THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO HERODOTUS

EDITED BY

CAROLYN DEWALD

Professor of Classics and History, Bard College

and

JOHN MARINCOLA

Professor of Classics, Florida State University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

42. Even Homer, who never as narrator calls attention to a different version from his own, shows that he is aware of the phenomenon: see Bowie (1993) 11–20; Pratt (1993) 29–30.
43. Scodel (2001) 120–1 suggests that the poet here is implying that these places have invented false traditions that promote particular interests.
44. Hesiod F 358 Merkelbach-West; Stesichorus, *PMG* 192: 'This story is not true; / neither did you go on the well-benched ships / nor did you arrive at the citadel of Troy.'
45. I cannot here enter into the complicated question of Herodotus' attitude towards religion, but my view is very close to that of Scullion in this volume.
46. For a list of Herodotus' variant versions see Lateiner (1989) 84–90; on the procedure of ancient historians in general when dealing with variants see Marincola (1997) 280–6.
47. The Athenian account makes Ameinias of Pallene the first to ram an enemy ship; the Aeginetans claim they started the battle; and a popular belief held that a phantom voice faulted the Greeks for backing water and urged them on. There is also the story that the Corinthians sailed away at the beginning of the battle, although Herodotus says that only the Athenians claim this.
48. See *Poetics* 9, 1451a36–b11. Discussions of the passage are legion; for some representative views see Gomme (1954) 49–72; Ste. Croix (1975); Halliwell (2002) 193–8.
49. Ste. Croix (1975) 49–53, with important remarks on the importance to history of 'the as a general rule' (*to epi to polu*).
50. On the historian's wonder see the full treatment of Munson (2001a); cf. Goldhill (2002) 21: 'For the historian . . . wonder provokes a desire to know, followed by research, hypothesis and argument.'
51. A point that Lucian recognises when he denies invention to the historian because the material already exists: *de hist. conscr.* 51.
52. I am grateful to Carolyn Dewald, Robert Fowler, Richard Rutherford, and Kathryn Stoddard, who read earlier versions of this chapter and suggested many improvements. They do not, of course, necessarily agree with the views here expressed.

2

ROBERT FOWLER

Herodotus and his prose predecessors

Herodotus being so miraculous, and the Herodotean urge to seek origins still being so strong with us, the desire to historicise him remains irresistible. Knowing what lay around and behind him could make clearer what was unique about him; it could, assuming an agreed definition of history, tell us whether he really was its Father. It happens that we do have a certain amount of information – desperately fragmentary, permitting only the smallest number of verifiable hypotheses – about his predecessors and contemporaries. But in truth, if one wishes to know what relationship exists between Herodotus and his colleagues, it is best to look first in Herodotus' own text.

Herodotus is frequently argumentative and judgemental. From the very first chapters he rejects foolish opinions, weighs up conflicting evidence, makes firm pronouncements on method: were it not for his winning charm, one could find all this very irritating (as indeed some readers have). For all its prominence, however, scholars have only recently begun to relate this feistiness to Herodotus' conception of himself as an historian. For it is obvious (now) that he must be arguing *with* someone, and a close study of the intellectual terrain over which these battles and negotiations are being conducted can do much to illuminate Herodotus' situation as a writer.

The word *historia* (or *historiē*, in Herodotus' dialect), which he uses in his first sentence to describe his amazing gallimaufry, is the first important clue. It does not mean 'history' until well into the fourth century.[1] Until then the noun and its associated verb *historein* have a more general meaning of 'inquiry', 'question', 'investigate'; related is the noun *histōr* meaning 'judge', 'expert', or 'witness' (i.e., 'one who investigates / knows / sees').[2] These words are used in a relatively unmarked way by Herodotus and other early writers, as their narratives happen to involve people asking questions or making judgements. But they are also used in a marked and self-conscious way to denote intellectual activity. The philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 500 BCE) is the first, who in his usual enigmatic style tells us that 'philosophers

really have to know (*historas einai*) a lot of things well'.[3] 'Philosophers' in this period could mean any intellectual or scientist. The remark need not be complimentary: in another place, Heraclitus dismisses Pythagoras, who 'cultivated inquiry (*historiē*) more than any other man, and from out of his books put together his wisdom (*sophiē*), his manifold learning (*polymathiē*), his pernicious expertise (*kakotechniē*)'.[4] His comment about philosophers knowing a lot of things could, then, be sarcastic: their knowledge is uselessly diffuse, focussed on the wrong object (not the Heraclitean *logos*), and acquired by risible methods. On the other hand, given the right methods and goals, Heraclitus might well embrace the notion of *historiē*, and the comment could be sincere. In another place, he claims to have 'asked himself';[5] he learned everything by introspection, and had no teacher (contrast Pythagoras). However that may be, *historiē* in these passages plainly denotes self-conscious intellectual activity: 'asking questions' raised to professional standards, which must imply some thought about methods and goals, aspirations of expertise, and a public profile, i.e. publication of findings (whether in oral or written form). Yet, curiously, there seem to be no restrictions as to the object of inquiry, which could be anything; among the witless polymaths scorned by Heraclitus there is an ethnographer *cum* geographer, a cosmologist *cum* moralist, a mythologer and a mystical mathematician. All these things are *historiē*. It is as though people have suddenly realised that the world holds an infinity of secrets awaiting discovery, and that we have the wherewithal to discover them all, if only we make the effort. Parallels with the Enlightenment are tempting.

