already the total in one reading of Aeschylus. The presence of various sorts of (more or less mildly digressive) annotation is a feature shared by *Iliad* 2 and the Persian catalogue and to a rather slighter degree other Herodotean catalogues.

But there are differences. Herodotus give greatest space to a catalogue of the enemy. That catalogue consistently pays attention to armaments and weaponry, which is not true in Homer (in either catalogue) or in other Herodotean Greek catalogues. The sense of ethnic diversity central to the Persian catalogue and mildly present in Herodotus' Salamis and Isthmus Wall passages (with their remarks on Greek ethno-history or ethno-assignment) is quite absent in the Homeric Greek catalogue and barely present in the Trojan one (the Carian entry being the strongest example). Greek readers of the Homeric Greek catalogue would enjoy references to places they had heard of and the odd way its contents related to what they knew of the current geography of Greece, whereas in the Herodotean Persian catalogue they were mostly dealing with places they had not heard of—which might also, of course, be an occasion for enjoyment, albeit of a different kind. The geographical order in the Homeric Greek catalogue (Boeotia first) works differently from Herodotean Greek catalogues, while the Persian army list uses types of weaponry as an organising principle, and such other geographical grouping as there is recalls Homer's arrangement only inasmuch as it involves occasional jumps across the map, though the placing of heartland peoples at the start matches the Trojan Catalogue. The Persian *nomos*-list's consistent west to east arrangement has its least poor analogue in the catalogue of Agariste's suitors! The narrative frames the Persian army-list in terms of the organisation of troops into national contingents after they have been counted. That in Homer frames the catalogues in terms of the drawing up of troops for battle. That is occasionally reflected within the catalogue (Phocians to left of Boeotians; Salamis ships beached next to Athenian ones) but essentially the catalogue is not a description of battle disposition in the way that is true of some other Herodotean catalogues.

In short, the presence of catalogues globally is a tribute to the catalogues of *Iliad* 2 that exhibits a mixture of similarities and contrasts. The intertextual significance is relatively simple: Herodotus' catalogues are a historical marker of important events and a compositional marker that his text is an epic narrative. The contrast between the celebration of ethnographic

diversity in 7.60–99 and the relative absence of such things in Homer reflects the different subject matter (and offers the reader a different sort of entertainment) and the non-Homeric ethno-historical issues in the Salamis catalogue remind us that the Greek world of 480 differs from the Homeric one, but such dissonances do not alter the basic consonance of narrative type. And the 29 contingents and 1207 ships are a nice gesture for the reader to take the trouble to look.

Unusual Intertexts

Intertexts comes in various shapes and sizes, but some are decidedly unusual. The catalogue of Agariste's suitors (just mentioned) is part of a narrative widely recognised as having a Homeric feel,⁹¹ but this may be because Cleisthenes of Sicyon was a man sensitive to the power of Homer (he once tried to ban Homeric poetry because of its pro-Argive bias: 5.67) and had planned it thus:⁹² it is the event that is an intertext, not Herodotus' report of it—which does not prevent him using it to add lustre (and also critique?) to the lineage of Cleisthenes the reformer and Pericles (the lion-like grandson of Megacles).⁹³ Also wholly external to Herodotus is the fact that the Persian Masistius was called Macistius by Greeks (9.20). Homeric *μήκιστος* is a word for giants. Masistius was impressively large in stature (9.25.1). So perhaps the Greek sobriquet is a pseudo-dialectal adaption of the Homeric word to Masistius' actual name—not just an intertext put into the mouth of an in-text character by an imaginative historian, but an actual intertext from the real world, and even one that betokens respect for an impressive adversary (cf. below, p. 356).⁹⁴

The reference to the Lotophagi in 4.177 is odd in a different way. They are the only people Odysseus encounters in *Odyssey* 9–12 whom Herodotus

⁹¹ Griffiths (2006) 136; Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 276.

⁹² Murray (1993) 212–13.

⁹³ The absurd story of Alcmaeon (involving Croesus) and Megacles' link to the tyrant Cleisthenes (even if he was a Homeriser—or is that too a little absurd?) make an odd endnote to Herodotus' ostensible defence of the Alcmaeonidae as tyrant-haters who could not have been pro-Persian in 490. Is there a subtext here running counter to the surface argument, one to which Pericles the lion and future 'first man' (Thuc. 2.65.9) also contributes? Do Alcmaeonids belong to a pseudo-Homeric world of tyrants?

⁹⁴ Giants: *Il.* 7.155 (the tallest and strongest adversary Nestor ever killed), *Od.* 11.309 (Otos and Ephialtes). Large and beautiful leaders: Flower–Marincola (2002) 145. Intertext from the real world: *ibid.* 139.

mentions and their story is not as famous in antiquity as some of the others in those books,⁹⁵ but it would be hard to encounter them without thinking of the *Odyssey*.⁹⁶ Yet Herodotus produces a matter-of-fact entry (like others in the Libyan *logos*) in which he says nothing about Homer. His description of the lotus—it is the size of a mastic berry and sweet as a date, and the Lotophagi make wine from it—might be said to hint at Homer: Homer says only that it is *μελιηδέα*, but that is a word often applied to wine. But it is a very faint hint. A more prominent fact is that Herodotus' Lotophagi are next to the Machlyes who also eat lotus (but not exclusively) and live by Lake Tritonis—about which we then hear that the Argonauts were driven there by a storm off Malea (179), the same location of the storm that drove Odysseus to the Lotophagi (*Od.* 9.80). So Herodotus has not only *not* adduced Homer; he has actually linked the Lotophagi (or strictly some not-quite-Lotophagi) with the Argonautic cycle. This must be deliberate.⁹⁷ What is the motive? (1) He simply pretends to be unaware of a Homeric connection and proudly produces an Argonautic one instead. (2) He is playing a Homeric game in the spirit of 2.112–30 (see above, pp. 292–4): his quiet correction/extension of Homer's information about the lotus proves that he knows Homer's story, but he has chosen a different story involving Argonauts, although not presumably because it is more decent (*euprepēs*) for *historiē* (any such criterion being surely satisfiable by either version). Or (3) his silence amounts to an implicit view that the story of Odysseus visiting Lotophagi was simply untrue. So in any event a literary game/pleasantry, but perhaps with an intratext to doubts about Homeric veracity—one resembling Irwin's reading of the Ethiopian *logos* and Marincola's of Book 2.

⁹⁵ Tuplin (2003) 117.

⁹⁶ The *polis* and *demos* (!) of the Cimmerians in *Od.* 11.14 is not evoked in any of Herodotus' references to the historical Cimmerians. Their baleful destructiveness may help account for Homer's location of them near the Underworld (Lanfranchi (2002); Xydopoulos (2015) 119–20) but that is a different matter.

⁹⁷ Another absent intertext or intertext consisting in absence: see above, p. 287. The absence of the marsh at Marathon (putatively visible in the Stoa Poikile) has been construed similarly (Pelling (2006) 243): the Homeric quality of Marathon is underlined by excluding a feature that would not have Homeric resonance. So too, perhaps, cavalry and hoplite-fighting: Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 244; Fragoulaki, above, pp. 123–4.

Jokes

The absent Lotus-Eaters verge on being a joke.⁹⁸ Some items come even closer. I have already commented on Rhodopis and Archidice (above, pp. 316–7), which surely comes into this category, even though it is making a serious point, and other pieces of humour will be encountered later.⁹⁹ Two further examples may be noted here.

At the turning point in the Masistes story, Xerxes is forced to assent to Amestris' demand for the wife of Masistes, whom she will shortly mutilate. The word used is *κατανεύει*, the sole occurrence in Herodotus of a verb associated in Homer with the assent of gods (especially Zeus). The context makes this a faint evocation of the relationship between Zeus and Hera, but casts Xerxes as a supreme god who has lost autonomous agency.¹⁰⁰ It does not add much to the already ghastly story, but this is almost our last sight of Xerxes and it is a sardonic final twist to occasional implicit and explicit assimilations of the Persian king and Zeus (and his court and Olympus) earlier in *Histories*.¹⁰¹

There is a comparable effect at 8.98. In Herodotus no snow, rain, heat, or darkness prevents the speedy delivery of Persian messages. In Homer (*Od.* 4.566) no snow, storm, or rain spoils the easeful existence of those in Elysium but instead a refreshing zephyr blows in from the Ocean. The rapid transit of Persian post has all the untroubled ease of a permanent beach holiday for the heroic dead. This absurd comparison confers a delightfully satirical superhuman gloss on the system at a moment at which it is being used to report Persian failure.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ It will certainly wrong-foot the reader: after a string of obscure Libyan tribes comes one that seems gratefully familiar—and it is not acknowledged as such.

⁹⁹ See below, pp. 364–5.

¹⁰⁰ Flower–Marincola (2002) 297.

¹⁰¹ See below, pp. 333, 335–7, 343. — Xerxes' relations with his wife contrast with the politically productive relations of Darius with Atossa in a more cosily domestic setting: 3.134. Perhaps there are distant echoes here also of Zeus and Hera (Hart (1982) 22), even with a slight hint of *Iliad* 14 where Hera takes Zeus to bed to stop him watching the fighting: for Atossa in bed with Darius diverts him from his existing military plans. And Atossa *εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος* (7.3), so here too the Great King's agency is compromised.

¹⁰² A. M. Bowie (2007) 187.

Elusive Intertexts

Echoes of Homer can seem to be present without there being any very clear intrinsic pay-off. Examples involve Homeric grammatical forms, Homeric words present only once or twice in Herodotus, Homeric turns-of-phrase, and even allusions to particular Homeric passages. Some may contribute additional colour to contexts that already have other Homeric features (further examples of that phenomenon occur elsewhere in this discussion), others are free-standing signs that Herodotus' lexicon and style is epic-flavoured. I consign a number of examples to a footnote,¹⁰³ but note here a few of the more tantalising cases.

The Homeric phrase ἀναπλῆσαι κακά occurs in Herodotus' description of the Thracian Trausi, who mourn a new-born ὄσα μιν δεῖ ἐπέιτε ἐγένετο ἀναπλῆσαι κακά (5.4). The general sentiment intratextually chimes with the variability-of-*eudaimoniē* theme, a theme that has Homeric intertextual colour elsewhere (see above, pp. 297–8, 299–300, 308–9, 311–15, 354, 367). Is the presence of ἀναπλῆσαι κακά a sufficient trigger to see this passage as also

¹⁰³ *Grammatical forms*: use of perfect/pluperfect of πείθω to mean 'trust': 9.88. On the infinitival imperative see below, p. 333. *Rarely used Homeric words*: ὀπέωνες (9.50, 51) epicises Sparta's provision-fetchers but has no particular significance. Κάματος (9.89) is at best a faint Homerisation of the Persians' hard *nostos*. On φιλοφροσύνη (5.92γ.2), ποταμὸς Καύστριος (5.100), and ὄπισ (8.143.2; 9.76.2) see below, pp. 342, 348, 360 (n. 189). *Turns-of-phrase*: Stein thought ἀνά τ' ἔνδραμον καὶ ἔβλαστον (Syracuse under Gelon) had a Homeric flavour. A distant parallel with *Il.* 18.56, 437 on Achilles (Pelling (2006) 91) would be contextually appropriate (see below, pp. 337–8), but I think there is nothing here but default Homerising linguistic flavour. So too οἶός τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο (6.122.3), as compared with *Od.* 4.242 (Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 269). ἄμα ἠλίω σκιδναμένω (8.23) is surely in that category. (The marking of dawn/daybreak is a Homeric narrative feature found elsewhere too: 8.83; 9.47) On ἐς θυμὸν βάλλειν see above, p. 311. *Particular passages*. The use of ἐπιρρεῖν in 9.38.2 (ἐπιρρεόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων of the medising Greeks) and *Il.* 11.724 (τὰ δ' ἐπέρρεον ἔθνεα πεζῶν of Pylians going to relieve the siege of Thyroessa) is unique in each author (though Herodotus uses συνέρρεε of ships going to Salamis: 8.42.1), but reading the passages together produces no obvious point. Artabanus' vision of Mardonius torn by birds and dogs (7.10θ.3) perhaps evokes the phrase's prominent use in *Il.* 1.4 (and may even be piquant in view of 1.140, though Mardonius is not a *magus*: cf. Boedeker (2002) 102), but I see it as a small Homeric flourish (in a characteristically sententious speech) that is simply a sign that further *Homeric* are in the offing (see below, pp. 349–50) and a passing marker of the epic quality of the war to come. (But see below, n. 183 on omens for Mardonius' death.) The testing of Phocian *alkē* in 9.18 has no particular point as event or intertext. The snake-woman in 4.8–10 detains Heracles against his will until he has fathered three children. E. Bowie (2018a) 62 thinks this evokes Odysseus and Circe/Calypso (does the bow-drawing test Heracles sets the children help draw attention to Odysseus?), but, if so, there seems no obvious pay-off.

specifically evocative of Homer? Perhaps so: if Herodotus means us to see that, although the Trausi are unusual in taking a sombre view of life to the point of counter-normal rituals, the underlying idea is not alien, he may be trying to give the point special validation by invoking Homer.¹⁰⁴

At Artemisium the two fleets separate *έτεραλκέως άγωνιζόμενους* (8.11.3). This is one of two uses of a Homeric word that (apart from a single instance in Aeschylus) does not recur until Nicander. The Homeric sense is ‘victory won with another’s help’ or ‘victory won by the side that was losing’ (five occurrences) or ‘capable of turning the tide and giving victory’ (*Il.* 15.738: *δημος έτεραλκής*). *μάχη έτεραλκής* in 9.103.2 is a battle evenly poised and needing an intervention to decide it (one was forthcoming from the Samians), and a similar sense can apply in *έτεραλκέως άγωνιζόμενους*, though, since the Persians reckoned the battle did not turn out as expected (*πολλόν παρά δόξαν άγωνισάμενοι*), there may even be a hint that the Greeks had been winning against the run of play. But there is no real intertext here, merely some Homeric flavour from an exceptionally unusual word, shared by Homer and Herodotus but used by Herodotus in a slightly un-Homeric sense. Or if there *is* an intertext, it lies in the pleasure a discriminating reader might get from noticing that Herodotus has given the word a slightly new meaning.¹⁰⁵

At 9.13 Mardonius *ανεκώχευε ... ούτε έπήμαινε ούτε έσίνετο γήν τήν Άττικήν*. The distinctive combination of a word connoting truce-making and the sole Herodotean appearance of *πημαίνειν* perhaps evokes *Il.* 3.299: whoever first damages (*πημαίνειν*) the oaths of a treaty will suffer.¹⁰⁶ Over winter 480–479 Mardonius hoped the Athenians would do a deal with him, so he maintained a truce and did no harm. When no deal was made, he burned Athens and retreated. Do we say that, in realising the Athenians will not make a deal and burning the city, Mardonius is breaking a (metaphorical) oath and will therefore suffer (at Plataea)? Or that the Athenians have broken a (metaphorical) oath and must therefore suffer (in the burning of their land). Or that, since there *were* no oaths, nobody should suffer (so burning Athenian land was unjustified)? Or just that the Homeric passage came into Herodotus’ mind essentially randomly?

¹⁰⁴ Suggested intertext: Gould (1989) 133. The phrase also appears in 6.12 and 9.87.

¹⁰⁵ In this regard see below, n. 189 on *όπισ*; p. 333 on *άγορώμαι*.

¹⁰⁶ Flower–Marincola 2002 (123) note that *πημαίνειν* is Homeric (the root is quite common) but make no further comment.

