

Aleksandr Sinitsyn, Igor Surikov
<https://doi.org/10.26485/AAL/2020/66/13>

**A CHAOTIC TOURS OF THE ‘HALLS’ OF THE LOGOI OF THE HERODOTUS ‘MUSES’:
 REVIEW OF THE ENGLISH HISTORIOGRAPHY ON THE ‘FATHER OF HISTORY’
 AND HIS WORK IN THE NEW GUIDE-BOOK¹**

The article contains a brief description of the content and a critical analysis of a new book devoted to Herodotus: *Sean Sheehan. A Guide to Reading Herodotus’ Histories*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. XIV, 316 p. ISBN 9781474292665.

The change in the historiography that surrounds the work of the great Historian of Halicarnassus, which has taken place over the past few decades, can be summarized in the following way. Back in 1968, a British classicist, John Hart, began his book “Herodotus and Greek History”² with a story telling that no sooner had he started preparing a university course of lectures on this author, than he realized that students had practically nothing to go on with – there was only J.L. Myres’s “Herodotus Father of History”,³ and a very good, though very old, book of commentaries by W.W. How and J. Wells.⁴ This prompted J. Hart to start writing the book.

That was half a century ago.⁵ The picture is totally different now: the authors of this review

have noted, when analyzing another work devoted to Herodotus,⁶ that the literature on him has become immense, first and foremost, with reference to Anglo-American studies on the ancient world. One of the side effects of such a change, by the way, is that no study of the ‘father of history’ is likely to exhaust the list of references. Almost all are selective, with the criteria looking as if chosen at random. Examples are not far to seek, take Sean Sheehan’s work, which is to be dealt with later, it refers neither to J. Hart’s book nor even to J. Myres’s work,⁷ and the commentaries written by R.W. Macan and How & Wells in the early 20th century are mentioned only a couple of times,⁸

¹ This research has been carried out thanks to funding from the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project No. 19-09-00022a “‘Forefathers of history’: The oldest representatives of ancient historical science” / Работа выполнена при поддержке гранта Российского фонда фундаментальных исследований (проект № 19-09-00022а «‘Праотцы истории’: древнейшие представители античной исторической науки»).

² Hart 1982: IV.

³ Myres 1953.

⁴ How, Wells 1912.

⁵ Hart may have been exaggerating, for example, we cannot help but mention the book on Herodotus by the very same J. Wells (Wells 1923, with an interesting essay at the end of “Herodotus in English Literature”, ch. XI, p. 205-228), or the monograph by J.E. Powell (Powell 1939), the author of “A Lexicon to Herodotus” (Powell 1966, the first edition of the book came out in 1938), and a complete English translation of “The History” (Powell 1949), or a valuable

research work by H.R. Immerwahr “Form and Thought in Herodotus” (Immerwahr 1966). Still, J. Hart’s exaggeration is insignificant.

⁶ Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019: 184 (also here is selected literature in notes 1 and 2).

⁷ J. Myres’ work marked a milestone for its time: in particular, it expounds the thesis of ‘pediment composition’ of the work of the historian from Halicarnassus, the thesis further developed by Michael L. Gasparov (Gasparov 1989 = Gasparov 1997: 483-489), who arrived at the general conclusion that Herodotus’ Histories was not completed. Both the authors of this review have frequently examined M.L. Gasparov’s views in their articles, while one of the reviewers was in complete accord with the considerations of the Russian classicist (Surikov 2007; Surikov 2010; Surikov 2011: 149-160, 271-279), the other has often been critical of this idea of Gasparov’s, see: Sinitsyn 2013; Sinitsyn 2017a; Sinitsyn 2017b; Sinitsyn 2019.

⁸ Apart from the references found in the ‘Author’s note’ (p. XIII), R.W. Macan’s classical commentary is rarely referred to: pp. 5, 223, 228, 281 n. 15. And the

which can be accounted for by a recently published fundamental commentary written by leading scholars supervised by David Asheri,⁹ which is the commentary Sheehan keeps referring to.

It is quite natural that this ‘Niagara Falls of literature’ contains texts not only of different characters but also of different level of proficiency. Truly ‘breakthrough’ works on Herodotus are not frequent to come by;¹⁰ and Sheehan’s book is not among them. One cannot help noticing immediately that, practically speaking, it cannot be classed as a work of research, and it is by no means a monograph, since it is meant, first and foremost, for students. The author himself defined its genre as a ‘guide’, that is, it is something to take one through Herodotus’ *Histories*. To facilitate the acquisition of the material by the students, the book contains a lot of boxes (the list of 40 boxes is on p. XI-XII, “Lists of boxes”), such as are used for computer presentations. It sometimes seems that the book is an outgrowth of a cycle of such academic presentations.

The main body of the text is divided into two unequal parts: a long introduction entitled ‘Approaches to Herodotus’ (p. 1-57) and a part named ‘Commentary’ (p. 59-284). The introduction begins with the standard praise of Herodotus as a captivating storyteller,¹¹ whose work, even 2,500 years later, has not lost the power to arouse the keen interest of the reader. Sheehan tries to make observations on certain peculiarities of the mastery of Herodotus’ narrative, but they largely look lackluster.

Then the author dwells on the specifics of form and structure of Herodotus’ work, pointing out that it is abundant in ‘symmetries, doublings, echoes and inversions’ (p. 8). Here the precedence is given to the technique of ‘ring composition’,

‘guide’ mentions only the impressions of the last part of Macan’s work (commentaries on Books VII-IX) in electronic form (2013) with a reference to the 1908 edition, though at first only two parts of the Commentary on Books IV-VI came out, and the rest was published only 13 years later in two parts: Macan 1908a; Macan 1908b. The author refers to the other English commentary (How & Wells) even less frequently: p. 55 n. 45, p. 104; this two-volume book is not even found in the book’s Bibliography (*sic!*).

⁹ Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2007.

¹⁰ Among relatively recent works are: Hartog 1980; Thomas 2000; Bichler 2001. The book by Prof. Detlev Fehling *Herodotus and his ‘Sources’* (Fehling 1989; its first edition was in German in 1971.) falls short of it, in spite of the author’s claims to be otherwise.

¹¹ On this issue, see: Bowie 2018.

described in a good amount of detail.¹² But the author says nothing of another technique, namely, the technique of ‘pediment composition’ proposed by some researchers into the work of the Halicarnassian historian,¹³ who note that it is specific to him alone (while ‘ring composition’ is found in other Greek authors, be it Homer, Attic dramatists or Thucydides¹⁴).

S. Sheehan proceeds from the word ἱστορίη, used by Herodotus at the beginning of *The Histories*, which is rightly understood here as ‘a study’, that is, in its initial Ionic sense and not in the later sense of a ‘narrative of the past’.¹⁵ Correspondingly, Herodotus’ ἱστορίη refers to an array of spheres which have now been made separate, and defined as ‘history, ethnography, geography, cultural studies, comparative religion, philosophy’ (p. 9), while Herodotus saw them as a coherent whole.

Sheehan notes that the structure of the work is determined by the clash of the West and the East, where the East is a solid empire and the West is composed of a cluster of unrelated Greek states. Herodotus is largely systematic in interpreting the

¹² S. Sheehan frequently mentions this compositional principle: p. 125, 136, 243 ff. (discussing the final chapters of Herodotus’ *Histories*).

¹³ First and foremost, it is the afore-mentioned conceptual book by J. Myres (1953, esp. p. 89-117), with pictures of ‘pediments’ for certain episodes in Herodotus’ *Histories*, also, a studies: H.R. Immerwahr (1966: 54-55, *et al.*), Ingrid Beck (“Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik”, 1971, *passim*, with bibliography), Henry Wood (“The Histories of Herodotus: An Analysis the Formal Structure”, 1972, *passim*), also Miller 1984: 29-38; Ellis 1991: 346 ff.; Johnson 1994: 231-232; Boedeker 2002; de Jong 2004: 112-113, *et al.*; Welser 2009: 361 ff.; and also M.L. Gasparov’s publications on the symmetry of the historian’s work (see above, note 7); cf. Surikov 2009a: 222-225; Surikov 2010: 356-358; Surikov 2011: 149-151; 271-279; objections in summary: Sinitsyn 2012; Sinitsyn 2013, also in other A.A. Sinitsyn’s works indicated in note 7.

¹⁴ See, for example, Engels 2007. About Homer: Whitman 1958; Lohmann 1970; Stanley 1993: 307 f. + n. 21; Minchin 1995; Reece 1995; Nimis 1999; Douglas 2007; Minchin 2007; Beck 2014: 245 f.; Strolonga 2015-2016 (about symmetry and ring composition in “Homeric hymns”); Person 2016 (with new literature); Ready 2019: 10, 68; about Thucydides: Hammond 1952; Katičić 1957; Connor 1984: 177-178, 190, 195, 257-258, 261; Allison 1989; Ellis 1991; Bowie 1993 (Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides); Ellis 1994; Scardino 2007: 50 ff., 109 f.; Lang 2011 (critically); Allison 2013: 261; Liotsakis 2017: 23, 52-53, 61, 133; Rawlings 2017, 202-203.

¹⁵ Cf. Bakker 2002.

Eastern scenarios (by giving accounts of the events in the regions where Persian kings wage their campaigns), while the Greek accounts are rather chaotic. At least this holds true for the first part of *The Histories*, but with the Greek-Persian conflict brewing up, the Hellenic cohesion becomes less fragile, and the narration becomes more dramatic, focused on the imminent danger.

The historian sets the aim of the work at the very start, and it can be defined as the struggle against merciless Time that threatens to destroy the memory of human deeds. It was Arnaldo Momigliano who, in his classical article 'Time in Ancient Historiography',¹⁶ was the first to come up with this beautiful thought about Herodotus' historiography as an instrument to struggle against Time. Strange as it may be, Sheehan does not refer to him here (though in other parts of the book he occasionally mentions some of his works; how can it be otherwise when A. Momigliano made a greater contribution to the study of Greek historiography in the second half of the 20th century than Felix Jacoby had done in the first half?).

