

РЕЦЕНЗИИ И БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ / REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE HERODOTUS ENCYCLOPEDIA: A GRAND EDITION TO THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE “FATHER OF HISTORY”

Book review: Ch. Baron (ed.) *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1 (A–D). Vol. 2 (E–O). Vol. 3 (P–Z). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2021. LII+XXXII+XXXII, 1653 p. ISBN 9781118689646 (hardback) | ISBN 9781119113539 (adobe pdf).

ALEXANDER A. SINITSYN,
Russian Christian Academy for the Humanities
aa.sinizin@mail.ru

IGOR E. SURIKOV
Institute of World History Russian Academy of Sciences
isurikov@mail.ru

ABSTRACT: In 2021 the Wiley Blackwell Publishing turned out a huge (three monumental volumes, over 1,700 pages) encyclopedia devoted to the historian Herodotus and everything related to him: Ch. Baron (ed.) *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1 (A–D). Vol. 2 (E–O). Vol. 3 (P–Z). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2021. LII+XXXII+XXXII, 1653 p. ISBN 9781118689646 (hardback) | ISBN 9781119113539 (adobe pdf). This grand edition was compiled to commemorate the 2,500th birthday of the “Father of History”. The work brought together over 180 scholars from dozens of academic centers from 18 countries. The head of the writing team, Christopher Baron, strove to make “The Herodotus Encyclopedia” represent the entire contemporary state of the Herodotus studies. The book encompasses a broad range of subjects: every anthroponym, ethnonym, toponym, hydronym mentioned in the work of the Father of History is dealt with in a separate entry. Of special interest are conceptual, controversial entries related to various theoretical and methodological aspects of Herodotus’ work. The authors of the review decided against focusing on purely informational entries (which constitute the bulk, similar to every encyclopedia), but concentrated on the conceptual ones, they also made a number of critical remarks, since even the best works cannot be devoid of flaws. The work compiled to commemorate the grand jubilee of the “Father of History” is undoubtedly comprehensive and useful, and in spite of some minor flaws of the edition, this project of vast dimensions cannot help but impress.

KEYWORDS: Ancient history, encyclopedia, Herodotus, historiography, historian, writer, subjects, Greeks, barbarians, ethnonym, toponym, hydronym, Reception, cinema, myth.

Herodotus was unbelievably lucky. Here, before us is something unprecedented: an immense (three monumental volumes, over 1,700 pages) encyclopedic edition, entirely devoted to the historian of Halicarnassus and everything related to him. Thucydides may well turn over in his grave.

Well, we must stop being frivolous. The head of the writing team, Christopher Baron (professor at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, USA) has gone to great lengths to encapsulate the contemporary achievements in Herodotean studies. “The Herodotus Encyclopedia” encompasses a broad range of topics. Every anthroponym, ethnonym, toponym, hydronym mentioned in the work of the “Father of History” appears as a separate entry. Moreover, there are a host of entries for various themes: “Archaeology”, “Anthropology”, “Ethnography”, “Geography”, “Autochthony”, “Oracles”, “Climate”, “Geology”, “Nomads”, “Boundaries”, “Fortifications”, “Iron”, “Time”, “Numbers”, “Papyri”, “Death”, “Athletes and Athletic Games”, “Gods and the Divine”, “Freedom”, “Friendship”, “Travel”, “Myth”, “Maps”, “Music”, “Children”, “Warfare”, “Wine”, “Cinema”, “Money”, “Humour”, etc., etc. Of special note are a number of conceptual, controversial entries related to theoretical and methodological aspects of Herodotus’ works; they seem to be of greatest importance, and it is about them (at least, some of them) that we are going to speak in detail. Most entries, from the longest to the shortest, contain a selected bibliography; many entries have cross-references to other sections of “The Encyclopedia”, those closely related to the topic, and references to works mentioned in the entries.

This grand work had been done to mark the jubilee of the “Father of History” celebrated several years ago. Each volume begins with a dedication: “To Herodotus: 2,500 years and still going strong”. Ch. Baron in his brief foreword acknowledges that he has spent six years to compile “The Encyclopedia”, he says the idea to embark on “this crazy project” leaped up back in 2012 (vol. 1, pp. VIII, IX). The work involved 180 scholars from dozens of academic circles in eighteen countries: the USA, the UK, Canada, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, Austria, Australia, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey and others.

Among them are many most distinguished scholars. Ch. Baron’s special achievement is his ability to choose the right classists to write on a specific subject, each time he found the most competent ones. Thus, “Historical method” (pp. 694–699) was written by Donald Lateiner,¹ whose monograph on the same topic² has, in many respects, become a milestone. Rosalind Thomas wrote “Medical writers”

¹ This three-volume edition also has D. Lateiner’s entries: “Bodily Adornment” (pp. 232–234), “Extremes” (pp. 563–565), “Gestures” (pp. 609–612), “Laughter” (pp. 787–789), “Weeping” (pp. 1540–1542) and others (in all, 10).

² Lateiner 1989.

(pp. 874–875); she must have been one of the first in the world scholarship who had emphasized in the book “Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion”³ the influence contemporary medical scientists had exerted on the historian of Halicarnassus.⁴ The entry for Greek dialects belongs to Stephen Colvin, a greatest expert on the Hellenic dialectology.⁵ The well-known German and Austrian classics, R. Bichler, R. Rollinger, J. Wiesehöfer, who have long studied Persian subjects (and Near Eastern ones, in the large)⁶ made their contributions to “The Encyclopedia”. R. V. Munson, well-known for her work on Herodotus’ discourse,⁷ was commissioned to write “Metanarrative” (pp. 901–905), interpreting rather complicated issues pertaining to the category of discourse. John Marincola, whose name as an expert on the Ancient Greek historiography⁸ needs no comment, contributed entries for his renowned colleagues specializing in Herodotus: David Asheri (pp. 170–171), Felix Jacoby (pp. 762–764), Arnaldo Dante Momigliano (pp. 924–926) and John Enoch Powell (pp. 1162–1163).⁹ Such examples are galore. In fact, “The Encyclopedia” also presents young authors: M. Wauke, R. C. Heth, W. Stover, R. S. Walker, A. Zautcke, A. Foley, and L. Stephens, J. White and others;¹⁰ some of whom attended Ch. Baron’s Herodotus class on at the University of Notre

³ Thomas 2000.

⁴ R. Thomas is the author of entries “Ionians and Ionia” (pp. 747–749), “Panionion” (pp. 1041–1042), “Proof” (pp. 1174–1176), “Science” (pp. 1294–1296) and others (in all 6).

⁵ See Colvin 1999; Colvin 2007; Colvin 2014.

⁶ For example: Bichler, Rollinger 2000; Bichler, Rollinger 2021; Bichler 2001; Bichler 2016; Rollinger 2004; Rollinger 2009; Rollinger 2017; Wiesehöfer 2004; Wiesehöfer 2009.

⁷ Munson 2001.

⁸ At least, see: Marincola 2001.

⁹ “The Encyclopedia” contains entries not only for Herodotus and his work but also for the reception of the works by the historian from Halicarnassus from antiquity to the present day: Jan Haywood, “Reception of Herodotus, Ancient Greece and Rome” (pp. 1206–1209), Luke Gorton, “Reception of Herodotus, Christian” (pp. 1209–1211), Jane Grogan, “Reception of Herodotus, 1350–1750” (pp. 1211–1215), S. Marchand, “Reception of Herodotus, 1750–1900” (pp. 1215–1218) and Emma Bridges, “Reception of Herodotus, 1900 – Present” (pp. 1218–1222). There is a series of entries for European publishers of “The Histories”, translators and major scholars on Herodotus, mainly, British researchers, with the exception of information about German classics Heinrich Stein (Aldo Corcella, pp. 1373–1374) and F. Jacoby (see above), also about Lorenzo Walla (A. Foley, pp. 1517–1518). Apart from the above-mentioned entries by J. Marincola, Niki Karapanagioti, who specializes in the reception of Herodotus’ *Histories* in contemporary times, contributes an entry for R. W. Macan (pp. 833–834), brothers Henry and George Rawlinson (pp. 1203–1204).

¹⁰ For example, Melody Wauke, master’s student specialising in epic poetry and Latin and Greek paleography, contributed over 50 entries for “The Herodotus Encyclopedia”.

Dame (see vol. 1, pp. VIII–IX). Composite authors include non-classics, as for instance, Jessica Baron, who is a specialist in the history of medicine and works in a health care firm.

We are fully aware of the difficulties in reviewing such a fundamental work. Among other matters, the limited size of the review, willy-nilly, obliges us to make a selective survey. The authors decided on the following course: not to dwell on purely informative entries (of which there are an overwhelming majority, as there should be in any Encyclopedia), but to concentrate on some of the conceptual articles, and also to provide (closer to the end) a number of critical remarks since even works of quality are not devoid of certain flaws.

In particular, we shall touch upon the issue of Herodotus' sources, various aspects of which are dealt with in several entries (M. Dorati, "Source citations", pp. 1353–1356; K. Ruffing, "Sources for Herodotus", pp. 1356–1359; M. Tamiolaki, "Liar School", pp. 804–806). This issue became extremely topical after Detlev Fehling's sensational book "Herodotus and his Sources".¹¹ To be more exact, after its English edition had come out, while the original, German, book published a little earlier, in 1971,¹² somehow created a little stir; could it have been because of its more academic and less "sensational" title? Or could it have happened because most classics find *Germanica non leguntur*?

As is well known, D. Fehling tried to revive the ancient vision of the historian of Halicarnassus as a "father of lies". According to this scholar, all references Herodotus made to sources are fictitious and all the trips he allegedly took to glean information were made up. If we consistently and wholly adopt Fehling's concept, the source value of "The Histories" is close to naught. Soon followed a rather tough response from a very reputable expert, W. K. Pritchett,¹³ who coined the phrase "the Liar School of Herodotus", which has become a hackneyed term. The American classic included in "this school", apart from Fehling, F. Hartog¹⁴ and S. West,¹⁵ many other scholars.

M. Tamiolaki notes in "The Encyclopedia" under review (p. 804) that it might be not quite reasonable to group together the scholars whose works are very different; thus, F. Hartog is not interested at all in the issue of Herodotus' references to sources and the credibility/incredibility of his evidence, the French classic studies the arrangement of mental constructions, the formation of the identity through

¹¹ Fehling 1989.

¹² Fehling 1971.

¹³ Pritchett 1993.

