HERODOTUS—THE MOST HOMERIC HISTORIAN?

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

T his 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 Naoíse 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*.

1

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

A n 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

[1] Marincola (2018) 3.

qualification. However, the fact that Herodotus was the most Homeric among ancient historians—ὁμηρικώτατος, to use pseudo-Longinus' adjective[2]—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 (ὑψηγορία) 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 ζηλωτὴς 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: Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος, παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἀφ᾽ αὑτοῦ 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 Ὅμηρον, 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*—ᾄδων 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 ἥκειν οἱ νομίσας τὸν καιρόν, οὗ μάλιστα ἐγλίχετο, πλήθουσαν τηρήσας τὴν πανήγυριν, ἀπανταχόθεν ἤδη τῶν ἀρίστων συνειλεγμένων, παρελθὼν ἐς τὸν ὀπισθόδομον οὐ θεατήν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγωνιστὴν Ὀλυμπίων παρεῖχεν ἑαυτὸν ᾄδων 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. Higbie (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 ἀείδω, '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 ἄειδε θεά Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος, *Il.* 1.1).[17] ἀείδω is always used in Homeric epics and other archaic poetry to indicate singing, and is often related to the activity of the bard (ἀοιδός ἀείδε).[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 διατρίβειν πολλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ δὴ καὶ μάλιστα ἐν Ὁμήρῳ, 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, ἀείδω 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 ἀοιδῇσι κλείουσαι, | δεῦτε Δί᾽ 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 ἀείδω 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 *Epigonoi* (4.32),[28] and the Ὁμήρεια ἔπεα being recited at Sicyon and banned by tyrant Cleisthenes.[29] In fact, the expression Ὁμήρεια 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 *Epigonoi* see Currie (2015) and Cingano (2015) respectively.

[29] Hdt. 5.67.1: ταῦτα δέ, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐμιμέετο ὁ Κλεισθένης οὗτος τὸν ἑωυτοῦ μητροπάτορα Κλεισθένεα τὸν Σικυῶνος τύραννον. Κλεισθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψῳδοὺς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέαται ('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 τῇ γνώμῃ[33] καὶ Ὁμήρου ἔπος ἐν Ὀδυσσηίῃ ἔχον ὧδε·
> '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 (τεκμηριοῖ δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος), 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 2.116[36]— 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 intertexts[39]— 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: $\mathring{\hat{η}}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma'\ o\mathring{\imath}\mu\acute{\omega}\xi\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \acute{o}\ \Pi\epsilon\lambda o\pi\acute{\imath}\delta\eta s\ \mathring{A}\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu\omega\nu\ \pi\upsilon\theta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu os\ \Sigma\pi\alpha\rho\tau\iota\mathring{\eta}\tau\alpha s\ \tau\mathring{η}\nu\ \mathring{η}\gamma\epsilon\mu o\nu\acute{\imath}\eta\nu\ \mathring{a}\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\rho\mathring{η}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \mathring{v}\pi\grave{o}\ \Gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\nu\acute{o}s\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}\ \Sigma\upsilon\rho\eta\kappa o\sigma\acute{\imath}\omega\nu$ (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: $\mathring{\hat{η}}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma'\ o\mathring{\imath}\mu\acute{\omega}\xi\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu\ \mathring{\imath}\pi\pi\eta\lambda\acute{a}\tau\alpha\ \Pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\acute{v}s$ ('Surely, he would groan aloud, Peleus, the aged horseman'). The expression $\mathring{\hat{η}}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma'\ o\mathring{\imath}\mu\acute{\omega}\xi\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \acute{o}\ \Pi\epsilon\lambda o\pi\acute{\imath}\delta\eta s\ \mathring{A}\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu\omega\nu$ 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 Ὅμηρος ὁ ἐποποιὸς ἄνδρα ἄριστον ἔφησε ἐς Ἴλιον ἀπικέσθαι τάξαι τε καὶ διακοσμῆσαι 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 Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς.
τῷ δ᾽ οὔ πώ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ᾽ ἀνὴρ
κοσμῆσαι 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 εὕρηται σχῆμα ὅμοιον τῷ Ὁμηρικῷ ἐν τῷ "ἦ 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 Ἀχιλληίου πόλιος ὁρμώμενοι καὶ Σιγείου ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνὸν Μυτιληναῖοί τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἱ μὲν ἀπαιτέοντες τὴν χώρην, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὔτε συγγινωσκόμενοι ἀποδεικνύντες τε λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετεὸν τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης ἢ οὐ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, ὅσοι Ἑλλήνων συνεξεπρήξαντο Μενέλεῳ τὰς Ἑλένης ἁρπαγάς.