Herodotus, according to Sheehan, can be classed among the Pre-Socratic philosophers, and it is this, above all else, that determines the breadth of his interests, still undivided and compartmentalized. In this respect, he resembles the first natural philosophers (such as Thales or Anaximander) or Hecataeus, "a writer who along with Thales is mentioned by Herodotus and whose ethnographic and geographic interests most probably influenced his own writing" (p. 11).

Such a prominent figure as Hecataeus is mentioned in the Introduction only once, as was just cited. Hellanicus of Lesbos and Pherecydes of Athens are never referred to, not only in the Introduction, but in the whole book (I checked up on it not only in the Index, but also in the electronic text). It seems that at this stage one of the most topical and vital questions to be put in the studies of Herodotus' work must be the question of its correlation with works written by his predecessors, especially the immediate ones. It is clear that one cannot expect such 'sapience' from S. Sheehan's work, which, as was already noted, is not a study; its author confines himself in this context (p. 13) to another proverbial citation from the same Momigliano: "There was no Herodotus before Herodotus".¹⁷ Well, there was none – and so what?

¹⁶ Reference to the impression in one of the collections of the scholar's articles: Momigliano 1977: 191.

¹⁷ Momigliano 1966: 129.

There was no Shakespeare before Shakespeare, no Pushkin before Pushkin, but does it mean that their works were not a natural outgrowth of the works of their predecessors and that the process of this growing must not be the subject of serious study?

Again, this is not about Sheehan. A more significant collective work on the 'father of history'¹⁸ has a similar omission, as we pointed out in our article in this regard.¹⁹ If Herodotus, this representative of the Greek 'epic' historiography, is ever to be compared to somebody or derived from somebody, then this somebody will be Homer. We cannot help but adduce the prominent observation made by such a great figure as François Hartog, "Herodotus wanted to contend with Homer, and, having completed *Histories*, became Herodotus".²⁰

The epic aside, could Herodotus disregard the historians working before him, the very same Hecataeus and Pherecydes? What did he borrow from them (not facts but methods), what, on the contrary, did he deliberately ignore? This is the plane we must work on. Is the contemporary 'Herodotiana' up to the mark? Without doubt, what hobbles it is the poor preservation of the works of the 'forefathers of history', those pre-Herodotean 'servants of Clio', and the great disdain in which they are held in professional literature. Until recently, apart from the first volume of *FGrHist* by Felix Jacoby,²¹ there was only the old book by L. Pearson *Early Ionian Historians*.²² But now we can say that this research domain dramatically changed when a monumental two-volume book by R.L. Fowler *Early Greek Mythography*²³ came out. This book highlights certain fundamental differences between Herodotus (and Thucydides) and the 'forerunners'.²⁴

By the way, S. Sheehan is unaware of the afore-mentioned work by R. Fowler (though his book considers some of his articles). In general, it seems that the approaches assumed by this scholar are simplifying, reductionist. For example, Sheehan's examination of the evolution of views on how the *Histories* were created boils down to

¹⁸ Bowie (ed.) 2018.

¹⁹ Sinityn, Surikov 2019: 206-207.

²⁰ Hartog 1999: 178. Cf. a pendant, as it were, to another leading expert: "Herodotus may indeed have been 'most like Homer', but he was above all most like himself" (Marincola 2018: 20).

²¹ Jacoby 1995 (the latest impression).

²² Pearson 1975 (also an impression, the book came out in 1939).

²³ Fowler 2007; Fowler 2013.

²⁴ Fowler 2013: 668-669.

references to only a few works, namely, the famous encyclopedic article (the size of a good book) by Felix Jacoby²⁵ that indeed had been extremely influential for many decades, monographs by Ch.W. Fornara²⁶ and D. Fehling²⁷ (with its dubious hyper-critical conclusions reviving the Herodotus-the-Liar theory).

The author is right in pointing out that Herodotus makes a clear distinction between ‘mythical time’ and ‘historical time’, with the Halicarnassian’s focus shifted to the latter.²⁸ But this thesis has been frequently put forward,²⁹ sometimes in a fuller and more interesting form. Thus, it has been noted that the ‘father of history’ drew a much clearer dividing line between the ‘heroic epoch’ and ‘human epoch’ than his predecessors (‘logographers’, if to use their common, though incorrect, designation) and even Thucydides had.³⁰

Later in the Introduction, Sheehan touches upon such issues as causality in Herodotus (noting that the term αἰτία used in this context means not only ‘cause’ but also ‘guilt’, hence, the causality category proper does not fit into the contemporary scholarship, being, rather, of juridical character resolving itself to ‘responsibility’ incurring ‘retribution’), the role of the divine in the world, and ethnographic material in *The Histories* (this would suggest a reference to Reinhold Bichler’s important book,³¹ but there is none).

The emphasis is made on a thorough examination of Herodotus’ work as a literary monument³². The final part of the Introduction frequently features the word ‘postmodernism’ (pp. 33, 41, 58 n. 58), and this is only logical. The present situation when it comes to studying Herodotus, and almost every ancient author indeed,³³ is that they have become the domain of philologists who, to a varying extent, sympathize with the postmodernist

paradigm and whose interests encompass such categories as deconstruction, narratology, ‘memory space’, *etc.*, and not the value of text as a historical source.

S. Sheehan is one of them. Typical of the author is the postmodernist scorn for precision, which at times results in glaring mistakes. Thus, speaking about the episode when the Persian satrap Artayctes looted the sanctuary of the hero Protesilaus on the Thracian Chersonesos (Hdt. 9. 116), the author mistakenly asserts (p. 8) that this Greek hero was called Artayctes (the satrap’s name is not mentioned, it may well have been Protesilaus?!). Yet Sheehan discusses Herodotus’ *logos* of Protesilaus and the impure satrap Artayctes in the penultimate chapter of his work (p. 246 f).

The first part (Introduction) of the peer-reviewed book, is followed by a ‘Commentary’ (p. 61-87). We have enclosed the word in inverted commas because in fact what is given here is not a commentary. It is common knowledge what a classical commentary is, and, for one, the brilliant work by D. Asheri with colleagues³⁴ meets this definition: it does comment, and most meticulously at that, on every passage, nigh every word in Herodotus’ work. And in this case, we have a certain number of essays about various pieces of *Histories*.

The commentary to the First Book of Herodotus is named “Croesus and Cyrus” (p. 61-87). It begins with remarks about *prooemium* of *The Histories* (p. 61-63). At the very beginning, S. Sheehan offers the profane reader Homer’s and Herodotus’ notions of κλέος, γενόμενα, ἔργα, ἱστορία, ἀπόδειξις, *et al.* (p. 62-63 and 251-252 nn. *ad loci*). Both the ‘bards’ state outright (each in his own way) the chosen subjects; ‘Homer and Herodotus share a rhetorical interest in engaging with their audiences and they each announce their chosen subjects with a degree of theatricality: declarative statements highlighting the dramatic importance of their subject matter’ (p. 62). When comparing the beginning of Herodotus’ *Histories* with the beginnings of Homer’s poems and the assertions made by Homer’s characters (Hector, Achilles, Penelope and others – p. 62-63, 251 n. 1), Sheehan notes the dual character of the work of the Halicarnassian: the researcher and story-teller. ‘These twin interests will combine the art of an epic narrator with the empirical concerns of a historically-minded observer; like Homer, Herodotus seeks to reach out to a truth that exists independent

²⁵ Jacoby 1913.

²⁶ Fornara 1971.

²⁷ Fehling 1989.

²⁸ What he himself calls ἀνθρωπιῆς λεγομένης γε-νεῆς (Hdt. 3.122).

²⁹ Including one of the authors of this review: Surikov 2011: 398-399.

³⁰ Cartledge 1993: 34.

³¹ Bichler 2001.

³² See specifically about Herodotus as narrator: Dovatur 1957: esp. 65-178 and 185-200. And also Bowie (ed.) 2018: 3-122 (J. Marincola, A. Bowie, K. S. Kingsley, P.J. Finglass, I.M. Konstantakos, G. Nagy), and see Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019, 185-195.

³³ We are safe to argue that it was the same in the case of Solon, see at least Anhalt 1993; Irwin 2005.

³⁴ Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2007.

of the narrator, a truth bound up with warfare, and in doing so the historian's text assumes the mantle of the bard's song' (p. 62). Sheehan himself, when introducing the reader into the subject matters in Herodotus, specifically emphasizes the narrative method.

The section 'Abductions (1.1-5)' retells the first chapters of Book I where Herodotus elaborates on the causes of the conflict between Persia and Hellas (p. 63-66). It is supplemented with a table of reciprocal abductions in the East and the West (p. 64) that happened in the mythic times: *cherchez la femme*. The next passage tells the story about Croesus: the rulers of Lydia before him and the reign of the renowned Lydian king himself (p. 67-76); then comes the *logos* about the Athenian sage Solon and Croesus (p. 73-75),³⁵ the next passage is about the establishment of the Persian power in the "Story of Cyrus" (p. 76-81), followed by a brief essay "Persian ethnography" (p. 81-82): on the Persian mentality, their customs and laws, sacrifices, gluttony and other exotic instances. However, all this is made of citations from Herodotus. In the next passage "The Ionia *logos*" Sheehan notes (p. 82) that the chapters about Ionia in *The Histories* may seem boring and confusing, so the profane reader should just skim them (*sic!*); then follows a similar clarification: Herodotus' ethnographic and political digression on Ionia is of little import for the contemporary reader (probably, it is the English-speaking audience the writer is aiming at?). All the problems arising from their migrations, the self-perception of the Ionians, their pedigrees, *etc.* could be important only for the contemporaries of the 'father of history', hence, only for his audience (p. 83). We think that such 'commentaries' are appropriate if to regard Herodotus' work exclusively as a pastime read (a kind of 'light reading') and not as the richest of historical monuments. Each of these paragraphs (except for the last one – "Cyrus, Babylon and the Massagetae", p. 84-87) is supplied with unpretentious 'boxes' for illustration purposes (p. 68, 71, 77, 80, 81, 83).