After the Battle of Ephesus ‘those who survived scattered (ἐσκεδάσθησαν) to their cities. So on that occasion they fought (τότε μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἠγωνίσαντο), but afterwards the Athenians entirely abandoned the Ionians ...’ (5.102.3–103). Hornblower (2013) 286 draws attention to *Il.* 24.1–2: λῦτο δ’ ἀγών, λαοὶ δὲ θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἕκαστοι | ἐσκίδναντ’ ἰέναι. The conjunction of scattering and reference to an *agōn* might suggest that the latter is not there in Herodotus simply because the death of a games-competitor (Eualcides of Eretria) is mentioned in the previous lines.¹⁰⁷ But the statement that Simonides praised Eualcides does rather distract attention from Homer to another poet, and comparing the dispersal of survivors from a bloodbath at Ephesus with the orderly conclusion of Patroclus’ Funeral Games is odd. If one were sure that there is an intentional allusion, one could say that there is an implied contrast between the Achaeans, who will win the war of which Patroclus’ Funeral Games are a sad side-issue (especially as Achilles has now returned), and the Ionians, who may try to treat the ‘Games’ at Ephesus as a side issue but lose their Athenian allies (who refuse to help despite repeated pleas: shades of the earlier Achilles?) and will eventually lose the war. But this feels a little forced, and the echo of *Il.* 24.1 may not really be an allusion—unless the wider context within the passage sits says otherwise (see below, p. 348).

In Herodotus 6.9.3, 8.109.4, and 8.118.3 we encounter the Homeric use of *τῆς* in affirmative exhortation.¹⁰⁸ Is this more than just a casual grammatical feature? Homeric examples occur in pre-battle narratives as is the case in Herodotus 6.9.3, but whereas the Homeric cases are uncomplicated (Agamemnon exhorts the Achaeans to prepare their weapons for battle and Achilles exhorts the already keen Myrmidons to fight with ἀλκιμον ἦτορ), the Persian leaders exhort exiled Ionian tyrants to benefit the royal house by asymmetrical non-military methods (secret communication and threats designed to undermine the enemy’s morale). Might there be a contrastive intertext underlining the Persians’ already advertised lack of confidence in their own troops?¹⁰⁹ That Herodotus *is* doing something deliberate is suggested by the passages in Book 8, which are *also* about serving the king. In 8.118.3 the king himself exhorts fellow-travellers on a foundering ship to leap to their deaths to save his life—a metaphorical battle against the forces of nature and an exhortation not to preparedness for combat but to self-

¹⁰⁷ ‘The mention in 102.3 of the agonistically successful Eualcides might have exerted an unconscious pull towards this choice of verb’: Hornblower (2013) 286.

¹⁰⁸ *Il.* 2.382–4; 16.209. Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 95 mention only the latter.

¹⁰⁹ They are frightened by the Ionians’ 353 ships, even though they have 600 (6.8.2–9.1).

destruction.¹¹⁰ And in 8.109.4 Themistocles exhorts his fellow-Athenians to rebuild houses and plant seed and *not* to fight Xerxes at the Hellespont—thus storing up credit with the king in case he should ever have to flee Athens! The intertextual message of all three passages could then be that serving the Persian ruler is not like serving a Homeric king, does not involve actual battle, and may involve treachery. But one has to wonder how many readers Herodotus might have thought likely to spot these intertextual and intratextual links simply on the basis of a grammatical feature. The fact that two are quite close together and belong within in the same narrative episode (Xerxes' return to Asia) is perhaps a help, but the case remains debatable.

Finally in this section we come to an echo that cannot (one feels) fail to be an allusion, but is hard to interpret.¹¹¹

At 9.93–5 Herodotus tells the story of the seer Evenius. The starting point is the death of a flock of sheep belonging to Helios, and that inescapably evokes the slaughter of the Cattle of Helios—a crucial episode in *Odyssey*, mentioned in the poem's opening lines, doubly predicted by Circe and Tiresias, and responsible for Odysseus' final travel disaster and loss of all of his companions. Even though Herodotus may need a seer story to retard the narrative here as a parallel for that in 9.33–7, he could not choose this one without realising that Homer would come to the reader's mind.¹¹²

Both Evenius and Odysseus fall asleep by divine will and Helios' animals are then slaughtered (by wolves and Odysseus' companions respectively). Neither is culpably responsible, both survive and (after suffering) prosper: Odysseus loses his companions and fails as a leader, but gets home; Evenius loses his sight, but gets a home and a divine skill—and in undertaking to be ἀμύνητος already lays claim to the special quality of those who feel μῆνις.¹¹³ There is a further interaction in that the blind seer Tiresias warned Odysseus of disaster if the Helios cattle were killed: that tends to underscore the Odysseus–Evenius link; and the agreement between Delphi and Dodona perhaps echoes that of Circe and Tiresias.

¹¹⁰ One may remember the Herodotean Xerxes sending waves of troops to predictable death at Thermopylae.

¹¹¹ The case was discussed by Carmen Sánchez-Mañas in a paper presented at the Newcastle conference but not included in this publication.

¹¹² That said, Flower–Marincola (2002) 266 and Asheri–Vannicelli (2007) 303 note the link with 9.33–7, but not the Homeric intertext.

¹¹³ See below, p. 354 on 7.229.2. ἀμύνητος is unknown in Greek literature until the 2nd c. AD, except thrice in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 649, 1036; *Supp.* 975).

But the mapping of the two stories is not perfect. (1) If Evenius corresponds to Odysseus, the Apollonians are *prima facie* the Companions: but they come out of it much better than the Companions. (2) The divine will that causes Odysseus' problems is less opaque (we know him to be the object of competing divine wills throughout) than that which causes the death of the Apollonian animals (for which no explanation is supplied). Odysseus understandably senses divine will in the situation from the outset, the Apollonians understandably do not: for why should the gods attack their own (which is not what happens in *Odyssey*)?

Given these dissonances one might say the intertext shows two things. First, divine will is inscrutable: you may not spot its presence and it may do unexpected things. Second, divine punishment does not fall as one expects: the wolves are not punished at all (which only makes sense when it turns out that they are agents of divine will), Evenius initially suffers unjust punishment (and is unable to demand the sort of recompense Tisamenus gets in the structurally parallel tale), and the Apollonians get away with things rather well, despite having acted against divine will.

Since the Helios cattle incident is vitally important in *Odyssey*, its intertextual use ought not to be casual. How do we explain it?

1. One possibility is that it underscores the contrast between the heroic and the modern world, a theme encountered elsewhere and one implicit in the whole Herodotean Homeric enterprise. But in order to construct a contrast between an epic story about an individual (Odysseus) and a modern one about a collective (Apollonia) one has to see both the Apollonians and Evenius in corresponding to Odysseus, and that is not easy.

2. Contextually the story marks the Greeks' decision to advance to Asia. Stadter sees this as an important moment where understanding the inscrutability of divine will (i.e., the difficulty of divining what it is) is pertinent. The message of story and the intertext is that the advance into Asia may not have been in accordance with divine will.¹¹⁴

3. Stadter's reading entails questioning the correctness of the mantic advice given by Deiphonus. But the Evenius story and its intertext are a celebration of mantic skill (the Apollonians erred because they assumed they knew what was what and did not consult oracles, and only got things right when they asked Delphi and Dodona, while in the *Odyssey* the seer Tiresias and magician Circe know the score from the outset) and in principle underline the authority of Evenius and his son—who might indeed take from

¹¹⁴ Stadter (1992).

his father's story the point that the *mantis* must, like everyone, be very careful in practising his art. So one could argue that the story actually affirms the authority behind the decision to go east. In fact, if there is uncertainty about the son's interpretation, it lies not in the Evenius–Odysseus stories but in the suspicion that Deiphonus was *not* Evenius' son in the first place—a suspicion tossed in by Herodotus at the end with extraordinary casualness. So Stadter's proleptic political reading might be correct, but not for the reason he alleged—and without the intertext itself being complicit in the proleptic reference in the same way.

This is an unsatisfactory situation, and it is complicated by the fact that the Evenius story is not the only mass slaughter of grazing animals in *Histories*. When the Greeks withdrew from Artemisium (despite an earlier undertaking that they would not), Themistocles had them slaughter Euboean sheep and goats (since it was better for Greeks to take and eat them rather than leave them for the enemy)—a disaster great enough to have been foretold in a Bacis oracle that Euboeans had ignored (8.19–20). Blösel detects an intertextual connection with the Cattle of Helios,¹¹⁵ and, if that is correct, it is relatively easily interpretable as a comment on the behaviour of Themistocles, who in this story is not the clever Odyssean we might normally expect (and who is visible in other parts of the opening of Book 8) but plays the role of Odysseus' companions. The imputation is that he behaved as wrongly as they did and (presumably) that sooner or later he will be punished for it: none of them got home and, one day, he will be forced to flee from his home into Persian exile (cf. above, pp. 303, 330). The incitement to see the incident as a Cattle of Helios story is not as strong as in the Evenius case—the animals are not sacred, though they were the subject of an oracle—but it is not negligible. But the easy availability of a possible interpretation only underlines the uncertainty in the Evenius case.

Self-undermining Intertexts

The possibility that in-text characters might be ascribed self-undermining intertexts was mentioned earlier. Some further examples follow.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Blösel (2004) 158–60.

¹¹⁶ Leutychedas' story about the dreadful fate of a dishonest man (6.86) is ironic, given his own association with dishonesty (6.66, 72), and this irony has been compared with Antinous' admonitory allusion to the drunken centaur Eurytion in *Od.* 21.299–301 (Antinous will shortly die, and with a cup of wine in his hands: *Od.* 22.8–20); Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 203. But Leutychedas is primarily guilty of hypocrisy rather than a bad choice of Homeric intertext.

1. A new moment in the narrative leading to Marathon is marked by Darius firing an arrow in the air, instructing his servant to repeat 'Master, remember the Athenians', and uttering a prayer that has no precise verbal parallel in Homer but is in a Homeric grammatical form (infinitival imperative) found in prayers to Zeus and in content most closely resembles Agamemnon's prayer in *Il.* 2.413 that he will destroy Troy before the day is done (5.105).¹¹⁷ Darius does not request such immediate success, but his prayer is like Agamemnon's in that it is not answered as he would wish. For the salient thing about *Il.* 2.413 is that Zeus says no: he accepted Agamemnon's offering but repaid it with *πόνον ἀμέγαρτον* (420). That is a nice (and even amusing) point for anyone who notices the echo—perhaps made easier by a string of Homerisms since 5.92: see below, pp. 341–8.¹¹⁸

2. At 6.11–12 we find a speech by Dionysius of Phocaea. The event is (sardonically?) marked at the start by Herodotus' sole use of *ἀγορῶμαι* (applied to an Ionian gathering) in a form that occurs only once in Homer (albeit in a different sense) in reference to an assembly of the gods,¹¹⁹ but the vivid Homerism is Dionysius' assertion that things are on a razor's edge (*ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ... ἀκμῆς*)—also a *hapax* in both Homer and Herodotus (who uses other phraseology in comparable crucial moment passages).¹²⁰ The critical situation in *Iliad* is that the Trojans have reached the wall round the Achaean ships (provoking already the failed embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9), and Nestor uses the words in *Iliad* 10.173–6 when waking Greek leaders to urge inspection of the guard-posts and an operation to spy on the Trojan camp. (Are there after-echoes here of the secret communication between enemy

¹¹⁷ 'Darius knew his Homer!' (Hornblower (2013) 292).

¹¹⁸ One might compare Xerxes at Troy in 7.43. He casts himself as Priam and ignores the fact that Homer's Athena supported the Achaeans. Since the visit is surrounded by ill omen (preceded by a disastrous storm and the Scamander unprecedentedly running dry, and followed by a night-time panic), things do not look good. The visit to Troy was, of course, *meant* to have much more positive implications: see Haubold (2007), esp. 53–8.

¹¹⁹ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 96, noting that it prepares the way for the more striking allusion to come.

¹²⁰ 6.109.3; 8.60a, and 118.3. These are all 'it's up to you moments': Miltiades in the first speaks of freedom—but also of possible Athenian power (which Themistocles does not in 8.60a—but he is seeking to persuade a Spartan commander); the third passage is Xerxes on his sinking ship, which is presumably a sardonic intratextual comment on a contrast with Themistocles? (See also above, pp. 329–30, for another indirect Themistoclean aspect of this passage.) See also 8.74 (those at Isthmus built a wall *ἅτε περὶ τοῦ πάντος ἤδη {δρόμον} θέοντες*) and 9.60 (Pausanias to Athenians: *ἀγῶνος μεγίστου προκειμένου ἐλευθέρην εἶναι ἢ δεδουλωμένην τὴν Ἑλλάδα*).

camps in 6.9–10?) The spy operation has its successes, but in the longer term the Achaeans' situation gets worse, so the overtones of ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς are not encouraging. Dionysius changes the stakes from life and death in Homer to freedom and slavery (an intertextual assertion of their equivalence), but his plan—not inspections and espionage but the hard labour of military training—fails through Ionian softness: τίνα δαιμόνων παραβάντες τάδε ἀναπίμπλαμεν, they say, Homeric (if not exclusively) in the use of ἀναπίμπλαμαι and speculation about the action of *daimones*. Dionysius is made to look a fool and his use of Homer (and echo of Nestor—famous for good organisation of troops!) underlines the point: he is right that there is a crisis, but the Homeric tag does not bode well for its resolution.

3. At 9.11 the Athenians complain that they are wronged by Sparta and bereft of allies (χήτει συμμάχων). The use of χήτει—a *hapax* in Herodotus, and rare in classical authors (once each in Eupolis and Plato)—gives a rather personal colour to the situation, and there is a particular echo of a famous passage of *Iliad* 6 (460–5) in which Hector imagines the captive Andromache in Argos grieving the loss of the heroic husband (ὅς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι | Τρώων ἵπποδάμων) who could have protected her from slavery.¹²¹ Athens, the latter-day Andromache, has now abandoned the high tone of 8.144 (τὸ Ἑλληνικόν) and is threatening to join the Persians in inflicting slavery on other Greeks.¹²² That sits awkwardly with Andromache's earlier declaration of a peculiar family bond with Hector (he is father, mother, and brother to her as well as husband)—shades of τὸ Ἑλληνικόν?—and with Hector's insistence that honour requires him to fight even in a doomed cause.¹²³ Herodotus' Athenians will later claim ἡμῖν πατρώιον ἐστὶ ἐοῦσι χρηστοῖσι αἰεὶ πρότοισι εἶναι (9.27), but they seem to have forgotten such values for the moment. The intertextual effect is not to justify the Athenians (deprived of protecting Spartans they have no option but slavery) but to denounce them. And the twist is that this is the Athenians speaking: they are denouncing themselves. But we should not leap to (the wrong sort of) judgement. What they are proposing is awful—a plan whose presentation tramples on one of the most moving passages in the *Iliad*. But it is a thought

¹²¹ Flower–Marincola (2002) 120. Asheri–Vannicelli (2007) 188 notes the Homeric word, but not the Andromache context.

¹²² I doubt Provençal's claim ((2015) 253) that τὸ Ἑλληνικόν is an intertext with the Shield of Achilles.

¹²³ *Il.* 6.444–6: ἐπεὶ μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλὸς | αἰεὶ καὶ πρότοισι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι | ἀρνύμενος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος ἦδ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ.

experiment whose purpose is to be rejected, and the Homeric overtone is there to underline that point.

4. In 7.103 Xerxes starts his response to Demaratus' improbable claim that the Spartans would march against him with only a thousand men with the words *Δημάρητε, οἶον ἐφθέγγξαι ἔπος*, thus using a formula associated in Homer with the outraged complaint of a god (usually Hera) about something said by another god (usually Zeus). The norm in the Homeric cases is that the complainant does not persuade the other party to change tack and the *status quo* is maintained: the only exception is when Zeus has proposed something entirely absurd—ending the war and letting Troy survive or saving Sarpedon or Hector from their fated death. One might say that, since Demaratus' claim is extraordinary,¹²⁴ the fact that he does not back down at Xerxes' complaint in itself breaches the Homeric norm, but it is certainly true that Xerxes' use of the speech formula is quite out of line. In Homer the formula is used by one god to another who is either of equal or (normally) higher status. Demaratus is far too weak a figure to be addressed in this way by the Great King—or he should be: but the point of the intertextual colouring is to indicate that in this context Demaratus is the more powerful figure to whose solemn assertion of what he knows about Spartan character Xerxes can only respond with a faintly absurd bit of arithmetical bluster. Moreover, although Xerxes affects amused astonishment (he replies with laugh—generally a bad sign, as Lateiner (1977) noted), Demaratus had feared Xerxes' anger, and the intertext may hint that Xerxes is actually more angry than he is prepared to admit. (The divine complainants are normally genuinely angry, and even the mock outrage of Hera in *Il.* 14.330 is a little strained, given that Zeus has just given her a long list of his adulterous lovers.) So, the effect of Xerxes' use of *οἶον ἐφθέγγξαι ἔπος* is to make him look weak and hypocritical.

