HERODOTUS' PHOENICIANS: MEDIATORS OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Dannu J. Hütwohl*

Abstract: In this paper the author explores Herodotus' representations of the Phoenicians. Although Herodotus does not include an ethnography of the Phoenicians as he does with many other cultures, such as the Persians and Egyptians, the Phoenicians play an important role in the dispute between the Persians and the Greeks. Scholarship on Herodotus' ethnography has tended to focus on the literary goals of the historian in his construction of Greek identity or the problems with using his ethnographies to reconstruct historical information. In this paper, the author builds on current scholarship and argues that Herodotus represents the Phoenicians as the intermediaries of knowledge between the cultures of Egypt and Greece. The author argues that this representation is not simply a literary representation, but is also based on the historical dynamics of cultural exchange in the Mediterranean where the Phoenicians acted as the conduit for material and cultural goods, such as myths and rituals.

Keywords: Herodotus; Phoenicians; Ethnography; Cultural exchange; Mediterranean.

There is no ethnography of the Phoenicians in Herodotus, and yet they are one of the first three groups of people (Greeks, Persians, and Phoenicians) he mentions at the start of his inquiry into the dispute between the Persians and the Greeks.[1] Over the last forty years, there have been, broadly speaking, two distinct approaches to Herodotus' ethnographic sections. One has been largely concerned with discerning and cataloging the means by which the historian uses these sections to define Hellenicity in opposition to various "others." According to this approach, any correlation between what Herodotus wrote about non-Greek peoples and historical fact is secondary to his literary goals.[2] On the wake of scholarly interest on ancient identities and ethnography, more recent scholars, on the other hand, have called into question the assump-

* The Ohio State University. email: dannu.hutwohl@icloud.com. I want to thank Christopher Erlinger for his input in the initial draft of this paper, as well as Carolina López-Ruiz and the anonymous reviewers for their feedback.

1 Hdt. I 1,1.

2 The most influential example of such an interpretation is that of Hartog 1980, who argues that Herodotus' Egyptians and Scythians serve as "mirrors" whose reflections (inverted, naturally) were the means by which Herodotus allowed the Greeks to look at and define themselves. Scholarship in this vein tends to focus almost exclusively on the groups of "others" to whom Herodotus pays significant, prolonged attention – the Egyptians, Scythians, and Persians. The result of such scholarship is that scholars who once read these ethnographic sections with the goal of either obtaining or checking historical facts now acknowledge the role of Herodotus' literary aims therein. Hartog 1980 often is considered the pioneer of this trend, but Moyer 2011 notes that Froidefond 1971 anticipated Hartog's major points, albeit with his eye predominantly focused on Egypt and not Scythia. Hartog's influence is so great that even scholars taking a different approach to Herodotus' ethnographies (e.g., Moyer 2011), must first fight their way out from under his shadow. For other examples of this approach, see Lateiner 1989, Benardete 2009, Munson 2005. Even Lloyd 2002, pp. 432-35, who once read book two with his eye towards fact-checking Herodotus' claims about Egypt, later ceded the role of literary technique in book two. Perhaps because this vein of scholarship has focused on "others" who are prominently featured in the *Histories*, scholarship on other non-Greek peoples in Herodotus does not yet regularly consider whether any such literary goals impact Herodotus' representation of other peoples. Katzenstein 1979, pp. 23-34; Bonnet 1989; Rainey 2001, pp. 57-63; Elayi 2006 all rely on Herodotus as evidence for discussions of Phoenician history or culture. The information that Herodotus provides about peoples who are not described in Herodotus' ethnographic excursus is not equally analyzed and is still often taken as fact or, when it can be proven erroneous, as a failed attempt at fact.

tion that Herodotus presents a strict antithesis between Greek and barbarians, as well as the unreliability of Herodotus' inquiries of foreign cultures. According to Rosaria Munson, Herodotus' presentation of foreign languages undermines the traditional opposition between barbarians and Greeks.[3] In particular, Munson argues that Herodotus shows how the Greek language is a hybrid of barbarian languages, and in some respects, the barbarian names for cultural institutions might be more correct than the Greek names.[4] The evidence presented by Munson exemplifies how the linguistic diversity of the ancient Mediterranean was not an impediment for cultural exchange.[5] Moreover, throughout the *Histories* Herodotus shows himself to be adept at understanding differing linguistic and cultural practices. In a similar vein, Ian Moyer finds evidence in Egyptian king-lists and genealogies to corroborate some of the information from Herodotus.[6] Moyer argues that Herodotus is not simply constructing an "Other" and that the Egyptians had more agency in Herodotus' representations than has been previously acknowledged.[7] According to Moyer, the Egyptian priests were well aware of their past and equally concerned with their self-representation of Egyptian history and identity.[8]

Building from these approaches I suggest that the Phoenicians were also well-aware of their place in history as skilled merchants, technological innovators, and sailors, including their role as naval warriors, and that Herodotus depicts them as such. The earliest literary depictions of the Phoenicians in Homer demonstrate that the Phoenicians were well-known throughout the Mediterranean for their skill in sailing and over-seas trading.[9] Current research into Phoenician culture and the interconnectedness of the ancient Mediterranean has also shown that the Phoenician trade networks were vital, not only for the exchange of merchandise between the cultures of the Mediterranean, but also for the transmission of art, myths, and other knowledge.[10] In this article, I suggest applying Moyer's conclusions about Herodotus' depictions of the Egyptians to a better understanding of Herodotus' representation of the Phoenicians.

In particular, I argue that Herodotus' representation of the Phoenicians is more historically accurate than has been previously recognized, in so far as Herodotus depicts the role of the Phoenicians as mediators in the exchange of not only material goods but also cultural artifacts and technological innovations. That the Phoenicians acted as middle-men for the transmission of knowledge between the cultures of the Near East and Greece is most notably exemplified by the Phoenician origins of the alphabet, which, in addition to oral

3 Munson 2005.

4 Herodotus connects the Athenians to the Pelasgians, who originally spoke a barbarian language (Munson 2005, pp. 7-13). For the correctness of barbarian names, see Munson 2005, pp. 51-56.

5 See the sections "Language and relativity" (Munson 2005, pp. 63-66) and "Language makes no difference" (pp. 70-77). Scholarship on the cultural exchange between Greece and the Near East has burgeoned since the last quarter of the twentieth century. Burkert 1992 and West 1997 played a major role in this growth; Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 8-16 contains a thorough review of relevant scholarship.

6 Moyer 2011, p. 68.

7 «In Herodotus' description of Egypt, the Greek encounter with another culture is not purely a textual mirage constructed from the elaboration of Greek cultural ideas and oppositional self-definitions. Herodotus confronted not only the vast antiquity of an Egyptian Other, but also – through the mediation of the Egyptian priests – the Egyptian historicity of a particular moment, a characteristic set of relations with the past» (Moyer 2011, p. 50). For other examples of this approach, see Lateiner 1989, Benardete 2009, Munson 2005.

8 Moyer 2011, p. 71.

9 *Il.* XXIII 740-745; *Od.* XIV 295-300; XV 415.