The section entitled 'Book Two' (p. 89-110) is shorter than the previous one, here almost one third – 6 pages out of 20 – is composed of schematic 'presentations': the Outline of the structure of Book Two (p. 90); two three-page boxes filled with thematic jottings from the Egyptian *logos* (p. 92-94); a list of Egyptian rulers (p. 103), the story about Proteus (p. 105). This part

discusses Herodotus' accounts of natural phenomena, religion, exotic beasts, mummification and other Egyptians curiosities which might have been of interest to the listener/reader of *The Histories*. As Sheehan notes, "Piety underlies their (Egyptians. – *A.S., I.S.*) reverent attitude towards animals but Herodotus' interest in the fauna is a mixture of zoological curiosity and a populist desire to appeal to his Greek audience with evidence from the natural world of Egypt's unique wonders" (p. 100).

The longest passage in the chapter "Early kings and the Helen *logos* (2.99-120)" (p. 102-107) is devoted to the story about Proteus (p. 104 ff.), where Sheehan examines the subject of the Trojan cycle in Herodotus' interpretation, the Helen and Menelaus *logos*, and the subject of hospitality (ξενία).³⁶ In this case, the 'guide' largely draws upon M. de Bakker's study on the myth and the story about Proteus, one of the last, specifically devoted to this subject in *The Histories*.³⁷ Now, there are more works to refer to, namely, the work by Nikolay P. Grintser and Smaro Nikolaidou-Arabatzi in a new collection of articles on Herodotus as a scholar and narrator.³⁸

This part is completed by two sections: Rhapsinitus, pyramid builders and chronology (Hdt. 2.121-146)' (pp. 107-109) and a brief essay 'The Labyrinth and the Saite kings (Hdt. 2.147-178)' (pp. 109-110). And the last chapters of Book II are altogether missing: on the rights of the commercial harbor Naucratis (Hdt. 2.179), donations to construct a new temple in Delphi (Hdt. 2.180), Amasis and Ladice, dedicatory gifts sent by King Amasis to Hellas (Hdt. 2.182). Sheehan's 'commentaries' are abundant in such 'gaps'. Can it be that the author may have left out the chapters which are of least interest to the contemporary reader?

The next section – loosely based on Book III – is entitled "Cambyses, Samos and Darius" (p. 111-130). This integral part covers less than a decade: from the reign of Cambyses (529-522 BC) to the first year of Darius' rule. "The chronological backbone" of Book 3 contains digressions on Samos (three stories). The general pattern of the book is shown in Box 1 (p. 112). In Cambyses'

³⁵ See Surikov 1999; Pelling 2006; Leão 2020 (with bibliography).

³⁶ For more detail, see: Austin 2008 (specifically on the *logos* in Herodotus "Herodotus and Helen in Egypt", p. 118-136); Fialho 2020: 263-265.

³⁷ Bakker de 2012 (with an extensive bibliography *ad loc.* Hdt.).

³⁸ Grintser 2018 (and also Grintser 2016); Nikolaidou-Arabatzi 2018. See the discussion in our review: Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019: 197-198 and 205. And see new: Fialho 2020.

passionate speech on his dream, his brother Smerdis' murder and the woeful fate of the Persian king himself (Hdt. 3.65 sq.), Sheehan, referring to M. Finkelberg's article on Sophocles' *Trachiniae*' (p. 263 n. 27³⁹), highlights the clout of the Attic tragedy and draws a parallel between Herodotus' Cambyses and Shakespeare's Macbeth – similar stories about “an individual's tragic downfall”⁴⁰. “It also points forward and across millennia to ‘Macbeth’ and that play's dramatization of an individual's tragic downfall. Like Cambyses, Macbeth starts from a position of security but succumbs to temptation, arising from a prophecy, that leads to murdering someone close to him. Cambyses and Macbeth each descend into a state of moral degradation, ruefully coming to accept that their own death is imminent. A prophecy (a second one in the case of Macbeth) that they seek to disprove through murder is going to be realized in a way they never foresee. Cambyses' dying words do not reach the tragic profundity of Macbeth's ‘tomorrow and tomorrow’ speech but both men give expression to what for each of them is an important truth about life” (p. 121-122).⁴¹ Speaking about the disgraceful death of ‘the lucky’ Polycrates by the hand of the ignoble Persian Oroetis, Sheehan notes that Herodotus is sympathetic to the tyrant Samos and thinks that the detailed accounts (Hdt. 3.120 sqq.) in this chapter suggest that the historian had some local patriotic sources of information available (p. 126). King Darius' revenge exacted on Oroetes for the vile murder of Polycrates is ‘a link between Samos and Darius’. This part ends with a brief discourse on the early reign of Darius (p. 127-130, with a large box – p. 129).

Sheehan provides no special introduction to Book 4: “Darius, Scythia and Libya” (p. 131-151), the way he did for the previous sections. He draws upon the most important fundamental research works written by F. Hartog (1989), A. Corcella (2007), S. West (2002), O.K. Armayor (1978a, b), D. Fehling (1989) and other classics. The first chapter of the section “Scythia and Darius” (pp. 131-134) features different topics of the Scythian *logos*: the issue of the origin of Scythians,

the composition of the population, the geography of Scythia, religion of Scythians, their outlandish customs, *etc.* There are some references to ‘structural dualism’ in the ethnographic descriptions provided by the Halicarnassian historian, about the polarity of cultures: us and them, Hellenes – barbarians, the settled – the nomadic, locals – newcomers (p. 134 ff.). These issues have been broadly discussed in the world study of Herodotus in the latest three decades (Sheehan refers to P. Cartledge's).⁴² Another issue is put forward for discussion: Herodotus the researcher (historian, ethnographer, geographer), who recounts reliable information about other peoples, vs. Herodotus the ‘structuralist’, who works within the framework of a considered paradigm (p. 134 and notes to this section – p. 264-265).⁴³ ‘The account of Scythian culture, notes Sheehan, comes to an end with the dark side of ethnocentrism’: Herodotus (4.76-79) relates two parallel stories about the members of the Scythian royal family of Anacharsis and Scyles, who paid with their own lives for borrowing the alien customs (p. 139-140).

The section describes Darius' march to Scythia, the action of the allies and the strategy of the Scythians. Then comes a brief story about Thera, followed by the *logos* about the founding of Cyrene and its rulers. The ‘commentary’ to the section ends with a passage ‘Ethnography of Libya’ (half a page long, p. 151) which covers Chapter 31 of the Histories (4.168-199). On the interaction of myth and ethnography in the Libyan *logos* of Herodotus, we can now point out an interesting study by Vasiliki Zali.⁴⁴ While the last six chapters of the Book (4.200-205) are crammed into several sentences (p. 149); it may have been so because this finale was not in line with the subject of the section indicated by the author. Yet, the Pheretime *logos* is a macabre and insightful story.⁴⁵

⁴² Cartledge 1993.

⁴³ From among the recent works on this theme, the following monographs should be considered: Joseph E. Skinner *The Invention of Greek Ethnography* (Skinner 2012), Kostas Vlassopoulos *Greeks and Barbarians* (Vlassopoulos 2013), new collection *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus* (Figueira, Soares 2020) and others (see the bibliography in question: Sinitsyn 2015 and Sinitsyn 2017c).

⁴⁴ Zali 2018 (with new literature), here pp. 126-132 (Libya), 132-137 (Cyrene). See the discussion in our review: Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019: 195-196.

⁴⁵ Ruthless Pheretime, who was severe in her revenge for her son Arcesilaus, and her savage death

³⁹ Finkelberg 1995 (the author's name and the date of the article are inaccurate; see below).

⁴⁰ See McKeon 2020: 352, 353-354.

⁴¹ There is yet another parallel with this play by Shakespeare (p. 201): an analogy is drawn between the aspirations of the two tragic heroes Xerxes and Macbeth; with reference to (ibid. and p. 276 n. 13) the article by Jasper Griffin “Herodotus and Tragedy”: “We are close here to the world of ‘Macbeth’” (Griffin 2006: 50).

The next section is entitled “The Ionian revolt – causes and outbreak” (p. 153-172). Sheehan outrightly warns the reader that Book 5 will be full of various digressions from the ‘kernel’, general topic of *The Histories*, that there Herodotus keeps diverging from the account of the revolts of Ionic cities against the Persian rule. The motif of the East and the West gets stronger in Book 5, and Sheehan writes, “Crossings between Asia and Europe using bridges and boats, which began with the Scythian campaign in Book Four, now become a significant part of the narrative and will reach a climax when Persia decides to invade Greece” (p. 153). The Ionian city of Miletus, which even before had been a place of paramount importance, now became “the bridge between Europe and Asia ‘more so than the actual bridge of the Hellespont’” (p. 154, with reference to the article by S. Bouzarovski and E.J. Bakker).⁴⁶ The proem to the discussion of Book V of *The Histories* is accompanied, for illustrative purposes, by two large boxes: ‘Digressions’ in Book 5 (p. 154) and “Crossings between Asia and Europe” (p. 155).

Sheehan touches upon the issue of the shift of focus in *The Histories*: from geographic and ethnographic *logoi* of the first part (Books 1-4) the Halicarnassian historian passes to a continuous account of the Greek-Persian wars, dealing with the historical and political problems (Books 5-9). The version of the two-part structure of Herodotus’ *Histories* can be called ‘the Jacobi formula’ (the German classicist’s well-known assumption made explicit in his Pauly-Wissowa’s article on Herodotus published in *Supplementum Realencyclopädie*).⁴⁷ The author of the ‘Guide’ indicates that Book V begins the second part of the whole work, marking ‘a more general fault line’ (p. 155) dividing *The Histories* into two parts, yet Sheehan does not give references to F. Jacoby.⁴⁸ This Book shows how the

scenario unfolds determined by the actions of particular figures, first and foremost, of the tyrant of Miletus Aristagoras and king of Sparta Cleomenes (p. 161-164), Cleisthenes (p. 166-167), Socles of Corinth, Athenians Isagoras and Hippias (p. 167-171), the satrap Artaphrenes (p. 160-161, 163, 170-171, *et al.*). The review of the last 30 chapters of Book 5 “The Ionian revolt (5.97-126)” is condensed to a page and a half (p. 171-172). The section is concluded by another parallel that Sheehan draws between the original conflict between the West and the East – The Trojan war (p. 171).