Among other examples of this unrestricted sense of *historiē*, it is most helpful to cite the proem of *On the Medical Art*, one of the oldest treatises in the Hippocratic corpus:

> There are those who have made a profession (*technē*) out of reviling the professions; in so doing they think they are producing a display of their personal researches (*historiēs oikeiēs epideixis*), though this is not my assessment of their activity.[6] For me, finding out something which is better for being discovered, is what intelligence should wish to do, and make it its task to do; similarly bringing partial discoveries to completion. To wish to use one's skill (*technē*) in abuse (*logoi kakoi*) to scorn what others have found out, while making no improvements of one's own, and slandering to the ignorant the discoveries of the learned, cannot be the inclination and task of intelligence; rather it is a proclamation of one's own mean nature, or a lack of professional skill (*atechniē*). As for those who may attack other professions in this manner, let those concerned with those professions fend them off as best they can; this treatise shall oppose those who so proceed against medicine, taking

> courage from the very people it finds fault with, drawing its resources from the profession it seeks to help, and finding strength in the wisdom education imparts.

One infers that these non-professionals (or 'unprofessionals') are to be found dogging honest practitioners of all the *technai*. Not that the author of this treatise would, on another day, be loath to advertise his own *historiēs epideixis*; after all, *historiē* is about finding out, and he has much to say about discovery in this passage. It is a matter, he says – somewhat lamely – of the right kind of discovery (just as Heraclitus desiderates the right kind of inquiry). The rhetoric is palpable, and bespeaks a highly competitive environment, in which authors are as much concerned to discredit rivals as to persuade audiences of their own views. Herodotus is thoroughly at home in this environment, as Rosalind Thomas' recent book has shown in detail.[7]

Herodotus' first words provide a close parallel to the doctor's turn of phrase: 'This is the publication of the inquiry (*historiēs apodexis*) of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, so that human events (*ta genomena ex anthrōpōn*) should not fade from memory in the course of time, and that great and marvellous deeds (*erga*), whether of Greek or barbarian, should not be without their meed of glory; in particular, the reason why (*di' hēn aitiēn*) they fought each other' (*praef.*).[8] *Historiē* being a general term, the writer must specify the scope of his particular inquiry, as Herodotus does here. The first part, 'human events', is in Greek more generally 'what has come about as the result of human agency': close to 'history' in our sense, but still broad enough to include ethnography, the description of foreign customs. The second part is *erga*, which as many commentators have pointed out includes not only actions but monuments (such as the pyramids, Polycrates' tunnel, and many other engineering marvels in the *Histories*). Between them these two clauses encompass much of the work, but not quite everything: they exclude geography, and inquiry into natural phenomena such as the cause of the Nile's annual flooding. Yet there is a sense in which these subjects are implied by the proem. In the final clause Herodotus states the special focus of his book, the cause (*aitiē*) of the Persian Wars. Since he shares the contemporary view that the natural environment helps to shape human behaviour,[9] geography is a logical part of his ethnography. Moreover, the notion of cause, here produced with all emphasis, is an essential part of *historiē* in the writers of this period.[10] Herodotus has much to say about causes in the course of his inquiry.[11] He is entitled to take a generous view of relevance, given his clear inclination to get to the bottom of everything. The work is encyclopaedic: one way or another, the whole of the known world (and much beyond) is

worked into the narrative; every major division of the human race – Greeks, Persians, Egyptians, Libyans, Scythians, various Asian tribes – is traced back to its remotest ancestors. Everything in Egypt depends on the Nile, so it behoves Herodotus to discuss its peculiar flooding. But although he could produce a plausible justification for many of his inclusions, he is nonetheless conscious of stretching the bounds of tolerance;[12] even if the particular focus, the Persian Wars, requires him, on his understanding of his task, to range very far afield, there are times when the reader might think he is in danger of losing his way.[13] The compulsion to be comprehensive, inherited from Homer but reinforced by philosophy and Herodotus' prose predecessors, was too powerful to resist.

This linking of *aitiē* and *historiē* which suddenly appears in the writers of the mid-fifth century must be a contemporary development. The search into the origin of the world had begun in the preceding century, and one can argue that, in essence, the first philosophers were not so very different from their successors, for they too sought causes. But the change in vocabulary – older writers spoke of *dizēsis* and *archai*, 'seeking' and 'beginnings'[14] – marks a change in the tenor of discourse. *Aitiē*, 'cause', is a more abstract notion and one with greater explanatory power than 'beginning'. Although in many of its instances in Herodotus and other writers the word does not go beyond recognised legal or religious usages, there are some passages (e.g. 2.20–7, again on the flooding of the Nile) where the abstract principle of cause and effect is becoming explicit.[15] *Historiē*, as already noted, contains an element of 'judging' – an activity Herodotus dramatises both with regard to his own *historiē* and that of his characters.[16] A greater sophistication of analysis has been attained, and authors foreground the conditions of this analysis in their accounts. Intellectually these writers have grasped that difficulties of method claim priority of consideration. As a matter of rhetoric too, simple pronouncements *ex cathedra*, in the manner of a Hecataeus, no longer persuade an audience. One must give evidence of how one arrived at one's conclusions, weighing pros and cons. One of Herodotus' trademarks is his frequent expressions of uncertainty; he often *declines* to judge between conflicting accounts. This is partly intellectual honesty, but it is also very persuasive rhetorically (unkind critics have called it the trademark of the liar).