10 The study by Irad Malkin (Malkin 2011) has pointed out how trade networks fostered cultural exchange in the ancient Mediterranean. For a detailed analysis of the archeological and epigraphical evidence for the Phoenician trade empire, see Lipiński 2004. For a study of the Tyrian trade network, see Aubet 1993. According to Fanni Faegersten 2003, pp. 264-265, the Cypriote art style was transferred from Egypt to Cyprus via Phoenician artisans from the Levant such that it can be more accurately described as a "Phoenicianizing" style. Carolina López-Ruiz 2010 emphasizes the role of the highly mobile Phoenicians for the transmission of Near Eastern myths and religion to Greece.

transmission, was instrumental for the transmission of art and knowledge.[11] As Corinne Bonnet has most recently argued, for the Greeks «the Phoenicians were the closest and most familiar of the "barbarians"».[12] Accordingly, Herodotus, perhaps deeming unnecessary a full ethnography or description of the collective culture denoted by this ethnonym,[13] uses the Phoenicians for his inquiries to bridge the gap between the cultures of Greece and the Near East. This is not simply a literary trope, but also reflects the historical dynamics of cultural exchange in the ancient Mediterranean. The chronological range of Herodotus' inquiries is broad, concentrated in the time of the sixth century Persian expansion and the early fifth century wars between Greeks and Persians, but often covering background information about the different areas he discusses going back to the seventh century and earlier. It is likely, therefore, that Herodotus drew from earlier historical sources for his representations of the Phoenicians as mediators in the ancient Mediterranean, even if it is unclear to what extent Herodotus relied on these sources because he often does not specify his sources and the extant literature against which we could contrast his reports is either fragmentary or largely lost.[14]

1. Who Were the Phoenicians?

"Phoenicians" was the Greek name for people who likely called themselves *can'ani* – transliterated, at times, as "Canaanites" – whose territory during the Bronze Age roughly corresponded to modern Lebanon but was confined to the coastal strip running from the isle of Arvad (ancient Aradus) in the north to Mount Carmel in the south, in Herodotus' time.[15] Its major cities shifted between Byblos, Tyre, and Sidon, over the centuries, and it is not unusual for Greek authors to use "Phoenicians" as a general term interchangeably with the more city-specific "Sidonians," "Tyrians," etc.[16] They appear in Greek literature as far back as Homer, wherein they are famous for their ornamented textiles, skill as sailors, and penchant for abduction.[17] Their reputation for nautical prowess was indubitably well-founded, as they had what have been variously described as trading

11 According to Herodotus (V 58,1) the alphabet was transmitted via the Phoenicians who came to Greece with Cadmus. For the transmission of the Phoenician alphabet to Greece, see Brixhe 2007 and Voutiras 2007.

12 Bonnet 2019, p. 109.

13 The term "Phoenicians" was used by the Greeks to describe the Levantine people. For the usage of the terms *Phoinix* and *Poenus* (the Latin translation of *Phoenix*), see Prag 2014, pp. 11-23. As Josephine Quinn has discussed most recently (Quinn 2018, pp. 25-43) these inhabitants of the Levantine coast did not identify themselves with the collective term "Phoenicians," which is an exonym. The Phoenicians themselves, however, like the Greeks, identified themselves by their city-state, such as Sidon, Byblos, Tyre (e.g., discussion in Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 24-26). The Phoenician cities were not unified under a political arch until the first century of the Roman period under the province of Syria, and it is in Roman times that we have testimony of their collective identity as Phoenicians (Alvarez Martí-Aguilar 2018, pp. 114). Until then, each Phoenician city-state remained autonomous and maintained some dialectal features within the Phoenician language (one of the Northwest Semitic languages of Canaanite descent) and their distinctive pantheon of preferred gods. Nevertheless, the city-states shared similar urban characteristics, gods, language, and iconography (see Markoe 2000). There are linguistic, religious, institutional, and material/artistic markers, therefore, that show a common culture for the people of the Levantine coast, while lack of political unity among the Phoenician city-states is not a requisite for such an ethnic or cultural identity. For example, the Greeks themselves did not meet that standard and were identified with each other as sharing the elements of language, religion, and customs. A strong sense of shared "Greek" identity was probably only formed in the fifth century BCE (see Hall 2002), and it was not based on territorial or political unity, which, as for the Phoenicians, only came with imperial domination, first by Macedonians, then by Romans.

14 For earlier writers of historiography, such as Hecataeus of Miletus, and their influence on Herodotus, see Fowler 2006. Cf. Hornblower 2002.

15 Aubet 2001, pp. 1-18; Boardman 2001, *passim*; Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 1-26 largely agrees but disputes that the "Phoenicians" had a collective term for themselves, suggesting that primary identification would have been dictated by one's city, e.g., a Tyrian or Sidonian, not a "Phoenician" (Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 24-26). Herodotus uses "Phoenician" interchangeably with the former two options, and he is my primary focus here, I consider "Phoenician" as a valid descriptor and use it as such.

16 Aubet 2001, pp. 1-18; Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 23-47; Boardman 2001, *passim*.

17 *Il.* VI 290-292; XXIII 740-745; *Od.* IV 615-619; XIV 288; XV 415-419.

posts or colonies ranging from Phoenicia to modern Spain and Portugal, some established by the late ninth century and most over the course of the eighth.[18] Generally speaking, Herodotus presents two different types of information about the Phoenicians: historical accounts (such as their role as the navy for the Persians) and mythological or legendary traditions.[19] In this paper, I focus primarily on the mythological representations of the Phoenicians. Nevertheless, this does not detract from my argument that by depicting the Phoenicians as mediators in these narratives, Herodotus is reflecting the historical reality of their traditional involvement in cultural exchange, not the least because Herodotus' historical method interacts with myth.[20]

There is no lengthy, uninterrupted ethnography in Herodotus dedicated to the Phoenicians, and yet they are mentioned with remarkable frequency and their significance to the *Histories* as a whole is indicated by the work's opening.[21] They are the third people mentioned, appearing after only the Greeks and the Persians, and they are, at least according to the Persians, responsible for the long-standing dispute between Greece and Persia – a dispute whose eruption into large-scale war is the focus of Herodotus' work (I 1). According to the Persians, the Phoenicians had been trading-partners with the Egyptians for some time, and then eventually began to bring trade goods to Argos (I 1). As the Phoenicians leave Argos on one such occasion, they kidnap Io, daughter of Inachos, and then sail off to Egypt (I 2,1). The abduction of Io leads to a series of abductions, which culminates in Paris' of Helen and the Trojan War. Herodotus also records the story from the Phoenician point of view, who claim that they did not kidnap Io by force, but rather the intercourse between the captain and Io was consensual and she sailed with the Phoenicians on her own free will.[22] Herodotus also adds an important detail from the Persian version of the story, that the Phoenicians carried Egyptian and Assyrian merchandise.[23] The opening of Herodotus' work establishes the Phoenicians as middlemen in the Greek-Near east commerce, but also as direct intermediaries between Egypt and Greece, insofar as they bring goods from Egypt to Argos and a woman from Argos to Egypt.