A brief introduction precedes the ‘commentaries’ to Book 6; this section goes under the name of “The Ionian revolt – defeat and aftermath” (p. 173-191). Sheehan begins with remarking on the conditional division of Herodotus’ work into nine Books (p. 173 and p. 272 n. 1),⁴⁹ highlights the thematic ‘continuity’ of Book 5 from Book 6: both are devoted to the revolt of Ionic *poleis* against the Persian rule and the effect of this revolt for the whole Hellenic world. According to the author, the motives related to religious aspects constitute a special *topos*, and Herodotus expresses a common Greek viewpoint, according to which religious defections are bound to incur the divine punishment. ‘Instances of transgressive behaviour that populate Book Six, especially in relation to the swearing of oaths, bear out the punitive role of the gods as a basic cause of reversals in human fortune’ (p. 175). Here (p. 173 ff.) again, the subject of retribution/*tisis* (cf. p. 24 ff., 41-42) is brought to light. But if to speak about terms at all, we should note that of the 14 instances of τίσις in *The Histories* in Books 5 and 6, this word occurs only four times – twice in each of the Books.⁵⁰

The section is made up of four passages. The first two – developing the topic of Book 5 of the Ionian revolt – are a little too short: ‘Failure of the Ionian revolt’ (p. 175-178, with a Box ‘Histiaeus’ biography’, p. 176 referring to passages mentioning the tyrant of Miletus in the *Histories*, with notes), while comments on ‘After the Ionian revolt’ (p. 178-179) fill less than a page. Both the passages, likewise those of the previous section, provide a scanty overview of the first third of Book 6, focusing on the chapter ‘The Ionian revolt’ prepared by O. Murray for the fundamental *CAH*²

(she was eaten alive by worms) as a retribution sent to the queen by the gods is frequently mentioned in the book: p. 22, 149, 175, 245, 281. Sheehan cites the passage about ‘a bloodthirsty monster’ Pheretime from Aldo Corcella’s introduction to the commentary to Book 4 of Herodotus’ *Histories* (Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2007: 569), yet the citation here is inaccurate, with omissions.

⁴⁶ Bouzarovski, Barker 2016: 172.

⁴⁷ Jacoby 1913: 281-419; by the way, the Soviet scholar S.Ya. Lurie (1947: 124-132) elaborated on this version in the mid-20th century (see Lurie 1947: 124 n. 1).

⁴⁸ To this effect, Sheehan confines himself to brief remarks in the Introduction which contains references to the renowned German researcher: p. 13, 30 and 33.

⁴⁹ “... The length of a papyrus roll may have influenced the division into books” (p. 272 n. 1, with reference to J. Priestley’s monograph on the reception of Herodotus in the Hellenic age: Priestley 2014).

⁵⁰ Cf. Powell 1966: 357, col. 2, s.v. τίσις.

(vol. 4), the monograph by George L. Cawkwell *The Greek Wars* (2005), and the commentaries on Herodotus' Book 6 written by Lionel Scott (2005), and some others. Sheehan completes this section with two chapters: "Sparta, Aegina and Athens" (p. 179-184, with a box of the same name – p. 180) and "The Marathon campaign" (p. 185-191). The main characters the author focuses on in the section are Histiaeus and Miltiades. Again, almost a third of the whole is given in huge schematic boxes.

Part 7 "The road to Thermopylae" (p. 193-214) opens with a reminder of the Persian first failed attempts to invade Europe (p. 193). Speaking about the Council at Susa (Hdt. 7.5 sq.), Sheehan refers to the parallel between great councils of heroes and gods in Homer's poems.⁵¹ The introduction features three big boxes: the first one is the structure of Book 7 (p. 194), the second one encompasses passages from Book 3 to Book 7 telling about the Persians getting ready to invade Hellas, "The road to Thermopylae" (p. 195), the third one – "Persian imperialism: Successes and setbacks" (p. 196) – contains passages about the Persian kings, Cyrus and Cambyses. The campaign is considered in the chapters "Reaching and crossing the Hellespont" (p. 202-207), "Hellespont to Thermopylae" (p. 207-210), a short chapter "The Greeks respond" (p. 210-211) and the section is concluded by the chapter "Thermopylae" (p. 212-214). It discusses the subject of hubristic Xerxes/Persians and punishment for their ὕβρις (p. 199, 201-202, 204-205). This entails the issue of religious and moral motives of the *logos* of the Persian wars, and Sheehan adduces a whole group of ethical terms Herodotus and Aeschylus use: τύχη, ἄτη, φθόνος, θεῖον, νέμεσις, *et al.* The notes contain selected literature (p. 277 n. 22, 23),⁵² related to the parallels between Aeschylus' Persians and chapters of Herodotus' Book 7.

⁵¹ Sheehan refers to Books 1 and 9 of *Iliad* and Books 1 and 5 of the *Odyssey* (p. 275 n. 2). But this is an incomplete selection, for councils of Achaean warriors (in *Iliad*), citizens of Ithaca (in *Odyssey*) and assemblies of gods in either poem are more frequent: *Iliad* 2, 7, 24 *et al.* Yet, Sheehan notes that the main purpose of the episode of the dispute at Susa is to create the sentiment of a beginning. But it is Book 2 of *Iliad* with a misleading dream Zeus sent to Agamemnon, the counsel given by Achaean chiefs, the all-arms assembly and the testing of warriors that is the outset of new military actions at Troy; as is Book 2 of *Odyssey* with the assembly of the citizens of Ithaca to discuss the issue of sending Telemachus to find Odysseus.

⁵² On the Hellespont motives in Aeschylus and Herodotus: Sinitsyn 2017a; Sinitsyn 2017b; Sinitsyn 2019 (with bibliography).

Sheehan points (p. 209-210) to the passage in Hdt. 7.137, which scholars regards as *terminus ante quem*, that is, the date 430 BC to be the year for Herodotus to have completed *Histories*. Citing a well-known assertion made by the 'father of history' on the Athenians being the only defenders of Hellas (7. 139: 'Here I am constrained perforce to declare an opinion [γνώμην] which will be displeasing to most; but I will not refrain from uttering what seems to me to be true [μοι φαίνεται εἶναι ἀληθές]'⁵³), the author focuses on the notions γνώμη and ἀλήθεια (p. 210) to describe the methods and principles applied by Herodotus in his historiography.

Here, likewise in every section, Sheehan, drawing upon certain literature on the invasion of barbarians on Hellas, gives an outline of yet another Book. The author turns to the most well-known works on the battle of Thermopylae: C. Matthew and M. Trundle (2003), two short monographs by P. Cartledge (*Thermopylae*, 2006 and *After Thermopylae*, 2013), the afore-mentioned book by G.L. Cawkwell (2005), articles by L. Tritle (2006), E. Foster (2012) and others. When describing Xerxes' march from Hellespont to Thermopylae, the following recent works should be considered (all of them are in English): P. Delev, V. Sarakinski, J.Z. van Rookhuijzen, recent monographs by R. Stoneman, M.I. Vasilev, T.J. Russell,⁵⁴ and others.

The next part – "Book Eight: Showdown at Salamis" (p. 215-232) – consists of 4 chapters and 3 boxes. The first chapter "Artemisium and retreat" (p. 215-221) begins with Athens and Sparta arguing about which of them was to take the helm of the Greek fleet in the battle of Artemisium, and with Herodotus' stand: "the authorial voice concurs with an observation about the corrosive harm of internal strife"; with the deliberation on the passage Hdt. 8.3 (p. 215-216). Sheehan adduces the translation of this passage done by Aubrey de Sélincourt and compares it with other English translations; and in the note (p. 280 n. 1) he refers to the literature to be discussed: the monograph by Rosaria Munson (2001) and Emily Baragwanath (2008). The next three chapters are devoted to the pitched battle – ἀκμή of The Histories: "Before Salamis" (p. 221-224), "The Battle of Salamis" (p. 224-226) and

⁵³ Trans. by Alfred Denis Godley in "Loeb Classical Library": Herodotus 1922: 441, 443.

⁵⁴ Stoneman 2015; Vasilev 2015; Russell 2017. From among the recent works: "Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion": van Rookhuijzen 2018.

“After Salamis” (p. 226-232). The author does not examine the course and the map of the battle, only referring to the literature on the details of the battle related by Herodotus, and, again, in Aeschylus’ “Persians” (p. 227 and p. 281 n. 17). The English-language literature also has quite a recent monograph by B. Strauss *The Battle of Salamis*,⁵⁵ unknown to Sheehan, but of use to those interested in the history of the Greek-Persian wars.

The ‘guide’ again deliberates on the τίσις-motive (p. 225-226; cf. p. 25), which is spurred by the story about Hermotimus and Panionius (Hdt. 8.104-106); while in the note (p. 281 n. 19) he refers to J. Redfield’s article (1985-2013) on the forms of symmetry in the *Histories* for the Hermotimus *logos* – “the most horrible revenge for giving umbrage”, as Herodotus confesses, the most abhorrent of those he knows. Discoursing upon this μέγιστη τίσις, he again turns to the subject of Herodotus the Narrator (p. 226).