So far as our evidence, with all its uncertainties of date and vast gaps, allows us to judge, Herodotus was the first writer to apply this powerful new concept of 'inquiry' to the study of the human past. Indeed he is the first writer to use the word at all, so that the possibility exists in theory that the physicists are the debtors, Herodotus the creditor. Yet most 'inquiry' was, in fact, devoted to physical phenomena (so that occasionally 'inquiry' without

specification meant 'scientific inquiry'),[17] and the general sense prevailed for a long time. Neither Thucydides nor Xenophon uses the word to describe what they do; Plato uses the word only its generic sense. Even Aristotle, in his day, continued to add qualifiers such as 'inquiry into nature' or 'inquiry into animals' or, to designate history, 'inquiry into events' (*Rhet.* 1360a36). In his *Poetics*, however, *historiē* without qualification means 'history': possibly the earliest example of the usage.[18] Significantly, his stock example of the historian is Herodotus (1451b2). One wonders whether Herodotus' classic text, which determined the course of all subsequent historiography, was precisely what altered the meaning of *historiē*, at a time when the boundaries of prose genres were finally becoming a matter of explicit definition. But to return to Herodotus himself: his constant foregrounding of the difficulties inherent in conducting 'inquiry' is integral to his self-conception and without parallel in the surviving fragments of contemporary writers of history, or in earlier writers of ethnography or geography.[19] It does, however, find its echo in contemporary 'inquirers' of other kinds, and there are signs of similar concerns with methodology in other historians whose working lives overlapped with Herodotus'. So it is best to see Herodotus as a man constantly engaged in the debates of his day, continually shaping his own *historiē* in conversation with others, over the course of a career spanning perhaps four decades. This in no way underestimates the power of his own voice or the brilliance of his personal achievement.

If we may credit Herodotus with first applying *historiē* to the past, with all that that entails, it is not of course the case that Herodotus was the first to write about the past. Homer and other poets were already historians; the great legends counted as history. Beginning in the late sixth century, Greeks began to write these legends down in prose. Hecataeus of Miletus was the first to do so. The backbone of the narrative was provided by the complicated genealogies of gods and heroes; the poetic foundation document underlying all mythography, as the Greeks came to call this activity once 'myth' and 'history' had been distinguished,[20] was not Homer but the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.[21] Before Herodotus began his career, several major works of genealogy were already in circulation: those of Hecataeus, Acusilaus, and Pherecydes.[22] Over 250 fragments survive from these authors, sometimes in verbatim quotation, more often in paraphrase, with admixture of later material of uncertain extent.

Nor was Herodotus the first to write about foreign peoples and customs. Of Hecataeus nearly 350 additional fragments survive from his *Periodos* or *Circuit of the World*, though the great majority are disappointing one-liners from the epitome of the early medieval lexicographer Stephanus of Byzantium; for instance, 'Esdetes: an Iberian tribe; Hecataeus in the

"Europe"' (i.e. Book 1 of the *Periodos*; Book 2 was 'Asia', which included Egypt and Libya). In this work Hecataeus gives an account of a voyage clockwise around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (with inland excursions at various points), recording places of interest and importance, distances, oddities, and mythical lore. A few fragments, similar in nature, survive of Scylax's work or works, and his voyage is described by Herodotus (4.44). Euthymenes' views on the cause of tides in the Atlantic and the flooding of the Nile (connected to the Atlantic in his view) were passed to posterity by Theophrastus. Hanno's Phoenician text was translated at an unknown date; something of his exploits might have been known to Herodotus through oral sources (and it is notable that Herodotus' account of Libya shows little contact with the surviving fragments of Hecataeus, suggesting an alternative source).[23] Hecataeus himself figures as a player in the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 5.36, 125–6), and is cited for his version of the Pelasgian eviction from Attica (6.137). He was certainly a major source of the Egyptian *logos* of Herodotus, who pays him the compliment of abuse in a famous passage therein (2.143, to which we will return below).

These two types of book – genealogy and ethnography *cum* geography – are the only ones unequivocally known to predate Herodotus. The evidence that Scylax wrote an historical work on Heracleides of Mylasa is too late to trust. It is not clear that Dionysius of Miletus was more than an ethnographer. *If* he wrote but one book, the *Persica*, and mentioned Mt Haemon in it (as opposed to in a *Periodos*: cf. Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 FF 167–9), one infers he related Darius' Scythian campaign (cf. Hdt. 4.49). That he told the story of the false magus (Hdt. 3.61) is unambiguously attested: perhaps this information seemed pertinent at some point in a basically geographical work, but it is curious that in all the fragments of Hecataeus, the geographer, while freely relating myths associated with various sites, never makes a reference to an historical event. Yet if Dionysius' *Persica* was a work moving towards Herodotean history, there is little hint of it in our sources (the book was still known to Apollodorus of Athens in the second century BCE).[24] One could also wish for more information about the local historians. Whether any of them was active before Herodotus is controversial. Dogmatism on the point is unwise when so much is uncertain; it is better to hold options open. One can see certain points of contact between Herodotus and the local historians at least in method. When one recalls that Herodotus was at work for several decades, and accepts that he did not work in a vacuum, it becomes probable that the influence between him and other investigators of the past was not entirely in one direction. His text as it stands is a document of the 430s; its latest datable reference is 430, and many passages yield their richest meaning when read against the background of the Athenian Empire and the

brewing war.[25] By 440, the other writers named in the Appendix come into view.[26]