¹⁴ Hartog 1980; the more frequently used edition now: Hartog 1988.

¹⁵ West 1985.

creating “the image of An Other”, etc. But, as to Fehling as such, his criticism of Pritchett’s ideas proved compelling: “his (Pritchett’s – *A. S., I. S.*) book demonstrates convincingly that the characterization of Herodotus as a liar stems from modern and anachronistic assumptions about the role of the historian” (p. 804).

Yet, contrary to M. Tamiolaki, M. Dorati and K. Ruffing take a less negative stance on D. Fehling’s constructions. While pointing out serious weaknesses of his position (“is rather radical and overly dogmatic”, p. 1357) and admitting that most of their colleagues have taken it sceptically (though Fehling has strict advocates¹⁶), they maintain that his book has become “a turning point in modern research” (p. 1357), “a watershed in Herodotean scholarship... Fehling’s rhetorical interpretation of SCs contributed to shift the focus from the image of a Herodotus proto-scientist to that of a writer operating within a system of literary conventions that cannot be measured by the yardstick of modern historical methodology” (pp. 1354–1355). It is impossible to deny this process, but we believe that by no means did it depend on the publication of Fehling’s monograph (in which we can see nothing but extreme hypercriticism), but it was conditioned by the inner logic of the development of scholarship, the influence of new philological trends (for example, the very same narratology). Also, it had begun much earlier: H. R. Immerwahr’s research paper, produced well in advance of its time,¹⁷ may have been the “first harbinger”.

It seems pertinent to dwell on the issue of the date of completion and publication of Herodotus’ work. The point is that the article on the subject written for “The Encyclopedia” by Elizabeth Irwin (“Date of Composition”, pp. 409–412), contains, in our view, quite unexpected and controversial theses.¹⁸ Since the latest events mentioned in “The Histories” relate to the 430s BC, the author, according to *communis opinio*, stopped writing (and, must have died) soon after this time, that is, in the first half of the 420s BC. Ch. Fornara’s point of view¹⁹ (which practically none shared) stood out, according to which, *terminus post quem* for the treatise to be published was the Peace of Nicias (421 BC), therefore, it happened in the 410s BC. But Irwin goes further than Fornara does.²⁰

¹⁶ Including Russia, for that matter. See, for example: Podossinov 2021. Drawing upon D. Fehling’s observations, A. V. Podossinov argues against certain opinions entertained by D. S. Raevsky, E. A. Grantovsky, A. I. Ivantchik.

¹⁷ Immerwahr 1966. “The Encyclopedia” contains an entry for Henry Immerwahr prepared by Sheila Murnaghan, an American classicist and philologist (pp. 734–735).

¹⁸ See E. Irwin’s previous works, where she treated this topic: Irwin 2007; Irwin 2013; Irwin 2018.

¹⁹ Fornara 1971.

²⁰ One of the authors of this review has already remarked on E. Irwin’s radical change in the dating of Herodotus’ “Histories” (considering several works by the American scholar,

The researcher begins her part with stating that “Questions of dating rest on three types of evidence: information from the biographical tradition; supposed allusions to Herodotus in Attic drama and Thucydides; and the “Histories” own references to contemporary events, whether those explicit or only inferred by scholars” (p. 409). The bibliographical tradition gives little to proceed from, even more so that it is largely of a later period. One of the infrequent exceptions is a remark made by Diyllus, a writer of the late 4th century BC (FGrHist. 73. F3), that is, relatively close to the time of the “Father of History”.²¹ According to it, the well-known ruling, prompted by a certain Anytus, was made in the Athenian Ecclesia to award Herodotus 10 talents for public recitals. Irwin identifies this Anytus with the one who, starting from 399 BC, made accusation against Socrates, and occurred in the sources as a strategos. Hence, she concludes that the context of the event is the last decade of the 5th century BC, but this reasoning looks feeble. The sameness of the two Anytuses is impossible to prove, even if it did take place; Anytus, already not very young at the time of Socrates’ trial, could have entered on his political career before the Peloponnesian War. Moreover, the disbursement of such a large sum of money to the historian in the 400s BC, when Athens had been impoverished by military expenditures and the *phoros*²² was discontinued, looks highly unlikely.²³

As to the allusions made by other authors of the 5th century (among dramatists, there are Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and we must not forget Thucydides²⁴), Irwin adduces a predictable series of arguments to show that they are not a date-establishing characteristic. First, in a number of occasions before us there may be

including her contribution to this “Encyclopedia” edited by Ch. Baron, which in 2019 was released over the Internet): Sinitsyn 2019: 109–111 (with discussion and literature). Cf. Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019: 191.

²¹ References to this observation made by Diyllus are also found in the articles by Ch. Welsch (p. 192) and G. Monti (p. 1275).

²² It is in 400 BC that financial measures were made to testify to the utterly poor state of the Athenian polis’s budget: the statue of Nike was remelted to mint gold and copper coins.

²³ Irwin comments: “While certainly large, the attested honorarium, ten talents, would not seem outlandish for the performance of a text that in its entirety must have required days to perform” (p. 409). But by no means does it follow that Herodotus narrated the whole of his “Histories” to the Athenians. It is almost certain that he familiarized the audience with some excerpts from his work.

²⁴ See, Sinitsyn 2008: 377–378 (on the similarities of subjects and realities in Sophocles and Herodotus, who are deemed to have influence on each other), 378–386 (relevant literature); Sinitsyn 2013: 39–44 (on parallel issues in both the “Histories”). On coincidences in Herodotus and Thucydides: Hornblower 1996: 137–145 and Stadter 2012. Cf. in this “Encyclopedia” Haywood’s entry for reception of Herodotus (p. 1206).

not allusions but “intertextuality” (a device favoured by protagonists of de-constructivism). Second, since Herodotus, long before finishing his work, had been holding his notorious recitals, his contemporary authors could obtain the appropriate information from these recitals and not from the text of his “Histories”. Third, the order of borrowing can be reverse: thus, according to the researcher, Herodotus’ passage on Minos (Hdt. 3. 122) is an answer to that of Thucydides (Thuc. 1. 4), and not otherwise. As for Herodotus’ mentioning three or four events of the 431–430 BC, but not in any later years, Irwin argues that this fact cannot be regarded as a proof that he had seen no later ones. He just did not intend to write about them as his treatise dealt with a totally different topic – the history of wars with the Persians up to 478 BC. Also, we have only 17 references to what was happening after this year, in particular, none at all for the period between 450 and 431 BC.

Irwin believes that Herodotus had references to the death of Artaxerxes I (Hdt. 6. 98), the capture of Cythera by the Athenians in 424 BC (Hdt. 7. 235) and even the battle of Aegospotami (Hdt. 9. 114–121). And the well-known passage on Decelea (Hdt. 9. 73), in her opinion, could have been written only after the end of the Peloponnesian War and the following *stasis* in Athens (404–403 BC).²⁵ So, concludes Irwin, the “Father of History” either published his work at the very end of the 5th century BC, or, at least, had an enlarged edition published. Some of Irwin’s arguments cannot be found uninteresting, but on the whole, the system produces a picture which is hard to believe in: Herodotus, who died a little earlier than Thucydides. Or even outlived him? The researcher goes in for a paradoxical assertion: the statements in Thucydides’ “methodological” passage (1. 22) incur that the latter allegedly had not seen Herodotus’ work in the written form (p. 410).

By the way, we cannot help but notice that should the historian of Halicarnassus have lived at least to the end of the 5th century BC, he would have been in his eighties. In which case, it is strange that he is not on any lists of long livers, of whom there were quite a few in the Antiquity. And, finally, it should be mentioned that Irwin’s original viewpoint stands distinctive among the authors of “The Encyclopedia” under review. Her other entries which, this way or another, touch upon the dating of “The Histories”, refer to the traditional dating of this event, that is, the 420s BC.²⁶

²⁵ For a deeper discussion of this argument, see in Irwin’s entry for Theseus’ *hybris* (Irwin 2013).

²⁶ References to Irwin’s opinion about a later dating of Herodotus’ work occur in other entries of “The Encyclopedia”, for example, Ch. Baron (p. 81; and in his entry for the “Father of History” — p. 677), D. Kellogg (“Decelea”, p. 419), J. Haywood (p. 1206) and others.

Another question related, though indirectly, to the previous issue, is whether the work had been completed by the author. It is dealt with by a distinguished expert, Deborah Boedeker (“End the *Histories*”, pp. 503–505). According to her, though most of the scholars studying Herodotus (including F. Jacoby) thought that he had not brought it to an end, “Recent criticism, however, has tended to accept the end of our text as the end of the ‘Histories’” (p. 504). Boedeker also shares this opinion. Indeed, Herodotus’ treatise, contrary to that of Thucydides, does not end abruptly; it has a minor conclusion hinting to further developments. But one cannot help but get rid of the impression that the “Father of History” had intended to narrate the following course of the Greco-Persian wars, but something prevented him from doing so. This is what many classics believe in.²⁷ We can find a middle ground by presuming that in the 420s BC Herodotus’ death was not unexpected. Having realized he would not be able to complete the whole design, he decided to go as far as the inflection point – the time when the enemy had been driven away from Hellas – and to end the account in a clincher with the story about Artembares and Cyrus (Hdt. 9. 122). This peculiar “epilogue” performed a dual function: it summed up the history and hinted at what was left unspoken.²⁸

Again, among scholars who contributed to “The Herodotus Encyclopedia” are those who, contrary to D. Boedeker, agree with F. Jacoby in his opinion that “The Histories” are unfinished. It is not for the first time that we encounter the disagreements in the writing team. This is absolutely normal (with such a number of contributors it is impossible to reach unanimity on all issues, and this was not meant) and by no means is it a flaw.

In the recent decades, the issues of relations between the “Father of History” and the epic traditions, Homer’s influence on Herodotus, and “contests” between the historian of Halicarnassus and “the first poet” have become topical in the world Classics. As S. Murnaghan notes in the entry *Homer*, contemporary scholars trace “Homeric resonances” throughout “The Histories” (p. 702). The same goes for

²⁷ In particular, in Russian historiography: Mikhail L. Gasparov (Gasparov 1997: 483–489). For the discussion of this “Herodotean issue”, see Sinitsyn 2017a: 138–140; Sinitsyn 2017b: 38–43; Sinitsyn 2019: 84–88 (with literature).