The significance of the passage is underlined if one takes account of two others in which Herodotus uses the formula. In both it is in the mouth of a Persian functionary speaking to the Persian king, so the power relationship is correct, at least in theory. In the first Megabyzus expostulates about Darius' award of Myrcinus to Histiaeus, and he succeeds in making the king change his mind—which, intertextually speaking, rather nicely establishes that the award had really been entirely improper and unwise. In the second we have (also rather nicely) Histiaeus himself outraged at Darius' suggestion

¹²⁴ It resembles the boast Agamemnon attributes to drunken Argives (*Il.* 8.230–4) who are now terrified of Hector (cf. Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 419). But Demaratus is stone-cold-sober serious.

that he bore some responsibility for the Ionian Revolt. The reader knows that this is entirely true, but Histiaeus successfully placates the king (despite bluntly telling him that the revolt was the *king's* fault, because had 'deported' Histiaeus in the first place) and persuades him that he will travel to Ionia, put everything right, *and* conquer Sardinia without changing his clothes. This brazen performance bamboozled the king (*διέβαλλε*), and in achieving this Histiaeus outdid the goddess Hera:¹²⁵ for when Hera rejects an accusation (1.552; 8.462; 18.361), Zeus nonetheless gets his way; and when she makes a proposal *δολοφρονέουσα* (that they should return to Olympus to have sex), it is refused. Darius, by contrast, emerges as an easily manipulable version of the supreme god: so the power-relationship between Histiaeus and Darius is not as correct as it looked initially.

Taken together, the three passages chart a downward curve in the *Ersatz* Olympus that is the Persian royal court: Megabyzus speaks urgently but rationally¹²⁶ and the king is sensibly persuaded; Histiaeus is an absurd show-off and chancer who tricks a manipulable king; and Xerxes cedes the high ground (moral and otherwise) to a Spartan king, who is unmoved by his prissily arithmetical protestations.¹²⁷ It is altogether a model example of what

¹²⁵ Compare Socles: see below, p. 342. In this case Histiaeus is not undermining himself, but undermining Darius.

¹²⁶ Hornblower (2013) 291 detects an attempt to suggest court rhetoric in this speech and that of Histiaeus, noting the redundancy of *καὶ ἡμέρης καὶ νυκτός* and *πολλὸς ... πολλός* (5.23.2) and *ἡ μέγα ἢ μικρόν* and *πάντα ... πάντων* (5.106). And *καὶ ἡμέρης καὶ νυκτός* is an actual Persian phrase (DB §7), so Greeks whom it 'struck ... as specially appropriate in a Persian context' (Hornblower (2013) 120) were right. (It recurs in the alleged letter of Xerxes to Pausanias in Thuc.1.129.3.) But there is still a real contrast between Megabyzus' sobriety and Histiaeus' extravagance. Demaratus is also sober (see above, n. 124).

¹²⁷ Demaratus' stature as an adviser was arguably Homerically marked when he first came to Asia (6.70). He arrives as an exile and ex-ruler and is received grandly, with gifts of land and cities, having previously shone in Sparta *ἔργοισι τε καὶ γνώμησι*. Homer's Phoenix arrives as an exile in Phthia, is given riches and a people (*laos*) to rule over (*Il.* 9.482–4), and, when Achilles (whom Phoenix nurtured from childhood) goes to Troy, he accompanies him with the task of making the young man, lacking experience of war or counsel, into a 'speaker of words (*μύθων ῥητῆρα*) and doer of deeds (*πρηκτῆρα ἔργων*)' (9.443). Demaratus, having provided a clinching argument for the throne going to Darius' fourth youngest son (7.3: an act of nurturing?), accompanies the young (but not entirely inexperienced) Xerxes to war, where he acts as an expert on matters Spartan and spokesman for an ideology opposed to that of the Persian monarch. His analysis and advice are unsurprisingly always rejected. That is also (of course) Phoenix's undeserved fate in *Iliad* 9, and we are never told how much Achilles' prowess owed to Phoenix's instruction of him in words and deeds. But the Demaratus–Phoenix assimilation tends to ascribe to Demaratus extra authority for the true things he will say to Xerxes. Any implicit assimilation of Xerxes and Achilles is another

intertextuality can achieve: the downward curve is there anyway, but giving it a pseudo-Olympian colour both underlines the point and increases our enjoyment of it.¹²⁸

5. There is also a great deal to enjoy in the Greek embassy to Gelon in 480 (7.159–61).¹²⁹

There are two Homeric intertexts in 7.159. The primary intertext is with *Iliad* 7.124: Peleus would groan at the Greeks' cowardice in face of Hector. Nestor's complaint is prompted specifically by Agamemnon dissuading Menelaus from fighting Hector: eventually lots are cast and Ajax wins. Ajax was the best hero after Achilles (*Il.* 2.768), and Nestor's reference to Peleus has already evoked the absent Achilles, especially as he then describes the mission to Peleus' court to recruit Achilles for the Trojan War. Syagrus' reapplication of the words to a Spartan Agamemnon is thus *mal à propos* because the intertextual passage (a) shows Agamemnon devaluing the Spartan Menelaus and (b) reminds us that Agamemnon was responsible for the absence of the figure whom the Achaeans really need, viz. Achilles. That did not show Agamemnon's leadership at its best; and, if his view that Menelaus was not up to fighting Hector was a better bit of leadership, it is not one that can properly be deployed by Syagrus.

A secondary intertext follows on from this. The allusion to Nestor has evoked one sort of embassy in search of military help. But *Iliad* 9 offers a more prominent one, sent to Achilles as the Achaeans' military crisis deepens. This reinforces the fact that Syagrus' approach casts Gelon as an *Ersatz* Achilles—an awkward and unintentional consequence given Achilles' heroic primacy and additionally *mal à propos* because leadership is not an issue in *Iliad* 9 (Achilles is offered gifts but not even a share of leadership) whereas it is central in Syracuse. Achilles' response leaves open the possibility that he will fight if Hector directly threatens the Myrmidons. Gelon did indeed fight (on the same day as Salamis) in his own defence. But he refuses the Greeks' appeal because the Greeks did not help him earlier (Carthage, Dorieus, *emporía*) and he will not be subordinate to those who

reversal of the standard Achaeans–Greeks/Trojans–Persians script, albeit one that highlights Achillean pig-headedness. Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 182 note the verbal parallel with *Il.* 9.443 without further comment, save that Thuc. 1.139.4 also echoes Phoenix.

¹²⁸ For a different 'Olympian' Xerxes one might note how Salamis plays out beneath his repeatedly mentioned gaze—rather as Iliadic battles are surveyed by (partisan) gods.

¹²⁹ That intertextuality can be fun is noted by Pelling (2006) 77 and 86. This case (which might qualify for Pelling's adjective 'roistering') is discussed in Pelling (2006); Grethlein (2006); (2010) 162–4; and Haywood, above, pp. 75–8.

rejected his plea and now, having remembered him,¹³⁰ nonetheless insult him (*ἀτιμίη*: 158.4; Syagrus' words as *ὑβρίσματα*: 160.2). This seems like a counterpart to Agamemnon's insult to Achilles, and reinforces the Gelon–Achilles link. Yet, unlike Achilles, Gelon is prepared to make a compromise and share leadership. Syagrus' approach is doubly *mal à propos* but the intertext also underlines that he is still more successful than he deserves to be because the Sicilian Achilles whom he has called into virtual existence is not quite as unbiddable as the original one.

But the Athenians then reject Gelon's compromise with a Homeric argument of their own which matches and indeed outdoes Syagrus. The Spartans have a problem: they cannot *say* that Homer reports that Sparta supplied the overall commander at Troy because he does not. So they are bound *not* to mention Homer and to resort to an indirect allusion (albeit with a verbal quotation). But the Athenians can proudly quote Homer explicitly and say smugly that Homeric authority means that no blame attached to what might look like boasting.¹³¹ And yet they do not entirely get the better of Syagrus. Syagrus scored an own goal by choosing a passage in which the actual Homeric Spartan king's inadequacy is thematised and Agamemnon's leadership at least debatable. But the Athenians do the same by choosing one that actually says that Menestheus was best at organising troops *except for Nestor, who was older*. They have quoted their source selectively or even lied about its identity: for what they say Homer says (and the annotation about there being no shame in mentioning it) recalls one of the 'Simonidean' epigrams about Eion: if that is a genuine mid-fifth century text, then Athenian misuse of Homer has a pre-Herodotean precedent. But in any event the real Homeric text (the thing they claim to cite) undermines their supposedly unnegotiable claim to undivided naval leadership.

Gelon's response brings a third allusive intertext, not with Homer but with Pericles: loss of his support means that the spring has gone out of the year. Since Pericles used the phrase of the Athenian war-dead (Arist. *Rhet.* 1365a and 1411a), whereas Gelon refers to an army that does not exist, Gelon perhaps speaks tastelessly and shows he has mastered the art of intertexting

¹³⁰ *μνηστis* (*γέγονε*) (Hdt. 7.158.3) is Homeric (once: *Od.* 13.280), a Herodotean *hapax* here, and otherwise just twice in Sophocles before the Hellenistic era (when it is still not common). In Homer Odysseus and a Phoenician crew are too tired to be *μνηστis δόρπου*, and they then abandon him with his goods while he sleeps. There is no specific intertext in Herodotus, just use of Homeric vocabulary.

¹³¹ A unique example of implicit and explicit Homeric allusions working together within the same discourse.

(and even of leadership: Grethlein) as badly as his antagonists. But the evocation of Athenian losses in the future days of imperial power acts as a *sphragis*-like activation of a theme already present in 159–61, antagonism between Sparta and Athens about leadership. That thematic strand is in the spirit of evocations of the topic (and associated *kaka*) earlier in *Histories*.¹³²

What does this all amount to?

1. Syagrus and the Athenians use Homer to claim primacy over a non-Homeric rival (the Athenians even add remarks about their antiquity and autochthony). This is not effective in the world of the meeting in Syracuse because, although willing to compromise (unlike his Homeric equivalent Achilles), Gelon is not cowed or impressed by the visitors' wish to live in the Homeric past. Perhaps that is a direct critical comment on subsequent fifth century discursive assimilation of the Trojan and Persian Wars—a theme encountered elsewhere in intertextual contexts.¹³³

2. But things are also problematic in the metaworld of intertext. The Spartans' primary intertext with Homer casts Agamemnon in a debatable light (a good leader because he knows Menelaus' limitations? a bad leader because he alienated Achilles? a leader from a generation less good than that of Peleus and Nestor?) and undermines the Agamemnon–Sparta identification (the real Spartan is Menelaus, whose inadequacy is a central point in the *Iliad* passage). The Athenian allusion to Homer is inaccurate, again evokes the inferiority of the Agamemnon–Menestheus generation (Nestor was better than Menestheus), and prompts a non-Homeric intertext that evokes later hegemony struggles and provides a dark proleptic setting for the 480 debate in Syracuse—one that chimes with much else in the narrative about difficult Spartan–Athenian relations. In fact, the intertexts the two parties are assigned are so poor as to be almost a joke at their expense. Syagrus' allusion hardly deserved to work and, even if the Athenians' one did (which is barely the case), the naval hegemony they yearned for would end in tears. The (or one) reason discursive assimilation of Trojan and Persian Wars is questionable is that Homeric analogies are so liable to be self-defeating and are in any case only a mask for *Realpolitik*. In 7.159–62, then, Homeric intertexts are (a) an object of comment *in se* and (b) a means of revealing the blind and mendacious manners of politicians engaged in the fight for hegemony.

¹³² See below, pp. 347, 368.

¹³³ See above, pp. 302–4; below, pp. 345–8, 351–2, 354–5, 356–60, 361–2, 368–9.

So far as the Athenians go there is a coda in Book 9. At 9.26–7 the Tegeans and Athenians debate their right to be posted on the left wing. The Tegeans appeal to a privilege going back to the return of the Heraclidae. The Athenians respond with mythical claims of their own from the Funeral Speech repertoire, concluding with a very perfunctory reference to Troy (their contribution was a good as anyone's), but then sweep all this ancient history aside as irrelevant compared with their achievement at Marathon. It is as though they have learned the lesson of the Gelon embassy—except that Marathon was, of course, no basis on which to argue for leadership at sea. In fact, 9.27 just emphasises that the ambassadors in 480 had a rather weak hand: until Salamis Athens had no proven claims as a maritime power, and Homer was no substitute. Once Salamis (as well as Marathon) had happened, Homer was unnecessary. But later-fifth-century Athenians did not learn and act on that lesson, and Herodotus uses another Homeric intertext to make that point, as we shall see below (p. 352).

3.5 Important Historical Episodes and Developments

We have already noticed the intertextual marking of important historical moments in the case of the fall of Lydia and Egypt (above, pp. 313–15). There is much more to be said under this heading.

1. *Lydia*

In the case of Lydia this was the end of a story (the history of the Mermnad dynasty) that also began with a Homeric intertext (the wife of Candaules: above, pp. 307–8), and there are in fact other Homeric moments in between. The Solon–Croesus episode has already been discussed (above, pp. 309–11). At its conclusion Herodotus announces that Croesus was seized by *ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις*. The word is only here in Herodotus and is Homeric. There is no intertext with any specific passage, but it injects Homeric (or generally poetic) colour to mark a strong interpretative statement about the next story-line and its connection with the previous one. The next story-line is the death of Croesus' son Atys, and it begins in a Homeric manner: reception of a guest, a variant on the dine first/questions second trope in which purification stands for dinner, Croesus' formulaic question about Adrestus' origins (again adjusted: 'whom did you murder?'), and the very fact that fugitive murderers are a Homeric trope. Later on, the boar-hunt is not without epic overtones. This is the second reception-of-guest story in succession (it is neat that the message of Solon is fulfilled by the arrival of another guest) and the Homeric overtones of the first are further realised here. But there is more. Fugitive

murderers are particular associated with Peleus' court. So is Croesus momentarily figured as Peleus? He *is*, after all, about to lose a son, albeit in a freak (yet presumably fated) accident rather than in the warfare from which he has strenuously sought to protect him. This notion is reciprocally supported by the view that, when Cyrus and his companions observe Croesus with wonder, it recalls Achilles and his companions observing Priam with the wonder occasioned by the arrival of a murderer (above, p. 313). The alert reader is thus given a hint that the fugitive will become a companion to Croesus' son (as Phoenix and Patroclus were to Achilles) and that that son is in danger. That might be a bit of a stretch at a first reading/hearing. But once the story unfolds, the sense of fate at work is retrospectively enriched by the idea that there is a sort of pattern.

The rise and fall of Mermnad Lydia is thus accompanied by Homer throughout. This phenomenon has parallels elsewhere, as does the basic principle of marking important historical moments intertextually.

2. Athens From Tyranny to War with Persia—and Beyond

The most remarkable sequence of Homerisms is the one in the second half of Book 5 that accompanies the narrative from Athens' liberation from tyranny to the onset of the Persian Wars proper.¹³⁴ We have already noted the second preface at 5.65 (above, pp. 305–6) and Cleomenes' ignominious failure in Attica in 5.77 (above, pp. 315–16). The next stage is the speech of the Corinthian Socles in 5.92.

The speech breaks the silence in a cowed assembly (an established Homeric trope¹³⁵) and is followed by a rerun of the same trope: the allies had been quiet but after Socles' intervention they spoke (5.93). It consists of the telling of an elaborate story (or several interconnected stories) in the manner of Phoenix in *Iliad* 9, but also of Nestor on more than one occasion (especially as they are stories about Socles' own city and in that sense about his own past), Achilles on Niobe (24.602–17), and Diomedes on Bellerophon (6.155–95).¹³⁶ The speech contains several Homerisms. The Homeric 'loose the knees' embedded in an oracle is perhaps not particularly significant. But the

¹³⁴ An exceptional example of the principle that intertexts can come in clusters (Pelling (2006) 77).