Nevertheless, direct connections are hard to establish. The clearest are between Herodotus and Hecataeus. Porphyry says the former's account of the phoenix, the hippopotamus, and the hunting of crocodiles is lifted word for word, with minimal changes, from Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1 F 324), though such charges are usually overstated in the ancient lists of plagiarism, and in general one should avoid attributing too much to the absent and unverifiable source: the *Periodos* only extended to two books, after all.[27] Both writers commented on the Nile delta, on the 'floating' island Chemmis, and on Egyptian bread and beer.[28] We sometimes detect anonymous criticism, for instance at 4.36, where Herodotus 'laughs' at 'the many writers of *Periodoi*' who make Ocean a circular stream surrounding the earth, and think Asia and Europe are of equal size. Hecataeus held this view, so he may be the target here, though perhaps not only he.[29] There are, however, two explicit citations, apart from the reports of Hecataeus' role in the Ionian revolt (5.36, 125–6). One of them (6.137) concerns the Pelasgian eviction from Attica, on which Hecataeus had a different version from the Athenians. Although analysis of this passage is profitable,[30] it is the other which I propose to examine briefly here. After his account of the first 341 generations of Egyptian history (2.99–141), as recounted to him by the priests of the temple of Zeus (Amun-Re) at Thebes (Karnak), Herodotus pauses to consider the implications of their vast chronology. He first reckons the sums, and then wheels Hecataeus onto the stage of his history. Hecataeus, he claims, had been there before him, and had recited his own genealogy, which led back through sixteen generations to a god; whereupon 'the priests did for him what they did for me, though I did not recite my genealogy': they showed him the 341 statues erected by each priest before his death, assured him that in every generation a son succeeded a father, and noted that in the entire period no god had trodden Egyptian earth. Consequently they refused to believe that a god had fathered one of Hecataeus' ancestors a mere sixteen generations before.

This is a troubling passage, prompting difficult questions. Did Hecataeus really present himself in such a bad light, or is this Herodotus' malicious gloss? Could Hecataeus have told this story in such a way as to preserve face? Would self-deprecating irony be probable in a text of the period? If he did realise the extreme disparity of Greek and Egyptian chronology, would this not undermine the whole of his genealogical research, to say nothing of obliging him to abandon family pretensions? If he realised the implications, hadn't he already made Herodotus' point for him; is the epigone motivated by mere spite and jealousy?

Scholars have variously answered these questions. A way forward is offered by West's careful discussion, in which she demonstrates convincingly how difficult it is to believe that Hecataeus' encounter actually took place as presented.[31] However, we are not obliged to conclude that the whole is merely invented, or that Hecataeus did not go to Karnak. It is becoming clearer all the time how Herodotus often presents opinions ('the Egyptians say') as fact, when what lies behind the statement is inference: he conjectures that this is what the Egyptians would say, were you to ask them.[32] This is not a fraudulent procedure in his view. Following this principle, I suggest that in the present passage Herodotus *infers* that this was Hecataeus' experience, on the basis of two facts: the 16-generation genealogy, which Hecataeus must have given somewhere in his works; and his belief that Hecataeus had visited Karnak.[33] Hecataeus must therefore have heard the same speech from the priests, who would have rejected his claims absolutely. For Herodotus the implication of the statues was truly staggering; it lies at the heart of his historical vision.[34] The tremendous emphasis placed on this implication is surely his own. He is very proud of his superior insight, and must scorn Hecataeus for having missed it completely. His account implies that his predecessor was utterly wrong-footed by the experience, and left feeling foolish and bewildered. One sees how very subtle and damaging this competition amongst the *logioi* could be.

This reconstruction must, of course, remain speculative. Other connections between Herodotus and his colleagues are even more elusive. Some of his targets of frequent outspoken disagreement on historical and geographical affairs are apt to be names in our Appendix.[35] Since he deals with the relatively recent past, Herodotus avoids almost entirely the terrain of the genealogists, who rarely bridged the gap between the end of the heroic age and their own day.[36] Where he happens to tread on their ground, giving a genealogy from the 'mythical' period, we usually do not have a corresponding fragment in the mythographical corpus for comparison; in one egregious example, the genealogy of the Athenian Philaids (6.35.127–9), he and Pherecydes (F 2) give contradictory versions.[37] Herodotus seems in this case to have got his information from talking to people in Athens.

'Talking' was, in fact, what Herodotus did most of the time. In his own work, though obviously written,[38] he does not distinguish between written and oral sources in respect of reliability. The world he lived in was still predominantly oral in character; books there were aplenty, but they were not privileged over other sources of information. Fleeting points of contact between Herodotus and another author should not predispose one to think that the latter was the former's principal or sole source. Herodotus was always free to supplement his reading with data obtained from oral