Phoenicians again appear in conjunction with the Greeks and the Egyptians, early in book two. During the description of the geography of Africa, Herodotus cites the Phoenicians and the Greeks as the only two non-African peoples to occupy territory on the continent (II 32,4). This passage is part of Herodotus' broader discussion of the Nile, during which he also advances the argument that the entire world is made

18 See Aubet 2001, pp. 97-143 for the debates about early Phoenician commercial networks in the Mediterranean. See Aubet 2001, pp. 194-211; Lopez-Ruiz 2010, pp. 26-37; Arruda 2010, *passim* for Phoenician presence in Spain in the eighth century. For a general introduction to Phoenician seafaring and shipwreck archaeology, see Emanuel 2019. See updated archaeological evidence in the chapters of López-Ruiz and Doak 2019, in particular, see Aubet 2019.

19 For the Phoenician fleet, see Hdt. III 19, 3. For the Phoenicians in Herodotus, in general, see Demetriou (forthcoming).

20 Cfr. Boedeker 2002.

21 The "Phoenicians" (Φοίνικες) are mentioned 68 times in the *Histories*: I 1,2; 4; I 5,2; 3; I 105,3; I 143,1; I 193,4; II 32,4; II 44,4; II 54,1; II 56,1; II 57,1; II 104,3; 4; II 112,2; II 116,6; III 19,2; 2; 3; III 37,2; III 107,2; III 111,2; IV 42,2; 3; IV 44,2; IV 147,4; IV 197,2; V 46,1; V 57,1; 1; V 58,1; 2; V 108,2; V 109,1; V 112,1; VI 3,1; VI 6,1; VI 14,1; VI 25,1; VI 28,1; VI 33,2; 2; 3; VI 41,1; 1; 2; 3; 4; VI 47,1; VI 104,1; VII 23,2; 3; VII 34,1; VII 44,1; VII 89,1; 2; VII 96,1; 1; VII 165,1; VII 167,2; VIII 85,1; VIII 90,1; 1; 3; 4; VIII 100,4; VIII 119,1; IX 96,1. The place name "Phoenicia" (Φοινίκη) is mentioned 15 times: I 2,1; II 44,1; II 49,3; II 79,1; II 116,2; III 5,1; III 6,1; III 91,1; III 136,1; 1; IV 38,1; IV 39,2; IV 45,5; VI 3,1; VI 17,1; VII 90,1. "Sidonians" (Σιδώνιοι) or "Sidonian" (Σιδώνιος or Σιδών) or the place name "Sidon" (Σιδών) are mentioned 13 times: II 116,2; 6; II 161,2; III 136,1; VII 44,1; VII 96,1; VII 98,1; VII 99,3; VII 100,2; VII 128,2; VIII 67,2; VIII 68,1; VIII 92,1. Tyrians (Τύριοι) or "Tyrian" (Τύριος) are mentioned seven times: II 49,3; II 112,2; 2; II 161,2; IV 45,4; VII 98,1; VIII 67,2, and the place name "Tyre" (Τύρος) is mentioned four times: I 2,1; II 44,1; 3; 3. The "Carthaginians" (a Tyrian colony) (Καρχηδόνιοι) are mentioned 16 times: I 166,1; I 167,1; III 17,1; 2; III 19,3; IV 43,1; IV 195,1; IV 196,1; V 43,1; VI 17,1; VII 158,2; VII 165,1; VII 166,1; 1; VII 167,1; 2, and "Carthage" (Καρχηδών) twice: III 19,2; VII 167,2. The place name "Ashkelon" (Ἀσκάλων) is mentioned twice: I 105,2; 4. The name for a man from Arwad (Ἀράδιος) is mentioned once: VII 98,1. The adjective "Phoenician" (φοινικήϊος), used to describe a variety of products and technology, such as wine (I 194,2; II 86,4; III 20,1), cargo ships (VIII 97,1), clothing (IV 43,5), and the alphabet (V 58,1), appears six times.

22 Hdt. I 5,2. Herodotus (I 5,3) does not choose between the two stories but rather attributes the blame to Croesus.

23 Hdt. I 1,1.

up of three continents – Europe, Asia, and Africa (II 16).[24] Herodotus' Africa, then, is home to one people from Europe (the Greeks) and one from Asia (the Phoenicians). And while much ink has been devoted to understanding what Herodotus' text tells us about the Egyptians and their relationship with the Greeks, almost none has been devoted to the Phoenicians' relationship with the Greeks, or the relationship between all three.

One might object that Herodotus' mention of Phoenicians living along the African coast is nothing more than his inclusion of a historical fact, given the known existence of Phoenician colonies from western Libya to Morocco since at least the eighth century BCE, the most famous being Carthage.[25] Later in book two, however, their significance for Herodotus' discussion of Egypt is suggested a second time, when he interrupts his description of his trip to Egypt in order to discuss his trip to Phoenicia (II 44). Together, this trip-within-a-trip and the earlier pairing of the Greeks and Phoenicians in Africa suggest that Herodotus is not simply telling us about Egypt and providing a mirror for Greek self-definition throughout book two, but also incorporating the Phoenicians into the equation. As I argue in the remainder of this article, Herodotus' Phoenicians function as the conduit through which Greeks receive and adopt Egyptian culture.

2. Dating Herakles

Herodotus' visit to Phoenicia is the most patent example of Phoenicia's mediating role between Greece and Egypt (II 44). After discovering a chronological discrepancy between the Egyptian and Greek stories of Herakles, Herodotus sails to the Phoenician city Tyre to investigate the matter (II 44,1). Herodotus explains that he selected Tyre because he knew there was a temple of Herakles there, which was the oldest temple to the Tyrian god Melqart, who the Greeks identified with Herakles.[26] Therefore, Herodotus seeks information about the Greek hero from a Phoenician source. That Tyre is Herodotus' destination for finding an answer to this discrepancy between the Egyptian and the Greek traditions is telling in and of itself, as it suggests that he perceives the Phoenicians as experts at mediating such cultural discrepancies. In Tyre, Herodotus finds two sanctuaries of Herakles, one of which was built upon the city's founding twenty-three hundred years before Herodotus is writing and is therefore clearly too old to be dedicated to Herakles son of Amphitryon (II 44,3). The other Tyrian temple, concerning whose age Herodotus is silent, bears the epithet "Thasian" (II 44,3). Therefore, Herodotus sails to Thasos – a Greek island off the southern coast of Thrace – where he finds «a sanctuary of Herakles founded by Phoenicians» (II 44,4).[27] According to Herodotus, the Phoenicians founded this temple on Thasos when they founded the island's eponymous city, during their search for Europa. This search, he explains, took place five generations before the birth of Herakles the son of Amphitryon (II 44,5). Finally, in his conclusions on Herakles' dates, Herodotus explains that there must be two Herakleis: an ancient god of Egyptian origin by that name and a later Greek hero of the same name (II 44,5). Neither the Egyptians nor the Greeks are "wrong" about Herakles, but Herodotus cannot reach this conclusion until he considers both the Greek and Egyptian evidence through Phoenician mediation.

24 This is part of the Ionian geographical tradition that Herodotus aligns with. For Herodotus and his predecessors, such as Hecataeus of Miletus, see Fowler 2006. For Herodotus and his intellectual milieu, see Thomas 2006.

25 Aubet 2001, pp. 159-62.

26 This "Herakles" is, in reality, his Phoenician equivalent Melqart, whom the Greeks sometimes referred to as "Egyptian Herakles" (Burkert 1985, pp. 210-212). For the myths and cult of Melqart, see Bonnet 1988. For a study of the networks that helped facilitate the dynamics of syncretism between Melqart and Herakles, see Malkin 2011, pp. 119-142.