¹³⁵ Also used in 7.10, noted by, e.g., Pelling (2006) 101. Hornblower (2013) 249 compares *Od.* 8.532–3, which is a similar focusing device, but not particularly close.

¹³⁶ Gould (1989) 56; Hornblower (2013) 247. The compositional device recurs in Herodotus on a smaller scale in the speech of Leutychidas in 6.86 (see above, n. 116). Johnson (2001) examines them in tandem.

speech opens with ἦ δῆ (a common Homeric speech opener found only here in Herodotus), contains the only Herodotean use of φιλοφροσύνη, a word that also occurs just once in Homer, rehearses the story of Periander and Melissa (which Richardson links with Andromache's idea to burn Hector's clothes, 'not for your profit ... but as a source of honour in the sight of Trojan men and women'),¹³⁷ and ends with a plainly Homeric speech-trope ἵστε ὑμῶν Κορινθίου γε οὐ συναινέοντα.¹³⁸ This is a Homeric speech both in essential conception and some aspects of content. How are we to interpret this?

1. Socles' speech is an example of Homerically coloured political history. In that respect it is analogous to the *Histories* itself. It can thus be set alongside other examples of an analogy between Herodotus and in-text characters (see above, pp. 317–19)—and it may also express Herodotus' own political view.¹³⁹

2. If the Homeric analogy for the Periander/Melissa story is recognised, it points up the difference between that pair and Hector/Andromache and supports the denunciation of tyrants.

3. The use of φιλοφροσύνη is harder to call. It expresses the reason for which Labda (wrongly) imagined the Bacchiad hitmen had come to see the child: φιλοφροσύνη τοῦ πατρός (Eetion? Amphion?) The sole Homeric occurrence of the word is in a γὰρ ἄμεινον line-ending of the sort Herodotus plays with in Book 3 (above, p. 305) and it occurs during the embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9 that is also home to the speech of Phoenix to which Socles' speech as a whole is formally analogous. These are both signs that the word's appearance is not accidental. Moreover, the precise context is Odysseus' recollection of what happened when he and Nestor went to fetch Achilles to the Trojan War¹⁴⁰—another scene in which people come to get a child (albeit one older than Cypselus). But what Odysseus says is that Peleus told Achilles that φιλοφροσύνη is better than the μεγαλήτωρ θυμός and spirit of ἔρις that he is showing in his quarrel with Agamemnon, and the relevance of this to Labda's situation is opaque.¹⁴¹ Are we invited to link μεγαλήτωρ

¹³⁷ Richardson (1993) ad *Il.* 22.510–14.

¹³⁸ With συν- nicely substituted for ἐπ-, as Hornblower (2013) 267 notes.

¹³⁹ Moles (2007).

¹⁴⁰ 9.256: the episode recurs in 7.124–8 and 11.765–91.

¹⁴¹ Hornblower says that it is from a speech Achilles dismisses as insincere, so the reader should infer that the men were insincere (as they were). But Achilles does not dismiss the speech as insincere: Friedrich (2011).

θυμός and ἔρις with the Bacchiads? That might be appropriate but adds little to our existing understanding of them. Or, if Cypselus stands for Achilles, is it his future *μεγαλήτωρ θυμός* and ἔρις that are evoked? But that seems a bit tortuous. Perhaps the word is just a largely unconscious sign that Herodotus' mind has been on the embassy scene.

4. The final Homerism is, by contrast, easier—and important.¹⁴² The trope casts Socles as a god addressing the Spartans as though they were Zeus. These are more disconcerting equations than those arising when Persians use the *οἶον ἔπος* trope (above, pp. 335–7)—a trope that appears at the start of some speeches that end with the phrase Socles uses, a fact that demonstrates that we are right to treat both as intentional allusions. But it seems likely that Socles *is* claiming the authority with which Athene or Hera challenge Zeus and that we are to approve of his doing so. And he actually claims more authority. In Homer speakers say ‘do it if you want, but we shall not approve’, but in Herodotus Socles does not: rather he just says ‘are you going not to stop but to continue trying to restore Hippias contrary to justice? Be assured that the Corinthians do not approve’. The truth is that Spartans are *not* Zeus, cannot do what they want, and are indeed powerless. This is why there is no narrator comment at all on the Spartan reaction to Socles' speech, only a report of the response of other allies—which is what settles things. The Spartans are marginalised. Socles is successfully claiming more authority than Athena or Hera and exposing Spartan weakness: they are would-be Zeus with none of his power. (We recall that the *οἶον ἔπος* passages also question the power of a Zeus-like ruler.¹⁴³)

The Socles intertext varies Homer in another way. The Homeric cases are about war and death continuing as they are fated to (whether explicitly in the passage or not: the reader of Homer knows there is no way the Trojan War is suddenly going to end), whereas Socles is arguing for a war to stop and maintaining that its not doing would be contrary to the natural order.¹⁴⁴ So he uses the Homeric trope to a non- or counter-Homeric end and that perhaps adds to force of his achievement. In any event, however, the intertext is one that greatly reinforces Socles' authority and the effectiveness of his denunciation of tyranny.

¹⁴² See Pelling (2006) 102–3, Hornblower (2013) 267.

¹⁴³ See above, pp. 335–7.

¹⁴⁴ Affirmed at the start in a topsy-turvy trope that is not Homeric: Hornblower (2013) 250 moots Archilochus.

The Homeric colour continues after Socles is finished. Defeated, Hippias retired to Sigeium, a place that was tied both to Cypselid history (the Pisistratids had it thanks to Periander) and to Homeric history: for the Athenians affirmed that they had as much right to Sigeium as any of the Greeks who fought alongside Menelaus to punish the abduction of Helen. The implication is that defeat of Troy gave all participating Greeks a right by conquest to Trojan territory (5.94). Athens fought Mytilene on that basis and it was the arbitration of that war by Periander that established Athenian control. Hippias' bolt-hole thus exemplifies the use of Homeric history to establish a claim, just as Socles' speech exemplifies the use of Homeric text to win an argument (and the Gelon embassy exemplified using it to lose one). But Hippias also copies Socles more exactly: for he says that the Corinthians will yearn (*ἐπιποθήσειν*) for the Pisistratids when the time comes for them to be hurt by Athens (5.93.1). In doing so he echoes Achilles' forecast that sufferings at the hands of Hector will lead the Achaeans to yearn (*ποθέειν*) for Achilles,¹⁴⁵ just as Socles echoed Athena or Hera when denouncing Spartan support of tyranny. Socles (as we saw) actually trumped the authority of Athena and Hera, and Hippias does something similar. For, whereas Achilles simply accompanied his statement with an oath, Hippias claims the extra insight due to his knowledge of oracles. Achilles makes what he says true by mere assertion—which he can do because what happens lies in his own hands: he can choose to fight whenever he wishes. But Hippias is speaking of a future beyond his own time, one only accessible by informed prediction. Enhanced Homeric authority is thus claimed both for Corinthian (and Spartan) hostility to tyranny and for the prospect of painful Corinthian–Athenian conflict—and extra weight is given to the opportunity inescapably offered to the reader to contemplate post-*Histories* history. Herodotus sometimes does that explicitly, in the various proleptic references to events down to the 420s: here at least there can be no doubt that he is implicitly inviting us to see the content of his text from the perspective of a later world.¹⁴⁶

And what is he inviting us to see? Perhaps an Athens freed from tyranny that has become tyrannical and one whose poor relations with Corinth characteristically involved conflicts over territory—Megara (which Athens defended from Corinthian encroachment: Thuc. 1.103), Aegina (which

¹⁴⁵ Pelling (2006) 103.

¹⁴⁶ Hornblower (2013) 267: Hippias' prediction 'is the best card in the hands of the "irony" school of Herodotean interpreters'.

Corinth failed to defend, suffering a major defeat in the process: 1.105) and, most notoriously, two places further afield that Corinth claimed as hers (because they were colonies) but Athens had acquired as subjects (Potidaea) or as allies (Corcyra). The cosy territorial relationship between Athens, Corinth, and Sigeium in the days of actual tyranny stands in contrast to an unc cosy relationship in the days of metaphorical tyranny. Moreover there is potential Homeric colour to both sides of the comparison. Imperial Athens could claim that her power, which went back to her willingness to fight the barbarian and protect the Greeks after 478, was rooted in an ongoing Trojan War. Perhaps she had as much right to Potidaea as she had had to Sigeium—a right that the Corinthians *had* recognised. But anyone inclined to that reading (based on Athens as avatar of the Achaeans at Troy) might be given pause by the next Homeric intertext just three chapters later. The ongoing Trojan War was ultimately an artefact of the Persian attacks on Greece, and the next intertext disrupts the putative Athenian script by providing a different Homeric take on Athens' role in the origins of those attacks.

The Athenian ships sent to Ionia in 499 were, Herodotus says, the start of evils for Greeks and barbarians (5.97.3): this channels three Homeric passages, but most notably *Iliad* 5.62–4.¹⁴⁷ The reference to the start of evils contrasts with the stress at the beginning of *Histories* on the start of crimes (the mythological crimes involving women and what Herodotus takes as the real first crime, that of the Lydian conquest) but it also picks up on something implicitly present at or near the outset of the work: for the passage evokes the *kaka* involving Miletus and Naxos in 5.28–30 and those evils in turn are the second in a series of evils for Ionia that began either with the Persian

¹⁴⁷ *Il.* 5.62–4: the ἀρχεκάκους ships which were an evil to all the Trojans and for their builder since he did not know θέσφατα. Note that ἀρχεκάκους is a distinctive Homeric hapax absent except in *Il.* 5.62–4 related contexts until the Roman era. *Il.* 11.604: Patroclus comes out of his hut at a call from Achilles: κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή. *Il.* 3.100: Menelaus says that Argives and Trojans have suffered much εἴνεκ' ἐμῆς ἔριδος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἀρχῆς (codd.: ἄτης Zenodotus). The intertextual link is widely recognised. (It was already noticed by Plutarch in *Her. Mal.* 24, 861B.) A similar idea is expressed by Helen in *Il.* 6.356, a high-profile passage where she also says Zeus created an evil destiny (κακὸν μόρον) so that we shall be αἰοίδιμοι to later generations (cf. above, pp. 295, 316): εἴνεκ' ἐμέλο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης—and it is identical if one adopts Zenodotus' reading of ἀρχῆς for ἄτης. On 8.142.2 see n. 149. E. Bowie (2018a) 59 notes a further use of the trope in Hdt. 2.139: his daughter's death was the start of evils for Mycerinus—a story whose sexual content recalls another starting point, Candaules' wife (see above, pp. 307–8).

conquest of the region¹⁴⁸ or perhaps even with its first enslavement by Lydia. And yet there is still a contrast, because those were evils for Ionia and what we now have are evils for Greeks and barbarians. That much increased ambit extends the most direct Homeric intertext, where the ships are an evil for Trojans, and one of the secondary ones (the start of evil for Patroclus), but is matched in *Iliad* 3.100 where Menelaus says that the *Argives and Trojans* have suffered much εἴνεκ' ἐμῆς ἔριδος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἀρχῆς.¹⁴⁹ So the mixture of intratextual and intertextual features mark how important a new stage we have now reached.

But that is not all. Menelaus' perspective is historical (Paris started something and both parties have suffered between then and now), but Herodotus (like the other Homer passages) is prospective. The Homer passages look forward to the annihilation of Troy and Patroclus. That is a large weight for the undefined future evils of *Greeks and barbarians* to bear.

The conventional script about the Persian Wars would surely be more in line with the Homeric originals—defeat (though not annihilation) for Persia and victory for Greece. Herodotus' change is not casual. But is he just alluding to the fact that bad things happened to Greeks along the road to 479 (perhaps particularly to the Athenians whose city was destroyed)? That he is not limiting himself in this way is suggested by the observation in 6.98 that a Delian earthquake after Marathon portended *kaka* in the time of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, some of it due to the Persians and some to Greek *koruphatoi* fighting about *arkhē*. That is another explicitly proleptic Herodotean comment about the post-*Histories* world, like Histiaeus' remark in 5.93, and given the proximity of that remark to 5.97.3, it is clear interpreters are correct to understand the ambit of the ἀρχὴ κακῶν to extend far into the future—and to take it that the punning ambiguity of *arkhē* invites

¹⁴⁸ Hornblower (2013) 125.

¹⁴⁹ This may be connectable with Hdt. 8.142.2, depending on the text one adopts. The Spartans say to the Athenians: you started this war οὐδὲν ἡμέων βουλομένων, καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς (codd.: ἀρχῆν Schaefer) ὁ ἀγὼν ἐγένετο. With ἀρχῆς we have a play on words 'about your beginning'/'about your rule' (proleptically), an allusion to *Il.* 3.100 (if the MS reading there is accepted, which on this scenario it should be, since it is supported by Herodotus), and an intratext to 5.97.3 (where both ἀρχή = beginning and ἀρχή = empire can be felt to be in question: Hippias' warning has prepared the reader for that), and the effect is to support the message of 5.97.3 about the evils to which fight for hegemony will expose Greece. With ἀρχῆν there is no play on words (unless one supposes Herodotus used ἀρχῆν in the hope of evoking ἀρχή—virtually inciting us to read περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς) and no intertext with Homer: but in content, if not form, there may still be an intratext with 5.97.3. For another intertext affected by textual uncertainty see below, n. 168.

thought of the Athenian empire or at any rate the struggle about *arkhē* in 6.98. In 6.98 Herodotus described the evils as worse than those suffered by Greece in twenty generations and that accords with the intertextually implicit seriousness of the evils for Greeks and barbarians unleashed by the Athenian and Eretrian ships. Appropriately, twenty generations takes us before the time of Homer (400 years away: 2.53), so the evils to come outdo those since his time, though not perhaps the ones he records (which lie 800 years away: 2.145).¹⁵⁰

In these terms it is also appropriate that the basic intertext with *Il.* 5.62–4 (and the secondary one in *Il.* 3.100) controvert the simple Persian War/Trojan War script by equating the Athenians with the Trojans: Athens is bringing disaster on herself not only because of the city's destruction in 480 but also because of the longer-term Greek evils of which she will be part. That is, of course, an aggressively dark reading of fifth-century Athenian history, at least until after 413. For those who believe Herodotus wrote after that date the situation is straightforward; for those who do not, it is more interesting: the fight for *arkhē* inflicts damage on both sides, and power is in any case a disaster waiting to happen because *eudaimoniē* does not stay permanently in one place (1.5.3–4). One wonders whether Herodotus knew that the Spartan Melesippus alluded to Homer at the outset of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.12.3–4). Thucydides professed to have realised from the outset how momentously greater than the Trojan or Persian Wars that conflict would be. Perhaps the combination of 5.97.3 and 6.98 reflects a similar realisation on Herodotus' part.

There is more than one way to react to this disruption of the New Trojan War script in the context provided by Hippias' warnings. (1) The Athens–Troy assimilation casts the Athenians as (bluntly) wrongdoers and indirectly links Athens and Persia: that is appropriate since the Hippias section has invoked Athens' future role as tyrant city. (2) 5.97.3 embraces Athens among the Greeks and barbarians who will suffer terrible things in the post-Persian Wars future: so the Athenians will be losers (like the Trojans) as well as winners (like the Achaeans). (3) Perhaps 5.92–4 has not only been displaying examples of the deployment of Homer as a tool of argument about contemporary politics but setting us up to question the wisdom of that enterprise—in which spirit we might go on to observe that, although in the

¹⁵⁰ 20 generations at three to a century (2.142) falls short of 800 years. But Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 219 envisage that Herodotus means the Trojan War or the return of the Heraclidae 80 years later (Thuc. 1.12). If the arithmetic is stretched anyway, one might as well go for the former option. But maybe we should not stretch it.

short term we may admire Socles' authoritative dismissal of Spartan support of tyranny, his posture nonetheless undermined, if not himself personally, then his city. These three reactions are not inconsistent. Perhaps it would be wiser of the Athenians not to talk about the Trojan War.