informants; such informants, indeed, might often be the common source of both writers, who could be entirely ignorant of one another. The general level of talk in the Greek cities of the mid-fifth century BCE is hard to overestimate: open, dynamic, democratic city-states, materially booming and culturally exploding, generated an incessant buzz: political speeches, legal proceedings, military and civilian councils, philosophical conversation, learned expositions, religious aetiology, tales told for casual entertainment or education of the young, fables (and to this list one must add the countless poetic performances). This background must be borne in mind by anyone asking what Herodotus' genre might have been. 'Inquiry' was already a bewilderingly broad term: what are we to do with *logoi*, 'talk'? Yet its importance to Herodotus is obvious; after his opening sentence, he continues 'The *logioi* amongst the Persians say that the Phoenicians were responsible (*aitious*) for the quarrel.' These *logioi andres*, the talkers, are those ready to provide information and opinions on important topics wherever one happens to end up in one's travels. The talk, like the 'inquiry', could in theory be about anything. Like 'inquiry', *logoi* is being used in a marked sense, as its prominence in Herodotus shows. These *logioi* have status; they are expert, informed, meaningful talkers, sociologically apparent, though one would not go so far as to call them an institution.[39] An even more marked term is *logopoios*, '*logos*-maker'; Herodotus applies it three times to Hecataeus (2.143.1, 5.36.2, 5.125), and once to Aesop (2.134.3). 'Maker' appropriates for the talker the activity of the *poiētēs*, the poet; it connotes a more active involvement in the production of *logoi* than mere transmission of reports. Just as the marked use of 'inquiry' implied self-consciousness about one's procedures, so the marked use of 'talk' implies a sense of rules to the game. 'The Persians say', 'the Egyptians say', 'the Corinthians say', and the like, are expressions in constant use in Herodotus. Close study shows that these are artfully employed – so artfully, that they give rise to accusations of fraud; but in fact, Herodotus sees nothing fraudulent about reporting undifferentiated consensus, even when based on nothing more than reasonable conjecture about that consensus.[40] This is the way the *logioi andres* conducted their conversation. It is for this reason that scholars have begun to study closely the dynamics and conventions of this sort of interchange: the arguments, the posturing, the narrative technique, the critical methods of a predominantly oral environment.

In this broader perspective, comparison of Herodotus and his colleagues can be more fruitful than the hunt for specific connections. For instance, the problematisation of *logoi* already in the opening words of Hecataeus' *Genealogies* confirms our general assessment of their importance.[41] Features of discourse which can be usefully studied include: the author's *persona*

(e.g. explicit and implicit first-person statements, relation of implied author to text, attitude to others' texts);[42] narratology (e.g. implied audiences and their manipulation; rhythm of fabula vs. story, prolepses and analepses, actorial and narratorial motivations, focalisation);[43] scientific methods such as rationalisation, chronography, etymology, probability (*to eikos*), use of eyewitness (*opsis*) and hearsay evidence (*akoē*), critical judgement (*gnōmē*);[44] attitude to the past;[45] use of sources;[46] deployment of various kinds of argument.[47] The gain for students of historiography is that in every one of these categories Herodotus can be seen to win hands down. He is a far subtler manipulator of his persona and discourse than his predecessors; he is in a league of his own as a storyteller (and that not only with respect to predecessors); he deploys every weapon of the scientific arsenal with greater sophistication; he makes awareness of method an important part of his text; he has achieved greater critical distance from the object of his inquiry; so far from evading the problem of sources, he has in effect discovered it; his enthymemes are proto-Aristotelian. Herodotus' predecessors deserve all credit for their pioneering efforts, and part of the charm of studying them is seeing how often they have been underestimated; but in the end one seeks most to take the precise measure of the difference between them and Herodotus. Moreover, one not only sees the difference in this or that respect, but the difference resulting from the concentration of the entire arsenal on the historian's various targets; the combination of all these methods is as unique as the combination of subject-matter, ethnography and history – a combination not seen on this scale before or after Herodotus, but necessary to his grandiose task as he conceived it.[48] And grandiose it was: though one can see the encyclopaedic spirit thriving in the all-inclusive, panhellenic genealogies, and in the catalogues (ostensibly complete) of every city Greek and barbarian in the known world, no other work had Herodotus' breathtaking sweep, not only of space and time, but of human life from the bathetic to the sublime. That is why Herodotus is Father of history.[49]

FURTHER READING

There is no up-to-date, comprehensive treatment of all the predecessors and contemporaries of Herodotus, but one may usefully consult in English the works of Pearson (1939), (1942) ch. 1 (on Hellanicus), (1987) 11–18 (on Antiochus), and Drews (1973); in German, Lendle (1992) introduces Hecataeus, Acusilaus, Pherecydes, Xanthus, and Ion; von Fritz (1967) is a thorough and authoritative discussion. For Hecataeus, see Bertelli (2001); for Ion of Chios, see West (1985) and Dover (1986); for Hellanicus, see Möller (2001); for Antiochus of Syracuse, see Luraghi (2002). Pertinent in various ways are Thomas (2000), Fowler (2000a) xxvii–xxxviii, (2001), and Raaflaub (2002a).

APPENDIX
WRITERS OF GENEALOGY, ETHNOGRAPHY, GEOGRAPHY, AND LOCAL HISTORY[50]

Active before Herodotus' working life (born c. 485)

Name	Dates	Titles of Works[51]	Edition of Fragments[52]
Hecataeus of Miletus	c. 555–485	*Genealogies* or *Histories*;[53] *Periodos* ('Circuit') or *Periegesis* ('Guide') *of the World*	*FGrHist* 1; *EGM*
Acusilaus of Argos	flourished before 480	*Genealogies*	*EGM*
Pherecydes of Athens	published c. 465	*Histories* (genealogies, in fact)	*EGM*
Scylax of Caryandra	c. 550–475	*Periplous* ('Circumnavigation') *of the World Outside*[54] *the Pillars of Hercules*; *Circuit of the World*; *Events in the Time of Heracleides King of Mylasa*[55]. Sailed from the Indus to Suez (Hdt. 4.44).	*FGrHist* 709; for pseudo-Scylax see *GGM* I 15ff.
Euthymenes of Massilia	end of 6th cent.	none transmitted; a periegete like Scylax; voyaged down west coast of Africa (compare the voyage of Sataspes, Hdt. 4.43)	*FHG* 4.408
Hanno of Carthage	beginning of 5th cent.	*Periplous* (originally in Phoenician; translated into Greek sometime before the 3rd cent. BCE); voyaged down west coast of Africa	*GGM* I.1ff.
Dionysius of Miletus	coeval with King Darius (reigned 521–486)	*Persica*; *Periegesis of the World*; *Events after Darius* (or possibly 'in the Time of Darius'); *Troica*	*FGrHist* 687[56]