An important aspect of Books 7 and 8, according to Sheehan, is that Herodotus arranges the actions of land and sea forces (p. 231)⁵⁶ in a strict chronological order. He points out that the season-by-season arrangement of historical events is a distinguishing feature of Thucydides’ method worked out for the *History of the Peloponnesian War* (p. 231-232), and refers to the differences between Herodotus (“‘entertaining’ historian, the artful teller of sometimes tall stories”) and Thucydides (“‘professional’ historian, scientific and meticulous”) (p. 232).⁵⁷ At the end of the section, the author again touches upon the matters of chronology and time structure in Herodotus (with reference to the article by a German scholar Justus Cobet).⁵⁸

The last section “Book Nine: Persia defeated” (p. 233-249) consists of 5 chapters and 2 presentation boxes. The first chapter “Hostilities

resumed” (p. 233-237) describes the Persian army after the Hellenic sea victory at Salamis: Xerxes returns to Asia, Queen Artemisia’s stance, the behaviour of Commander Mardonius left with his army in Europe (p. 233, 235). Box 1 represents the structure of Book 9 (p. 234). Sheehan speaks about signal lights Mardonius could use, in the case of his victory over the Athenians, to transmit the news of his triumph from Europe to Asia across the Aegean Sea; with a reference to Emily Baragwanath, the author highlights the literary parallel – “Agamemnon” by Aeschylus begins with of the signal lights sent after the fall of Troy.⁵⁹ He also highlights the two meanings of ἀνάγκη (‘necessity, fate’), providing its occurrence not only in Book 9, but also in the previous Books of *The Histories* (p. 235-236; with reference to the articles by R.V. Munson “Ananke in Herodotus” and Suzanne Saïd “Herodotus and Tragedy”⁶⁰ – p. 282 n. 3 and 6). The next three chapters relate the events of the two last, decisive battles in Xerxes’ campaign in Hellas: “Battle of Plataea” (p. 237-240), “Plataea’s aftermath” (p. 240-241) and “Battle of Mycale” (p. 241-243). The section is concluded by three passages under the title of “The ending of the Histories” (p. 243-249), which relate the last chapters of Herodotus’ work: “Xerxes’ infatuations (9.108-13)”, “Artayctes’ (9.116-20)” and “Cyrus’ advice (9.122)”; also the section discusses the siege of Sestos, Herodotus’ evidence of the Athenians’s cruel punishment of their enemies captured during this campaign (Hdt. 9.119-120), while the deeds performed by the victorious Greeks are compared to the ruthlessness of their rivals (p. 246-248; for example, “The Athenians have no doubts before nailing Artayctes to the cross and bludgeoning to death his manifestly innocent son”, p. 247). Likewise in many other parts of the book, Sheehan, once again, points out that “Herodotus, the fact-bound historian but also the storytelling artisan, juggles with the two different types of discourse that such narrative ambidextrousness requires” (p. 242). The author of the Guide points at the ring composition of the work. Indeed, the final chapters of *The Histories* prove to be the most controversial parts of Herodotus’ work (especially, in the recent three decades). “Some readers find in the ending of ‘the Histories’ indications that Herodotus is indeed aware of the dangers of an incipient Athenian imperialism” (p. 243) and further: “The last chapter of the Histories is open

⁵⁵ Strauss 2005.

⁵⁶ Attempts to establish control over the consecutive account of the events were made earlier, in Book 6 of Herodotus’ *Histories*, where temporal indicators are also used (the year/years, the beginning of the spring campaign): 6.31, 42, 43, 46. Sheehan noted this in an appropriate place (p. 175); see the article by one of the authors of this review: Sinitsyn 2013: 44-49.

⁵⁷ The issue of polarizations of the Halicarnassian and Athenian historians, of their techniques and principles arises sporadically in other parts of the book: p. 6, 14, 26, 52 n. 18, 77, 249, 263 n. 30, 267 n. 27, 271 n. 26 *et al.* For various intersections in the works of Herodotus and Thucydides see Foster, Lateiner (eds.) 2012: *passim*. Selected literature in Sinitsyn 2013: 40-40, notes 8-13.

⁵⁸ Cobet 2002. On images of Time in Herodotus’ *Histories*: Surikov 2009b; Surikov 2011: 179-211.

⁵⁹ See Baragwanath 2012, 303 ff.

⁶⁰ Munson 2001; Saïd 2002.

to different interpretations and one view is that Herodotus is suggesting Athens might be heading towards the kind of imperialistic ambitions that saw the rise and fall of the Persian Empire” (p. 248-249). Notes provide selected literature on the final chapters of Herodotus’ work: D. Boedeker (1988), J. Herington (1991), C. Dewald (1997), W. Desmond (2004) and others (p. 284 n. 23, 24). The last *logos* on Cyrus and Artembares (the latter being the grandfather of Artayctes executed by the Greeks) is one of the most questionable in the studies of Herodotus. Without making his position clear on the issue of completeness of Herodotus’ *Histories*⁶¹ (as well as other issues), Sheehan is likely to tend to the opinion of Carolyn Dewald, citations of whose article he adduces in the Conclusion (p. 249). In the finale, the author again links the first extant *Histories* with the first ‘historical’ poem of the Greeks’,⁶² thereby, as it were, closing the composition of his own work in a ring.

The notes to ‘commentaries’ (p. 251-284) present an academic apparatus of the ‘guide’ to the Herodotus study: references to sources and research works, analysis of terminology (partly repeating, partly supplementing the main sections), discussions of controversial issues outside the main body of the text.

The list of over 400 references (p. 285-305) comprises many English-language publications on Herodotus and his work, but missing out some works of utmost importance (at least those written in the last quarter of a century). The main text, notes and bibliography contain some inaccurate references. The book ends with an eclectic index of proper and geographic names, and terms (p. 307-316), but owing to numerous *lapsi linguae* in the book, this index is incomplete and contains errors.⁶³

⁶¹ As was noted above (see notes 7 and 13), here the views of the authors of the review radically diverge.

⁶² “Like the ending of the *Iliad*, Herodotus’ final remarks make plain the dissimilarity between the necessary finitude of the text’s narrative and ongoing events set in place by the history recorded in that narrative. At the end of the *Iliad*, the reader of Homer knows that in time to come Troy will fall and Achilles will die; Herodotus’ readers know that after the events recorded in Book Nine Athens will go on to develop an empire of its own. An event referred to at the start of the *Histories*, Helen’s journey from Europe to Asia, has shown itself to be a starting point for, in addition to ten years of war at Troy, a multilayered history that continues to unfold beyond the end point of Herodotus’ *Histories*” (p. 249).

⁶³ In the *Appendix* contains *lapsus* in this “guide”, which, according to the author’s intention, is addressed

As to the book typography, we should note that all words and phrases in Greek are given in Latin transliteration, which is feasible, even more so that the ‘guide’ is aimed, first and foremost, at students (though English and American student ought to know the classical languages). The long vowels η and ω of the Greek alphabet are sometimes rendered with accents (*ē*, *ō*), sometimes without. Diacritical signs are a disaster: *dike* or *dikē*, *thomasta* or *thōmasta*, *thoma* or *thōma*, *kleos* or *kléos*, *aretē* or *arēte*, *gnome*, *histor*, etc. The Old Greek word ‘myth’ in Latin transliteration can become *muthos*,⁶⁴ and the word τύχη (“chance, luck, fate”) – everywhere as *tuchē* (p. 45 *bis*, 46 *quater*, 170, 271 n. 37, 277 n. 15, 316), *suntukhiēn* (p. 122); similarly: *sumphorē* (p. 46), *misoturannoī* (p. 187), *megalophrosunē* (p. 203, 204 *bis*, 210, 312, col. 2), *khrusophoroī* (p. 142), *aikhuntheisa* (p. 253 n. 23), *turannidos* (p. 255 n. 46, 277 n. 19), *huperēdomai* (p. 261 n. 11 *bis*), or ο υ is rendered as “i” – *apodeiknimi* (p. 251 n. 6) instead of *apodeiknymi*. The word φύσις (Sheehan has it as ‘nature’ or ‘national character’) is transcribed either as *physis* (p. 11, 208, 314), or *phusis* (p. 97, 101 *bis*). The Old Greek religious and ethical notion ὕβρις (‘hubris’, also ‘pride, arrogance’) occurs a dozen times as *hybris* or its derivatives (p. 74, 95, 123, 190, 199, 201 *bis*, 204, 208, 223 *bis*, *et al.*) or as *hubris* (p. 74 *bis*, 87, 123 *bis*, 141, 199, 200, 204, 264 n. 4, *et al.*), with differences occurring at times in one sentence; for example: ‘*Kambuseō hubrin ... Magou hubrios ... the word hybris...*’ (p. 123); also in note 15, p. 277. The letter χ in the book rendered either as *ch*, or *kh*. And *iota subscriptum* is often missing from the transcribed Old Greek citations, for example, *khronō* – χρόνω (p. 198). Frequently, words miss letters (for example, p. 178: *kallistn* – the last syllable misses *ē*: Hdt. 6.24: καλλίστην); or, on the contrary, extra letters pop up (for example, p. 156: *ēesan* – Herodotus has the verb ἔσαν, 1.6.2); in the process of transliteration some words in the text get stuck together; for example, p. 95: *paidas|hybristas* – в Hdt. 2.32.3: παῖδας ὑβριστάς; p. 101: *pleista|thōmasia* – в Hdt. 2.35.1: πλεῖστα θωμάσια; p. 259 n. 22: *es|diapeiran* – в Hdt. 2.28.4: ἐς διάπειραν, and so on and so forth. Why should one parenthesize Latin transliteration of Old Greek words and phrases, if this ‘simplification’ is often misspelt? It looks nonsensical and does not add to the ‘guide’ purpose.

primarily to students. These “Errata et corrigenda” are “work on mistakes”, of which there are many in the book by Sean Sheehan.

⁶⁴ Henceforward, the underscore in words are the authors.

Now, about misprints: the book is full of reshuffled letters in Greek and non-Greek names. This just a preliminary list: the name Συλοσῶν is spelt as either Sylsson or Sylosson (p. 45, 170, 315) or Syloson (p. 128 *ter*, 129 *bis*, 195 and 304) instead of Sylosōn; the name Ἀρτάβανος – Artanabus (p. 281 n. 14), Ἀρταφρένης – Artaphranes (p. 157, box 3, *ad loc.* Hdt. 5.30-32); and on over 20 occasions in another variant: Artaphernes. Extra letters emerge: Xerexes (p. 255 n. 37), Cyclon (p. 188, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. 5.71), Scycles (p. 43, 315), *etc.* The names of contemporary scholars are mistakenly spelt: Bernadette (p. 114, 286) instead of Benardete; Finkelbeg (p. 263 n. 27, 291) instead of Finkelberg; Węowski (p. 252 n. 14) instead of Węcowski; Griffiths (p. 271 n. 37) instead of Griffiths; initials are wrong, for example, Hegel, G.W.H. (p. 311, col. 1); the name of the storyteller Scheherazade (p. 36) comes as Scherazade in 'Index' (p. 315, col. 1), and there are many other blunders. Misspellings sometimes reach the point of being ridiculous: Alcmeon occurs on many occasions, but three dozens of times it is Alcmaeonid(s), though the name of the family derives from the name of its progenitor (Ἀλκμαίων / Ἀλκμαιωνίδαί);⁶⁵ paradoxical as it may be, different spellings can occur in one sentence: 'Alcmaeonid, Alcmeon' (p. 188, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. 6.125; cf. p. 189, 275). Thus, the Index contains incomplete and incongruous indications: 'Alcmaeonid family: 8, 1' (*sic!*). The book features both *anankē* (p. 42, 235 *bis*, 307, col. 2), and *pasa anagkē* (p. 164 *bis*), *anagkazomenos* (p. 182), *anagkaiē* (p. 210).