Herodotus and Homer have thus brought us some way from the heady excitement of Athens' empowerment by liberation and *isēgoria*, and the dark story of Athens' progression from suffering tyranny to exerting it is suffused by a Homeric colour that makes it an epic tale in its own right.¹⁵¹ Nor does that colour disappear after 5.97. We have already noticed Darius' intertextually futile prayer for revenge on Athens (above, p. 333) and, in the light of the larger pattern, we may now be more tempted to detect a deliberate allusion to *Il.* 24.1 at 5.102.3–103.1 (above, p. 329). In the same vein there is one more passage that perhaps deserves mention.

As the Ionians, Athenians, and Eretrians march to Sardis they go along the River Cayster. Hornblower imagines some of them recollecting the comparison between the Achaean host and the birds of the Cayster valley in *Iliad* 2.459–65.¹⁵² Should the reader be doing that too? Does mention of the Cayster evoke Homer as strongly as, e.g., Lotus-eaters or animals belonging to Helios (above, pp. 324–5, 330)? When Aristophanes makes an embassy to Persia pass that way (*Acham.* 68), Olson for one does not see a Homeric element, merely the place's position on the Ephesus–Sardis–Persia route, and that is *prima facie* all Herodotus had in mind.¹⁵³ But the Cayster is absent from surviving texts between Homer and Herodotus, and the richly Homeric material of 5.92–7 might prime the reader to notice the name's Homeric resonance. What does it add if it is there? The Homeric simile evokes the huge number of troops pouring from the ships and huts onto the plain—an army that had been all for sailing home but for whom war is now sweeter than leaving (2.453–4). Perhaps, then, it is a sardonic comment on numbers and aspirations and a hint at the rapidity with which the Athenians, who came in ships, will go away again—a faint proleptic warning comparable with the one that might be read into 5.102.3–103.1 (above, p. 329).

¹⁵¹ The same was true of the history of Mermnad Lydia: above, pp. 340–1.

¹⁵² Hornblower (2013) 283.

¹⁵³ Olson (2002) 93.

3. Xerxes Goes to War

If the Athenian ships were the start of evils, another major point in the development of those evils was Xerxes' decision to invade Greece, and the series of dreams (involving figures standing over the dreamer in the manner of Homeric gods)¹⁵⁴ and assemblies linked with mobilisation for war in 7.12–17 evokes *Iliad* 2, where (in somewhat peculiar circumstances) troops are eventually massed for the first actual fighting in the poem.

There is a difference of scale (there are four dreams and four assemblies in Herodotus, only one dream and three assemblies in Homer¹⁵⁵), but there are many thematic links: a general willingness not to fight; the idea of the same dream coming to different people (the real Nestor says if anyone else had reported a dream like this we would say it was false, but since the commander-in-chief has had it, it must be real); a dreamer initially doing opposite of what the dream said; a warner figure who changes his mind (elaborated out of the two guises of Nestor, though *they* were both in favour of war); the potential deceptiveness of dreams; and even the testing of an assembly with a false message—Xerxes' announcement to the second assembly is effectively like that as he is going against what the first dream said.

There are two sorts of intertextual point here. The first is general in nature: the epic paraphernalia once again adds colour, weight, and sense of occasion to a crucial historical moment, and indeed lodges the definitive decision to go to war in a transcendent realm: the rational argumentation of self-interested parties is replaced by a different sort of discourse. Xerxes first decides on war and then changes his mind, moved by Artabanus' arguments. But that he changes it back again is entirely due to dreams. The second is more specific and concerns the matter of deception.

Agamemnon's dream in Homer is explicitly deceptive (though Nestor—whom the dream impersonated—thinks it is not). But the situation in Herodotus is less clear. Xerxes' third dream is plainly wrongly interpreted by the magi, but seems to tell the truth (Xerxes as ruler is going to suffer a reverse.). Carey insists that the earlier dreams are deceptive: it is the expedition that will be disastrous, not—as the dream says—the failure to have an expedition.¹⁵⁶ The dreams do indeed say that not attacking Greece will be disastrous for Xerxes: the first dream threatens not to forgive Xerxes

¹⁵⁴ *Od.* 20.32 and elsewhere: Hornblower (2013) 174; Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 321.

¹⁵⁵ Herodotus is generally very fond of dreams: Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 235.

¹⁵⁶ Carey (2016).

if he changes his mind; the second dream says Xerxes will be laid low if he does not mobilise; that is reiterated by the Artabanus dream which also threatens Artabanus with punishment if he tries to deflect τὸ χρεόν. Artabanus infers that there is a δαιμονίη ὄρμη, that φθορή τις θεήλατος is going to overtake the Greeks, and that Xerxes must do what the god says. Xerxes makes no comment, but then accepts a false magian interpretation of a plainly off-putting dream. Herodotus makes no comment at all. But there seems to be no undertaking that the expedition will be successful, and Artabanus' inference that it will be can be as wrong as the magi's interpretation of the third dream. All that is certain is that Xerxes' survival in power right now depends on the expedition happening. Agamemnon was told he would capture Troy. This was false. He then told the army that he had been told he would not capture Troy. This was also false. But the upshot is that the war continues, and Odysseus reminds everyone that Calchas' prophecy puts victory in the tenth year. What Agamemnon had been told was false *now* but not false in perpetuity. What Agamemnon told the army was false *now and* in perpetuity. But what Calchas said is a plausible interpretation of the omen, is taken as true by Odysseus, and can be taken as true by anyone because ten years are not yet up. The situation in Herodotus is different. What Xerxes is told is true *now* (he has to attack) but it has no future ramifications once the attack is undertaken. The inference of Artabanus is not authoritative (he is not a Calchas figure) and the view of the magi (who *are* Calchas figures) about the final dream, though taken to be true by Xerxes, is manifestly false.

The situation is clear in Herodotus' text without further additions. But the intertext tends to underline the point by offering a story in which there *is* a clear and authoritative prophecy of success—the thing that is lacking in Herodotus. The crucial proposition that Xerxes was structurally compelled to go to war *whatever the outcome*—a proposition almost entirely articulated through the dream sequence—is thus greatly reinforced when one sees the matter through the intertextual perspective of *Iliad 2*.

4. Battles

War entails battles, and they are a natural focus for Homeric colour in a work presenting itself as a new *Iliad*. There are certain recurrent narrative features that recall Homer in very broad terms,¹⁵⁷ though there is no trace

¹⁵⁷ Marincola (2018). Battles with Persians are long (6.113.1; 9.62.2, 67, 70.2, 102.3, 119.2) like day-long Homeric battles.

of the prolonged *aristeia* of a specially heroic individual:¹⁵⁸ we are not in that sort of individualistic world, just as we are not in a world of physiologically vivid death¹⁵⁹ or, concomitantly, obituary digressions.¹⁶⁰ But the degree to which Herodotus adds more specific Homeric character varies.

Apart from *ἑτεραλκῆως ἀγωνιζομένων* (above, p. 328) and a rather plain catalogue of Greek forces, Artemisium has little to offer.

Mycale is intratextually linked with Artemisium by use of *ἑτεραλκῆς* and involves non-Persian barbarians who (in quasi-Homeric terminology) 'no longer turned to *ἀλκή*', but is most notable for the word *ἔρκος*—not so much for its use to designate the actual Persian palisade (9.96.3, 97: also called *τεῖχος* in 9.102), since Homer never uses it in that way (and in particular does not apply it to the Achaean wall), but for the statement that the Persians used their shields to make a *ἔρκος*, which recalls Homer's statement that the Greeks sought to protect their wall *ἔρκεϊ χαλκείῳ* (*Il.* 15.567). As the Persian shields were made of wicker, there is contrast as well as similarity here: we have heard before (at Plataea: 9.62) that, compared with Greeks, Persians do not lack valour but are at a disadvantage in equipment, and this small intertextual allusion (almost a joke?) reinforces the intratextual point. Of course, if the Persians are compared with the Achaeans, we have another case in which the Greeks are assimilated with Trojans.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ Post-battle round-up passages identify those who fought best but that is not the same—or is the closest approach possible in the post-epic world? The occasional naming of individual fighters (usually as casualties) in the battle-narrative proper is part of the background Iliadic colour. But the Persians' capture and celebration of the heroically wounded Pytheas (7.181) is not really a Homeric incident.

¹⁵⁹ See Boedeker (2003); Fragoulaki, above, Ch. 5.

¹⁶⁰ The closest formal approach is 7.224, a five-line note on Abrocomes and Hyperanthes, sons of Darius by his niece Phratagune, a lady who inherited the whole of her father's estate—which matches the often genealogical character of Homeric passages. 6.114 famously does *not* say who Cynegirus was. Post-battle round-ups do afford the chance of elaborating about particular individuals, though characteristically about ones who are not dead. These can be stories about what happened in the battle (Epizelus (6.117); Eurytus (7.229); Ameinias (8.93); Adeimantus (8.94); Aristides (8.95); Aristodemus (9.71); Callicrates (9.72); Sophanes (9.73–4)) or at other times before or after (Dieneces (7.226); Aristodemus (7.229–31); Sophanes (9.75)). The Sophanes passage is particularly striking, with elements of mythological history, strange behaviour (Sophanes' anchor), and prolepsis to the 460s and the Peloponnesian War.

¹⁶¹ See below, p. 356 for more on the (actual) wall.

And this is also true at Marathon.¹⁶² The climax of the Marathon narrative is plainly Homeric: not only does it contain the only Herodotean instances of the Homeric use of *κόπτειν* in reference to battle violence,¹⁶³ but the calling for fire (something hardly readily available at Marathon?), the arm wounds, and the word *ἄφλαστον* (only ever encountered here and in *Iliad*-inspired passages) channel *Iliad* 15.713–15, in Hector's assault on the ships at the height of the post-Wrath crisis for the Achaean cause. Moreover, Hector was grabbing what had been Protesilaus' ship, just as the Persian ships at Marathon are the first to have landed in heartland Greece. And yet (as in 5.97.3) this heroic picture casts the Athenians as Trojans. The Trojan assault was, of course, ultimately unsuccessful, and the Persians will be back: both Trojan and Persian Wars continued. That is one point that may be in Herodotus' mind. But the Athenians paired Marathon with the *capture* of Troy in the Stoa Poikile,¹⁶⁴ and it seems inescapable that Herodotus is again taking a rather high-profile opportunity to comment a little sceptically on fifth-century use of the Trojan/Persian War script.

There is also an element of Homer-based critique in the treatment of Salamis. News of capture of the Athenian acropolis caused a commotion (*thorubos*) in which some Greek commanders at Salamis board their ships for flight, while the rest held a meeting, decided to defend the Peloponnese, and boarded their ships (to leave next day). The *thorubos* is contextually out of place in Herodotus, and a clear signal that an *Iliad* 2 parallel is at work here:¹⁶⁵ as with the fire at Marathon, an intertext deforms the historical record in a rather specific manner.¹⁶⁶ The crisis is stemmed by Mnesiphilus acting through Themistocles—a mundane alternative to Athena and Odysseus. In the ensuing assembly, Themistocles clashes twice with Adeimantus, responding to his barbs with witticism (59) and insult (61), in scenes that have been felt to echo Odysseus and Thersites.¹⁶⁷ The references to beating and to Themistocles being *apolis* (and thus inferior) give colour to this: if so, Themistocles is the Thersites figure, even though as Mnesiphilus'

¹⁶² See Pelling (2006) 255; (2013) 9–11; Fragoulaki, above, pp. 122–5.

¹⁶³ *Il.* 11.146; 12.204; 13.203. The point is noted by Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 243, 255.

¹⁶⁴ Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 28 note the pairing, but not the dissonance.

¹⁶⁵ Pelling (2006); A. M. Bowie (2007) 145; Blösel (2004) 236–41.

¹⁶⁶ I distinguish this from, e.g., the way the dream sequence in Book 7 substitutes literary fancy for actual political and strategic discussion or the doubts one might have about the historicity of the Candaules' wife story.

¹⁶⁷ Asheri (2003) 261.

agent he echoes Odysseus. Perhaps this complicates and enriches the figure of Themistocles;¹⁶⁸ or perhaps it shows that any intertextual relation between *Iliad* 2 and these events is general and impressionistic—a suggestion that the difficulty of establishing sensible strategy at Salamis has something in common with the absurd (self-inflicted) disorder of *Iliad* 2.

Moreover *Iliad* 2 may not be the only thing lurking in the background. Underlying the arguments at Salamis is creation of a wall at the Isthmus, a counterpart to the wooden walls of the fleet but also to the crisis in *Iliad* 7 onwards centring round the Achaean wall and defence of the ships: walls, crisis, and ships are thus recombined in a different fashion. The Herodotean situation disjoins wall and ships, whereas in Homer the wall can protect the ships, and the point of intertext is to underline the disjunction: the Isthmus walls are no good for protecting ships—and so no good for protecting anything else.¹⁶⁹ Thinking along these lines, one is then tempted to associate the clandestine night-time episodes involving Sicinnus (who goes to the enemy camp) and Aristides and the Tenians (who in a sense come with information from it) with the events of *Iliad* 10, when the Achaean wall crisis has worsened and Greeks venture into the Trojan camp to return with information and booty.¹⁷⁰ Once again any echoes remain of a generic and impressionistic sort, and the Greeks of 480 *will* resolve the immediate crisis forthwith, whereas there is still a long while to go to anything similar in the *Iliad*.

So Herodotus *is* giving Salamis an epic quality befitting its importance: there were two moments at which Salamis was nearly abandoned—first in response to fall of the Acropolis (when some commanders rush to the ships and the rest make an assembly decision to withdraw the next day) and second in response to Persians advancing towards Isthmus and its wall-

¹⁶⁸ Thersites recurs in Book 8. At 8.92.2 (Polycritus speaks to Themistocles) the presence of *ἐπεκερτομήσε* and *ὄνειδίζων* brings us close to *Il.* 2.255–6 and the fact that *ἐπεκερτομήσε* is a Herodotean *hapax* and that 2.255–6 is from an episode already evoked in the pre-Salamis narrative suggests deliberate allusion, especially as there are plausible evocations of Thersites in 8.59–61 (Themistocles = Thersites) and 8.125 (Timodemus = Thersites). This is not fatally damaged by emending *ὄνειδίζων* to *ὄνειδίζοντα*, though with the latter both Polycritus and Themistocles become Thersites-like and the overtones of the intertext (and the place of this passage among the others) would be a bit different. (For another intertext affected by textual uncertainty see above, n. 149.) That Themistocles comes out in three Thersites-evocations variously as Odysseus, Thersites, and Agamemnon is perhaps a tribute to his slippery quality. He was channelling Odysseus' companions at the start of Book 8 (above, p. 332); and cf. also above, p. 330 for his dubious role in another intertext.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. below, p. 356.

¹⁷⁰ An episode already evoked earlier: see above, p. 333.

under-construction (when a new assembly is held)—and both provoke Homeric intertexts. But Herodotus is also seeking to underline what a dangerously close-run thing it all was and how much the Greeks themselves were responsible for this. And it should not be forgotten that he has already used the bizarre episode in *Iliad* 2 to suggest something similar about the original Persian decision to attack Greece. Homer does not always exist to make Greeks beautifully heroic: he can be used to establish that both sides can end up looking like headless chickens.

Things are a little different at Thermopylae, where a good deal of the narrative fulfils a simple agenda of investing Thermopylae in general and Sparta and/or Leonidas in particular with epic colour.¹⁷¹ There are mostly no dissonant complications, though the marking of *kleos* as communal (as well as individual) is a reminder that we are in a post-epic world (see above, p. 315), as in a different way is the attribution of *μῆνις* to the Spartans collectively (7.229.2) rather than to a god or exceptional individual as in Homer and normally in Herodotus.¹⁷² (In a nice intratext the Athenians describe their anger at Sparta's dilatoriness in 479 with the verb *μηνίω*: 9.7β.2.) Another programmatic theme from the opening of *Histories* resurfaces: Leonidas' *kleos* is paired with the preservation of Sparta's *eudaimoniē* (7.220.2).