(*cont.*)

Active during Herodotus' working life

Name[57]	Dates	Works	Edition of Fragments
Euagon of Samos	flourished before 431	none transmitted; local history of Samos	*EGM*
Dei(l)ochus of Proconnesus[58]	flourished before 431	*On Cyzicus*; *On Samothrace*	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 471
Democles of Phygela	flourished before 431	none transmitted; local history?	*EGM*; cf. *FHG* II.20–1
Eudemus of Paros or Naxos	flourished before 421	none transmitted; local history?	*EGM*
Charon of Lampsacus	flourished c. 450	*Aethiopica*; *Persica*; *Hellenica*; *Libyca*; *Cretica*; *On Lampsacus*; *Lampsacene Chronicles*; *Prytaneis* ('Civic Officials') *of the Lacedaemonians* (emend to *Lampsacenes*?); *Foundations of Cities*; *Periplous of the World Outside the Pillars of Hercules*	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 262
Hellanicus of Lesbos	?480/79–after 407/6	*Phoronis*; *Deucalionia*; *Atlantis*; *Asopis*; *Troica*; *Aeolica/Lesbica*; *Argolica*; *On Arcadia*; *Atthis*; *Boeotiaca*; *Thessalica*; *Cypriaca*; *On the Foundation of Chios*; *Aegyptiaca*; *Expedition to the Shrine of Ammon*; *On Lydia*; *Persica*; *Scythica*; *Origins of Cities and Tribes*; *Barbarian Customs*; *Priestesses of the Temple of Hera in Argos*; *Victors at the Carneia: Set Down in Prose*; *Victors at the Carneia: Composed in Verse*[59]	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 4, 323a, 601a, 645a, 687a

Active during Herodotus' working life

Name	Dates	Works	Edition of Fragments
Xanthus of Lydia	flourished c. 450	*Lydiaca*; *On the Magi*; *On Empedocles*	*FGrHist* 765
Damastes of Sigeum	flourished c. 440–430	*Genealogy of Those who Fought at Troy*;[60] *Catalogue of Tribes and Cities*; *On Poets and Sophists*	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 5
Xenomedes of Ceos	?flourished c. 450	none transmitted; local history of Ceos	*EGM*
Ion of Chios	c. 480–422/1	*Foundation of Chios*; *Epidemiai* ('Visits': reminiscences of his meetings with famous people); poetic and philosophical works	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 392; *TrGF* 19; B. Gentili, C. Prato, *Poetarum elegiacorum testt. et frr.* II.61–9, *IEG* II.79–82; A. Leurini, *Ionis Chii testimonia et fragmenta*
Antiochus of Syracuse	died after 424/3	*On Italy*; *Sicelica* (history of Sicily)	*EGM*; *FGrHist* 555
Simonides of Ceos the Genealogist	flourished before 431	*Genealogy*; *Inventions*	*EGM*[61]
Stesimbrotus of Thasos	flourished c. 430	*On Themistocles, Thucydides and Pericles*;[62] *On Religious Rites*; a book of Homeric problems, title not transmitted	*FGrHist* 107
Hippias of Elis	end of 5th c.	*Names of Tribes* (ethnography); *Victors in the Olympics* (chronography); *Synagōgē* ('Collection'; a work of miscellaneous content); *Trojan Dialogue* (see Pl. *Hippias Major* 286a)	*FGrHist* 6; *VS* 86

NOTES

1. Below, n. 18. On *historiē* generally see Thomas (2000) 161–7.
2. See most recently Munson (2001a), index s.v. *Histor.*
3. *VS* 22 B 35, quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*5.140.5). There must remain some doubt whether 'philosophers' is Heraclitus' word. Herodotus uses the verb *philosophein* at 1.30.2 of Solon's curiosity-driven travel.
4. *VS* 22 B 129. For the negative connotation of *polymathiē* in Heraclitus see also B 40 *VS* = Hecataeus T 21 *EGM*: '*polymathiē* does not teach intelligence; if so, it would have taught Hesiod and Pythagoras, Xenophanes and Hecataeus'.
5. Using the verb *dizēsthai* (B 101 *VS*): on this word see below p. 32.
6. Following the text of J. Jouanna (Budé) and others.
7. Thomas (2000); see also her contribution to the present volume.
8. For a close study of the phrase *historiēs epilapode(i)xis* see Bakker (2002).
9. Most emphatically at the very end of the work, when Cyrus opines that 'soft countries produce soft men' (9.122.3); the Persians took the point, declined to emigrate from their harsh land, and retained their ability to rule. On the theory of environmental determinism in Herodotus and others see Thomas (2000) 102–14, and in this volume.
10. See Bakker (2002) 13–14.
11. Gould (1989) ch. 4; Lateiner (1989) ch. 9.
12. 'My work from the outset has required digressions', he apologises (4.30.1).
13. 'Path' (*hodos*) is in fact one of his metaphors for his narrative (1.95.1; cf. 1.117.2, 2.20.1, 2.22.1). On the cohesion of the various elements in the *Histories* see especially Immerwahr (1966) and Munson (2001a).
14. For early philosophical use see Parmenides, *VS* 28 B 2.2: 'I will tell you the only paths of *dizēsis*', cf. 6.3, 7.2, 8.6. In Herodotus, it a less forceful word than *historiē*, denoting simple seeking for something lost, or desiring: see 1.67.5, 1.94.3 ('seeking' a cure: one might think this example a little more marked than the others), 2.66.1, 2.147.3, 2.156.4, 4.9.1, 4.139.3, 4.151.2 ('asking' for factual information), 5.92.2, 7.16.2, 7.142.1 ('seeking' the meaning of the oracle of the wooden walls). Similarly in earlier writers: Homer, e.g. *Il.* 4.88, 17.221, *Od.* 1.261, 11.100, 16.391 = 21.161; Theogn. e.g. 83, 180; Anacr. *PMG* 360.2; Simon. *PMG* 514, 542.22. It appears to be the ordinary Ionic word for 'seek'.
15. Vegetti (1999).
16. For example, 1.24.7, of Periander's inquiry (resembling a police investigation) into Arion's curious tale; 1.56.1–2, of Croesus investigating the current state of Greece; 2.19.3, 29.1, 34.1, 44.5, 99.1, 113.1 of his own inquiries in Egypt, 4.192.3 of his inquiries into Libyan geography; 2.118–19, of the Egyptian priests' inquiries of Menelaus; 7.96.1, of what the rationale (*logos*) of his inquiry requires him to mention.
17. Eur. *TrGF* F 910.
18. In Isocr. *Panath.* 246 the word might have this meaning, but cf. Aeschin. *In Tim.* 141 where it is equivalent to *paideia*, education; as examples he gives Homer and other poets, who, though they told stories which were historical enough for most Greeks, are cited here for their morally improving *exempla*. 'General knowledge' might be a good translation. Isocr. *Ep.* 8.4 has *historia tēs paideias* which appears to mean 'expertise (expert judgement) in education'.