27 Herodotus and Pausanias both refer to Phoenician presence on Thasos, but thus far no archaeological evidence has been found supporting their claims (Bonnet 1988, pp. 346-371). There is, however, evidence of Phoenicians on Thasos in the Semitic place names Ainyra and Koinyra (Bergquist 1973, p. 35). There is also epigraphical evidence of cult practices at the sanctuary of Herakles at Thasos that align with the characteristically Semitic practices of prohibitions against the sacrifice of pigs (see Bergquist 1973, p. 66).

Moreover, Phoenicia functions as a "middle ground" between Egypt and Greece in several other ways, during this Herakles investigation. First, as a simple, physical "third space" between Egypt and Greece, in so far as Herodotus goes there on his way from Egypt to Greece (Thasos). Second, and more tellingly, as a cultural mediator, in that Herodotus goes there with the goal of reconciling a discrepancy between an Egyptian and a Greek version of Herakles and achieves that goal in his dual-Herakles theory – a model he finds in Phoenicia. Bonnet notes that there is a popular misreading of this section that concludes that there are two distinct temples to two distinct Herakleis on the Greek island of Thasos, while, in actuality, the two distinct Herakleis appear in Tyre.[28]

While these two points are self-evident from Herodotus' text itself, there is yet a third important way in which the Phoenicians act as mediators, that is in the chronological plane. As Herodotus moves from Egypt to Phoenicia to Thasos the vast chronological discrepancy that he initially faced shrinks down, establishing the Phoenicians as mediators between the Egyptians – the oldest people, in the Greek popular imagination – and the relatively young Greeks.[29] Herodotus elsewhere tells us that Herakles, son of Amphitryon, lived nine-hundred years before himself (II 145), but the Egyptian Herakles joined the Egyptian pantheon seventeen thousand years before the reign of Amasis (570-526 BCE) (II 43,5).[30] Therefore, the gap between the Greek Herakles and the Egyptian one is nearly sixteen-thousand years. The earlier of the two Phoenician temples at Tyre, on the other hand, was "only" founded twenty-three hundred years before Herodotus' time, or fourteen hundred years before the Greek Herakles (II 44,3). Finally, the Phoenician temple on Thasos is given no hard date but is described as having been built just five generations before the birth of Greek Herakles (II 44, 5). In neither Phoenicia nor the Phoenician temple on Thasos does Herodotus find chronological evidence that perfectly matches either the Egyptian or the Greek dates for Herakles, but he does find a series of clues that gradually reduce this gap the further he investigates.

Herodotus' final word on this topic is that there were two Herakleis – one, the god whom the Egyptians and Phoenicians know and, another, the hero whom the Greeks know (II 44,5) – who lived far apart chronologically. As for the dates of the temples, they need not match the gods' existence (temples after all are by nature later than the gods they house). Instead, I argue that these dates operate on a symbolic level: By specifying the Tyrian and Thasian temples' dates, Herodotus shows how Phoenicia bridges Egypt and Greece.[31] In this way, Herodotus writes about Phoenicia not just as a physical place wherein he can find evidence to reconcile Egyptian and Greek data but also as bridges between the two cultures.

28 Bonnet 1988, pp. 346-348.

29 Moyer 2011, p. 42.

30 Thus Herodotus situates Herakles, the son of Amphitryon in the Late Bronze Age, before the Trojan war, whereas the earlier Herakles (i.e. Melqart) lived during a pre-historical time period, which situates him in the early cosmogonical realm.

31 Moyer 2011, p. 81 argues that Herodotus here implies a shift in the birth of Herakles son of Amphitryon back five generations than previously accepted. This shift, Moyer argues, is a means of pushing back the boundary between mythic and human time, of «recalibrat[ing] the historicity of Greek collective memory». This attractive argument provides a reason for the inclusion of this particular date, but not the others. Furthermore, Herodotus explicitly contrasts the date of the Thasian temple to the birth of Herakles the son of Amphitryon: [Φοίνικες] οἳ κατ᾽ Εὐρώπης ζήτησιν ἐκπλώσαντες Θάσον ἔκτισαν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ πέντε γενεῇσι ἀνδρῶν πρότερά ἐστι ἢ τὸν Ἀμφιτρύωνος Ἡρακλέα ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι γενέσθαι, «The Phoenicians who set sail in search of Europa established Thasos and these things happened five generations before the birth of Herakles the son of Amphitryon in Hellas» (II 44,4). If Herodotus' implied point were that the birth of Herakles the son of Amphitryon should be changed because of this temple's date, then using the accepted date of that Herakles' birth as the reference for dating this temple is an exceptionally odd approach. Given the acuteness and undisguised nature of some of Herodotus' polemic towards Greeks elsewhere in Book II (e.g., II 16,1: Ἴωνες οὐκ εὖ φρονέουσι), such an oblique route here seems out of place. See Thomas 2000, pp. 168-113 for a discussion on Herodotus' tendency for and use of polemic in Book II.

3. The Origins of Dionysiac Ritual

The night before the Egyptian festival of Dionysus, each Egyptian slaughters a pig in his house's doorway and then gives the carcass back to the swineherd from whom they bought it (II 48,1). The festival itself is a parade that includes large marionettes with giant, moving phalli, a flute player, and singing (II 48,2). Melampous of Pylos – a mythical Elian prophet of Dionysus – was responsible for teaching the Greeks about these rites, Herodotus explains (II 49,1).[32] After Melampous learned about the cult of Dionysus from the Egyptians, he changed a few parts of it and brought it to Greece (II 49, 2). Herodotus' narrative of the spread of Dionysiac ritual up to this point is relatively straightforward, but now it becomes rather more complicated. After telling us that Melampous learned about Dionysus in Egypt and brought this cult to Greece, Herodotus shifts gears and says, «It seems most likely to me that Melampous learned about Dionysus from Kadmos of Tyre and those coming with him from Phoenicia, after they arrived in the place now called Boeotia» (II 49,3). At first, the chronology seems to collapse upon itself: Melampous goes to Egypt; then brings the cult of Dionysus to Greece; and then learns about Dionysus from Kadmos of Tyre – who is already in Greece. But if Kadmos had already brought Dionysus to Greece, then there was no need for Melampous. A closer consideration of the passage clears things up and demonstrates again the role of the Phoenicians in the process of cultural exchange between Egyptian and Greek culture.

In his commentary, Alan Lloyd explains that Herodotus here is grappling with two different Greek traditions concerning Dionysus.[33] According to the first of these, which was especially popular in Boeotia, Kadmos introduced the cult of Dionysus to Greece. According to the second, Melampous was responsible. Although postulating these divergent Greek traditions soothes some of the discomfort caused by the passage's ambiguity, this explanation does not tell us everything we need to know about Herodotus' approach to this topic. This is far from the only time that Herodotus has to weave together multiple Greek traditions, and he usually does so in less jarring ways. Herodotus here, however, is not merely weaving two disparate Greek traditions together, but also bending the text to his own ethnographic goals.