Letters are frequently missing, for example, 'ethnograpp[h]y' (p. 90, box 1 and p. 94, box 3); 'logo[s]' (p. 111). There are many mistakes in punctuation, titles of articles and editions: for example, M. Finkelberg's article goes as "Sophocles' 'Tr.' 634-69..." instead of "Sophocles' Tr. 634-639...", and this article is published in the journal "Mnemsoyne" instead of "Mnemosyne"; or the reference to the commentary to Book III by Herodotus: Asheri, D. (2007c), 'Book III' (p. 285), *etc.*

Inconsistencies and inaccuracies are aplenty in Sheehan's short text. All these blunders may be regarded as embarrassing traits of indecent haste and carelessness of the author; but the proof reader ought to have done a bit of correcting. 'Bloomsbury Academic' is undoubtedly a quality publisher,

but the blunders in the book under review are obvious. It should be noted again that such an inconsistency in spelling, misprints, errors and gaps question the feasibility of this book for students who are unfamiliar with classical languages (?!), and for whom, actually, this 'guide' to the Herodotus study is meant.

The author frequently has recourse to illustrative parallels with classics of European literature of different epoches (today's English students may be more familiar with this). For example, references to Grimm Brothers' tales (p. 19 and 107) or comparison to Shakespeare's tragedies (p. 111, 121-122, 126, 201) and his characters (the villains – Iago, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth). We find the following parallel with the drama of the English classic (pp. 11 and 112): the Herodotus *logoi* involve a host of characters who play minor 'roles' in the grand drama of history;⁶⁶ they appear in the text of The Histories, perform their 'bits' and leave the stage to the main actors. 'They enter a scene, perform their roles and suffer vicissitudes before exiting and leaving the stage to the main players. The brief appearances of some of these minor characters, like their equivalents in Shakespeare, belie the force of the impressions they leave in their wake. Their fates, the natures of which range from the incredulous to the macabre, unfold in a series of anecdotes about personal gratitudes and grievances that transcend the public and political arena, that animate the text' (p. 111). We can only add that these minor characters are secondary only in their involvement in the plot of *The Histories*, not in their importance (similarly, Shakespeare's plays have no characters of 'minor roles'). Herodotus' one-act characters are usually shown as 'hubristic', they suffer punishment and perish. As another classic Russian said, "And everywhere fateful passion invades, / And from one's fate there is no release" (Alexander Pushkin "The Gypsies").

As a presentation of the contemporary state of the Herodotus studies, S. Sheehan's book has left out many authoritative commentaries. The most important German, French, Italian edition are missing, also missing is a reference to the three-volume work by Alan B. Lloyd (on Book 2 by Herodotus),⁶⁷ which cannot be replaced by the second part of the new scholium by D. Asheri and Co

⁶⁵ And in the English version by A.D. Godley, S. Sheehan largely drew upon (p. XIII), it is always *Alcmeon* and *Alcmeonid(ae)*, without the diphthong 'ae/ai' in the middle of the name and family.

⁶⁶ In the Introduction S. Sheehan specifies that the 'cast' in Herodotus' Histories is over 900 persons with names (p. 33).

⁶⁷ Lloyd 1975; Lloyd 1976; Lloyd 1988.

(whose author is A. Lloyd).⁶⁸ But there are references to G.W.F. Hegel's works on philosophy and history, and contemporary men of letters and philosophers. The Introduction begins with Walter Benjamin's elucidating a word from Franz Kafka's work (the German philosopher provides his interpretation of it, but in the English version it is 'unfolding', p. 3 and cf. p. 6), then follows a reference to Virginia Woolf (p. 6), one of the leaders of the English modernist literature of the first half of the 20th century. The author discusses Herodotus' *logoi* about Miltiades, Polycrates, Cambyses, Croesus, Oedipus immediately to shift to W.S. Maugham's short story and a Slavic philosopher Slavoj Žižek (p. 43). Here we find a passage in which the Spartan King Leonidas' behaviour is likened to that of Japanese kamikaze pilots (p. 279 n. 45). As a parallel with the warning given by Sandanis to King Croesus (Hdt. 1.71), the author adduces Vladimir Lenin's utterance (well-known in the Soviet tradition much earlier) about Beethoven's 'Appassionata' (Piano Sonata No. 23, *f-moll*, op. 57) and about the 'esthetic' influence of this piano sonata, which prompts one to "say nice platitudes and stroke the heads of those who, living in such squalor, can create such beauty" (p. 257 n. 59, surely, Sheehan does not mention that these words are borrowed from Maxim Gorky's essay "V.I. Lenin", 1930).

In our opinion, it is indicative of the reviewed 'guide' that the author himself, while taking the reader through 'the halls' of the *logoi* of the Herodotus 'Muses', very rarely voices his own judgement and gives his assessments. The book reviews selected literature, elucidates positions of some contemporary scholars, outlines the main fields of today's Herodotus studies, but the researching self of Sheehan is concealed behind it. One illustrative example is the paucity of discussion about the completeness of Herodotus' *Histories*. Here we should mention that the authors of this review espouse different views on the subject, but that is not the point, what is important is that there must be a position adopted on this matter.

The book contains interesting observations, but on the whole it is cultural eclecticism before us, which may have been elaborated to demonstrate to the contemporary student that Antiquity is by no means something boring, that a classic author is not something archaic, rusty and alien. The book was rather a disappointment. It was about an author of a work that is said to "have so much novel and valuable in it..."

APPENDIX: *Errata et corrigenda*

- P. 8: In Hdt. IX. 116 confusion with the Persian satrap Artayctes: "The Greek in question, Artayctes, is a legendary hero credited as the first Greek to have died at Troy..."
- P. 11, 208, 314: word φύσις is transcribed as *physis*, but *phusis*: p. 97, 101 (*bis*).
- P. 35: as 'anacronical' → as 'anachronical'.
- P. 36: Scheherazade, but in index: Scherazade (p. 315, col. 1).
- P. 43: Scycles → Scyles (Hdt. IV. 76, 78-80: Σκύλης).
- P. 45: Sylsson → Syloson (Συλοσῶν).
- P. 74, 95, 123, 190, 199, 201 (*bis*), 204, 208, 223 (*bis*), *et al.* word ὕβρις is transcribed as *hybris*, but *hubris*, *hubrin*, *hubrios*: p. 74 (*bis*), 87, 123 (*bis*), 141, 199, 200, 204, 264 n. 4, *et al.*
- P. 77, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. I. 106: Niniveh → Ninus (Νίνος).
- P. 90, box 1: Ethnograph[h]y of Egypt → Ethnography of Egypt.
- P. 94, box 3: Ethnograph[h]y of Egypt → Ethnography of Egypt.
- P. 95: *paidashybristas* → *paidas hybristas* (Hdt. II. 32. 3: παῖδας ὑβριστάς).
- P. 96: Amon → Ammon (Ἄμμων).
- P. 101: *pleistathōmasia* → *pleista thōmasia* (Hdt. II. 35. 1: πλεῖστα θωμάσια).
- P. 111: "the Egypt *logo*[_]" → "the Egyptian *logos*".
- P. 114: Bernadette 1969 → Benardete 1969.
- P. 156: *pantes Hellēnes ēsan eleutheroi* → *pantes Hellēnes ēsan eleutheroi* (Hdt. I. 6. 2 verb ἦσαν).
- P. 157, box 3, *ad loc.* Hdt. V. 30-32: Artaphranes; cp. Artaphernes (p. 154, 157, 160-161, 163, 170-172, 174-177, *et al.*) → Artaphrenes (Ἄρταφρένης).
- P. 162: naratees → narratees.
- P. 170: Sylosson → Syloson (Συλοσῶν).
- P. 178: *polin kallistin* → *polin kallistēn* (Hdt. VI. 24: πόλιν καλλίστην).
- P. 188, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. V. 71: Cyclon → Cylon (Κύλων).
- P. 188, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. VI. 125: Alcmaeonid, Alcmeon → Alcmaeonid, Alcmaeon.
- P. 188, box 4, *ad loc.* Hdt. I. 59-60: Alcmeon → Alcmaeon.
- P. 189 (*bis*): Alcmeon → Alcmaeon.
- P. 251 n. 6: *apodeiknimi* → *apodeiknymi*.
- P. 252 n. 14: Wçowski → Węcowski.
- P. 255 n. 37: Xerexes → Xerxes (Ξέρξης).
- P. 259 n. 17: *to theoi* (the gods) → *hoi theoi* (the gods).
- P. 259 n. 22: *esdiapairan* → *es diapairan* (Hdt. II. 28. 4: ἐς διάπειραν).

⁶⁸ Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2007: 219-378.

- P. 263 n. 27: Finkelbeg → Finkelberg.
 P. 271 n. 37: Griffiths → Griffiths.
 P. 275 n. 30: Alcmeon → Alcmaeon.
 P. 275 n. 31 (*bis*): Alcmeon → Alcmaeon.
 P. 281 n. 14: Artanabus → Artabanus (Ἀρτάβανος).
 P. 285: Asheri, D. (2007c), 'Book III', ... → Asheri, D. (2007c), 'Book III',
 P. 286: Bernadette, S. (1969) → Bernardete S. (1969).
 P. 291: Finkelbeg, M. (1995), 'Sophocles' "Tr." 634-69 and Herodotus', *Mnemosyne* 48, no. 2: 146-52 → Finkelberg, M. (1995), 'Sophocles' Tr. 634-639 and Herodotus', *Mnemosyne* 48, no. 2: 146-152.
 P. 307, col. 1: Alcmaeonid family 8, 1 – ??
 P. 307, col. 1: Alcmeon → Alcmaeon.
 P. 311, col. 1: Hegel, G. W. H. → Hegel, G. W. F.
 P. 315, col. 1: Scycles → Scyles (Σκύλης).
 P. 315, col. 2: Sylsson → Syloson (Συλοσῶν).