²⁸ In a sense, this assumption is a compromise agreed to by the authors of this review since one of them thought that Herodotus intended to continue his account of the Greco-Persian war until the Peace of Callias 449 BC (Surikov 2009: 223–224; Surikov 2010; Surikov 2011: 271–279), the other one sticks to the opposite opinion: having completed his work on the great war between the Hellenes and the Persians with the expulsion of the latter from Europe, the “Father of History” has executed his grandiose design (Sinitsyn 2013; Sinitsyn 2017a; Sinitsyn 2017b; Sinitsyn 2019); for the remarks on this controversies, see our previous publications (Sinitsyn, Surikov 2020: 151–152; Sinitsyn, Surikov 2021: 521).

J. Haywood, the author of the entry for the reception of Herodotus in ancient Greece and Rome (p. 1208). It is not fortuitous that we find the name of the “Poet of poets” in articles by many other authors in “The Herodotus Encyclopedia”.²⁹ This is understandable since the travelling historian (keen and inquisitive, in the line of the Homer’s Odysseus) regarded himself as a successor to the great Homeric bard. C. H. George³⁰ in his entry for “Prosa”, when speaking about the evolution of the prosaic genre of the Ancient Greek literature and the place of the “Father of History” in this process, notes, “Herodotus sets up his work in dialogue with Homer and other poetry” (p. 1181). The scholar points out that various genres of prose emerge from poetic analogies while history from epos; but it is Herodotus who in the ancient times was called a “Homeric” and even “the most Homeric” (ὁμηρικώτατος) writer. Murnaghan points out that “Homer was for Herodotus both an indispensable predecessor and a foil against whom he defined his own innovative practice. Herodotus’ profound debt to Homer has been recognized since antiquity” (p. 702); the authors of entries adduce references (pp. 702–703; 1181–1182, 1208) to Pseudo-Longinus (*Subl.* XIII. 3); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ep. ad Pomp.* 3), Plutarch (*Mor.* 874b), consider the Salmakis inscription.³¹ Murnaghan points to a number of parallel places in *The Histories* and Homer’s poems, but she shows the differences between them: Herodotus considers a broader range of human achievements than Homer does, including monumental engineering constructions; the veracity of the historian’s accounts comes not from the divine Muse but from his own observations and critical thinking (p. 703). The theme of Herodotus and Homer has remained debatable to this very day. J. Marincola’s article

²⁹ See “Aretē” (J. M. Romney, pp. 124–125), “Epic poetry” (E. J. Bakker, pp. 513–514), “Hesiod” (Z. Stamatopoulou, pp. 682–683), “Historical method” (D. Lateiner, pp. 694–699), “Homer” (S. Murnaghan, pp. 702–703), “Myth” (K. Wesselmann, pp. 952–955), “Poetry” (Ch. C. Chiasson, pp. 1149–1151), “Prosa” (C. H. George, pp. 1180–1183), “Trojan War” (V. Parker, pp. 1502–1503) and dozens of other articles devoted to gods, heroes, ethnonyms and toponyms occurring in Homer’s poems and Herodotus’ “Histories”.

³⁰ C. H. George is Professor of classics at the University of Virginia, specializing in the historical development of ancient languages (see George 2005; George 2014; George 2020); the entry for “Prose” is his only contribution to “The Herodotus Encyclopedia”.

³¹ The text of inscription is cited below. See Isager 1998. Apart from the above-mentioned articles by Murnaghan, George and Haywood, where there are references to S. Isager’s paper in *ZPE*, it is also referred to by Ch. Baron (p. 517) and Ian Oliver in the entry for “Panyassis” (p. 1046).

“Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus”³² and a new collection “Herodotus — The Most Homeric Historian?” compiled by I. Matijašić,³³ must be added to the three articles and a monograph listed in the scanty additional literature (p. 703, here are all the works of the 1970s – 2000s).

“The Encyclopedia” does not contain an entry “Fortune”, but the Polish classic, M. Wecowski’s entry for “Versatility” (pp. 297–300) describes different stories in which the volatile τύχη is totally missing. The notion of *tyche* is treated in E. Eidinow’s long article (pp. 1507–1509), and *moira* never occurs in the entries “Fate” (p. 571), “Gods and the Divine” (p. 620) and “Tyche” (p. 1507).³⁴ The researcher, referring to her monograph on fate and fortune,³⁵ notes that “Yet *moira*, in fact, makes few explicit appearances in *The Histories*” (p. 1507). Yet it should be noted that the word τύχη (fortune, lot) occurs in “The Histories” 14 times while the word μοῖρα (lot, portion) is used by Homer more often (in all, 37 occasions of which over a half have fateful meanings).³⁶ Eidinow examines the passages in “The Histories” containing θεῖη τύχη and concludes that on all occasions it is not about any act committed by a deity, but about the influence of outside supernatural forces that exert their influence on fates of humans or the outcome of certain events (ibid.). This assertion requires no argumentation, the same goes for the following, “Tychē is often translated as ‘good fortune’, but it has more nuances than this single meaning”. The author adduces examples from “The Histories” to illustrate various meanings of this and cognate words used by Herodotus: εὐτυχίη, συντυχίη, etc. (pp. 1508–1509). While M. Fragoulaki in his article on Herodotus observes only the meaning of happenstance for τύχη in Herodotus’ younger contemporary: “Contingency or chance

³² Marincola 2018. For the review and discussion of this work and the whole of the collection “Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian”, where it was published (Bowie 2018), see in our review: Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019 (it also contains references to the additional literature of the influence of the Homerean epos of Herodotus’ work: pp. 185–187). Also: a long article of Herodotus-Ὀμηρικώτατος: Berruecos Frank 2015.

³³ Matijašić (ed.) 2022. The collection was published as a supplement to the American electronic journal *Histos* (Supplement, vol. 14).

³⁴ The title “Moirae” on p. 92 has a reference to “Fate”. But the entry for fate prepared by A. Ellis, Moirae (capital letter for goddesses of fate and destiny) are mentioned only once in the list of “external metaphysical powers — the gods, “fate”, or the Moirai, deciding the future...” (p. 571). H.-G. Nesselrath’s entry for gods (pp. 617–622), “the *Moirai* (Fates)” are invoked only in connection with the story about Cyrus (Hdt. 1. 91). The reference to the prediction from the same chapter (1. 91. 1), speaking about τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν, is also found in C. Dewald’s entry for Croesus, the Lydian King of (p. 368).

³⁵ Eidinow 2011.

³⁶ See Powell 1960: 227, s.v. μοῖρα; 363, s.v. τύχη.

(*TYCHĒ*) is another factor of human history in Thucydides” (p. 1464). But it is not true, for the term is polysemous and in the work of the Athenian historian τύχη and other words with the root τυχ- express different aspects of the manifestation of the supernatural in “The History of the Peloponnesian War”.³⁷

D. Branscome’s “Memory” (pp. 891–893) examines numerous examples from “The Histories” with words denoting “memory” (with the root μνη-), gives references to many oracles and prophecies the memory of which urges Herodotus’ heroes to act in a particular way; he mentions special objects, memorials which are supposed to preserve memories. The theme of history and memory emerges in Maria Pavlou’s “Time” (pp. 1473–1475). The Greek researcher begins with comparing the “Father of History” with his younger contemporary: “In contrast to Thucydides, Herodotus sets out to memorialize the past rather than record contemporary political history” (p. 1473). But Herodotus’ narration is not built on a linear chronological order; his works seldom have events that are date-bound. Pavlou shows “chronological linchpins” in “The Histories” (first of all, Heracles), speaks about the purpose of Herodotus’ digressions from the main theme, which, seemingly disrupting the unity of narration, create a metanarrative of the past (pp. 1474–1475). The scholar speaks about different perceptions of time by different peoples as seen through the prism of Herodotus, about the “chronological gap” and complex synchronization of events in the work of the historian, she keeps pointing to “relative chronology”, “reinforces chronological”, “indifferent attitude to chronological precision” and “anachronical” (here with reference to the work by I. J. F. de Jong³⁸) contrary to Thucydides, who chronicles the course of events dividing them into summer and winter military campaigns (*cf.* M. Fragoulaki’s entry on Thucydides, p. 1464).

K. Dolle in “Calendars” (pp. 258–259) also examines the issue of “relative chronology” in Herodotus, speaks about infrequent dates and complex synchronization of events in “The Histories”, about genealogies and the use of paper-and-pencil calendars. K. Dolle does not mention the first month in a calendar year in Athens, but this occurs in Ch. Baron’s entry in “Chronology” (pp. 312–314): “the Athenian calendar began with what is ‘July 1’” (p. 312). The topic of this article is relevant to that in the two previous entries – on time and calendars, but, contrary to Pavlou and Dolle, Ch. Baron delves into various problems and aspects. He notes that Herodotus

³⁷ This is dealt with in the dissertation of one of the authors of this review: Sinitsyn 1998.

³⁸ de Jong 2001. *Cf.* also Ch. Baron’s entry for “Chronology” (p. 313).

wrote his works at the time when “absolute chronology” did not exist (with reference to D. Bouvier³⁹), and his historical narrative defied continuous linear chronological order; at least, as Ch. Baron points out, until Xerxes invaded Hellas (that is, Books 7–9 of “The Histories”) (p. 312); he also cites Macan on Herodotus’ “chronological triumph” in Books 7–9 (p. 313). But then Ch. Baron points out that the course of time in “The Histories” gets more clearly defined in Book 6 onward (with reference to the well-known work by P. J. Rhodes on chronology in the historian’s narrative).⁴⁰ Ch. Baron dwells on Herodotus’ remarks on Calliades, the archon, (Hdt. 8. 51. 1), speaks about the ways the historian used to synchronize events, about “transitional temporal phrases: ‘somewhat earlier’, ‘at the same time’, ‘after this’, ‘some time later’, etc.” (p. 313) Here we also encounter a remark on “markers of historical time”, though only in passing. Yet, the temporary markers and summing-up phrases related to the end of a certain period (a generation, a year or days) constitute an important point in discussions about chronology in the Herodotus’ narrative.⁴¹ The afore-mentioned entries for time and chronology draw upon works by E. J. Bickerman, P. Vannicelli, Ju. Cobet, I. J. F. de Jong, F. Mitchel, P. J. Rhodes, T. Rood, R. Thomas, R. W. Wallace, H. Strasburger and other scholars.⁴²

We live in the age of the cinema, and, in our view, an entry for the cinema (pp. 319–921) seems to be appropriate in such a classical edition. It was written by Monica S. Cyrino, Professor of Classics at the University of New Mexico (it is her only work in this “Encyclopedia”), who is the author of monographs and a co-editor of collections on ancient culture in the cinema.⁴³ The article begins with a quotation from A. Bazin, a well-known film theorist, about the ability of an historical film to “form our understanding of the past”. “Cinema as an art form was born to recount and preserve the drama of human history”, continues Cyrino (p. 319). The researcher gives a synopsis of the Italian-French film “The Battle of Marathon” (“La battaglia di Maratona”, known world-wide as “The Giant of Marathon”), created in 1959 by Jacques Tourneur, B. Vailati and Mario Bava (it is strange that the second director of Cyrino is missing), which features the Marathon battle waged by the Hellenes (490 BC) and a ‘marathon’ runner, both becoming a legend. The main part of the entry depicts the heroic confrontation between Leonidas, a Spartan King, and his army and the Persians in the battle of Thermophile after the latter invaded

³⁹ Bouvier 2000.