More disturbing is the description of the Spartans as *ἀτέοντες* (7.223.4)—a *hapax* in Herodotus and in Homer (*Il.* 20.332), where Aeneas would be *θεῶν ἀτέοντα* if he fought against Achilles, a better man and one more beloved of gods: so a specific passage of Homer seems in view that carries the overtone of affront to the gods. Perhaps this is an acceptable exaggeration to capture

¹⁷¹ Apart from items noted just below, attention has been drawn at various times to the catalogue (7.202–4), a Homeric dawn (7.217.1), a time-indication from peacetime (7.223; Carey (2016) 86), a hint of long-haired Achaeans (7.208), the naming of casualties mid-battle (7.224), the fight over Leonidas' body (7.225), the four attacks followed by failure (7.225; cf. above, p. 316), and the lion-statue (7.225.2) as an evocation of Homeric lion similes. For these and other items (including the double-*hapax* *περισταδόν* and various complexities in 7.229–34) see Fragoulaki, above, pp. 130–48; Barker, above, pp. 174–84. I am less persuaded that 7.219 recalls the panicking Greeks of *Iliad* 2 (Pelling (2006) 98), though it *is* an episode used elsewhere (see above, pp. 349–50, 352–3). For another *Iliad* 2 analogy one could look to 9.117: straight after a reference to Protesilaus, we have the Greeks wanting to abandon the siege of Sestos and go home, for all the world like the Greeks of *Iliad* 2. See Boedeker (1988) 34.

¹⁷² 7.134.1, 137.1–2 (hero Talthybius), 169.3 (the dead Minos), 197.3 (god). The Athenians' wrath in 5.84 is about religious deficiency. See also above, p. 330 on the *ἀμῆνιτος* Evenius. Spartan wrath is directed against Aristodemus. On the intertext (*λιποψυχέοντα* in 7.229.1) which links him to Sarpedon and chimes with Herodotus' disapproval of the Spartan reaction to his death at Plataea, see below, pp. 359–60.

the circumstances of self-immolation—or perhaps it is simply true, since it is evident that the gods have willed the defeat at Thermopylae.¹⁷³ Either way it turns the Spartans into Trojans. The same happens both with Fragoulaki's enticing suggestion that the final act at Thermopylae echoes Hector's death outside the walls of Troy (above, pp. 134–6, 139, 142–8) and with Xerxes' decapitation of Leonidas' body (7.238): in the *Iliad* such behaviour is the reserve of Greeks and Leonidas thus becomes a Trojan—and of questionable rank: for the maltreatment of Hector's body is different and decapitation is limited to lesser persons. (Pausanias will later disavow this feature of Homeric Achaean behaviour (above, p. 361) as barbarous, but that actually intratextually validates the idea that Xerxes was inflicting Achaean indignity upon a Trojan.) It appears, then, that Leonidas and the Three Hundred provide another example of inversion of the New Trojan War script: they achieved Homeric *kleos* but at this point they were, after all, on the losing side. The case is provocative, but not, perhaps, quite as provocative as that of the Trojan Athenians at Marathon. The Athenians' victory *was* only provisional (above, p. 352), but assimilation to Hector in a moment of triumphant success is more disruptive than evocation of Hector in his hour of tragic failure.

Finally we reach Plataea, the battle with the largest number of discrete Homeric intertextual allusions. Some have already been noticed: Thersander's conversation with an unnamed Persian; the Persian–Phocian stand-off; Masistius' alternative identity as Macistius; the Athenian–Tegean dispute; the use of *ἐπιρρεόντων* in 9.38 and *ὀπέωνες* in 9.50–1¹⁷⁴—and one might add *ἄδην ἔχειν* in 9.39.¹⁷⁵ Such things contribute to a persistent drip of Homeric colour, but they are individually of varied intrinsic significance, the Thersander conversation and Athenian–Tegean argument being much more thematically significant than the others (of which *ἄδην ἔχειν* is perhaps the most interesting)—and *their* significance is as much for their intratextual connections elsewhere in *Histories* as for their commentary on Plataea. (Both, of course, come from the preliminaries to the fighting.)

One element of the actual fighting may actually be labelled as Homeric. 9.70 announces that, when the Persians fled to their palisade, a *τειχομαχίη*

¹⁷³ Vannicelli ap. Vannicelli–Corcella–Nenci (2017) 576.

¹⁷⁴ See above, pp. 312–3, 324, 327 (n. 103), 340.

¹⁷⁵ *ἄδην εἶχον κτείνοντες*: this is the sole Herodotean example of a word that Homer uses when saying that Greek heroes (Achilles, the Ajaxes, Teucer) will give their Trojan adversaries their fill of war (13.315; 19.423): the assimilation of the slaughter of easy non-combatant targets to epic battle is a bitter joke that plainly criticises Persian behaviour. Flower–Marincola (2002) 180 note the Homeric word but not the intertextual point.

ἐρρωμενεστέρη ensued. This is the first use of the noun in surviving Greek, and it is very tempting to think its appearance presupposes use of the word as a name for *Iliad* 11 (first attested in Pl. *Ion* 539b) and that the final act at Plataea is thus officially a Homeric event. If so, it is one in which the Greeks have again become Trojans, just as the Athenians did at Marathon. And that intratext is specially appropriate since it was specifically the Athenians who made the Plataea assault successful, even though (in another intratext) it is the Tegeans who enter the stockade first. Meanwhile the passage displays a third pair of (Homeric) intratexts when the statement that none of the Persians ‘remembered ἀλκή’ when the stockade was breached recalls not only the Phocians in 9.18 (who *did* have a share in ἀλκή) but also the Persians’ non-Greek subjects at Mycale who ‘no longer turned to ἀλκή’ (9.102.3) when *their* wall was overrun. The Mycale passage has its own verbal allusion to the Iliadic *teikhomakhīē* (see above, p. 351) and is the only Herodotean event that literally matches Homer in having an attack launched on ships protected by a wall: in Book 8 it was the disjunction of ships and wall that was thematically significant (above, p. 353), at Marathon there was no wall, at Magnesia there was no attack (though the commanders feared one: 7.191), and at Plataea there are no ships. All of these passages belong together in the intratextual metanarrative, and one must stress again Herodotus’ persistent interest in an episode that equates 480 Greeks either with Achaeans at their weakest (in Book 8) or with temporarily rampant Trojans.¹⁷⁶

Three passages turn the Homeric spotlight on the Persians.

Masistius is unheroically floored by a bowshot and despatched by an anonymous adversary,¹⁷⁷ but his fate involves a Homeric fight over his body, the closest Herodotus approaches to the gory tastes of Homeric narrative (he is killed by a stab in the eye), and ritual mourning that befits the death of a hero (even if its mode is distinctively Persian), and his adversaries may have meant to salute him with the name Macistius (above, p. 324).

The colloquy of Mardonius and Artabazus (9.41) can certainly be compared generically to those of Hector and Poulydamas in *Iliad* 12.200–50 and 18.243–313, where Hector disregards sound advice¹⁷⁸—particularly the latter where Poulydamas advises retreat within walls that even Achilles cannot storm. Poulydamas has the skill to see future as well as past (he reads omens,

¹⁷⁶ From the perspective of 1.0, it is nice that the Achaean wall will have world-wide *kleos* (7.451) and eventually be utterly destroyed (12.13–33).

¹⁷⁷ Fragoulaki, above, p. 125–7.

¹⁷⁸ Flower–Marincola (2002) 181; Asheri (2006) 236.

and this informs his comments), and Herodotus says Artabazus could evidently see the future ('foresaw more'): and there have already been predictions (9.16). In the first episode Hector articulates the *εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης* principle, while Mardonius speaks of following the *nomos* of the Persians. Omens favouring defence (not attack) figure in the immediately preceding narrative; and 9.42 is about oracles (including the manipulative use of one by Mardonius). The intertext marks a crucial strategic choice in Homeric manner, without creating any notable further complexities. Mardonius remains Trojan and perhaps (because he corresponds to Hector) at least mildly heroic.

Seven chapters later Mardonius issues taunts and a challenge (9.48–9). The contents and result of his taunt are generically Homeric:¹⁷⁹ heroic accusations about false boasting are echoed by Mardonius' remark that others falsely boast on Sparta's behalf,¹⁸⁰ he contrasts the Spartans' behaviour with what is expected *κατὰ κλέος* (the Homeric virtue largely confined to Spartans: above, pp. 315–6), the verb *πτώσσουντες* (only here in Herodotus) is absolutely appropriate,¹⁸¹ and the Spartans' silent response is Homeric (Diomedes (twice), Deiphobus, Paris) as well as Laconic. The ensuing challenge to the Spartans specifically recalls Paris' challenge of Menelaus in *Iliad* 3. That does eventually result in a fight (from which Paris is rescued by Aphrodite); and the Persians and Spartans *do* eventually fight at Plataea in a sort of *monomakhia*, recalling the Athenian *monomakhia* at Marathon.¹⁸² Mardonius is thus assimilated to Paris, and both lose, but Mardonius emerges from the intertext as the more heroic figure, one who wants to fight and whose death helps to provide some sort of closure. The Paris challenge, by contrast, was embarrassing. Paris' initial challenge resulted in his running away when Menelaus stepped forward to answer it and it is only resumed when Hector has denounced his cowardice (appropriately in a taunt speech) and reissued it on the penitent Paris' behalf; and, when Paris has been defeated, the Trojans break the truce, full-scale war continues, and the challenge has settled nothing.

¹⁷⁹ Taunts by enemies: *Il.* 8.148–9, 160–71; 13.446–54. Taunts by one's own side: *Il.* 3.39–57; 4.338–48, 370–400; 7.96–102; 8.228–44; 11.385–95.

¹⁸⁰ *ἐκπαγλομένων ὡς οὔτε φεύγετε ἐκ πολέμου οὔτε τάξιν ἐκλείπετε*. This is a rare and peculiarly Herodotean verb, also used in 7.181 and 8.92, both describing Persian admiration of the courage of the Aeginetan Pytheas.

¹⁸¹ It appears in taunt speeches in *Il.* 4.340, 370–1 and seven times in descriptions of poor battle performance.

¹⁸² The Tegeans (9.62) are side-lined: 9.65 makes it 'the Spartans beat the Persians'.

Mardonius thus emerges as a better version of Paris and even a simulacrum of Hector.¹⁸³ The tone of what he says *is* triumphalist (and that continues in his further taunting remarks at 9.58, which pick up on both of the previous passages)—ironically so, in view of the outcome—but the Homeric hero is not given to measured discourse, and, if readers feel that Mardonius is eventually somewhat redeemed from the manipulative and self-centred figure we saw at the start of Book 7, that is the product not just of what is said of his role in the battle (9.63)—the leader who can inspire his troops wherever he appears on the battlefield (itself a Homeric trope?)—but of the Homeric intertexts that precede it.¹⁸⁴

What about his Spartan adversaries? Four individuals are in question, Amompharetus, Aristodemus, Callicrates, and Pausanias.

Perhaps Amompharetus' joke for the benefit of the Athenian messenger, replacing a voting pebble with a rock requiring two hands to lift, is a nod towards Homeric heroes and big rocks,¹⁸⁵ but on the whole the Amompharetus scene (9.53–7) has only at best rather general echoes of Homeric heroism. His eventual willingness to abandon his position is not un-Homeric (Homeric heroes sometimes retreat or are made to do so by their guardian gods), but it may make one think by contrast of Leonidas: that comparison has been in the air since Mardonius' comment on Sparta's false *kleos* in 9.48 (see above, p. 357)—and it is a comment he will repeat (9.58) in reference to the retreat of which Amompharetus becomes part.

The Callicrates episode (9.72) has been compared with the wounding of Menelaus in *Iliad* 4.127–219.¹⁸⁶ That episode is a huge set-piece—lots about his attacker Pandarus and his bow, a fine simile describing the wound, Agamemnon's despairing speech, medical treatment by Machaon, and so

¹⁸³ His death is foreshadowed as befits an epic hero (7.10θ.3; 8.114.2; 9.64.1), and there is a certain heroic quality when he envisages dying nobly in a great cause (*καλῶς τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον ὑπὲρ μεγάλων αἰωρηθέντα*) in 8.100.1. Flower–Marincola (2002) 9–11 see him as a Hector-like character with the moral failing of being an agent of imperialism.

¹⁸⁴ Another potentially Homeric Persian is Zopyrus, whose exceptional and exceptionally rewarded *ἀγαθοεργίη* involved a self-mutilation that recalls Odysseus' trip to Troy (*Od.* 4.242–64). Zopyrus secured Babylon whereas Odysseus only spied on Troy, but his role in its fall is recounted in an adjacent passage (*Od.* 4.265–89), so Zopyrus and Odysseus are globally comparable in their respective spheres, though Zopyrus (excelled only by Cyrus) is the more remarkable. But see West (2003) 428–33, reminding us that non-Homeric epic and the inventions of Zopyrus' family may be more directly instrumental here than Homer.

¹⁸⁵ Flower–Marincola (2002) 205, citing *Il.* 5.302–4. And a suggestion that Athenians are not real heroes?

¹⁸⁶ Fragoulaki, above, pp. 127–9.

forth—occurring at a crucial moment in a part of *Iliad* already evoked in Mardonius' challenge. So it is memorable, and the description of someone wounded by arrow before battle *might* call it to mind. But there *are* differences: Callicrates was wounded during the pause while Pausanias sought good omens to start fighting, whereas Menelaus is wounded during a truce. Unlike Callicrates, Menelaus is not sitting when hit (he is last heard of striding around looking for Paris), though the rest of army is presumably still seated since the duel. Menelaus was a unique (specially chosen) victim, Callicrates one of many (cf. 9.61.3), though that is not highlighted in 9.72. Callicrates regrets that he will not now perform the great deeds he is capable of: that half-resembles Agamemnon's fear that the death of Menelaus will mean both abandonment of the war on Troy and the loss of both Helen and Menelaus' body, but Callicrates' dignity is at odds with Agamemnon's extravagantly misplaced apprehension, just as the brevity of the whole account is at odds with a Homeric set piece that is at times comical and altogether a bit over the top. If we do think of Menelaus, we may allow that it adds some weight to the incident, but we shall also (maybe more powerfully) be led to reflect that the modern world is not the Homeric one (see below, p. 367) and to feel enhanced sympathy for Callicrates' banal but real death.

Sympathy and contrast with the modern world are also elements in the more complicated case of Aristodemus, the disgraced survivor of Thermopylae who redeemed himself in death at Plataea. In the Spartans' view Aristodemus was at fault for fighting crazily (*λυσσῶντα*: 9.71.3). This is the only Herodotean occurrence of a state of mind Homer attributes to Hector and Achilles¹⁸⁷—on both occasions, oddly enough, in passages dealing with attacks on walls, the topic of the previous chapter in Herodotus. It is a state of mind unacceptable in the modern Spartan world, especially as Aristodemus also broke ranks to achieve great deeds,¹⁸⁸ and he is denied recognition as the best of the Spartans who fought at Plataea. From this unsympathetic perspective there is once again a difference between Homer's world and the present, and it works against Aristodemus' claim to be a Homeric hero.

¹⁸⁷ *Il.* 9.237–9, 353 (the *λύσσα* of Hector who rages madly because he trusts in Zeus) and 21.542 (the *λύσσα* of Achilles when he might have captured Troy had not Apollo intervened)

¹⁸⁸ ἔργα ἀποδέξασθαι μεγάλα, exactly in the spirit of the Herodotean programme: μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά ... ἀποδεχθέντα ἀκλεῖα γένηται (1.0). But in the Spartan view such acts fall short of becoming an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός.

But the Spartan perspective is not the only one nor, as Barker points out elsewhere in this volume (above, pp. pp. 166–7, 169–74, 189–90, 197–9, 201–4), is *λυσσῶντα* the only intertextually significant word in the story of Aristodemus. Herodotus' Aristodemus fainted at Thermopylae but survived disgrace to fight another day and die heroically (7.229). Homer's Sarpedon loses consciousness in *Iliad* 5 but recovers to fight again and eventually die at the hands of Patroclus. An intertextual connection between these stories is triggered when a Herodotean *hapax* (*λιποψυχέοντα*: 7.229.1), describing Aristodemus' faint, evokes a unique Homeric use of *τὸν δὲ λίπε ψυχὴν* to describe Sarpedon's temporary loss of consciousness (*Il.* 5.696), and it is a connection that claims a great deal for Aristodemus, given Sarpedon's status in *Iliad*, not least because of his ideologically programmatic speech about the heroic leader's duty to his community (12.310–28). The Spartans disdained Aristodemus twice, once for fainting and not wanting to die and then for dying when he plainly wanted to die (9.71). But Herodotus explicitly disagrees with the Spartans' post-Plataea judgement (mooting *phthonos* as its cause), and through the intertext he arguably rates Aristodemus as one of the greatest and most tragic of Homeric heroes – though, of course, in a by now familiar reversal, he is not a *Greek* hero: for Sarpedon is a Lycian and the buttress of the city of Troy (*ἔρμα πόλῆος*: 16.549).