Abbreviations

- AAL – *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia*, Łódź.
 AJPh – *American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, Md.
 AMA – *Antichnyi mir i arkhologiiia (Ancient World and Archaeology)*, Saratov.
 ClAnt – *Classical Antiquity*, Berkeley, Ca.
 CQ – *Classical Quarterly*, Oxford.
 GRBS – *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Durham.
 JHS – *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, London.
 RE – *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Neue Bearbeitung, begonnen von G. Wissowa, Hrsg. von W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler, Stuttgart; München, 1893-1980.
 VDI – *Vestnik drevnei istorii (Journal of Ancient History)*, Moscow.
 WS – *Wiener Studien*, Vienna.

Literature

- Allison J.W. 1989. *Power and Preparedness in Thucydides*. Baltimore.
 Allison J.W. 2013. *The Balance of Power and Compositional Balance: Thucydides Book I*. In: A. Tsakmakis, M. Tamiolaki (eds.), *Thucydides between History and Literature*. Berlin; Boston, 257-270.
 Anhalt E.K. 1993. *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics*. Lanham.
 Asheri D., Lloyd A., Corcella A. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. O. Murray and A. Moreno (eds.), with a contribution of M. Brosius. Oxford.
 Austin N. 2008. *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom*. Ithaca; London ('1994).
 Bakker E.J. 2002. *The Making of History: Herodotus' Historiēs Apodexis*. In: E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston; Köln, 3-32.
 Bakker M. de. 2012. *Herodotus' Proteus: Myth, History, Enquiry and Storytelling*. In: E. Baragwanath, M. de Bakker (eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford, 107-126.
 Baragwanath E. 2012. *Returning to Troy: Herodotus and the Mythic Discourse of his own Time*. In: E. Baragwanath, M. de Bakker (eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford, 287-312.
 Beck I. 1971. *Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*. Hildesheim; New York.
 Beck D. 2014. *Simile Structure in Homeric Epic and Vergil's Aeneid*. In: R. Scodel (ed.), *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity*. Leiden; Boston, 244-266.
 Bichler R. 2001. *Herodots Welt: Der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte*. Berlin.
 Boedeker D. 2002. *Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus*. In: E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden; Köln: Brill, 97-116.
 Bouzarovski S., Barker E. 2016. *Between East and West: Movements and Transformations in Herodotean Topology*. In: E. Barker, S. Bouzarovski, Ch. Pelling, L. Isaken (eds.), *New Worlds from Old Texts*. Oxford, 155-179.
 Bowie A.M. 1993. *Homer, Herodotus, and the 'Beginnings' of Thucydides' History*. In: H.D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes presented to John Pinsent*. Liverpool, 141-147.
 Bowie A. 2018. *Herodotus the Story-Teller*. In: E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 25-36.
 Bowie E. (ed.) 2018. *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston.
 Cartledge P. 1993. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford.
 Cobet J. 2002. *The Organization of Time in the Histories*. In: E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston; Köln, 387-412.

- Connor W.R. 1984. *Thucydides*. Princeton, NJ.
- Dovatur A.I. 1957. *Povestvovatel'nyy i nauchnyy stil' Gerodota* [Narrative and scientific style of Herodotus]. Leningrad (in Russian).
Доватур, А. И. *Повествовательный и научный стиль Геродота*. Л.
- Douglas M. 2007. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*. New Haven; London.
- Ellis J.R. 1991. *The Structure and Argument of Thucydides' Archaeology*. *ClAnt* 10/2, 344-375.
- Ellis J.R. 1994. *Thucydidean Method in the Kylon, Pausanias and Themistokles Logoi*. *Arethusa* 27/2, 165-191.
- Engels J. 2007. *Ringkomposition*. In: G. Ueding (hrsg.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Bd. 8: Rhet-St. Tübingen, 241-246.
- Fehling D. 1989. *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention, and Narrative Art*. Trans. by J.G. Howie. Leeds (= *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot. Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots*. Berlin, 1971).
- Fialho M. do C. 2020. *Ethnicity in Herodotus: the story of Helen through the Egyptians' eyes*. In: Th. Figueira, C. Soares (eds.), *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*. London; New York, 258-268.
- Figueira Th., Soares C. (eds.) 2020. *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*. London; New York.
- Finkelberg M. 1995. *Sophocles' Tr. 634-639 and Herodotus*. *Mnemosyne* 48/2, 146-152.
- Fornara C.W. 1971. *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay*. Oxford.
- Foster E., Lateiner D. (eds.) 2012. *Thucydides and Herodotus*. Oxford.
- Fowler R.L. 2007. *Early Greek Mythography. I. Texts*. Oxford.
- Fowler R.L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography. II. Commentary*. Oxford.
- Gasparov M.L. 1989. *Nepolnota i simmetrija v "Istorii" Gerodota* [Incompleteness and symmetry in Herodotus' "History"]. *VDI* 2 (189), 117-122 (in Russian).
Гаспаров М.Л. 1989. *Неполнота и симметрия в «Истории» Геродота*. *Вестник древней истории* 2 (189), 117-122.
- Gasparov M.L. 1997. *Izbrannye trudy. T. 1: O poetakh* [Selected works. Vol. 1: On poets]. Moscow (in Russian).
Гаспаров, М.Л. 1997: *Избранные труды. Т. 1: О поэтах*. М.
- Griffin J. 2006. *Herodotus and Tragedy*. In: C. Dewald, J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge, 46-59.
- Grintser N.P. 2016. *Gerodot kak literaturnyi kritik* [Herodotus as a literary critic]. *SHAGI/Steps* 2/2-3, 95-118 (in Russian).
Гринцер Н.П. 2016. *Геродот как литературный критик*. *ШАГИ/Steps* 2/2-3, 95-118.
- Grintser N.P. 2018. *Herodotus as a literary critic*. In: E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus - Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 157-174.
- Hammond N.G.L. 1952. *The Arrangement of the Thought in the Proem and in Other Parts of Thucydides I*. *CQ*, n.s. 2, 127-141.
- Hart J. 1982. *Herodotus and Greek History*. London.
- Hartog F. 1980. *Le miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris.
- Hartog F. 1999. *Pervye istoriki Gretsii: istorichnost' i istorija* [The first historians of Greece: historicity and history]. *VDI* 1 (228), 177-187 (in Russian).
Артог Ф. 1999. *Первые историки Греции: историчность и история*. *Вестник древней истории* 1 (228), 177-187.
- Herodotus 1922. *Herodotus [Histories]*. With an English trans. by A.D. Godley. In 4 vols. Vol. 3: Books V-VII. London; New York.
- How W.W., Wells J. 1912. *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes. Vol. 1-2*. Oxford.
- Immerwahr H.R. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland.
- Irwin E. 2005. *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation*. Cambridge.
- Jacoby F. 1913. *Herodotos*. *RE Suppl.* 2, 205-520.
- Jacoby F. 1995. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (F Gr Hist). Teil. 1: Genealogie und Mythographie. A. Vorrede, Text, Addenda, Konkordanz*. Leiden; New York; Köln.
- Johnson W.A. 1994. *Oral Performance and the Composition of Herodotus' Histories*. *GRBS* 35, 229-254.
- Jong I.J.F. de. 2004. *Herodotus*. In: I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, A. M. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 101-114.
- Katičić R. 1957. *Die Ringkomposition im ersten Buche des thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes*. *WS* 70, 179-196.
- Lang M. L. 2011. *Thucydidean Narrative and Discourse*. J. S. Rusten, R. Hamilton (eds.). *Ann Arbor*.
- Leão D.F. 2020. *Barbarians, Greekness, and wisdom: The afterlife of Croesus' debate with Solon*. In: Th. Figueira, C. Soares (eds.), *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*. London; New York, 271-295.
- Liotsakis V. 2017. *Redeeming Thucydides' Book VIII. Narrative Artistry in the Account of the Ionian War*. Berlin; Boston.