⁴⁰ Rhodes 2003.

⁴¹ For greater detail, see the work by one of the authors of this review: Sinitsyn 2013, 42–48.

⁴² A reference to a large article written by one of the authors of this review on this topic can be added: “Images of Time in Herodotus’ Historical Work”: Surikov 2011: 179–211 (with literature).

⁴³ For example, Cyrino 2005; Cyrino 2013; Cyrino, Safran 2015; Augoustakis, Cyrino 2017.

Hellas in 480 BC. The author describes in detail three American films: the classical *peplum* by Rudolph Maté “The 300 Spartans” (1962), the blockbuster film “300” (2007) by Zack Snyder and the relatively recent film directed by Noam Murro “300: Rise of an Empire” (2014). Cyrino notes that the story of R. Maté’s contains a large number of quotes from Herodotus’ *Histories* (p. 319). Snyder’s blockbuster, on the contrary, was severely criticized for its historical incongruities; the directors of the film were accused of racism and political incorrectness for a negative representation of the Persian King Xerxes and “the barbarian horde” of Asians, the critics failed to see that the film was based on F. Miller’s comics (p. 320). N. Murro made a sequel to the film directed by Snyder (who is also the author of the screen story). His “300” includes several events in the Persian invasion of 480 BC, but the focus is largely on the two sea battles which were fought at the promontory of Artemisium and on the island of Salamis, the latter became a turning point in the Greco-Persian War. Cyrino notes that owing to the world box-office takings, “300” established a new commercial and aesthetic standard for the ancient world on screen, and generated countless parodies in participatory mass culture” (p. 320; with reference to G. Nisbet’s article indicated in the previous Note), however, the scholar mentions neither.⁴⁴

Undoubtedly, the feat performed by the Greek heroes at Thermophile had become a super legend among all the outstanding battles in antiquity, and the sacrificial death of Leonidas and 300 Spartans, even the very number 300, had become

⁴⁴J. Friedberg’s and A. Seltzer’s film “Meet the Spartans” (2008) is the most well-known American parody film. It should be noted that rendering a film, together with its prizes and box office takings, is worth of an encyclopedic entry.

fateful in “the cultural memory of the English-speaking world” as the German classic, K. Ruffing,⁴⁵ put it (he is one of the authors of “The Encyclopedia”).⁴⁶ We cannot help but agree with it, yet, by no means is the Spartans’ heroism the only topic in “The Histories” that inspired the filmmakers. Of no less importance are (and should have been mentioned, if not detailed) the classical American films by D. W. Griffith. His monumental epic “Intolerance” (1916) is regarded as a masterpiece of the silent cinema, it marks an epoch in the cinematography. It has been frequently noted that the story (the part where the plot belongs to Babylon) was based on Herodotus’ work; and some film stories in “The Fall of Babylon” (1919) were borrowed from the Book of Daniel, the prophet, and Herodotus’ historical accounts of the Persian Conquests.⁴⁷ In no way are they loosely based on *The Histories*, likewise all those Cyrino writes about.⁴⁸ The article ends with a rather detailed rendering of A. Minghella’s “English Patient” (1996), which shows scenes of the Second World War – like a modern variation of one of the Eastern stories in Herodotus’ “Histories”.⁴⁹ Cyrino’s article contains no references to the new tele-series “American

⁴⁵ Ruffing 2013; 201: “Immerhin scheint sie soweit im kulturellen Gedächtnis der anglophonen Welt verankert zu sein, daß der den Opfertod der 300 thematisierende Comic von Frank Miller und die auf seiner Grundlage erfolgte filmische Umsetzung den schlichten Titel ‚300‘ trugen. Auch der deutsche Verleih sah diesen Titel als ausreichend an und versah ihn nicht etwa mit Untertiteln, um das Sujet einer näheren Erläuterung zuzuführen. Anders gewendet bedeutet dies, daß man offenkundig der Meinung war, allein mit der Zahl 300 beim Konsumenten das entsprechende Geschichtsbild aktivieren zu können” (with reference to the work by W. Kofler). On the legendary feat performed by the Spartans in cinematography, we shall point out selected recent works: Murray 2007; Levene 2007; Lillo Redonet 2008; Kofler 2011; Cyrino 2011; Nisbet 2012; Beigel 2013; Nikoloutsos 2013; Glass 2014; Blank 2015: 72–84; Teperik 2018.

⁴⁶ K. Ruffing is the author of entries mostly for Eastern realities: “Ecbatana (Median)” (pp. 478–479), “Euphrates river” (p. 547), “Tigris river” (pp. 1471–1472), “Erythraean Sea” (pp. 526–527), “Royal Road” (pp. 1246–1247), “Satrapies” (pp. 1271–1272) and others.

⁴⁷ See Mayer 2013: 97; cf. Seymour 2015: 25, 29–30 (here indirectly: M. Seymour shows that the director D. W. Griffith films the scenes drawing upon the picture “The Babylonian Marriage Market” executed by the British painter Edwin Long, who was inspired by the story from Herodotus’ “The Histories”; McGeough 2020: 122 (with reference to M. Seymour’s paper).

⁴⁸ See also about “historiographic” films in Bridges’ entry for the contemporary reception of Herodotus’ work (p. 1220). All of them are not screen versions of “The Histories” and even of its episodes, but all of them are loosely based on the accounts made by the historian of Halicarnassus.

⁴⁹ Cf. E. Bridges’ entry, p. 1220.

Gods” based on H. Gaiman’s novel (a brief account of which can be found in Bridges’ entry on the reception of Herodotus, pp. 1220–1221).

And there is another film, “Tomyris” directed by A. Satayev in 2019 (Kazakhstan), it is based on Herodotus’ story about Tomyris, the ruler of the Massagetae (1. 205–214), the invasion of the Persian army of Cyrus the Great into the land of Massagetae and the death of the King the Conqueror in the battle which the “Father of History” calls “the cruellest of all fought by the barbarians” (Hdt. 1. 214).⁵⁰ The list of bibliography to the entry *Cinema* contains 5 articles (the author of one of which is M. Cyrino) and 3 monographs on Antiquity in the cinema; it also has J. Solomon’s and G. Nisbet’s works, yet there is no mention of the French fundamental catalogue by H. Dumon,⁵¹ which is today’s best encyclopedia detailing not only all films on ancient history, mythology and culture, but also films encompassing all antiquity in the cinema: Egypt and other barbarians, biblical stories, the history of early Christianity, etc.

“The Encyclopedia” contains even the trifling information about certain realities. Thus, for example, a British classic A. Barker begins the entry on music with the following, “Despite the importance of music in ancient cultures, only a handful of Herodotus’ allusions run to more than a few words, and many are fairly trivial” (p. 940). But then the author writes at length – over two columns of text – about music, musical instruments, songs and dance, dramatic chorus and the patronage tyrants extended to musicians, the role of music in geographical description in Herodotus, etc. – in a word, all those sketchy musical and near-music details that occur in “The Histories” (pp. 940–941).

N. Karapanagioti’s “Amazons” (pp. 59–60) not only briefly renders Herodotus’ account of the legendary tribe of warring women (their way of life, clothes, relations with Sauromatians, clashes with the Hellenes, etc.), but also the evidence found in other ancient writers’ works. The list of additional literature contains three English-language books published in the USA in the 1980s,⁵² yet there is no reference to the relatively recent German collection “The Amazons between the Greeks and the Scythians”.⁵³

⁵⁰ An analysis of this film in the antiquity aspect was presented in the report of Professor E. V. Rung at a conference dedicated to the reception of ancient culture, see Sinitsyn, Svetlov 2021: 283–284; Sinitsyn, Svetlov 2022: 499.

⁵¹ Dumont 2009.

⁵² The short monograph by P. duBois “The Centaurs and the Amazons” of 1999 was published 40 years ago (duBois 1982).

⁵³ Schubert, Weiß 2013 (here, the most prominent article is the one by Ch. Schubert, with new literature: Schubert 2013); also Hinge 2005.

Herodotus' opus (both his literary work and his experience as an explorer) is really grandiose encompassing various spheres of not only Hellenic but also the neighbouring barbarian cultures. And the publishers of "The Encyclopedia" tried to echo this magnitude. Many entries deal with terms: "Archē" (pp. 114–116), "Aretē" (pp. 124–125), "Erga" (pp. 521–524), "Hubris" (pp. 711–712), "Isonomia" (pp. 755–756), "Nomos" (pp. 985–989), "Proxenos" (p. 1188), "Thōmata" (pp. 1452–1458), etc., including those related to non-Greek culture: "Proskynesis" (pp. 1183–1184), "Tiara" (pp. 1469–1470) and others. "The Encyclopedia" contains entries on the subjects that are topical today: "Metanarrative, Ethnicity" (pp. 532–535), "Cinema", etc.; the provocative, erotic subject was not overlooked either (in the last three decades it was greatly "emphasized" in the Western classical studies): "Sex" (pp. 594–595), "Gender" (pp. 1317–1318), "Pederasty" (pp. 859–860), and also "Marriage" (pp. 1065–1066), "Concubine" (pp. 344–345), "Prostitution" (pp. 1185–1186) and others.