Herodotus' description of Kadmos explicitly as a Phoenician in this passage marks the first time in Greek literature in which Kadmos is identified as such.[34] Attempts to explain this have focused on potential connections between Kadmos and the Phoenicians that exist outside of Herodotus, on the assumption that Herodotus would not create this label on his own.[35] I argue, however, that this is exactly the type of scenario in which Herodotus' depictions of the Phoenicians as mediators of cultural exchange is needed. If, as I maintain, Herodotus regularly uses the Phoenicians as intermediaries through which Greeks adopted knowledge from Egypt, then incorporating a Phoenician into the story of Dionysus' arrival in Greece makes perfect sense. Furthermore, in this instance, Herodotus faced two stories of how Dionysiac worship came to Greece: through Melampous or through Kadmos. Since both cannot be true, Herodotus combines them into one story in which Melampous the Greek brings Dionysus to Greece, but he «changes a few things» (ὀλίγα αὐτῶν παραλλάξαντα), since «he does not grasp it all accurately» (ἀτρεκέως μὲν οὐ πάντα συλλαβών) (II 49). Later in Boeotia, he encounters Kadmos the Phoenician who rectifies his knowledge of the cult. Just as Herodotus himself could not process the discrepancies between the Egyptian and the Greek Herakleis until he learned from the Phoenicians in Tyre, so too does Melampous learn the worship of Dionysus from the Phoenicians. He gains some knowledge of the Egyptian cult of Dionysus, but his understanding of it is unclear until it

32 Lloyd 1976, pp. 224-26 on Melampous' origins and ties to Dionysus.

33 Lloyd 1976, p. 226.

34 Gomme 1913; Lloyd 1976, p. 226; Edwards 1979, p. 67 objects that «none of the early sources state that Kadmos is *not* a Phoenician» but he slightly later reviews Pherekydes' genealogy of Kadmos in which his mother is an Egyptian (cit. *FGrHist* frs. 21 and 86).

35 Edwards 1979 *pass*im; Lloyd 1976.

is conveyed by Kadmos the Phoenician. What is perhaps most striking about this is that Pherekydes, who provides our best pre-Herodotean genealogy of Kadmos, gives him an Egyptian mother.[36] Thus, Herodotus could very easily have written of an Egyptian Kadmos who explained the cult of Dionysus to Melampous, who then returned to Greece. This, however, would have run counter to his ethnographic schema, in which the transference of culture from Egypt to Greece requires Phoenician intervention.

4. The Names of the Gods and the Oracle at Dodona

According to Herodotus, the Pelasgians learned «the names of the other gods from the Egyptians» (II 52,2). At first, this passage seems to directly counter my contention that the Greeks, or in this case the Pelasgians, required Egyptian culture to be mediated by the Phoenicians before they could adopt it for themselves. The Pelasgians did not, however, immediately begin using these names for the gods after they learned of them, but first asked the oracle at Dodona about the matter (II 52,2). This oracle, then, marks an essential stepping stone between the gods' names leaving Egypt and the Pelasgians adopting them. As expected according to my reading of Herodotus' Phoenicians, in his discussion of the origins of the oracle at Dodona, the historian shows that the Phoenicians acted as cultural mediators in the transmission of the gods' names from the Egyptians to the Greeks.

Herodotus provides two origin stories for the oracle at Dodona, the first of which he attributes to the Egyptians. According to the Egyptians, the oracle at Dodona – the oldest in Greece – and an unspecified oracle in Libya operate in nearly identical ways because the founders of these two oracles were both originally priestesses in Egyptian Thebes (II 54,1).[37] These two were kidnapped by Phoenicians, and sold as slaves, one in Greece and one in Libya (II 54). Each woman went on to establish an oracle in the region wherein she had been sold. The second origin story, attributed to the Dodonians, recounts how two black doves flew from Egyptian Thebes – one to Libya and one to Dodona. Upon arriving at Dodona, one of the doves sat in an oak tree and cried out in a human-like fashion. Consequently, the Dodonians built an oracle there (II 55,2).

The Egyptians' version that explicitly incorporates Phoenician abductors requires little explanation. The kidnapped Egyptian priestess simply introduces the oracle, once she learns Greek (ἐπείτε συνέλαβε τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν, II 56,3). Significantly, in this version that features Phoenicians, there is no ambiguity. On the other hand, Herodotus explains that the Dodonian version and its doves is not to be taken literally (II 57,1). Rather, the story is symbolic of the fact that the Dodonians could not understand the Egyptian woman «who seemed to utter only bird-sounds, as long as she was speaking a barbarian language» (II 57,2).[38] The Dodonians' aetiology, as presented by Herodotus, removes the Phoenicians from the plot, and it both recounts and is itself a misunderstanding of cultural elements that have come from Egypt to Greece: the Dodonians within the story cannot understand the Egyptian woman, and modern Dodonians cannot understand the truth about the oracle's foundation.

When Herodotus explains that the Dodonians' version of events should be understood as an allegory of the Egyptians' factual one, he explicitly adds that this includes the role of Phoenician kidnappers (II 56,1).

36 See note 8, above. Pherecydes was also said to have learned the wisdom of the Phoenicians (West 1971, p. 3). For an overview of the Phoenician cosmogonies transmitted by Pherecydes, see López-Ruiz 2010, pp. 158-159; For a more extensive analysis of the cosmogonies, see West 1971, pp. 1-75.

37 Unspecified by Herodotus. Lloyd 1976, p. 253 identifies it as the oracle at Siwa.

38 Munson 2005, pp. 67-70 views Herodotus' reconciliation of these two stories as evidence of the importance he attributes to language. What separates Herodotus from other Greeks, according to Munson, is his willingness and ability to treat non-Greek utterances as meaningful language and convey that meaning to a Greek audience. In this particular instance, however, Herodotus is clarifying the meaning of a *Greek* story for a Greek audience. He refers to an Egyptian story to do so, but its meaning is already clear. It is the seemingly impossible Greek story whose meaning he clarifies, not the non-Greek one.

In other words, Herodotus corrects both Dodonian errors by reinserting the Phoenicians into the story. According to Munson, Herodotus uses this passage to reflect on the process of the transmission of names.[39] Once again, then, it is accurate to describe the Phoenicians' role in the text as facilitating both the transmission and the understanding of Egyptian culture for the Greeks.

As noted above, the oracle at Dodona played a key role in the Pelasgians' adoption of the Egyptian names of the gods, insofar as they ask the oracle about whether to do so (II 52,2). The Pelasgians may have learned the names of the gods from the Egyptians, but they did not adopt them, for some time (II 52,2).[40] Only after they gained approval from an oracle – one whose existence in Greece was caused by the Phoenicians' abduction of an Egyptian priestess – do the Pelasgians begin to use these foreign names of the gods. During the period between the arrival of the gods' names from Egypt and the oracle's proclamation, the Pelasgians are unwilling or unable (or both) to use them.