Dem. *Cor.* 144 speaks of *historia tōn koinōn*, investigation into public affairs. (Wankel (1976) 782–4 would delete this clause; Yunis (2001) *ad loc.* is able to defend it.)

19. Fowler (1996).
20. The word 'mythography' first occurs in the late fourth century: see Fowler (2000a).
21. Fowler (1998).
22. See Appendix.
23. Thomas (2000) 53 n. 53. For a translation of Hanno's text see Cary and Warmington (1963) 63–8 or Carpenter (1966) 83–5.
24. Dionysius is unfortunately missing from the list of early writers in Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 5, but as John Marincola reminds me, Dionysius does not distinguish ethnography and history in his discussion of the predecessors of Herodotus; perhaps this is the desired 'hint'. Compare Marincola (1999) 297, Moggi (1972).
25. Moles (2002); Fowler (2003a). Raaflaub (2002a) 165 n. 53, citing Hornblower (1991) 83, notes that Hippias' warning to the Corinthians at 5.93 cannot predate 440, when Athens and Corinth were still on good terms according to Thucydides 1.40.5, 41.2. This whole section lies at the heart of Herodotus' work (I should have noticed this point in the article just cited).
26. Space forbids discussion of such interesting close contemporaries as Ion, Charon, Hellanicus, or Xanthus. See 'Further Reading'.
27. Erbse (1992) 172–3.
28. The delta: *FGrHist* 1 FF 301, 306–9, Hdt. 2.13ff.; Chemmis: 1 F 305, Hdt. 2.156; bread and beer: 1 FF 322–3, Hdt. 2.77.4.
29. Hec. *FGrHist* 1 FF 18, 36a, 302; Thomas (2000) 80–3, 215; Boedeker (2002) 107 points out that Herodotus' 'I laugh (*gelō*)' turns the tables on Hecataeus, who sneers at the stories of the Greeks as 'ridiculous (*geloioi*)', F 1. At 2.23 'the man who spoke of Ocean' in connection with the Nile is probably Hecataeus. For other possible connections between Herodotus and Hecataeus see Lloyd (1975–88) I.127–39, II.8–10.
30. See Luraghi (2001b) 159–60; Fowler (2003b); Sourvinou-Inwood (forthcoming). Hecataeus also mentioned Pelasgians in F 119; cf. Hdt. 1.56–8.
31. S. R. West (1991).
32. See below p. 37.
33. As Nino Luraghi points out (private communication), Herodotus' sly 'though I did not recite my genealogy' (why say this at all?) is in fact a forceful renunciation of Hecataeus' whole project of bridging the human and heroic ages. This and the priests' flat rejection of Hecataeus' account, as Herodotus imagines the encounter (either it is imagined, or he elicited their response during his own visit: either way, they are surrogates for Herodotus himself), make it hard to read the tone as other than denigrating. Whether the genealogy was given in the *Genealogy* or the *Periodos* is unknown; I think the former more likely. The latter could be the source of Herodotus' belief that Hecataeus visited Karnak. The wanderings of Hecataeus could also have been the subject of oral tradition (cf. the stories of his participation in the Ionian revolt); but it is extremely unlikely that this story as a whole, including the knowledge of Egyptian chronology so central to Herodotus' historical vision, circulated as an anecdote.