So far then, while Mardonius can claim some Homeric quality, the Spartan cases have been less straightforward—even contentious. And, even with Pausanias, things are not entirely different.

While the slaughter is going on, a female suppliant comes to Pausanias dressed in gold and other finery, the name of her father reveals a *xenia*-relationship, and the woman is spared from slavery.¹⁸⁹ Some detect here overtones of the meeting of Diomedes and the gold-armoured Glaucus in *Iliad* 6.119–236, where discovery of a *xenia*-relationship prompts gift-exchange rather than fighting.¹⁹⁰ If so, the rather notable absence of any stories about Pausanias' personal valour to Plataea (he is seen here 'directing'

¹⁸⁹ The lady uses a Homeric turn of phrase, describing the Persians as people who have regard (*ᾧπις*) neither for *daimones* nor gods and echoing the Athenians' reference to Mardonius' lack of *opis* for gods and heroes (8.143.2). *ᾧπις* occurs only in these passages in Herodotus and, although it is used in a non-Homeric way—in Homer *θεῶν ᾧπις* means the watchfulness of gods over men and their wrongdoings, whereas in Herodotus it is the respect men (should) show to the gods (a consequence of Homeric *θεῶν ᾧπις*)—the link and verbal colour are clear. But there is no more particular intertext involved.

¹⁹⁰ That Leutychidas' story about a different Glaucus in 6.86 is intertextually linked with this passage seems unlikely (Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 202). See also above, nn. 116, 136.

things during a massacre¹⁹¹) is partly compensated by a story that associates him with Homeric heroes who chose not to fight for honourable reasons (thus adding to his stature) and displays him behaving chivalrously to a woman (though, in *xenia* terms, he had little choice). But it is also another case of a famous Homeric scene (like the wounding of Menelaus, but much more dignified, notwithstanding Glaucus' moment of madness at the end) transmuted into something proper to the real world of 479.

When the fighting is finally over, Pausanias is celebrated for κλέος μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν for saving Greece (echoing—but exceeding? and also not communalising?—the *kleos* of Leonidas in Book 7 and his 'saving of Greece' in 8.114.2) and given prizes of women, horses, money, and camels, a list in which the women in particular recall the Homeric world¹⁹² and the camels insist upon the contemporary one. But then (in a moment that also intratexts with Leonidas) Pausanias is shown rejecting impalement of Mardonius' corpse in revenge for Xerxes' mutilation (decapitation) of Leonidas' body, declaring such behaviour more suited to barbarians, and in this he is entirely rejecting the *Iliad* model. As already observed (above, p. 355), in the *Iliad* corpses are mutilated by Greeks and in fact *only* by Greeks (Trojans threats of this sort are never fulfilled), but Pausanias will not play the role of an Achaean. His position is more in the spirit of *Od.* 22.411–18, where Odysseus rejects any gloating over dead enemies who have been adequately punished for their sins (as Leonidas has now been revenged). But those with precise recollection of *Odyssey* 22 will, of course, understand that Pausanias' attitude is in part a tribute to Mardonius' status: Odysseus is protective of the dead suitors, but the serving women are hanged and Melanthius is gruesomely mutilated. (When the Athenians indulge in barbarian behaviour towards Artayctes they have a Homeric precedent, but only if Artayctes, as a sinner against the shrine of a Homeric hero, is deemed to have forfeited the rights due to an aristocratic opponent.)

As a pendant to the Achilles-like prizes, Herodotus reports Pausanias' use of the accoutrements of Mardonius' royal tent to make a comparison between Persian and Spartan dining. The king concludes the demonstration describing the poor Greek fare that the Persians unaccountably wished to

¹⁹¹ Δίεπειν is the word Homer used of Odysseus getting the army back to assembly in *Iliad* 2—staff-officer terminology? The passage is formally part of the post-battle round-up, not the battle narrative itself.

¹⁹² E.g., the gifts for Achilles in *Il.* 9.122–30: tripods, talents, cauldrons, horses, gold, and women.

appropriate as *δίαιτα οἰζυρή* (9.82.3), using a Homeric poetic adjective proper to war, grief, and human wretchedness (but not food) that is found only here in Herodotus and not again until the second century AD—a final darkly humorous epic flourish for the depiction of Pausanias the hero, and one that underlines how un-Homeric Spartan *diaita* is. No hero would have eaten like that or thought it consonant with his status, and once again it turns out that the Spartans of 479 are not really Homeric heroes.

In fact, the only way in which that is absolutely not true in the Plataea narrative is the fact that Pausanias wins unparalleled *kleos*. The Thersander story in a sense prefigures Plataea as a final epic showdown, and it can be said that the Achaean hero Pausanias wins out over the Trojan hero Mardonius. But, although the narrative is one of epic proportion and literary presence, Herodotus has used intertexts to maintain a distance between the plain of Plataea (and especially the Greeks on it) and the plain of Troy. Ironically it is the Athenian assault on the stockade that comes closest to being a Homeric event—and it is one of those that confuses the Achaean–Greek and Trojan–Persian categories.

4. Concluding Remarks

We are dealing here with a topic where the devil is in the details. But some more general observations are possible by way of summary.

1. Intentionality can be an issue (see above, pp. 300, 323, 327–32, 342–3, 348, 354 (n. 171)). But the plentiful use of *hapax legomena* (both unique Herodotean use of Homeric words and Herodotean use of unique Homeric words and occasionally both) argues a discriminating knowledge of Homeric language that favours the possibility of quite slight linguistic hints (syntactical as well as lexical) being picked up,¹⁹³ and intratextual phenomena (cf. n. 197), including the adjacency of strong and faint allusions (e.g., pp. 332, 348), can assist the spotting and validation of relatively slight intertexts. In any case, there is no doubt that allusive intertexts do exist. If ancient commentators did not notice them, they were being blind, and if they did notice them but thought them uninteresting, their judgement must strike us as awry.

¹⁹³ For *hapax* and near-*hapax* uses see above, pp. 310, 316, 326, 328, 333, 334, 342, 348, 351, 354, 357, 359, 360, 362, 366 and nn. 64, 103, 130, 147, 168, 171, 175, 189. One may also note the deliberately restricted use of two iconic Homeric words, *kleos* (above, p. 366) and *mēnis* (above, pp. 330, 354).

2. The number considering the size of the text is not perhaps very large.¹⁹⁴ Whether it is larger than for any other target in Herodotus or for any other prose author intertexting with Homer is a matter for investigation. One suspects the answer is yes in both cases, though the issue may be complicated by later authors intertexting with Homeric Herodotus.

3. The relatively small number of specific intertexts in Herodotus means that they sit within a wider text that is (a) all in a sense Homeric inasmuch as 1.0–5 marks the *Histories* as such and the work's very general characteristics—long, leisurely, and digressive narrative about war and politics in many different settings—concur, but (b) often obedient to different literary and intellectual agendas. They are small islands in a large sea.

4. The target texts are not evenly spread across the entire Homeric corpus. There are several uses of *Iliad* 2 and 24 and of the middle books of *Iliad* (where the Achaeans are under pressure) but little sign (apart from 24) of the phase in which Achilles is back in the fray. Specific intertexts with *Odyssey* are less numerous (even though 1.5.3–4 makes the work programmatically fundamental) and relate to fairly limited parts of the work. The intertexts are also not spread evenly across the text of Herodotus. Scholars have been not as generous in alleging non-explicit Homeric intertexts in Book 2 or 4,¹⁹⁵ though both contain notable explicit references. Of course, full-blown ethnographic description is probably not going to engage with Homer in detail. But even in the historical narrative parts of *Histories* Homer's detailed impact seems comparatively small until we reach Books 5–9. Those are the books of the Persian War proper, and that is probably not coincidental. But one should acknowledge the possibility that modern readers have not looked for intertexts with the same attention in all parts of the work, because they have started out with certain assumptions about where they will be found.

5. Where intertexts do occur, they are found in association with important points in the structure of the text (above, pp. 296–300, 305–7, 309, 310–11, 311–15, 341, 345) and/or important events or trains of events in the narrative (above, pp. 306, 311–15, 323, 329, 331, 340–62). It is Herodotus' judgement of what belongs in this category that results in a dearth of cases in Books 1–4, apart from the Lydia sequence (above, pp. 309–10, 330–1, 340–1), Cambyses in Egypt (above, pp. 314–15, 320–1), and

¹⁹⁴ The dataset underlying this essay involves about 115 passages of varying extent.

¹⁹⁵ The intertext-of-absence in 4.177 seems clear (above, pp. 324–5). I am uncertain about 4.9–10 (above, n. 103) and about the impact of analogies or contrasts between Scythian habits and Homeric material noted by Skinner (2018) 220 (drinking) and Hartog (1988) 161 (booty).

some weaker touches in Darius' early reign,¹⁹⁶ and also leaves something of a gap between the battle of Lade (which ends a long sequence of material stretching back to 5.65) and Marathon. Once we reach Book 7 what count as important events come in a more continuous sequence, at least from Thermopylae onwards, and even the period between Salamis and Plataea attracts intertexts—which is to say that it is regarded as important in its own right.

6. There is a very important element of intratextual connection between intertext-marked material.¹⁹⁷ In some cases this helps to validate the recognition that an intertext is present at a particular point. The way in which a particular linguistic feature can mark a number of distinct passages that turn out to have a coherent message is striking (see, e.g., above, pp. 327–30, 335–7), as is the recurrent use of *Iliad* 2 and 24.

7. Intertexts can be in the narrator's voice or that of one of the in-text characters. They can trade on language (words and phrases), literary structure, episode-types, speech-types, other compositional elements, intratextual linkage, subject-type, or narrative content¹⁹⁸—and these are not, of course, mutually exclusive categories—and they can target (i) a specific Homeric passage (or perhaps two distinct specific passages at once: above, pp. 307–8, 337, 360), (ii) a set of Homeric passages (defined by language or content)¹⁹⁹ or (iii) a more generic Homeric feel (though in practice this last category is probably only an extended, if fuzzy, version of the second one). Their tone or effect can be notably jokey, sardonic, or even satirical (above, pp. 317–19, 323, 326, 333, 339, 346, 348, 351, 352, 359), and a wider range of cases may claim to display a certain degree of humour (e.g., above, pp. 335–8) or to be a source of enjoyment (above, pp. 302, 304–5, 325, 328, 336–7). But there is also tonal neutrality or positive sobriety, and, although the

¹⁹⁶ An intratextual link to a Hesiodic intertext (above, p. 305), the no-more-than-generically Homeric catalogue of tribute-*nomoi* (above, n. 90), Atossa (above, n. 101), faint Homeric echoes in 3.127.2–128.1 with *Il.* 10.303 (Hector invites volunteers) and *Il.* 3.316, 7.161–83 (the use of lots in passages reflected elsewhere in Herodotus: above, p. 337), and the case of Zopyrus (above, n. 184). The big intertextual show-piece of the accession narrative is the constitutional debate which belongs to an entirely non-Homeric part of Herodotus' intellectual tool-kit.

¹⁹⁷ Above, pp. 301, 305, 305–6, 307, 308, 309–10, 312, 313, 315, 317, 318, 319, 322–3, 327, 329, 331, 335–7, 340–1, 343, 344, 346, 346–7, 348, 351, 354, 355, 356, 361.

¹⁹⁸ This includes *absence* of content: Lotophagi (above, pp. 324–5), physiologically vivid deaths (above, p. 351).

¹⁹⁹ One may stand out as particularly telling: above, pp. 312–14, 335–7, 345–6.

representation of Persian decision-making at the start of Book 7 is in one sense absurd, it is not a joke. Intertexts can add colour, weight, grandeur, or emotional charge (above, pp. 301, 311, 312, 327, 335, 340–1, 343, 344, 347, 348, 349, 354, 358). And even when we *are* invited to smile, we are generally also invited to see a serious point.

8. The way intertexts work is quite variable. All intertexts involve juxtaposing distinct discursive environments. But the degree of contrast beyond that default distinctness may differ; and the way in which any contrast plays in terms of the point the intertext is meant to make and the extent to which it either reinforces or disrupts the message of the surface text (which may itself not be unnuanced) is variable.

Most intertexts serve to reinforce the message of the surface text, though that judgement depends a bit on how one defines that surface message. (There may be a danger of circularity here.) They can do so by virtue either of analogy or contrast or a bit of both.²⁰⁰ Slight contrasts need not disturb the reinforcing quality. Both modes can appear separately in cases that thematically run in parallel (e.g., above, pp. 324–8). The precise mechanisms that generate a contrast are variable, though not so much so that precise categorisation would be worth the effort.

Not infrequently something is revealed by an intertext that is not immediately so obvious (or obvious at all) in the surface text. That something is rather often negative, though that judgement is subjective: whether the revelation that freedom or slavery amounts to life or death (above, p. 333) is negative rather than heroic is debatable. It is a certainly a feature of intertexts that they may make the reader think of unarticulated aspects of the surface text/situation (e.g., above, pp. 289–90, 304, 306–7, 350). Often these additional perspectives do go along with general reinforcement of a surface message. But on other occasions they may be the principal effect of the intertext, which in that case is disruptive rather than reinforcing. Particular categories here are warning signs unnoticed by the actors in the story (above, pp. 312, 320–1, 329, 331–2, 339, 344–5, 345–6) and cases in which they undermine themselves (above, pp. 301–2, 305, 332–40, 348). The link between Herodotus' Odyssean character in 1.5.3–4 and the presence of a Persia-Ithaca intertext in 9.122 is a particularly charming example (above, pp. 310–11): the mere fact that the intertext is there in the final lines of

²⁰⁰ Analogy: above, pp. 304, 305–6, 309, 310–11, 314–15, 317–19, 320–1, 321, 322–3, 324, 330, 332, 333, 348, 349, 351, 353, 354 Contrast: above, pp. 306–7, 308, 309, 312, 315, 323, 325, 326, 329, 333, 335, 338, 349, 351, 357, 358. Both: above, pp. 341–3, 349–50, 355–6. Classification is this sort is a bit crude and subjective.

Histories and relates to one at the start of the work is far more important than its precise meaning in the context in which it is placed.

9. Sometimes it is hard to say what an intertext is about either because there may not be an answer (above, pp. 324–5, 327–8, 329, 342) or because the answer is ambiguous (above, pp. 309, 320, 325, 328)—though ambiguity might be a point in its own right (above, n. 168)—or because, though an answer can be found, Herodotus’ intention in articulating it remains unclear (above, pp. 331–2). More normally, however, one (thinks one) can recognise that a point is being made and why. (That is, of course, implicit in the judgements about reinforcement and disruption in the previous paragraph.) It must be acknowledged that there is a significant element of subjectivity involved, and that any exposition of identifications and explanations of intertexts, including this one, runs the risk of imposing distinct form on what is by nature an elusive activity.²⁰¹

Each individual intertext can in principle work independently as an invitation to the reader to view something from a different perspective and be amused (in the broadest sense) and/or instructed by the sight. But certain themes do emerge, which is unsurprising given the phenomenon of intratextuality and the linkage of intertexts with important moments in the narrative.

Some intertexts establish or reinforce basic things about Herodotus and his programme (including an elusive attitude to truth), giving him Homeric identity and status, while affirming distinctness and, if not superiority, then at least a human intellectual authority more appropriate to the world in which he was writing (above, pp. 296–300, 305–7, 310–11, 315–19).