- Lloyd A.B. 1975. *Herodotus. Book II. Introduction*. Leiden.
- Lloyd A.B. 1976. *Herodotus. Book II. Commentary 1-98*. Leiden.
- Lloyd A.B. 1988. *Herodotus. Book II. Commentary 99-182*. Leiden; New York; København; Köln.
- Lohmann D. 1970. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.
- Lurie S.Ya. 1947. *Gerodot [Herodotus]*. Moscow; Leningrad (in Russian).
- Лурье С.Я. 1947. *Геродот*. М.; Л.
- Macan R.W. 1895. *Herodotus. The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books. With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 1: Introduction, Text with Notes*. R.W. Macan (ed.). London; New York.
- Macan R.W. 1908a. *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books. With Introduction, Text, Apparatus, Commentary, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 1: Introduction, Book VII (Text and Commentaries)*. R.W. Macan (ed.). London.
- Macan R.W. 1908b. *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books. With Introduction, Text, Apparatus, Commentary, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 2: Books VIII and IX (Text and Commentaries)*. R.W. Macan (ed.). London.
- Marincola J. 2018. *Ἡρωδικὸτάτος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus*. In: E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 3-24.
- McKeon K.P.J. 2020. *Barbarians at the Gate: Herodotus, Bisotun, and a Persian Punishment in Egypt*. *AJPh* 141/3, 349-380.
- Miller T.A. 1984. *Grecheskaja epicheskaja istoriografija [The Greek Epic Historiography]*. In: M.L. Gasparov (ed.), Kuznetsova, T.I., Miller, T.A. *Antichnaja epicheskaja istoriografija: Gerodot. Tit Livij [The Ancient Epic Historiography: Herodotus. Titus Livius]*. Moscow, 6-79 (in Russian).
- Миллер Т.А. 1984. *Греческая эпическая историография*. В кн.: М.Л. Гаспаров (ред.), Кузнецова, Т.И., Миллер, Т.А. *Античная эпическая историография: Геродот. Тут Лувий*. М., 6-79.
- Minchin E. 1995. *Ring-Patterns and Ring-Composition: Some Observations on the Framing of Stories in Homer*. *Helios* 22/1, 23-35.
- Minchin E. 2007. *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*. Oxford.
- Momigliano A. 1966. *Studies in Historiography*. New York.
- Momigliano A. 1977. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Oxford.
- Munson R.V. 2001. *Ananke in Herodotus*. *JHS* 121, 30-50.
- Myres J.L. 1953. *Herodotus Father of History*. Oxford.
- Nikolaidou-Arabatzi S. 2018. *ιστορέειν and θωμάζειν: scientific terms and signs of unity in Herodotus' 'Histories'*. In: E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 223-241.
- Nimis S.A. 1999. *Ring-Composition and Linearity in Homer*. In: E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden; Boston; Köln, 65-78.
- Pearson L. 1975. *Early Ionian Historians*. Westport, CT (Oxford, 1939).
- Pelling C. 2006. *Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian 'Logos'*. *ClAnt* 25/1, 141-177.
- Person R.E., Jr. 2016. *From grammar in everyday conversation to special grammar in oral traditions: A case study of ring composition*. In: M. Antović, C.P. Cánovas (eds.), *Oral Poetics and Cognitive Science*. Berlin; München; Boston, 30-51.
- Powell J.E. 1939. *The History of Herodotus*. Cambridge.
- Powell J.E. 1949. *Herodotus [The Histories]*. Trans. by J.E. Powell. Vols. 1-2. Oxford.
- Powell J.E. 1966. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Hildesheim (Cambridge, 1938).
- Priestley J. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford.
- Rawlings H.R. III. 2017. *Writing History Implicitly through Refined Structuring*. In: R.K. Balot, S. Forsdyke, E. Foster (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*. Oxford, 195-209.
- Ready J.L. 2019. *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics. An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*. Oxford.
- Reece S. 1995. *The Three Circuits of the Suitors: A Ring Composition in Odyssey 17-22*. *Oral Tradition* 10/1, 207-229 (URL: https://journal.oraltradition.org/wp-content/uploads/files/articles/10i/13_reece.pdf).
- Russell T.J. 2017. *Byzantium and the Bosphorus. A Historical Study, from the Seventh Century BC until the Foundation of Constantinople*. Oxford.
- Saïd S. 2002. *Herodotus and Tragedy*. In: E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston; Köln, 117-145.
- Scardino C. 2007. *Gestalt und Funktion der Reden bei Herodot und Thukydides*. Berlin.

- Sinitsyn A.A. 2012. Fronton i final: po povodu 'zaimstvovaniya' Gerodotom u Fukidida printsipa khronologicheskogo povestvovaniya [Pediment and finale: on the 'borrowing' of the principle of chronological narration by Herodotus from Thucydides]. *Problemy istorii i arheologii Ukrainy: Materialy VIII mezhdunarodnoj konferentsii (Kharkov, 9-10 nojabrja 2012 g.)* [Problems of History and Archeology of Ukraine: Proceedings of the VIII International Conference (Kharkov, 9-10 November 2012)]. Kharkov, 58 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А. 2012. Фронтон и финал: по поводу «заимствования» Геродотом у Фукидида принципа хронологического повествования. *Проблемы истории и археологии Украины: Материалы VIII международной конференции (Харьков, 9-10 ноября 2012 г.)*. Харьков, 58.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2013. Fukidid i Gerodot, povlijavshie drug na druga? (po povodu odnogo 'interesno-go njuansa') [Thucydides and Herodotus – had they influenced each other? (as to an 'interesting nuance')]. *АМА* 16, 39-55 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А. 2013. Фукидид и Геродот, повлиявшие друг на друга? (по поводу одного «интересного нюанса»). *Античный мир и археология* 16, 39-55.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2015. *Greki i monstry: ob antichnoi mifologii kak zanimatel'noi etnogeografii (eskiz na temu puteshestvij i otkrytij)* [The Greeks and the Monsters: on classical mythology as an amusing ethnic geography (essay about travels and discoveries)]. *Bosporskie issledovanija* [Bosporus Studies] 31, 186-213 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А. 2015. Греки и монстры: об античной мифологии как занимательной этногеографии (эскиз на тему путешествий и открытий). *Боспорские исследования* 31, 186-213.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017a. *Gerodot ob izgnanii varvarov iz Evropy i problema zavershennosti pervoi 'Istorii'* [Herodotus on the Banishment of the Barbarians out of Europe and the Issue of the Completeness of the First 'History']. *Metamorfozy istorii* [Metamorphoses of History] 10, 35-92 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А. 2017а. *Геродот об изгнании варваров из Европы и проблема завершенности первой «Истории»*. *Метаморфозы истории* 10, 35-92.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017b. *Kanaty i mosty Greko-persidskoj voiny* [Ropes and Bridges of the Persian War]. In: O.L. Gabelko, E.V. Rung, A.A. Sinitsyn, E.V. Smykov (eds.), *Iranica: Iranskie imperii i greko-rimskij mir v VI v. do n.e. - VI v. n.e.* [Iranica: Iranian Empires and the Greco-Roman World from the Sixth Century BC to the Sixth Century AD]. Kazan, 137-171 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А. 2017б. *Канаты и мосты греко-персидской войны*. В кн.: О.Л. Габелко, Э.В. Рунг, А.А. Синицын, Е.В. Смыков (ред.), *Iranica: Иранские империи и греко-римский мир в VI в до н.э. - VI в н.э.* Казань, 137-171.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017c. 'Know thyself' through the dialogue with the Others: Formation of the ancient cultural dichotomy 'Hellenes-Barbarians'. *Judaica Petropolitana* 8, 48-82.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2019. *tà ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων of the Persian War: Herodotus on the Banishment of the Barbarians out of Europe and the issue of the Completeness of the First the 'History'*. *AAL* 65, 83-124.
- Sinitsyn A.A., Surikov I.E. 2019. *Novyj kollektivnyj trud ob 'ottse istorii' kak uchenom i rasskazchike* [A new collective work on the 'father of history' as a scholar and narrator]. *Mnemon* 19/1, 183-216 (in Russian).
- Синицын А.А., Суриков И.Е. 2019. *Новый коллективный труд об «отце истории» как ученом и рассказчике*. *Мнемон* 19/1, 183-216.
- Skinner J. E. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus. Greeks overseas*. Oxford.
- Stanley K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*. Princeton.
- Stoneman R. 2015. *Xerxes: a Persian Life*. New Haven; London.
- Strauss B. 2005. *The Battle of Salamis. The Naval Encounter that Saved Greece – and Western Civilization*. New York et al.
- Strolonga P. 2015-2016. *Structural Symmetry and Parallelism in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. *Αρτάδνη* 22, 15-44.
- Surikov I.E. 1999. *Gostepriimstvo Kreza I afinjane* [The Hospitality of Croesus and the Athenians]. *Zakon i obyčaj gostepriimstva v antichnom mire* [The Law and Custom of Hospitality in the Ancient World]. Moscow, 72-79 (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 1999. *Гостеприимство Креза и афиняне. Закон и обычай гостеприимства в античном мире. Доклады конференции*. М., 72-79.
- Surikov I.E. 2007. 'Nesvoevremennyj' Gerodot (epicheskij prosaik mezhdou logographami i Fukididom) [The 'Inopportune' Herodotus (An Epic Prosaist between Logographers and

- Thucydides*]. VDI 1 (260), 143-151 (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 2007. «Несвоевременный» Геродот (эпический прозаик между логографами и Фукидидом). Вестник древней истории 1 (260), 143-151.
- Surikov I.E. 2009a. *Gerodot [Herodotus]*. Moscow (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 2009. *Геродот*. М.
- Surikov I.E. 2009b. *Obrazy vremeni v istoricheskom trude Gerodota [Images of time in Herodotus' historical work]*. АМА 13, 10-35 (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 2009. *Образы времени в историческом труде Геродота*. Античный мир и археология 13, 10-35.
- Surikov I.E. 2010. *Poslednie glavy 'Istorii' Gerodota i vopros o stepeni zavershennosti ego truda [The last chapters of Herodotus' History and the question of the degree of completeness of the work]*. In: T.N. Dzhakson, I.G. Konovalova, G.R. Tsetskhladze (eds.), *Gaudeamus igitur: sbornik statei k 60-letiiu A.V. Podosinova*. Moscow, 356-363 (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 2010. *Последние главы «Истории» Геродота и вопрос о степени завершенности труда*. В кн.: Т.Н. Джаксон, И.Г. Коновалова, Г.Р. Цецхладзе (ред.), *Gaudeamus igitur: Сб. ст. к 60-летию А.В. Подосинова*. М., 356-363.
- Surikov I.E. 2011. *Ocherki ob istoriopisanii v klassicheskoj Gretsii [Essays on historical writing in Classical Greece]*. Moscow (in Russian).
- Суриков И.Е. 2011. *Очерки об историописании в классической Греции*. М.
- Thomas R. 2000. *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge.
- van Rookhuijzen J.Z. 2018. *Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion: Place and Memory in Greece and Anatolia*. Berlin; Boston.
- Vasilev M.I. 2015. *The Policy of Darius and Xerxes towards Thrace and Macedonia*. Leiden; Boston.
- Vlassopoulos K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge.
- Wells J. 1923. *Studies in Herodotus*. Oxford.
- Welser C. 2009. *Two Didactic Strategies at the End of Herodotus' Histories (9.108-122)*. ClAnt 28, 359-385.
- Whitman C.H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Wood H. 1972. *The Histories of Herodotus: An Analysis the Formal Structure*. The Hague; Paris.
- Zali V. 2018. *Herodotus mapping out his genre: the interaction of myth and geography in the Libyan logos*. In: E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 125-138.

Aleksandr A. Sinitsyn
The Russian Christian Academy
for the Humanities
St. Petersburg, Russia
aa.sinizin@mail.ru

Igor E. Surikov
Institute of World History
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russia
isurikov@mail.ru