Finally, Herodotus' diction in the passage wherein the Pelasgians ask the oracle about the gods' names emphasizes the oracle's role in this process. The Pelasgians' question is whether they ἀνέλωνται («should adopt») the Egyptian names and the description of the oracle answering begins with ἀνεῖλε («she proclaimed») – another form of the same verb (ἀναιρέω).[41] Although the word's meaning is different in the question and in the answer, it is not a stretch to say that after the Pelasgians make their inquiry, the first to ἀναιρεῖν anything is the oracle herself. The oracle herself, then, is the first to perform the very action (ἀναιρέω) that the Pelasgians are thinking about doing with the gods' names. Only after the oracle, brought about by Phoenician agency, has done this do the Pelasgians begin using the Egyptian names for the gods. As in the cases above, even when Greeks such as Herodotus or Melampous have gained some knowledge of Egyptian culture, they are unable to fully process it until it has been mediated by the Phoenicians, who, in Bonnet's phrasing, were the «most familiar of the 'barbarians'» to the Greeks.[42]

5. Helen's Temple

Later in book two, Herodotus writes of a temple of «Foreign Aphrodite» (ξείνης Ἀφροδίτης), as the Egyptians call it, but which he himself believes was actually built in honor of Helen of Troy (II 112,2). Whatever the goddess' background story, the temple of Foreign Aphrodite, writes Herodotus, is located in the Egyptian city of Memphis in the Delta, and Phoenicians dwell all around it (II 112,2).[43] As a result, any Greek going to or coming from this temple moves through a Phoenician space as they travel from an Egyptian to a Hellenic space or vice versa. In addition to this description of the temple's location, both its origin story and Herodotus' validation of that story also show the mediating role of Phoenicians for Greco-Egyptian interactions. This nar-

39 Munson 2005, p. 67.

40 Only μετὰ χρόνον (II 52,2) do the Pelasgians ask the oracle about these names, and only after the oracle approves them do the Pelasgians begin using them.

41 ἐπεὶ ὦν ἐχρηστηριάζοντο ἐν τῇ Δωδώνῃ οἱ Πελασγοὶ εἰ ἀνέλωνται τὰ οὐνόματα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἥκοντα, ἀνεῖλε τὸ μαντήιον χρᾶσθαι («when the Pelasgians then sought an oracle at Dodona whether they should adopt the names that came from barbarians, the oracle told them to use them») (II 52,3).

42 Bonnet 2019, p. 109.

43 Hdt. II 112,2: περιοικέουσι δὲ τὸ τέμενος τοῦτο Φοίνικες Τύριοι, καλέεται δὲ ὁ χῶρος οὗτος ὁ συνάπας Τυρίων στρατόπεδον («Phoenicians from Tyre live around this precinct and this whole place is called the camp of the Tyrians»). This temple has not been securely identified, and Egyptian sources make no reference to such a Tyrian installation (Lloyd 2007, p. 322). In the seventh century BCE, Greek traders settled at the Egyptian city of Naukratis and lived among Egyptians. Later in the sixth century BCE these Greeks adopted local customs and settled in Memphis where they were called Hellenomemphites (Hdt. II 153-154; 163; Cf. Diod. I 66,12). Herodotus (II 178,2-3) describes how the Ionians, Dorians, and Aiolians collaborated in the founding of a sanctuary named the 'Hellenion' at Naukratis during the reign of the Pharaoh Amasis (ca. 569-525 BCE). Sherds of pottery from the site of the sanctuary testify to the dedication «to the gods of the Hellenes» (Hall 2002, p. 130). For a study of Naukratis, see Möller 2000.

rative is different from the ones analyzed above because it does not deal with Egyptian traditions transmitted to Greece via the Phoenician milieu. Instead, it describes the reception in Egypt of a Greek tradition. Nevertheless, according to this tradition, Helen and Paris reached Egypt through Phoenicia, and therefore, the account again represents Phoenicia as the intermediary geographical space between Greece and Egypt.

In Herodotus' reconstruction, the temple's foundation has its roots in the Egyptian version of the epic cycle. En route from Sparta to Troy with Helen, the Egyptians say, Paris was swept off course and ended up in Egypt (II 113). There Paris' servants deserted him and alerted Pharaoh Proteus that someone who had kidnapped his last host's wife was currently visiting Egypt. Proteus subsequently relieved Paris of Helen and exiled him from Egypt (II 115). Proteus sent messengers to Menelaus alerting him of Helen's location, but Menelaus did not pay them heed until after the Greeks sacked Troy and discovered that Helen indeed was not there. At this point, Menelaus visited Egypt and reunited with Helen (II 118). Detained by adverse weather, Menelaus, aping his brother's earlier solution to the same dilemma, sacrificed two children and fled to Libya, hated and pursued by the Egyptians (II 119,3).

While recounting the Egyptians' account of the Trojan War, Herodotus adds that Homer was fully aware of this version of events. As Herodotus puts it, «Clearly he [i.e., Homer] wrote in the *Iliad* – and never contradicted himself anywhere – about the wandering of Paris, how he was driven off course while leading Helen and arrived in the Phoenician city of Sidon» (II 116,2). To corroborate his claim about Homer, Herodotus cites a passage of the *Iliad* that describes the beautiful textiles that Paris brought from Phoenicia, when travelling back to Troy with Helen (*Il.* VI 289-292).[44] The *Iliad* says that Paris brought Phoenician textiles to Troy specifically from Sidon.[45] Herodotus elaborates on this Homeric tradition: «while leading Helen, he arrived in Phoenician Sidon» (II 116,2).[46] In other words, Herodotus' "evidence" that Homer knew about Paris and Helen taking a trip to Egypt consists of lines from the epic about their visiting not Egypt but Phoenicia.[47]

There is a striking disconnect here between Herodotus' point – Homer knew of the Egyptians' version of the Trojan War, in which Paris and Helen stopped in Egypt en route back to Troy – and the evidence he provides for this – Homer refers to their having stopped in Phoenicia. After all, Phoenicia is not Egypt, and the Egyptians' story makes no reference of Phoenicia. One must ask, then, why Herodotus cites this line about Phoenicia as Homeric evidence of a trip to Egypt. The answer, I argue, is that Helen could have only spent ten years in Egypt and assimilated to such a degree that the Egyptians constructed a temple in her honor, if she had gone through Phoenicia before going to Egypt. The Phoenician references are not proof that the Egyptians' story is true but evidence that, in Herodotus' (or his interlocutors') mind, it *could* be true. They demonstrate that Helen had met the prerequisite for successful Greco-Egyptian interactions – namely, going through Phoenicia. The implication is that if Helen had not gone through Phoenicia, then her stay in Egypt could not have led to a temple built in her honor.

The difference in the outcome of Helen's and Menelaus' encounter with the Egyptians corroborates this premise. Helen – who reached Egypt by way of Phoenicia – spends ten years in Egypt, and she ends up honored as a goddess. Menelaus, on the other hand, does not visit Phoenicia, and he is driven out of Egypt, «hated and pursued», after a short period of time. Furthermore, his visit only takes place after he has failed for ten years to understand the message that the Egyptians sent him, concerning Helen's whereabouts. Hero-

44 Concerning Helen's departure from Egypt, Herodotus (II 116, 4-5) also cites *Od.* IV 227-230, 351-352. But these lines refer to Menelaus and Helen's Egyptian sojourn. They neither contradict the quotation from the *Iliad* nor elaborate on how the reference to Phoenicia in the *Iliad* pertains to her being in Egypt.

45 *Il.* VI 289-290.