Even the jacket of the book has a veneer of sexuality (in the Baroque style): it features "Kandaules' wife Discovering the Hiding Gydes" by Eglon Hendrik van der Neer, it illustrates one of the most well-known stories in Herodotus' "Histories", which, in fact, is the starting point (Hdt. 1. 10). As to illustrations; the three volumes contain over 60 plates, including pictures, layouts, tables and maps,⁵⁴ scenes on ancient vases, photographs of scholars, also pictures of coins, ethnic monuments, manuscripts, etc. All of them are of high quality. Of great use is the chart of places mentioned in Herodotus' "Histories" (Fig. 20, p. 601). However, Fig. 14 "View of the Temple and Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi" (p. 429) shows a picturesque panorama near today's Delphi at the bottom of Mount Parnassus, but the ancient monument is so small that it is practically invisible. The same can be said about Fig. 34 (p. 1097), the aerial photograph showing the ruins of Persepolis (Iran) at great distance. The same goes for the artist's reconstruction of the Athenian acropolis in the late fifth century BCE (Fig. 8, p. 186) and the picture of the model of the surroundings of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi (Fig. 15, p. 431).

"The Herodotus Encyclopedia" ends with a colossal index compiled for all the three volumes (pp. 1570–1653). Its electronic version is a very positive factor, which is very important at the age of digitization. All the three volumes are united in one file, and there is a system allowing for a quick search.

Now we should like to dwell on certain drawbacks of the edition.

We expected to find entries on "Hellanicus of Lesbos" and "Xanthus of Lydia", but there are none. Objections may be raised because Herodotus does not mention

⁵⁴ Apart from various maps included in the body of the text, each volume starts with three maps (Vol. 1: pp. LI–LII; vol. 2 and vol. 3: pp. XXXI–XXXII).

these historians. Indeed, but he does not mention Thucydides either. But “The Encyclopedia” contains entries for Thucydides (Maria Fragoulaki, pp. 1462–1466), Xenophon (Vivienne Gray, pp. 1556–1558), Ephorus, Theopompus (the author of both articles is Giovanni Parmeggiani, pp. 511–513 and 1437–1438) and even a short entry by an Israeli scholar Eran Almagor on the Hebraic historian Flavius Josephus (pp. 767–768).⁵⁵ And this, in our opinion, is the right approach since it allows us to incorporate Herodotus’ work in the context of the evolution of Ancient Greek historiography. And the inclusion of information about Hellanicus and Xanthus would contribute to a better understanding of the context.

Hellanicus, a senior contemporary of Herodotus (who had outlived him), knew him personally; together they had made a journey to Macedonia.⁵⁶ Their works bear traces of mutual influence and a certain dialogue.⁵⁷ Later works of Hellanicus, demonstrating a sharp rise in the interest in chronology, constitute a transition from Herodotus to Thucydides in the development of historical thought. As to Xanthus, he is frequently compared with Herodotus (both very Hellenised representatives of Minor Asian ethnoses) and they had much in common in many respects.⁵⁸ Judging from the names of his father and uncle, Herodotus was a Hellenised Carian. The historian’s uncle, Panyassis, was honoured with an entry (I. Oliver, pp. 1046–1047), while his father, Lyxex, somehow was not.

In his work, Herodotus never referred to dramatists, either.⁵⁹ But “The Encyclopedia” has entries for the comedy dramatist, Aristophanes (I. Oliver, pp. 145–146), tragedians Aeschylus and Phrynichus (the author of both entries is E. Bridges, pp. 31–32 and 1128), Sophocles (M. Lloyd, pp. 1352–1353). This stands to reason since Ch. Baron compiled not a dictionary of realities occurring in the work of the “Father of History”, but a fundamental Encyclopedia on Herodotus. Yet it is strange

⁵⁵ Also Aristotle (Susan D. Collins, p. 146–147), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (P. Payen, pp. 450–451), Plutarch, Lucian of Samosata, Strabo (the author of the three entries is E. Almagor, pp. 819–821, 1145–1148, 1376–1377) and other Ancient Greek writers who are, so to speak, *beyond* Herodotus’ “The Histories”.

⁵⁶ On Antiquity and the dating of this journey see Vasilev 2016.

⁵⁷ Surikov 2021: 855–858; Surikov 2022.

⁵⁸ For example, Mehl 2004.

⁵⁹ Apart from a single occasion when the historian mentions the poet Aeschylus, who presented Artemis as a daughter of Demeter in one of his dramas (extinct): Hdt. 2. 156. 6; see the entry for “Aeschylus” written by E. Bridges (pp. 31–32). But references to Aeschylus (largely to his tragedy “Persians” staged in Athens in 472 BC) occur in many entries of “The Encyclopedia: Barbarians” (H. J. Kim, pp. 216–218), “Marathon” (B. Steinbock, pp. 850–854), “Orientalism” (M. C. Miller, pp. 1021–1022), “Salamis, island and battle” (D. Yates, pp. 1254–1258), “Tragedy” (S. Murnaghan, pp. 1483–1484) and others.

that not only should an article on Euripides be missing, but even his name never occurs in the Index though references to Euripides can be found in the three volumes dozens of times (in all, over half a hundred). Well, we shall put it down as negligence on the part of the publishers.

We cannot help but note, either, that such an important edition should contain factual errors. Thus, the article on Scylax from Caryanda (pp. 1300–1301), who was mentioned in Herodotus (4. 44), says that his expedition sailed down the river Indus to the sea, and then, along the same Indus, returned to the port of origin. But Herodotus expressly says that from the estuary of the Indus they navigated the sea westward (διὰ θαλάσσης δὲ πρὸς ἐσπέρην) and arrived in Egypt. We fail to find an explanation of this curious “blunder” made by G. Shipley, who quite recently published a Pseudo-Skylax’s *Periplus*⁶⁰ and so should have been well-aware of everything related to Scylax.

In the entry “Fate”, A. Ellis reproduces the episode of the death of Atys, son of the Lydian king Croesus, who was killed by Adrastus (Hdt. 1. 34–44) and continues: “The best parallel for this sort of fate, which makes a mockery of human intentions and desires, is the story of Oedipus written by Herodotus’ contemporary Sophocles” (p. 571). But if we speak not about the myth of Oedipus in Sophocles’ “Oedipus Tyrannus”, it is not a tragedy of fate; this tragedy does not make fun of human intentions, but speaks about a hero who pledged his word to find and punish the murderer of his predecessor on the Theban throne no matter who this evildoer may have been, he conducted an investigation and on the same very day executed him. The theme “there is no escaping fate” in “Oedipus Tyrannus” is there, but the tragedy is not about it, contrary to Herodotus’ story about Croesus’ prophetic dream and the poor lot of Adrastus.

M. Lloyd’s article on Sophocles speaks about friendly ties between the tragedian and the “Father of History”. The coincidences listed by the author on p. 1352 may be supplemented with numerous parallels in the passages of Sophocles’ dramas and Herodotus’ “The Histories”.⁶¹ Similar points and motives are plentiful; all this is essential though gives little. True, here the authors’ opinions diverge: some regard the coincidences as substantial enough to make assertions about their being acquainted, close and even friendly (Sophocles’ “borrowing” from the historian is deemed as tokens of respect and dutiful affection),⁶² while the second reviewer is

⁶⁰ Shipley 2011.

⁶¹ Murnaghan’s entry for “Tragedy” is unambiguous: Sophocles was Herodotus’ personal friend. Here the American colleague argues (contrary to M. Lloyd — without any reservations): “several plays by Sophocles ... include direct borrowings from the ‘Histories’” (p. 1483).

⁶² See, for example, Surikov 2011: 336–361.

very sceptical of this.⁶³ Lloyd's article contains an inaccurate reference to Anonym. *Vita Sophocl.*, which speaks about young Sophocles playing the lyre after the Athenian victory at Salamis: instead of § 3 it gives § 4 (p. 1352). Speaking about Sophocles' dramas in relation to Herodotus' topics, Lloyd refers to 7 extant plays, but he disregards the satirical drama "Trackers" (*Ichneutae*); though in the vein of these parallels between the works of the Athenian tragedian and the "Father of History", it is "Trackers" that contains the passage that allegedly testifies to Sophocles' borrowing the information about the Egyptian realities occurring in the work of Herodotus: the cat and the ichneumon (Sophocl. fr. 314. *Ichn.* 303, 305 TGF, Radt ~ Hdt. 2. 67. 1).⁶⁴

Now down to animals. "The Encyclopedia" has entries for "Ants", "Dogs", "Camels", "Horses", "Lion", "Birds", "Fish", "Crocodiles" and other species of fauna. Various entries in "The Encyclopedia" mention Egyptian ibises, cats, snakes, etc. But the ichneumon, an Egyptian creature, a genuine curiosity for the Ancient Greek audience, is nowhere to be found. The hippopotamus occurs twice (pp. 1048, 1538), yet even these beasts were alien for the Hellenic audience for whom Herodotus wrote. The same goes for elephants, which are mentioned twice in the articles about Ethiopia, where elephants are found in large numbers (pp. 333, 530), and the very name of the town Elephantine (p. 496). Of other eastern beasties, crocodiles may have been the "luckiest": they are treated in A. McDonald's large entry (pp. 363–364). Jessica Baron, the wife of the editor of this "Encyclopedia", compiled two entries for animals: "Mules" (p. 936) and "Pigs" (pp. 1133–1134), and Christopher and Jessica Baron contributed an article "Fish" (pp. 579–580).

Without doubt, it is impossible to amass and describe everything even in such a monumental work as this present "Encyclopedia" is. Yet it is a pity that it missed separate articles on certain personalities and subjects. There are B. M. Lavelle's articles on the Athenian clans of Alcmaeonidae (pp. 48–49) and Peisistratidae (pp. 1067–1068), also his works on Alcmaeon and Peisistratus (pp. 1068–1069), which, of course, stands to reason since Herodotus singles them out, but no separate articles on other Athenian clans: Kerykes, Eumolpidae⁶⁵ and even Philaidae,⁶⁶

⁶³ See Sinitsyn 2006; Sinitsyn 2008a; Sinitsyn 2008b; Sinitsyn 2011; Sinitsyn 2012.

⁶⁴ Sinitsyn 2006 (with literature).

⁶⁵ The Encyclopedia just merely mentions these Athenian clans.

