

- he considers less credible, because, after all, 'it is told'. On these passages see Lateiner (1989) 79.
13. See the contributions of Fowler and Thomas in this volume.
 14. On Herodotus' intellectual affinities see especially Thomas (2000) and in this volume, and in brief Raaflaub (2002a) 155-64.
 15. For an exploration of Herodotus' attitude to cultural difference see Munson (2001a), correcting the excessive rigidity of the classic Hartog (1991).
 16. Compare Jacoby (1913) 395.46-50: among the sources of Herodotus' knowledge, *opsis* and *gnōmē* need no further explanation.
 17. This development is outlined in Luraghi (2001a).
 18. On the politics of oral history and oral tradition research see Prins (2001) 120-6, 138-9.
 19. For the development of the history of pre-colonial Africa and especially for the origins of Vansina's methods and concerns see Vansina (1994).
 20. See especially Vansina (1985), although ancient historians have been more influenced by Vansina (1961) - note the subtitle: *Essai de méthode historique*. On the difference between the two see Murray (2001b) 321.
 21. Studies of oral tradition in Greece inspired more or less directly by Vansina's works include Murray (2001a), Flower (1991), Thomas (1989), Evans (1991), Raaflaub (1988), Cobet (1988).
 22. Murray (2001a).
 23. Jacoby (1913) 412.
 24. The meanings of the Greek word *logios* range from 'important, illustrious', with implications of social prestige, to 'learned, competent'. On its meaning in Herodotus see Vannicelli (2001) 214-15 and Luraghi (2001b) 156-9, with references to the relevant passages.
 25. Jacoby (1949) 215-16, followed by Murray (2001a) 26-7; cf. also 40. For different versions of the *logioi*-theory see Nagy (1987), revised in Nagy (1990) 221-7 and Evans (1991). Criticism thereof in Luraghi (2001b).
 26. See Fehling (1989) 87-108 and Darbo-Peschanski (1987) 91-4.
 27. For an illuminating discussion of Herodotus' narratives on the foundation of Cyrene, highlighting the impossibility of taking Herodotean *akoē* statements at face value, see Giangulio (2001).
 28. See Griffiths in this volume.
 29. This interpretation, first put forward by Plutarch in his pamphlet against Herodotus (*de Her. mal.* 40), has been argued extensively in recent years by Detlev Fehling: see Fehling (1989). For an excellent discussion of Fehling's approach see Fowler (1996) 80-5.
 30. See Shrimpton (1997) 245-6 and the discussion in Hornblower (2002) 374-80.
 31. The main actors and their works are discussed in Luraghi (1994b).
 32. On Herodotus' ideas about the limits of possible knowledge of the past see Darbo-Peschanski (1987) 25-38 and Vannicelli (1993).
 33. Note Darbo-Peschanski (1987) 93-4: distance in time does not seem to affect local memory as depicted by Herodotus.
 34. For the notion of social surface see Moniot (1970) 134-5.
 35. This notion would also help make sense of Herodotus' peculiar attitude to written documentary evidence, whose existence is acknowledged without it being used

- as a source for specific statements; see the perceptive observations of Darbo-Peschanski (1987) 95-6, and West (1985) on inscriptions.
36. Luraghi (2001b) 159-60.
 37. Interestingly, the Herodotean narrator refers a number of times to his activity with the verb *graphō*, 'to write'; see Rösler (2002) 88-90.
 38. Boedeker (2000) 109; Boedeker's excellent discussion of the genre of the *Histories* forms the starting point for the considerations that follow.
 39. See Boedeker (2000) 108-11, Dewald (2002) 274-5 and Brock (2003).
 40. See Darbo-Peschanski (1987) 99-100.
 41. See Fowler's edition of the early mythographers and his forthcoming commentary (EGM).
 42. Calame (1986) explores thoroughly the problem of the construction of authority in Greek literature, from the archaic age to Herodotus. See also two recent and excellent articles, Scodel (1998) and (2001).
 43. See Dewald (2002).
 44. See Spiegel (1997), especially 3-28.