46 Hdt. II 116,2: ἄγων Ἑλένην... ἐς Σιδῶνα τῆς Φοινίκης ἀπίκετο («he (Alexander) led Helen…and came to Sidon in Phoenicia»).

47 Aubet 2001, pp. 182-189 discusses Mediterranean currents and usual sailing routes. Departing from Sparta, it is extremely unlikely to accidentally land in Phoenicia before arriving in Egypt.

dotus' description of this temple's location and history, then, clearly demonstrates his view on the role of the Phoenicians as mediators between Greece and Egypt. Moreover, Herodotus' description of the wandering of Paris and Helen in the eastern Mediterranean points to the importance of Phoenicia as the intermediary geographical space that facilitated transmission between the cultures of Egypt and Greece.

6. Herodotus' Phoenicians and Broader Implications

Discussions of Herodotus' ethnographic sections have tended to focus on the relationship between the one culture on whom such sections focus, such as the Egyptians or the Scythians, and the Greeks themselves.[48] In the case of the Egyptians, however, such an approach faces the difficulty of having to reconcile Herodotus' statement that the Egyptians «established customs and laws for themselves that are wholly opposite to those of other peoples» with the fact that he also attributes major aspects of Greek culture – such as Herakles, Dionysus, the names of the gods, and the first oracle in Greece – to Egypt (II 35). Indeed, «Herodotus indicates on eleven occasions that Egyptians differ from the Greeks or from all men».[49] How is it possible that so many and so essential aspects of Greek life came from Egypt?

The answer is that none of these "exotic" cultural traits came *directly* from Egypt to Greece. Rather, they were all brewed in a Greco-Phoenician middle ground. The Egyptian and the Greek Herakleis have widely divergent chronologies, but by visiting Phoenicia (physically and intellectually), Herodotus is able to incorporate both into a scheme that works. The relationship between the Greeks and the Egyptians is not binary but ternary, as the Phoenicians play an essential role in Greco-Egyptian interactions. Notably, cultural elements that are mediated by Phoenician traders do not emerge unchanged. One Herakles becomes two; the Dionysiac marionettes with large phalli in Egypt become simply large phalli in Greece; Helen of Troy becomes Foreign Aphrodite. The names of the gods may have come from Egypt, but Herodotus still has to clarify that the Egyptians refer to Demeter as Isis (II 156,5) and to Dionysus as Osiris (II 42,2; 144,2).

In his book on archaic Greeks' interactions with the Near East, Robin Lane Fox describes this type of slanted cultural borrowings as «flexible misunderstandings» and «creative mistakes», and he attributes them to the Greeks' inability to learn other peoples' languages, though we should consider a wider range of mutual recognition and understanding.[50] The religious equivalences drawn in book two suggests yet another way in which Herodotus' Phoenicians could have contributed to such creative adaptations. Here, it is not the case that the unsure or confused Greeks changed facets of Egyptian culture prior to adopting them. Rather, the Greeks are initially unable to employ any facets of Egyptian culture in any capacity because Egypt's culture, especially religion, is so unfamiliar or radically different. Only after a facet of Egyptian culture has been mediated through the Phoenicians' (closer, more familiar) culture does it take on a form that the Greeks can adopt.[51]

That there is such a consistent pattern concerning the Phoenicians suggests that their representation in the *Histories* can be categorized as an ethnographic depiction of the people who were instrumental in the transmission of cultural artifacts from the Near East to Greece. Although one can rely on Herodotus for data

48 See note 1, above.

49 Lateiner 1989, p. 148.

50 Fox 2008, pp. 216, 240. López-Ruiz 2010, pp. 15-16 objects to the particular words "misunderstandings" and "mistakes," arguing that they «impl[y] that something has gone wrong, as if the aim were scholarly accuracy». She prefers «creative adaptations» and notes that it is highly possible that such changes were purposeful, given the long history of interaction between Greeks and Phoenicians and the likelihood of a degree of bilingualism in areas where the interaction was more intense (Crete, Cyprus, de Egyptian Delta, Syria-Phoenicia, Cilicia, Bay of Naples, etc.). See also Munson 2011 where the author presents abundant evidence for Herodotus' knowledge of barbarian languages and culture.

51 Malkin 2011 aptly compares arrangements in which culture is shared due to the interactions between more than two parties to a decentralized computer network. For an overview of Greek and Phoenician interaction, see López-Ruiz 2010, pp. 23-47.

about the chronology of Sidonian kings no more safely than one can rely on him for a precise chronology of Egyptian kings.[52] Nevertheless, as Moyer has demonstrated, Herodotus' depictions of the Egyptians are not simply literary, but are also shaped by the motivations of the Egyptians. Thus, it is likely, considering his consistent depictions of the Phoenicians as intermediaries, that his representations of the Phoenicians were also motivated by their own role in the process of cultural transmission. That there is no large-scale ethnographic section dedicated to Phoenicia does not *de facto* make what Herodotus writes about it any more (or less) factual or literary than what he writes about Egypt or Scythia.

By reading the historian's representations of the Phoenicians within the historical framework of cultural exchange we can better understand why Herodotus presented the Phoenicians in this way. Rosalind Thomas, for instance, has demonstrated that one of the functions of Herodotus' ethnographies is to advance his arguments about popular intellectual debates of his time, specifically debates about medicine and the natural sciences.[53] Here I suggest that, at least when he writes about the Phoenicians, he does so in order to advance an argument about the transmission of foreign ideas and technologies to Greece.[54] The Phoenicians' presence throughout the Mediterranean from the eighth century onwards means that they were instrumental in the intensification of cultural transmissions that occurred during this time, the so-called "Orientalizing Revolution" of the eighth and seventh centuries, as several modern scholars have pointed out.[55] And although Herodotus focuses on the sixth and fifth centuries, his representation of the Phoenicians presents them as playing a key part in the earlier transmission of aspects of other cultures to Greece. Herodotus, I suggest, provides an ancient version of the modern arguments about the role of the Phoenicians in archaic cultural exchange.[56] The role that Herodotus consistently gives the Phoenicians demonstrates that he was well aware of this process. Herodotus' presentation of the Phoenicians is part of how he advances his own empirical observations concerning the transmission of foreign cultural elements to Greece via Phoenicia.

The Phoenicians' role in book two also has ramifications for the scholarly dialogue focused on Herodotus' literary techniques in book two and the goals of his ethnographic sections. By expanding the focus from a narrower one-to-one analysis (e.g., "Egypt and Greece") to one that cedes a role in the equation to other peoples, even those who do not have a dedicated ethnographic section in the *Histories*, our understanding of how Herodotus thought of and wrote about "others" experiences a radical shift. Even when ethnographic sections are mainly focused on one culture, such as Egypt, he is still telling us about more than that other culture's relationship with the Greeks. Arguably, it is because of the Greeks' familiarity with Phoenicians (already close partners in trade and in crime in Homer), that the historian does not need to objectify them and conscribe them to a separate ethnography. In the case of Greece and Egypt, the Phoenicians play an essential role. This being the case, the traditional view which considers Herodotus' Egypt as a «counter-standard» against which the Greeks can «contrast and measure» themselves should be reconsidered.[57] Certainly, the Greeks – or at least Herodotus – discursively defined themselves in opposition to the Egyptians; but Herodotus' description of this process involved more than just those two actors and indeed the Greco-Egyptian encounter cannot be fully understood without a third element, the ubiquitous Phoenicians.