Then there are themes arising from the author’s programme. Fame only rarely plays out in literally Homeric terms (*kleos*), and for that reason is particularly notable when it does (above, pp. 296–7, 301, 315–18, 354, 357, 361). But that both Herodotus’ own fame and the wonderful things he preserves from oblivion are generally not so classified symbolises rather well the historian’s claim to be doing something Homeric but in his own way. It is analogous to the shifting of *peripeteiai* from the actual experience of the Odyssean historian to the material through which he passes (above, pp. 297–8), and (once again), although that theme (the vulnerability of *eudaimoniē*) plays out through Homeric passages (above, pp. 297–8, 299–300, 308–9, 311–15, 327, 354), it is omnipresent in other guises. Another programme-

²⁰¹ See Pelling, above, pp. 44–5. Olga Tribulato’s essay (above, Ch. 8) exemplifies in a special case the mayhem that can result when people take a view about intertextual relation and then (literally) adjust the text to make it work better.

related theme (women, sex and historical causation: above, pp. 307–8), recurs in Homerised form: the ‘fame’ of Rhodopis and Archidice (above, p. 316), the distasteful tale of Periander and Melissa (above, p. 342), Xerxes’ loss of agency to a woman in a sex-centred story (above, p. 326), the manipulative Homer-quoting Artayctes mistreating women at the Protesilaum (above, n. 43), and (more decorously) the faint Olympian court overtones of Atossa and Darius (above, n. 101).

These last three items also belong in another thematic cluster, the Homerisation of Persia: we see Persian success (above, pp. 314–15), grandeur (above, p. 322) and even a touch of epic heroism (above, pp. 324, 356, 357, 361),²⁰² but also Persian hypocrisy (above, pp. 303, 315) and weakness (above, pp. 313, 320–1, 326, 330, 333, 335–7, 349–50, 351, 354). And Homeric treatment is also, of course, applied to the other major national players in the story.

Sparta comes out of it badly before the end of Book 7 (above, pp. 315, 341) and at the start of Book 9 (above, p. 354), but shines at Thermopylae and Plataea: and yet in the latter context Spartans are persistently marked as non-Homeric (albeit meritorious) and that even affects Pausanias, for all that he has the Homeric accolade of κλέος μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. They belong (or see themselves as belonging) to a modern, not a Homeric world. Although it may seem unfair to Aristodemus (above, p. 359), this attitude is not necessarily bad, if it means suffering a dignified death rather than being part of an epic circus (above, p. 359) or (more seriously) setting one’s face against the mutilation of a dead adversary’s corpse (above, p. 361). Perhaps valuing community against extravagant individualism (already seen at Thermopylae, where *kleos* is for the city, not just Leonidas: 7.220.2, 4) is a good thing, and helps account for the strange way in which it is Mardonius who plays the more uncomplicatedly Homeric role. But that also draws attention to a final twist in the Spartan theme. *Kleos* at Thermopylae was communal, but Pausanias’ *kleos* is strikingly *not* marked in that way.

²⁰² Is there (provocatively) originally a touch of this in Xerxes? Mardonius wanted a good *logos* among men for Xerxes ‘best of Persians, past, present, and future’ (7.5.9); Carey (2016) 82 notes that the singularity of Leonidas (with his long genealogy: 7.204) matches the singularity of Xerxes, who has κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος (7.187)—and a genealogy too (7.11), albeit shorter; and Xerxes wanted to leave μνημόσυνα (7.24), which are a bid for fame—and even *kleos* (cf. above, pp. 315–17)?—of a sort also encountered at Thermopylae (7.226.2). Desire for power and for profit won by risk-taking (7.24.50) is not a necessary disqualification for Homeric status. But Xerxes is probably doomed from the outset (above, pp. 349–50) and develops both intertextually and otherwise as an increasingly unappealing figure. Mardonius perhaps ends better than he started, Xerxes certainly worse.

Herodotus and his readers know that Pausanias later (allegedly) went to the bad by trying to become a quasi-Persian (5.32). The story of the two dinners at Plataea has often been seen as a proleptic hint at that development. Perhaps the management of Pausanias' fame and Mardonius' heroism are part of a similar strategy.

Contrast between the Homeric and contemporary fifth-century world, present by default in *all* intertexts and sometimes more specifically thematised (above, pp. 297, 307, 317, 322–3, 331, 351, 354, 358–61),²⁰³ is relevant to Athens and two final interconnected themes.

The longest coherent sequence of Homerisms has a persistently Athenian focus or reference (above, pp. 305, 341–8), and the Athenians figure in Homeric intertexts at many other points as well (above, pp. 303, 305–6, 310, 315, 320, 324, 328, 329, 332, 334, 340, 352–4, 357, 361). Some of these intertexts are neutral or positive moments from the point of view of Athens' reputation: they are beneficiaries of the Homeric fourth-attack principle and Darius' ill-judged prayer, they describe Mardonius as without regard (*opis*) for the gods, and deploy Homer rather shockingly (but effectively) in complaining about desertion by Sparta, something that also evokes their Homeric 'wrath'. (Whether their impalement of Artayctes is a justified divergence for Pausanias' non-mutilation principle is more debatable: above, p. 361.)

But the rest of the intertextual material is another matter. Athens faces disaster like Phaeacia, provides troops who scatter in un-Homeric fashion, and is the home of the intertextual shape-changer Themistocles and (if Irwin is to be believed) the target of a critical reading of *Odyssey* 9. Above all, the city figures at high-profile moments that intersect with inversions of the expected Trojan War/Persian War parallel to produce Achaean Persians and Trojan Greeks (above, p. 304) and proleptic forays into Greek history after the end of *Histories*. Both intersections associate the Homerisation of Athens with awkward topics: Athens' future history as a successful competitor for hegemony (even a tyrant city²⁰⁴) and the propriety of overt linkage between the Trojan and Persian Wars in public political discourse. Herodotus' Athenians sometimes do not want to be Homeric (their own achievements need no epic gloss or precedent: 9.28), but high-profile passages make them produce bad (and ineffective) claims to be quasi-

²⁰³ Cf. Haywood, above, pp. 75–81; Pelling, above, pp. 48, 51–2, 54; Fragoulaki, above, pp. 122, 149.

²⁰⁴ Hippias' remarks do invite that specific gloss by linking the future Athens with her Pisistratid predecessor.

Achaean or actually turn them into Trojans: one of the latter category concerns the very event that the Athenians of 9.28 claim renders epic precedent irrelevant (an event they actually celebrated publicly with a Homeric gloss) and another specifically associates the inversion with proleptic reference to Athenian *arkhē*.

Nobody can be truly Homeric in the modern age. The closest to an unequivocal Homeric achievement within the *Histories*, measured by the acquisition of *kleos*, is the Spartan one at Thermopylae and that of Pausanias at Plataea, but the former is rooted in annihilation (and involves role-inversion) and the latter is under a shadow from future history. The Athenians do not achieve *kleos* and future history throws a significantly larger shadow on their Homeric pretensions—to the point that they might do better not to nurture them.

10. Which does, of course, raise a question about the historian himself. He has pictured the *Histories* itself as a Homeric achievement, albeit one for which he does not explicitly award himself *kleos* and which is distanced from the original in various ways. Is he entitled to do that? Is it prudent to do it?

Athenians who associated Marathon with the capture of Troy or their achievements more generally against Persia with those of the Homeric Achaeans were investing a large amount of Hellenic cultural capital in modern politics and warfare. If the results were disturbing, whether for subjects of Athenians rule or for the Athenians themselves (since *eudaimoniē* is vulnerable), that cultural capital was in danger of being badly disfigured. And since the results of politics and warfare will always be viewed negatively by some parties, this is always a danger in comparable circumstances. The historian was not trying to conquer the world (or even just the Aegean), but he was trying to stake out a claim in the metaphorical world of Greek literature. Was there less risk that anyone might think that the result dishonoured Homer? In principle no. But *Histories* betokens a degree of authorial self-confidence that guarantees that, if Herodotus contemplated that question (as logically he should have done), he judged the risk extremely small, and in the event he was clearly justified. That the story-line of *Histories* could properly constitute an epic narrative of heroic events was always unlikely to be disputed by many Greek readers: in those general terms it was itself part of the cultural capital of classical Greece. More specific intertextual features were *not* intended to dictate attitudes but to provoke questions and highlight what remain unresolved ambiguities: intertextual worries about Athens (and invitations to contemplate her post-479 history in other less Homeric passages) coexist with the ringing but admittedly controversial

endorsement of the Athenian stance and contribution in 480 (7.139). *Historiē* does not provide black-and-white answers. As an investigator Herodotus took on a role sometimes performed by men of power in the world of politics and warfare (above, pp. 317–19). But he could fairly claim to be performing it in a way that was both more far-reaching and more disinterested: everyone can be the object but no one is the target of his questioning. And, if people said that he was a teller of tales and even (in the manner of Plutarch) a biased teller of tales, he had at his disposal the reasonable rejoinder that he made no programmatic claim to be a truth-teller and that his advertised models, Homer and Odysseus, were just the same.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asheri, D. (2007) 'Book III', in id., A. B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*, edd. O. Murray and A. Moreno (Oxford) 379–527.
- , ed. (2003) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VIII, La vittoria di Temistocle* (Milan).
- and P. Vannicelli, edd. (2006) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro IX, La battaglia di Platea* (Milan).
- Bakker, E., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).
- Baragwanath, E. (2007) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Blösel, W. (2004) *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart).
- Boedeker, D. (1988) 'Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus' *Histories*', *ClAnt* 7: 30–48.
- (2002) 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 97–116.
- (2003) 'Pedestrian Fatalities: the Prosaics of Death in Herodotus', in P. S. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford) 17–36.
- Bowie, A. M., ed. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Bowie, E. (2018a) 'The Lesson of Book 2', in Harrison–Irwin (2018) 53–74.
- , ed. (2018b) *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston).
- Carey, C. (2016) 'Homer and Epic in Herodotus Book 7', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou, edd., *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–89.
- Christ, M. (1994) 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry', *ClAnt* 13: 167–202.
- Currie, B. (2021) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Supplement 13; Oxford, Edmonton, and Tallahassee).
- Demont, P. (2009) 'Figures of Inquiry in Herodotean Inquiries', *Mnemosyne* 62: 179–205.
- Dewald, C. (1987) 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa* 20: 147–70.
- and J. Marincola, edd., (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds); rev. and expanded trans. by J. G. Howie of *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* (Berlin and New York, 1971).
- Flower, M. A. and J. Marincola, edd. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).

- Friedman, R. (2006) 'Location and Dislocation in Herodotus', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 165–77.
- Friedrich, R. (2011) 'Odysseus and Achilleus in the *Iliad*: Hidden Hermeneutic Horror in Readings of the *Presbeia*', *Hermes* 139: 271–90.
- Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (London and New York).
- Grethlein, J. (2006) 'The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: the Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153–163', *AJPh* 127: 485–509.
- (2010) *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).
- Griffiths, A. (2006) 'Stories and Storytelling in the *Histories*', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 130–44.
- Harrison, T. and E. Irwin, edd. (2018) *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Hart, J. (1982) *Herodotus and Greek History* (London and Canberra).
- Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: An Essay on the Representation of 'the Other'* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London); trans. by J. Lloyd of *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre* (Paris, 1980).
- Haubold, J. (2007) 'Xerxes' Homer', in E. Bridges, E. Hall, and P. J. Rhodes, edd., *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford) 47–63.
- Hazewindus, M. W. (2004). *When Women Interfere: Studies in the Role of Women in Herodotus' Histories* (Amsterdam).
- Henderson, J. (2007) "'The Fourth Dorian Invasion'" and "'The Ionian Revolt'", in Irwin–Greenwood (2007) 289–310.
- Hornblower, S., ed. (1994) *Greek Historiography* (Oxford).
- (2013) *Herodotus: Histories Book V* (Cambridge).
- and C. Pelling, edd. (2017) *Herodotus: Histories Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Irwin, E. (2014) 'Ethnography and Empire: Homer and the Hippocratics in Herodotus' Ethiopian *Logos*, 3.17–26', *Histos* 8: 25–75.
- and E. Greenwood, edd. (2007) *Reading Herodotus: Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories* (Oxford).
- Johnson, D. M. (2001) 'Herodotus' Story-telling Speeches: Socles (5.92) and Leotychides (6.86)', *CJ* 97: 1–26.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2006) 'The Homeric Narrator and his own *Kleos*', *Mnemosyne* 59: 188–207.
- (2012) 'The Helen *Logos* and Herodotus' Fingerprint', in E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker, edd., *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford) 127–42.
- Lanfranchi, G. B. (2002) 'The Cimmerians at the Entrance of the Netherworld: Filtration of Assyrian Cultural and Ideological Elements

- into Archaic Greece', *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Galileiana di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Parte III: Memorie della Classe di Scienze Morali, Lettere ed Arti* 114: 75–112.
- Lateiner, D. (1977) 'No Laughing Matter: a Literary Tactic in Herodotus', *TAPhA* 107: 173–82.
- Marincola, J. (2006) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald–Marincola (2006) 13–28.
- (2007) 'Odysseus and the Historians', *SyllClass* 18: 1–79.
- (2018) 'Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus', in E. Bowie (2018b) 3–24.
- Meissner, B. (2004) 'Strategies in Herodotus', in V. Karageorghis and I. Taifacos, edd., *The World of Herodotus* (Nicosia) 223–38.
- Moles, J. (1996) 'Herodotus Warns the Athenians', *PLLS* 9: 259–84.
- (1999) 'Ἀνάθημα καὶ κτῆμα: The Inscriptional Inheritance of Ancient Historiography', *Histos* 3: 27–69.
- (2007) "'Saving" Greece from the "Ignominy" of Tyranny? The "Famous" and "Wonderful" Speech of Socles (5.92)', in Irwin–Greenwood (2007) 245–68.
- Murray, O. (1993) *Early Greece*² (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- Nagy, G. (1987) 'Herodotus the *Logios*', *Arethusa* 20: 175–85.
- Olson, S. D., ed. (2002) *Aristophanes: Acharnians* (Oxford).
- Pelling, C. (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* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2013) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- (2016) 'Herodotus, Polycrates—and Maybe Stesimbrotus Too?', *JHS* 136: 113–20.
- (2018) 'Causes in Competition: Herodotus and Hippocratics', in E. Bowie (2018b) 199–222.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- (2020a) 'Homer and the Question Why', in C. Constantakopoulou and M. Fragoulaki, edd., *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (*Histos* Supplement 11; Newcastle) 1–35.
- (2020b) 'Fifth Century Preliminaries', in K. de Temmerman, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography* (Oxford) 87–99.
- Provencal, V. (2015) *Sophist Kings: Persians as Other in Herodotus* (London).
- Quack, J. (2013) 'Quelques apports récents des études démotiques à la compréhension du livre II d'Hérodote', in L. Coulon, P. Giovanelli-

- Jouanna and F. Kimmell-Clauzet, edd., *Hérodote et l'Égypte: regards croisés sur le livre II de l'Enquête d'Hérodote* (Lyon) 63–88.
- Raaflaub, K. (2002) 'Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 149–86.
- Richardson, N. J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21–24* (Cambridge).
- Romm, J. S. (1998) *Herodotus* (New Haven and London).
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 13–37.
- Skinner, J. (2018) 'Herodotus and his World', in Harrison–Irwin (2018) 187–224.
- Stadter, P. (1992) 'Herodotus and the Athenian *Arche*', *ASNP*³ 22: 781–809.
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).
- Tuplin, C. J. (2003) 'Heroes in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, L. Prandi, and G. Zecchini, edd., *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea* (Rome) 115–56.
- Vannicelli, P. (1993) *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (Rome).
- , A. Corcella, and G. Nenci, edd. (2017) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VII, Serse e Leonida* (Milan).
- West, S. R. (2003) 'Croesus' Second Reprieve and Other Tales of the Persian Court', *CQ* 53: 416–37.
- Xydopoulos, I. K. (2015) 'The Cimmerians: their Origins, Movements and their Difficulties', in G. Tsetskhladze, A. Avram, and J. Hargrave, edd., *The Danubian Lands between the Black, Aegean and Adriatic Seas* (Oxford) 119–23.