⁶⁶ On Herodotus and Philaidae: Surikov 2011; Surikov 2017. On p. 115 the title "Philaidae" is cross-referenced to "Miltiades", but references to "Philaidae" are found in many other entries speaking about members of this family.

though the historian of Halicarnassus may have been in close contact with the representatives of the latter.⁶⁷ Relevant and important, in our view, would be entries related to early Greek historians and the ancient historiography: *logopoioi*, *logographers*, *syngraphers*. Yet, they are missing, though the words *logographer(s)*, *logographoi* and *logopoios(-oi)* frequently occur, and the verb *syngraphein* is found in the entry for Thucydides. It is customary in modern classical studies to call early Ionic historians-storytellers “logographers”, which does not correspond to their ancient designation, but the present “Encyclopedia” maintains this approach, and Hecataeus of Miletus⁶⁸ is deemed the main “logographer” among Ionian writers. But Herodotus never uses the word *λογογράφος*, though he frequently refers to Hecataeus as *λογοποιός* (2. 143. 1; 5. 36. 2, 125),⁶⁹ cf. the article devoted to Hecataeus (p. 648) by Emily Varto, and K. Dolle’s entry “Logos”: “Herodotus would refrain from calling himself a *logopoios* (writer of prose); rather, it is Aesop and his own predecessor Hecataeus whom he designates with this slightly pejorative word (2. 134. 3; 5. 36. 1⁷⁰)” (p. 815). In the article on Ctesias, E. Almagor, with reference to the fragment of the work by the historian of Cnidus, points out that he branded his predecessor from Halicarnassus as *logopoios* (p. 374).

As to the terminology, such a curiosity as *cheiromaktron* (*χειρόμακτρον*) is mentioned only once in D. Branscome’s “Hades” (p. 634), meaning “kerchief”. Yet this Greek word occurring in Herodotus’ “Scythian logos” (Hdt. 4. 64, *bis*)⁷¹ with a meaning of “scalp” never features in these entries. But the Scythian scalping practice is mentioned in other entries of “The Encyclopedia” (see pp. 79, 875, 941, 1306, 1391, 1552, 1523).

There are a number of purely technical remarks. Each volume begins with brief particulars of all contributors to “The Encyclopedia” (vol. 1: pp. XIII–XXXV; vol. 2 and vol. 3: pp. VIII–XXX). But the editors also provide full names of the authors and places of their work at the beginning of each separate entry, thus, for most of over two hundred authors, this information is repeated dozens and even hundreds of

⁶⁷ “The Encyclopedia” contains references to the article on Herodotus and Philaïdae, published by one of the authors of this review in the German collection: Surikov 2013.

⁶⁸ See entries contributed by D. Branscome for Aristagoras: “the Milesian logographer Hecataeus” (p. 136); also in D. Lateiner (p. 563) and in other entries.

⁶⁹ On historiographers and syngraphers in Herodotus, see Sinitsyn 2021a; Sinitsyn 2021b.

⁷⁰ Here the reference is inaccurate, it must be: Hdt. 5. 36. 2 (cf. the above). On Aesop as *logopoios*: Hdt. 2. 134. 3; Cf. Jeremy B. Lefkowitz’ entries for “Aesop” and “Fable” (pp. 32, 566), in entries by Ch. C. Chiasson for “Sappho” (p. 1265) and G. Monti on “Reception of Herodotus” (p. 1276).

⁷¹ Sinitsyn 2008b; Sinitsyn 2011; Sinitsyn 2012.

times. For example, Ch. Byron, the editor of the three-volume book, is the author of almost 1000 (!) entries in this edition.

Most Ancient Greek words and phrases are transcribed into Latin characters. The editors may have had their reasons in doing so (for example, to accommodate a broader audience?), though this reason seems dubious. Moreover, not all Greek words are transcribed uniformly and sometimes in either way. For example, the phrase in Greek inscription of the 2nd century BC on p. 1181 is Latinised: *ton pezon en historiaisin Homēron*; and in another article on p. 1208 the same phrase is cited in the original: Ἡρόδοτον τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὀμηρον. In C. Dewald's article with a reference to Plut. *Mor.* 874b, the Ancient Greek word χάρις is in Latin characters (p. 641), and in another article the same fragment of Plutarch's "Moralia" is cited in the original (p. 1208). Why this disparity? A. Ellis's "Disaster" (pp. 455–456) contains only the Greek term in the singular and the plural: συμφορή, συμφοραί; In "Jealousy" (pp. 765–766) A. Ellis frequently uses Ancient Greek words together with their Latin transcription: for example, "Herodotus does not use the word ζῆλος (*zēlos*), only φθόνος (*phthonos*)". In one of the articles by the editor, Ch. Baron, the word is spelled at first in Latin and then in Greek: *dikē* (δίκη) (p. 449). A. Lanski's article on messengers/heralds (pp. 899–900) the order is reversed: a word/phrase is translated into English, followed by the Greek originals and Latin transcriptions: "messengers" ἄγγελος (*angelos*), "herald" (κῆρυξ, *kēryx*), "oracle-consultant" (θεοπρόπος, *theopropos*), "message-bearer" (ἀγγελιηφόρος, *angeliēforos*), such examples are galore. What purpose do these reiterations serve and for whom are the "elucidations"? The editor, Baron, provides spelling notes (pp. XI–XII), where he spells the rules to transcribe Ancient Greek diphthongs and long vowels into Latin characters. Yet, in many places inaccuracies occur. For example, p. 892 features initial forms of Greek words: *mnēmoneuo*, *diamnēmoneuo*, *anamimnēisko*, *hypomnēsō*, all of which end in a short vowel-*o* while the letter omega at the end of a word is always a long vowel -*ō*: ἀναμιμνήσκω, διαμνημονεύω, μνημονεύω, ὑπομνήσω. Ch. Baron violates the spelling rules he himself adopted in the title of the article "Dike". There are *angelos*, *angeloī*, but also *syggraphēin*; a lot of *charis*, *acharis*, *chronos*, *chrēsmologoi*, *parachrēma*, *tychē*, *syntychiē*, *eutychiē*, *eutycheō*, *lochagos*, *lochagos*, etc., and many times *kharis*, *khōrēgos*, *khōra*, *hyparkhos*, *psykhē*, *aiskhynē*, *epikhōrios*, *aiskhros*, *mounarkhos*, *eunoukhos*, *iakkhos*, etc. In the entry *Tychē*, along with *tychē* there are two variants *theiēi*, *tuchēi* (p. 1507). Dozens of times references to the entry on *hybris* are spelled either as *HUBRIS* or *HYBRIS* (though the Index contains 13 occasions of *hubris*). The examples of such a "variety" are plentiful).

M. de Bakker's *Audience* renders Phrynichus' tragedy as "Fall of Miletus" (p. 201; cf. p. 1602); D. Branscome (*Competition*) gives another English version of the same play: "The Capture of Miletus" (p. 343; cf. pp. 627, 1128, 1586); the third variant of the

same tragedy is found in E. Bridges' article on Phrynichus: "Sack of Miletus" (pp. 1128, 1541; *cf.* pp. 1582 and 1619). All these three translations of the name Phrynuchus' δράμα Μιλήτου ἄλωσις are possible and they can be found in the English-language literature,⁷² but, we believe that in the framework of one edition the names and titles should be unified: one play and several translations – as the saying goes: suit yourself. The editor should have come to an agreement with the authors about one version to avoid unnecessary "inconsistences".

And finally, some minor remarks. The information about the authors of the three-volume "Encyclopedia" cites E. Bridges' edition of 2014 (vol. 1 – p. XV, vol. 2 and vol. 3 – p. X), but in the articles and the bibliographies (pp. 32, 1220, 1221, 1558, 1561) references to this work are different: Bridges 2015;⁷³ the American collection "Clio and Thalia" is referred to either as published in 2016 (vol. 2 and vol. 3, p. VIII), or in 2017 (vol. 1, p. XXV, vol. 2 and vol. 3, p. XX, 714).⁷⁴ On p. 579 there is an inaccurate reference to the second book of "The Histories", where the author speaks about spawning fish in the Nile (Hdt. 2. 94 is not about fish). The story about a large beautiful fish that a fisherman presents to Polycratus of Samoa is told in 3. 42. 1 and 3, and not in a whole section 3. 40–43, as the article indicates (p. 580). On p. 1321 one English word is misprinted, and another misprint occurs in a Greek word rendered in Latin: "Herodotus (7. 97)... *hippagogē*", it should be: "Herodotus (7. 97)... *hippagōgā*" (*hic*: ἱππαγωγὰ πλοῖα). The date of the film 300 by Z. Snyder is given differently in different places: 2007 (pp. 319 and 1220), and the caption to Fig. 11 (p. 320) M. S. Cyrino's article: 2006. Examples of various inconsistencies and differences are in great abundance. All of them are surely the minor blunders that the editors should correct. Well, there is a proverb that says that "there are spots on the sun".

A great and important work had been done to commemorate the "Father of History". In spite of minor flaws, the magnitude of design and its execution cannot help but impress. We shall end our review and discussion with a "slogan" echoing the dedication which Ch. Baron places in his "Encyclopedia": Herodotus is as large as life, and quite as natural!

ABBREVIATIONS

FgrHist – Jacoby F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Bde. I–XV. Berlin, 1923–1958.

⁷² By the way, there are doubts about the authentic name of Phrynichus' tragedy mentioned in Herodotus' "Histories" (Hdt. 6. 21. 2); see, for example: Zabudskaya 2015.

⁷³ Bridges 2015. The author of the monograph on Xerxes, E. Bridges prepared the following entries "Aeschylus" (pp. 31–32), "Black Athena" (pp. 229–231), "Jason" (pp. 764–765), "Medea" (p. 870), "Penelope" (p. 1079) and others (in all 9 articles).

⁷⁴ Baragwanath, Foster (eds.) 2017.

TGF, Radt – *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. S. Radt (ed.). Vol. IV: Sophocles. Göttingen, 1977 (= 1999).

БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ / REFERENCES

- Гаспаров, М. Л. (1997) *Избранные труды. Т. 1: О поэтах*. Москва.
- Забудская, Я. Л. (2015) «Взятие Милета» Фриниха: проблемы изучения ранней греческой драмы», *Вестник древней истории* 3, 102–108.
- Подосинов, А. В. (2021) «Греческие боги и герои как прародители местных племен Северного Причерноморья (миф – фольклор – литература – история)», в кн. Е. А. Мельникова (ред.) *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Чтения памяти члена-корреспондента АН СССР Владимира Терентьевича Папуто. Вып. 33. Роль религии в формировании социокультурных практик и представлений*. Москва, 224–229.
- Синицын, А. А. (1998) *Фукидид и понятие судьбы-tyche у греков в V веке до н. э.* Дисс... Саратов: Саратовский государственный университет.
- Синицын, А. А. (2006) «Геродот, Софокл и египетские диковинки (Об одном историкографическом мифе)», *Античный мир и археология* 12, 363–405.
- Синицын, А. А. (2008a) «Plut. Mor. 785b: критические замечания о достоверности источника», *Мнемон* 7, 377–418.
- Синицын, А. А. (2008b) «Софокл и скифский логос Геродота», *Археология Восточно-Европейской степи* 6, 269–292.
- Синицын, А. А. (2011) «По поводу упоминания в классической драме экстравагантного «боспорского феномена» (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt)», *Боспорский феномен: население, языки, контакты. Материалы международной научной конференции (Санкт-Петербург, 22–25 ноября 2011 г.)*. С.-Петербург, 626–641.
- Синицын, А. А. (2013) «Фукидид и Геродот, повлиявшие друг на друга? (по поводу одного «интересного нюанса)», *Античный мир и археология* 16, 39–55.
- Синицын, А. А. (2017a) «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.
- Синицын, А. А. (2017b) «Геродот об изгнании варваров из Европы и проблема завершенности первой «Истории»», *Метаморфозы истории* 10, 35–92.
- Синицын, А. А. (2021a) «Замечания о синграфах-историописателях в ‘Epistula ad Pompeium’ Дионисия Галикарнасского», *Вестник Русской христианской гуманитарной академии. Филологические науки* 2/1, 65–81.
- Синицын, А. А., Суриков, И. Е. (2019) «Новый коллективный труд об «отце истории» как ученом и рассказчике» *Мнемон* 19/1, 183–216.
- Синицын, А. А., Суриков, И. Е. (2021) «[Рец.] S. Sheehan. A Guide to Reading Herodotus’ ‘Histories’. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018», *Вестник древней истории* 81/2, 520–528.
- Синицын, А. А., Светлов, Р. В. (2021) «Отчет о двенадцатом заседании семинара «Боги, люди и миры в прошлом и настоящем»», *Terra Aestheticae* 7, 270–298.

- Синицын, А. А., Светлов, Р. В. (2022) “Антиковедческие концепции и рецепции античности. Научный семинар памяти профессора Е. А. Чиглинцева”, *Вестник древней истории* 82/2, 498–501.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2009) *Геродот*. Москва.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2010) “Последние главы «Истории» Геродота и вопрос о степени завершенности его труда”, в кн. Т. Н. Джаксон, И. Г. Коновалова, Г. Р. Цецхладзе (ред.) *Gaudeamus igitur: сборник статей к 60-летию Александра Васильевича Подосинова*. Москва, 356–363.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2011а) *Очерки об историописании в классической Греции*. Москва.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2011б) “Геродот и Филадельфия”, *Аристей* 3, 30–64.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2017) “Геродот, Филадельфия и Алкмеониды (несколько слов о старой теме в связи с ее нынешним состоянием)”, *Метаморфозы истории* 10, 9–34.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2021) “К хронологии жизни и творчества историка Гелланика”, *Вестник древней истории* 81/4, 837–862.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2022) “Гелланик и Андокид”, *Вестник древней истории* 82/2, 303–318.
- Теперик, Т. Ф. (2018) “Рецепция античности в кинематографе: три версии о 300 спартанцах”, *Acta eruditorum* 29, 56–60.
- Augoustakis, A., Cyrino, M. S. (eds.) (2017) *STARZ Spartacus. Reimagining an Icon on Screen*. Edinburgh.
- Beigel, T. 2013: “With Your Shield or on It: The Gender of Heroism in Zack Snyder’s ‘300’ and Rudolph Maté’s ‘The 300 Spartans’”, in A.-B. Renger, J. Solomon (eds.) *Ancient Worlds in Film and television: Gender and Politics*. Leiden; Boston, 65–78.
- Berruecos Frank, B. (2015) “Heródoto ὁμηρικώτατος. La transformación del léxico homérico en las ‘Historias’ de Heródoto”, *Nova Tellus* 32/2, 115–171.
- Bichler, R. (2001) *Herodots Welt: Der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte*. Berlin.
- Bichler, R. (2016) “Persian Geography and the Ionians: Herodotus”, in S. Bianchetti, M. R. Cataudella, H.-J. Gehrke (eds.) *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Geography: The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition*. Leiden; Boston, 3–20.
- Bichler, R., Rollinger, R. (2000) *Herodotus*. Hildesheim.
- Bichler, R., Rollinger, R. (2021) “Greek and Latin Sources”, in B. Jacobs, R. Rollinger (eds.) *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire*. Vol. 1. Hoboken, 169–185.
- Blank, T. (2015) “Utopia. Cinematic Sparta as an Idea (Not a City)”, in M. G. Morcillo, P. Hanesworth, Ó. Lapeña Marchena (eds.) *Imagining Ancient Cities in Film: From Babylon to Cinecittà*. New York; London, 65–90.
- Bridges, E. (2015) *Imagining Xerxes: Ancient Perspectives on a Persian King*. London.
- Bouvier, D. (2000) “Temps chronique et temps météorologique chez les premiers historiens grecs”, in C. Darbo-Peschanski (ed.) *Constructions du temps dans le monde grec ancient*. Paris, 115–141.
- Bowie, E., ed. (2018) *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston.
- Colvin, S. (1999) *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Colvin, S. (2007) *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koiné*. Oxford.

- Colvin, S. (2014) *A Brief History of Ancient Greek*. Oxford.
- Cyrino, M. S. (2005) *Big Screen Rome*. Malden, MA.
- Cyrino, M. S. (2011) "This is Sparta!: The Reinvention of the Epic in Zack Snyder's '300'", in R. Burgoyne (ed.) *The Epic Film in World Culture*. New York; London, 19–38.
- Cyrino, M. S., ed. (2013) *Screening Love and Sex in the Ancient World*. New York.
- Cyrino, M. S., Safran, M. E. (eds.) (2015) *Classical Myth on Screen*. New York.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2001) "The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' 'Histories'", in S. J. Harrison (ed.) *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*. Oxford, 93–116.
- duBois, P. (1982) *Centaur and Amazons: Women and the Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being*. Ann Arbor.
- Dumont, H. (2009) *L'Antiquité au cinéma: Vérités, légendes et manipulations*. Paris.
- Eidinow, E. (2011) *Luck, Fate and Fortune: Antiquity and its Legacy*. London.
- Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots*. Berlin.
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and his "Sources": Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*. Leeds.
- Fornara, C. W. (1971) "Evidence for the Date of Herodotus' Publication", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91, 25–34.
- George, C. H. (2005) *Expressions of Agency in Ancient Greek*. Cambridge.
- George, C. H. (2014) *Expressions of Time in Ancient Greek*. Cambridge.
- George, C. H. (2020) *How Dead Languages Work*. Oxford.
- Glass, L. (2014) "'300' and 'Fellini-Satyricon': Film theory in the tertiary classroom", *Dialogue: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Popular Culture and Pedagogy* 1/1. <http://journaldialogue.org/issues/issue-1/300-and-fellini-satyricon-film-theory-in-the-tertiary-classroom/>
- Hartog, F. (1980) *Le miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris.
- Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Berkeley.
- Hinge, G. (2005) "Herodot zur skythischen Sprache: Arimaspen, Amazonen und die Entdeckung des Schwarzen Meeres", *Clotta* 81, 86–115.
- Hornblower, S. (1996) *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
- Immerwahr, H. R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland.
- Irwin, E. (2007) "The Politics of Precedence: First 'Historians' on First 'Thalassocrats'", in R. Osborne (ed.) *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430–380 BC*. Cambridge, 188–223.
- Irwin, E. (2013) "The *hybris* of Theseus' and the Date of the 'Histories'", in B. Dunsch, K. Ruffing (eds.) *Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots*. Wiesbaden, 7–84.
- Irwin, E. (2018) "The End of the *Histories* and the End of the Atheno-Peloponnesian Wars", in T. Harrison, E. Irwin (eds.) *Interpreting Herodotus*. Oxford, 279–334.
- Kofler, W. (2011) "300 und eine Nacht. Perser und Griechen als Opfer von Erzählkonventionen bei Herodot und Frank Miller?", in R. Bichler, R. Rollinger, B. Truschneegg (hrsgg.) *Herodot und das persische Weltreich. Akten des 3. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer*

- und altorientalischer Überlieferungen*”, Innsbruck 24.–28. November 2008. Wiesbaden, 159–175.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto.
- Levene, D. S. (2007) “Xerxes Goes to Hollywood”, in E. Bridges, E. Hall, P. J. Rhodes (eds.) *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium*. Oxford, 384–403.
- Lillo Redonet, F. (2008) “Sparta and Ancient Greece in ‘The 300 Spartans’”, in I. Berti, M. Garcia Morcillo (eds.) *Hellas on Screen. Cinematic Receptions of Ancient History, Literature and Myth*. Stuttgart, 117–130.
- Marincola, J. (2001) *Greek Historians*. Oxford.
- Marincola, J. (2018) “Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus”, in E. Bowie (ed.) *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 3–24.
- Matijašić, I., ed. (2022) *Herodotus — The Most Homeric Historian?* Oxford; Edmonton.
- Mayer, D. (2013) “Architecture and Art Dance Meet in the Ancient World”, in P. Michelakis, M. Wyke (eds.) *The Ancient World in Silent Cinema*. Cambridge, 91–108.
- McGeough, K. (2020) “‘Babylon’s Last Bacchanal’: Mesopotamia and the Near East in Epic Biblical Cinema”, in L. Verderame, A. Garcia-Ventura (eds.) *Receptions of the Ancient Near East in Popular Culture and Beyond*. Atlanta, 117–140.
- Mehl, A. (2004) “Herodotus and Xanthus of Sardis Compared”, in V. Karageorghis, I. Taifacos (eds.) *The World of Herodotus*. Nicosia, 337–348.
- Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus*. Ann Arbor.
- Murray, G. N. (2007) “Zack Snyder, Frank Miller and Herodotus: Three Takes on the 300 Spartans”, *Akroterion* 52, 11–35.
- Nikoloutsos, K. P. (2013) “Between Family and the Nation: Gorgo in the Cinema”, in K. P. Nikoloutsos (ed.) *Ancient Greek Women in Film*. Oxford, 255–278.
- Nisbet, G. (2012) “‘This is Cake-Town!’: ‘300’ (2006) and the Death of Allegory”, in S. Hodgkinson, I. Macgregor Morris (eds.) *Sparta in Modern Thought: Politics, History and Culture*. Swansea, 429–458.
- Powell, J. E. (1960) *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. 2nd ed. Hildesheim.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1993) *The Liar School of Herodotus*. Amsterdam.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2003) “Herodotean Chronology Revisited”, in P. Derow, R. Parker (eds.) *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Oxford, 58–72.
- Rollinger, R. (2004) “Herodotus, Human Violence and the Ancient Near East”, in V. Karageorghis, I. Taifacos (eds.) *The World of Herodotus*. Nicosia, 121–150.
- Rollinger, R. (2009) “Near Eastern Perspectives on the Greeks”, in G. Boys-Stones, B. Graziosi, P. Vasunia (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*. Oxford, 32–47.
- Rollinger, R. (2017) “Altorientalisches bei Herodot: das wiehernde Pferd des Dareios I.”, in H. Klinkott, N. Kramer (hrsgg.) *Zwischen Assur und Athen: Altorientalisches in den Historien Herodots*. Stuttgart, 13–42.
- Ruffing, K. (2013) “300”, in B. Dunsch, K. Ruffing (eds.) *Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots*. Wiesbaden, 201–221.