52 Lloyd 2002, p. 421 calls Herodotus' chronology the most «striking deficiency» in his discussion of Egypt.

53 Thomas 2000, *passim*.

54 I in no way mean to argue against Thomas. Rather, my point is that the ethnographies *also* forward Herodotus' arguments about cultural transmission, which must have been part of the intellectual dialogue in his time.

55 See n. 4, above.

56 See Burkert 1992, pp. 1-8; Lopez-Ruiz 2010, *passim*; Morris 1992.

57 Lateiner 1989, p. 147.

References

Álvarez Martí-Aguilar 2018 = M. Álvarez Martí-Aguilar, *The Network of Melqart: Tyre, Gadir, Carthage, and the Founding God*, in T. Ñaco – F. López-Sánchez (edd.), *Warlords. War and Interstate Relations in the Ancient Mediterranean, 404 BC-AD 14*, Leiden 2018, pp. 113-150.

Arruda 2009 = A.M. Arruda, *Phoenician Colonization on the Atlantic Coast of the Iberian Peninsula*, in M. Dietler – C. Lopez-Ruiz (edd.), *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia*, Chicago 2009, pp. 113-130.

Aubet 1993 = M.E. Aubet, *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies, and Trade*, Cambridge 1993.

Aubet 2019 = M.E. Aubet, *Tyre and Its Colonial Expansion*, in C. López-Ruiz – B. Doak (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford 2019, pp. 75-87.

Benardete 1969 = S. Benardete. *Herodotean Inquiries*, South Bend 1969.

Bergquist 1973 = B. Bergquist, *Herakles on Thasos: The Archaeological, Literary, and Epigraphic Evidence for his Sanctuary, Status, and Cult Reconsidered*, Uppsala 1973 («Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis», Boreas 5) .

Boardman 1999 = J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, London 1999[4].

Boardman 2001 = J. Boardman, *Aspects of 'Colonization*, in «BASOR» 322, 2001, pp. 33-42.

Boedeker 2002 = D. Boedeker, *Epic Heritage and Mythological Patterns in Herodotus*, in E.J. Bakker – I.J.F. De Jong – H. Van Wees (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden 2002, pp. 97-116.

Bonnet 1988 = C. Bonnet, *Melqart. Cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès Tyrien en Méditerranée*, Leuven-Namur 1988 («Studia Phoenicia», 8).

Bonnet 2014 = C. Bonnet, *Les enfants de Cadmos. Le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*, Paris 2014.

Bonnet 2019 = C. Bonnet, *The Hellenistic Period and Hellenization in Phoenicia*, in C. López-Ruiz – B.R. Doak, (edd.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford 2019, pp. 99-110.

Brixhe 2007 = C. Brixhe, *History of the Alphabet: Some Guidelines for Avoiding Simplification*, in A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 277-287.

Burkert 1985 = W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, Cambridge (MA) 1985.

Burkert 1992 = W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, Cambridge (MA) 1992.

Demetriou forthcoming = D. Demetriou, *Phoenicians*, in C. Baron (ed.), *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*, Malden, forthcoming.

Edwards 1979 = R. B. Edwards, *Kadmos the Phoenician*, Amsterdam 1979.

Elay 2006 = J. Elay, *The Role of the Phoenician Kings at the Battle of Salamis (480 B.C.E.)*, in «JAOS» 126, 2006, pp. 411-418.

Emanuel 2019 = J.P. Emanuel, *Seafaring and Shipwreck Archaeology*, in C. López-Ruiz – B.R. Doak (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford 2019, pp. 423-434.

Faegersten 2003 = F. Faegersten, *The Egyptianizing Male Limestone Statuary from Cyprus: A Study of a Cross-cultural Eastern Mediterranean Votive Type*, Lund 2003.

Fowler 2006 = R. Fowler, *Herodotus and His Prose Predecessors*, in C. Dewald – J. Marincola (edd.). *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 29-45.

Fox 2009 = R. L. Fox, *Travelling Heroes in the Epic Age of Homer*, New York 2009.

Garland 2014 = R. Garland, *Wandering Greeks*, Princeton 2014.

Hall 2002 = J. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago-London 2002.

Hartog 1988 = F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, Berkeley 1988.

Hornblower 2002 = S. Hornblower, *Herodotus and his Sources of Information*, in E. J. Bakker – I. J. F. De Jong – H. Van Wees (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden 2002, pp. 373-386.

Katzenstein 1979 = J. H. Katzenstein, *Tyre in the Early Persian Period (539-486 B.C.E.)*, in «The Biblical Archaeologist» 42, 1979, pp. 23-34.

Kelly 1987 = Th. Kelly, *Herodotus and the Chronology of the Kings of Sidon*, in «BASOR» 268, 1987, pp. 39-56.

Lateiner 1989 = D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Toronto 1989.

Lattimore 1939 = R. Lattimore, *Herodotus and the Names of the Egyptians Gods*, in «ClPhil» 34, 1939, pp. 357-365.

Lipiński 2004 = E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley (MA) 2004 («Studia Phoenicia», 18).
Lloyd 1975 = A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II. Introduction*, Leiden 1975.
Lloyd 1976 = A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II. Commentary 1-98*, Leiden 1976.
Lloyd 1988 = A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II. Commentary 99-182*, Leiden 1988.
Lloyd 2002 = A.B. Lloyd, *Egypt*, in E. J. Bakker – I. J. F. De Jong – H. van Wees (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden 2002, pp. 415-435.
Lloyd 2007 = A.B. Lloyd, *Book II*, in O. Murray – A. Moreno (edd.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford 2007, pp. 221-378.
Lopez-Ruiz 2010 = C. Lopez-Ruiz, *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*, Cambridge (MA) 2010.
Malkin 2011 = I. Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, New York 2011.
Markoe 2000 = G. Markoe, *Phoenicians*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 2000.
Möller 2000 = A. Möller, *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece*, Oxford 2000.
Morris 1992 = S.P. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton 1992.
Moyer 2011 = I. S. Moyer, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, Ann Arbor 2011.
Munson 2005 = R. Munson, *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Language of the Barbarians*, Cambridge 2005.
Prag 2014 = J. Prag, Phoinix *and* Poenus*: Usage in Antiquity*, in J. C. Quinn – N. Vella (edd.), *The Punic Mediterranean: Identities and Identification from Phoenician Settlement to Roman Times*, Cambridge 2014, pp. 11-23.
Quinn 2018 = J. Quinn, *In Search of the Phoenicians*, Princeton 2018.
Rainey 2001 = A. F. Rainey, *Herodotus' Description of the East Mediterranean Coast*, in «BASOR» 321, 2001, pp. 57-63.
Strassler 2007 = R. Strassler (ed.), *The Landmark Herodotus*, New York 2007.
Thomas 2000 = R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion*, Cambridge 2000.
Thomas 2006 = R. Thomas, *The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus*, in C. Dewald – J. Marincola (edd.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 60-75.
Voutiras 2007 = E. Voutiras, *The Introduction of the Alphabet*, in A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007, 266-276.
West 1971 = M. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, Oxford 1971.
West 1997 = M. West *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 1997.