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 ἐόντες ὡυτοὶ νῦν ἂν εἶεν φλαυρότεροι, καὶ τότε ἐόντες 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 ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών. τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ σμικρὰ αὐτῶν γέγονε· τὰ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρά, '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 πολλῷ 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 ἀπίκετο Ξέρξης, ἐς τὸ Πριάμου Πέργαμον ἀνέβη ἵμερον ἔχων θεήσασθαι· θεησάμενος δὲ καὶ πυθόμενος ἐκείνων ἕκαστα τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἔθυσε βοῦς 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 Παυσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδεω, 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, πάρεστέ 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 engage-
ment 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 ἀδνρῶν, 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: ἄειδε 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: ὤλετο μέν 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 ὑπερφυὲς μέγαθός τε καὶ κάλλος) so much so that 'the god has granted you the greatest glory of all Greeks of whom we know' (καί τοι θεὸς παρέδωκε ῥυσάμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα κλέος καταθέσθαι μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, 9.78.2). How these occurrences react *intra*textually within the *Histories* and *inter*textually 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: ἄειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν ('Singing of the glorious deeds of warriors'); *Il.* 9.524–5: οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν | ἡρώων ('So it was in former times too, the famous tales we have heard of heroes'); *Od.* 8.73: Μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν 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 ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών), he was clearly recalling the Odyssean phrase ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα 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 *exampla* 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):

ὃς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τεκτήνατο νῆας ἐΐσας
ἀρχεκάκους, αἳ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γένοντο
οἷ τ' αὐτῷ, ἐπεὶ οὔ τι θεῶν ἐκ θέσφατα ᾔδη.

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: αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί 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 οὐδῷ ('on the threshold of old age') occurring at *Il.* 22.60 (δύσμορον, ὅν ῥα πατὴρ Κρονίδης ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ | αἴσῃ ἐν ἀργαλέῃ φθείσει, 'ill-fated man, whom the father, the son of Cronus, will destroy at the threshold of old age'); 24.486–7 (μνῆσαι πατρὸς σοῖο, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ | τηλίκου ὥς περ ἐγών, ὀλοῷ ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ, '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 (εἴπ' ἄγε μοι περὶ μητρὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοι | πατρός θ', ὃν κατέλειπεν ἰὼν ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ, '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 ἑταίρου πένθος ἄξιον ἦν δακρύων, ὃς ἐκ πολλῶν τε καὶ εὐδαιμόνων ἐκπεσὼν ἐς πτωχηίην ἀπῖκται ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ ('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 (ὣς γὰρ ἄμεινον 'for it is better this way'); *Il.* 1.274 (ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὕμμες, 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 εἰδέναι τὴν ἐμεωυτοῦ 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 εἰπὲ 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 ἐγώ 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 ἠδὲ τοκῆες; ('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: ὤνθρωπε, τίς τε ἐὼν καὶ κόθεν τῆς Φρυγίης ἥκων 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 ὅ μευ 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 Phocaean 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 ἵσταται ἀκμῆς | ἢ μάλα λυγρὸς ὄλεθρος Ἀχαιοῖς ἠὲ βιῶναι· | ἀλλ᾽ ἴθι 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 ἵσταται ἀκμῆς); *Anth. Pal.* 7.250.1, ascribed to Simonides (ἀκμᾶς ἑστακυῖαν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν, cf. Plut. *Her. mal.* 870A); *Anth. Pal.* 9.475.2, anonymous (ὑμῖν ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται 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 (τήν σφιν θεὸς ἔμβαλε θυμῷ); 20.195–6 (ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ | βάλλεαι); 23.313 = 15.172–3 (ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δὴ σὺ 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.

βάλλευ); 19.485 = 23.260 (ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθης καὶ τοι θεὸς 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 ὦν 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, ὦ 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 φρεσί instead of ἐνὶ θυμῷ: *Il.* 1.297: ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσι ('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 γλυκὺν ἵμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ | ἀνδρὶ καταθνητῷ μιχθήμεναι ('But Zeus cast a sweet longing into Aphrodite's own heart to couple with a mortal man'); 53: Ἀγχίσεω δ' ἄρα οἱ γλυκὺν ἵμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ ('So he cast into her heart a sweet longing for Anchises'); 143: ὣς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἵμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ ('With these words the goddess cast sweet longing into his heart', transl. M. L. West).

[99] Hes. *Op.* 297: ὃς δέ κε μήτ' αὐτὸς νοέῃ μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων | ἐν θυμῷ βάλληται, ὁ δ' αὖτ' ἀχρήιος ἀνήρ ('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 *inter*texts and *intra*texts, 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' ἀχλύς). 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 *intra*textual connection

with *inter*textual 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) 'Epigonoi', 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 Millenium* (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', *HSCPh* 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) 'Ὁμηρικώτατος? 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* (Berkley, 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.

Saïd, 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 Ve 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.