34. Vannicelli (2001).
35. Lateiner (1989) 104–8 compiles a list of passages in which Herodotus is disagreeing with a source, usually unnamed.
36. In addition to Pherecydes F 2 (next note) and Hecataeus T 4 (his own genealogy: above, p. 35), Acusilaus' discussion of the Homeridae (F 2) referred by implication at least to recent history. Writers of local histories such as Charon, Antiochus or Hellanicus are different: they will have started in the age of the founding or autochthonous heroes and brought the story down to their own time.
37. Thomas (1989) 161–73. Ruschenbusch (1995) argued that all the genealogies in Herodotus reaching from the heroic age to recent history derive from Pherecydes; criticism in Fowler (2001) 114 n. 34.
38. Fowler (2001); Rösler (2002).
39. Luraghi (2001b) 157–8. We may view Herodotus in this light, even if it is far from certain that he would have accepted the labels *logios* or *logopoios* for himself (Vannicelli (2001) 214–15); that refusal could, indeed, be part of the characteristic competitiveness of this group.
40. Luraghi (2001b) and in this volume.
41. F 1 *EGM*: 'Thus speaks Hecataeus of Miletus: I write what follows as it seems to me to be true; for the *logoi* of the Greeks are, as it seems to me, many and ridiculous.' For *logoi* in other proems cf. Antiochus F 2 *EGM*, Ion of Chios *Triagmos* (F 20 von Blumenthal = 114 Leurini), Alcmaeon of Croton, *VS* 24 B 1, Diogenes of Apollonia, *VS* 64 B 1, Hippoc. *On Ancient Medicine* 1.1, *On the Medical Art* 1 (above, p. 30), *On the Nature of Man* 1, *Regimen* I.1. Thucydides writes up the Peloponnesian War in the expectation that it will be *axiologōtatos*, most worthy of *logoi* (1.1).
42. Thomas (2000) 235–47; Dewald (2002); Brock (2003).
43. de Jong (2002); cf. Munson (2001a). I shall discuss the narratology of mythography in *EGM* II.
44. For an overview of the first three items see Fowler (1996); more recently, Bertelli (2001), Möller (2001), Raaflaub (2002a) 157–8. *To eikos* possibly already a tool for Hekataios (F 27a); for *opsis, akoē, gnōmē* see especially Hdt. 2.99; discussion in e.g. Lateiner (1989) (index s.vv.), Schepens (1980), Hussey (1990), Thomas (2000) (index s.vv.).
45. Hartog (1989); Bertelli (2001); van Wees (2002).
46. Luraghi (2001b); Hornblower (2002).
47. Thomas (2000) 175–90.
48. On this point Raaflaub (2002a) 181–2 is eloquent. But Dionysius still raises a tiny doubt (above, n. 24).
49. My best thanks to Nino Luraghi, Ellen O'Gorman, and the editors of this volume for beneficial comment.
50. I include only authors for whom there is reasonably reliable information as to their dates. There are others one might suspect were working early enough for Herodotus to have known them. Discussion in Fowler (1996). I do not accept that Hippys of Rhegium is an early writer: see *EGM* I.xxxvi; Pearson (1987) 8–10.
51. As transmitted by various sources; this is not the place to discuss the various problems attending such lists. For authors in *EGM* I, see the forthcoming commentary (*EGM* II). In general one suspects that the lists of works in medieval

encyclopaedias such as the *Suda* have been artificially lengthened by fictitious or duplicate titles.
52. *EGM* I is the most recent edition, but gives only mythographical fragments; where other kinds of fragments survive, these are to be found in the other edition named.
53. None of these early titles is apt to derive from the authors themselves.
54. Some scholars think this a mistake for 'Inside' or even 'Inside and Outside'. Perhaps behind the first two titles lies a single work describing the circuit of the Mediterranean in one roll and of the Indian Ocean in the next; the titles were added later, with predictable confusion.
55. Herodotus mentions this man's role in the Ionian revolt (5.121). If genuine, this title must denote a proto-historical work.
56. See Rusten (1982) 68–74 who shows that *FGrHist* 32 F 42 (*apud* schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1116), attributed by Müller and Jacoby to Scytobrachion, is certainly by the Milesian. The five fragments appear to give not only geography of Persian-controlled areas, but history (see above p. 34). Of the transmitted titles, if 'Events in the Time of Darius (*ta kata Dareion*)' is a correct emendation, the first three could be alternatives for the same work; *Troica* one suspects is a spurious attribution.
57. The first five names in the list are put in the first, oldest group of writers by Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 5 = Hec. T 17a *EGM*, who 'lived before the Peloponnesian War'; the next four are a little later, alive 'a little before the war and down to the time of Thucydides'. In some cases we are able to supplement his meagre data from other sources. The last five are not mentioned by him at all.
58. Both forms of the name are transmitted with equal authority.
59. The first thirteen works (assuming all these titles denote discrete works) treat the major branches of the traditional mythical genealogies, but at least in some cases (egregiously, the *Atthis* or 'Attic History') bringing the story down to his own day, seemingly unaware of any difference between 'mythical' and 'historical' periods; the next seven works are ethnographical and geographical; the last three are chronographical.
60. Possibly rather by Polus of Acragas, who was still a young man in 427 BCE (testimonia in Fowler [1997] 27–34). The *Suda* also records a book *On Events in Greece*, but the title seems too vague; corruption is probable.
61. The fragments in *FGrHist* but not in *EGM* are probably to be attributed rather to the famous poet of this name; these record an additional title *Symmicta* ('Miscellany'; cf. Hippias' *Synagōgē*).
62. Although the book displays an active (conservative) political agenda, its title suggests a retrospective published after the death of Pericles in 429, about the same time as Herodotus' work. F 11 refers to the plague. Stesimbrotus has been suggested, somewhat adventurously, as the author of the Derveni papyrus. Janko (1997) 73–4, who believes Diagoras of Melos wrote the Derveni text, dates Stesimbrotus' *On Religious Rites* to the 430s.