- Schubert, C. (2013) "Amazonen und Transvestiten Zur Konstruktion von Mythen, Riten und Krankheiten", in Ch. Schubert, A. Weiß (eds.) *Amazonen zwischen Griechen und Skythen. Gegenbilder in Mythos und Geschichte*. Berlin; Boston, 89–110.
- Schubert, Ch., Weiß, A., eds. (2013) *Amazonen zwischen Griechen und Skythen. Gegenbilder in Mythos und Geschichte*. Berlin; Boston.
- Seymour, M. (2015) The Babylon of D. W. Griffith's 'Intolerance', in M. G. Morcillo, P. Hanesworth, Ó. Lapeña Marchena (eds.) *Imagining Ancient Cities in Film: From Babylon to Cinecittà*. New York; London, 18–34.
- Shipley, G. (2011) *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplus: The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Bristol.
- Sinitzyn, A. A. (2012) "ΣΚΥΘΙΣΤΙ ΧΕΙΠΟΜΑΚΡΟΝ. Sophocles' record of the extravagant Scythian custom", *Anabasis. Studia Classica et Orientalia* 3, 49–73.
- Sinitzyn, A. A. (2019) "τὰ 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'", *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia* 65, 83–124.
- Sinitzyn, A. A. (2021b) "The 'Archeology' of Historiography as a Rhetorical Agon. On the Juxtaposition of Hellenic Writers in the 'Epistula ad Pompeium' by Dionysius of Halicarnassus", *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia* 67, 89–115.
- Sinitzyn, A. A., Surikov, I. E. (2020) "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-Book", *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia* 66, 151–167.
- Stadter, P. A. (2012) "Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus", in E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.) *Thucydides and Herodotus*. Oxford, 39–66.
- Surikov, I. E. (2013) "Herodotus and the Philaids", in A. Mehl, A. V. Makhlayuk, O. L. Gabelko (eds.) *Ruthenia Classica Aetatis Novae: A Collection of Works by Russian Scholars in Ancient Greek and Roman History*. Stuttgart, 45–70.
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge.
- Vasilev, M. I. (2016) "The Date of Herodotus' Visit to Macedonia", *Ancient West and East* 15, 31–51.
- West, S. (1985) "Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests", *Classical Quarterly. N.S.* 35/2, 278–305.
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2004) "'O Master, Remember the Athenians': Herodotus and Persian Foreign Policy", in V. Karageorghis, I. Taifacos (eds.) *The World of Herodotus*. Nicosia, 209–221.
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2009) "Greeks and Persians", in K. A. Raaflaub, H. van Wees (eds.) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Oxford, 162–185.

References in Russian:

- Gasparov M. L. (1997) *Izbrannye trudy. T. 1: O poetakh* [Selected works. Vol. 1: On poets]. Moscow.
- Podossinov A. V. (2021) "Grecheskie bogi i geroi kak praroditeli mestnykh plemen Severnogo Prichernomor'ya (mif – fol'klor – literatura – istoriya)", [Greek gods and heroes as forefathers of local tribes of the Northern Black Sea region (myth – folklore – literature – history)] in E. A. Mel'nikova (red.) *Vostochnaya Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'e. Chteniya pamyati*

- chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent'evicha Pashuto. Vypusk 33. Rol' religii v formirovani sotsiokul'turnykh praktik i predstavleniy* [Eastern Europe in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Readings in memory of V. T. Pashuto. Vol. 33. The role of religion in the formation of socio-cultural practices and ideas]. Moscow, 224–229.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (1998) *Thucydides and the Concept of Fate-tyche in the Greeks in the 5th century BC*. Diss... Saratov: Saratov State University.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2006) "Gerodot, Sofokl i egipetskie dikovinki (Ob odnom istoriograficheskom mife)", *Antichnyy mir i arkheologiya* [Ancient World and Archaeology] 12, 363–405.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2008a) "Plut. Mor. 785b: kriticheskie zamechaniya o dostovernosti istochnika [Plut. Mor. 785b: Critical Notes of the Credibility of the Source]", *Mnemon* 7, 377–418.
- Синицын, А. А. (2008a) "Plut. Mor. 785b: критические замечания о достоверности источника", *Мнемон* 7, 377–418.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2008b) "Sofokl i skifskiy logos Gerodota [Sophocles and the Scythian Logos of Herodotus]", *Arkheologiya Vostochno-Evropейskoy stepi* [Archaeology of the East European Steppe] 6, 269–292.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2011) "Po povodu upominaniya v klassicheskoy drame ekstravagantnogo 'bospor-skogo fenomena' (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt) [Regarding the mention in the Classic Drama of the extravagant 'Bosporan Phenomenon' (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt)]", *Bospor-skiy fenomen: Naselenie, yazyki, kontakty: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii (Sankt-Peterburg, 22–25 noyabrya 2011 g.)* [Bosporan Phenomenon. Population, Languages and Contacts: Proceedings of International Research Conference (Saint Petersburg, November 22–25, 2011)]. Saint Petersburg, 626–641.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2013) "Fukidid i Gerodot, povliyavshie drug na druga? (po povodu odnogo "interes-nogo nyuansa") [Thucydides and Herodotus – had they influenced each other? (as to an "interesting nuance")]", *Antichnyy mir i arkheologiya* [Ancient World and Archaeology] 16, 39–55.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2017a) "Kanaty i mosty Greko-persidskoy voyny [Ropes and Bridges of the Persian War]", in O. L. Gabelko, E. V. Rung, A. A. Sinitsyn, E. V. Smykov (red.) *Iranica: Iranskie imperii i greko-rimskiy 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.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2017b) "Gerodot ob izgnanii varvarov iz Evropy i problema zavershennosti pervoy '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.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2021a) "Zamechaniya o singrafakh-istoriografakh v 'Epistula ad Pompeium' Dionisiya Galikarnasskogo [Remarks on the Syngrapheis-Historiographers in 'Epistula ad Pompeium' of Dionysius of Halicarnassus]", *Vestnik Russkoy khristianskoy gumanitarnoy akademii. Filologicheskie nauki* [Review of the Russian Christian Academy for the Humanities. Philological Sciences] 2/1, 65–81.
- Sinitsyn A. A., Surikov I. E. (2019) "Novyy kollektivnyy 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.
- Sinitsyn A. A., Surikov I. E. (2021) "[Rev.] S. Sheehan. A Guide to Reading Herodotus' 'Histories'. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018", *Vestnik drevney istorii* [Journal of ancient history] 81/2, 520–528.

- Sinitsyn A. A., Svetlov R. V. (2021) "Otchet o dvenadtsatom zasedanii seminaru 'Bogi, lyudi i miry v proshlom i nastoyashchem' [On the Work of the Twelve Session of the Seminar entitled 'Gods, People, and Worlds in the Past and in the Present']", *Terra Aestheticae* 7, 270–298.
- Sinitsyn A. A., Svetlov R. V. (2022) "Antikovedcheskie kontseptsii i retseptsii antichnosti. Nauchnyy seminar pamyati professora E. A. Chiglintseva [Conceptions and Receptions of Antiquity in Classical Studies. Academic Workshop in Memory of Professor E. A. Chiglintsev]", *Vestnik drevney istorii [Journal of ancient history]* 82/2, 498–501.
- Surikov I. E. (2009) *Gerodot [Herodotus]*. Moscow.
- 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 Completion of his Work]", in T. N. Jackson, I. G. Konovalova, G. R. Tsetskhladze (red.) *Gaudeamus igitur: sbornik statey k 60-letiyu Aleksandra Vasil'evicha Podossinova [Gaudeamus igitur: Studies to Honour the 60th Birthday of A. V. Podossinov]*. Moscow, 356–363.
- Surikov I. E. (2011a) *Ocherki ob istoriopisanii v klassicheskoy Gretsii [Essays on Historical Writing in the Classical Greece]*. Moscow.
- Surikov I. E. (2011b) "Gerodot i Filaidy [Herodotus and the Philaids]", *Aristey* 3, 30–64.
- Surikov I. E. (2017) "Gerodot, Filaidy i Alkmeonidy (neskol'ko slov o staroy teme v svyazi s ee nyneshnim sostoyaniem) [Herodotus, the Philaids and the Alcmeonids (Some Words on an Old Topic in Connection with its Present-Day State)]", *Metamorfozy istorii [Metamorphoses of History]* 10, 9–34.
- Surikov I. E. (2021) "K khronologii zhizni i tvorchestva istorika Gellanika [Towards the chronology of the life and work of the historian Hellanicus]", *Vestnik drevney istorii [Journal of ancient history]* 81/4, 837–862.
- Surikov I. E. (2022) "Gellanik i Andokid [Hellanicus and Andocides]", *Vestnik drevney istorii [Journal of ancient history]* 82/2, 303–318.
- Teperik T. F. (2018) "Retseptsiya antichnosti v kinematografe: tri versii o 300 spartantsakh [The Concept of Antiquity in Cinematography: Three Movie Versions of a 300 Spartans]", *Acta eruditorum* 29, 56–60.
- Zabudskaya Ya. L. (2015) "Vzlyatie Mileta' Frinikha: problemy izucheniya ranney grecheskoy dramy [Phrynichus' *Capture of Miletus*: Some Problems of the Study of Early Greek Drama]", *Vestnik drevney istorii [Journal of ancient history]* 3, 102–108.