



# THUCYDIDES & HERODOTUS

*Edited by* Edith Foster & Donald Lateiner

OXFORD

# Thucydides and Herodotus

Edited by  
EDITH FOSTER and DONALD LATEINER



OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries.

© Oxford University Press 2012

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First published 2012

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Data available

ISBN 978-0-19-959326-2

Typeset by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

*For  
Louise Gouëffic*

*§*

*For  
Bonnie Lateiner  
and  
Estella Paloma Lateiner*

## Acknowledgements

We would like in the first place to acknowledge the support we have received throughout the production of this volume from the contributors themselves. Of fundamental importance has also been support from Ohio Wesleyan University, Ashland University, the American Academy in Rome, and the American Philological Association. This book had its origin in a panel entitled *Historiographical Dialogues: Herodotus and Thucydides*, which was held at the American Philological Association's 2009 Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. Five of our present contributors, including both editors (Edith Foster, Donald Lateiner, Rosaria Munson, Catherine Rubincam, and Hans-Peter Stahl) participated in this panel.

The anonymous readers of Oxford University Press made many useful suggestions for the improvement of this volume. The copy-editors and proofreaders at Oxford University Press have also been indispensable. Undergraduate research assistants Nick Granitz, at Ashland University, and Elizabeth Foster at Cornell University, helped with production and indices. The advice and support of family members has been indispensable for this as for every other project. Finally, special gratitude is owed to Cynthia King.

## Abbreviations

The list below does not include standard abbreviations for classical authors and their works. Please see *OCD*<sup>3</sup> for these.

AA	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
AJAH	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
AJPhil.	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AK	<i>Antike Kunst</i>
AM	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung</i>
<i>Anc. Soc.</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
ASNP	<i>Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia</i>
ATL	<i>Athenian Tribute Lists</i>
BCH	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique</i>
BICS	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, London</i>
BMCR	<i>Bryn Mawr Classical Review</i> (online)
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>Cl. Ant.</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>C Phil.</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CSCA	<i>California Studies in Classical Antiquity</i>
CW	<i>Classical World</i> (Classical Association of the Atlantic States)
EA	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
EMC = CV	<i>Echos du Monde Classique: Classical Views</i> (Classical Association of Canada)
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , ed. F. Jacoby (1923–56)
G&R	<i>Greece and Rome</i> , NS

GHI	<i>Greek Historical Inscriptions</i> , ed. Todd
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
Harv. Stud.	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
ICS	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
JRGZM	<i>Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
LEC	<i>Les Études classiques</i>
LSJ	Liddell and Scott, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th edn. with rev. suppl.
MH	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
ML	R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC</i> (rev. edn., 1988)
NC	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i>
PCPS	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
Philol.	<i>Philologus</i>
PLLS	<i>Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar</i>
PP	<i>La parola del passato</i>
QS	<i>Quaderni di Storia</i>
RE	A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll, <i>Real- Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (1893– )
REA	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
REG	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
SCI	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> (1923– )
SO	<i>Symbolae Osloenses: Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies</i>
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
YCIS	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

## Notes on Contributors

EMILY BARAGWANATH is Assistant Professor in the Department of Classics at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. She is the author of *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford, 2008) and co-editor, together with Mathieu de Bakker, of *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford, forthcoming). At present she is writing a book on the fourth-century Athenian writer Xenophon.

WOLFGANG BLÖSEL, after having studied Classics, History, Egyptology, and Assyriology at the Universities of Heidelberg and Oxford, wrote his dissertation on 'Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert' (Stuttgart, 2004). His Colognian Habilitationsschrift is on the *imperia extraordinaria* of the Roman Republic and the demilitarization of the Roman nobility. He is also author of articles on the Greek oligarchy in classical times, Polybius' Sixth Book, and the *mos maiorum* and gentilitial mode of remembering the past in ancient Rome. Currently, he is Chair of Ancient History at the University of Kassel.

EDITH FOSTER is associate professor of history at Ashland University, Ohio. She is the author of *Thucydides, Pericles, and Periclean Imperialism* (2010), of articles on Thucydides and Lucretius in the *American Journal of Philology* (2009) and in *Sea of Languages: Complicating the History of Western Translation* (2011), and of numerous book reviews in *BMCR*, *C Phil.*, and *Gnomon*.

DONALD LATEINER is the John R. Wright Professor of Greek and Humanities at Ohio Wesleyan University. He studies and teaches Greek historiography, ancient epic, and the ancient novels. His publications include *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (1989) and *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behaviors in Homeric Epic* (1995), a revised and annotated edition of Macaulay's translation of Herodotus (2005), and an annotated edition of Crawley's translation of Thucydides (2006). At present, he is working on a monograph analysing the rhetoric and purpose of Ovid's Ceyx and Alcyone 'Idyll'.

ROSARIA VIGNOLO MUNSON is Professor of Classics at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania. She is the author of *Telling Wonders*:



*Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (2001), *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians* (2005), and several articles on Herodotus. She is currently co-editing (with Carolyn Dewald) a commentary on Herodotus book 1 for the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series, and editing the *Oxford Readings in Classical Literature: Herodotus*.

CHRISTOPHER PELLING is Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford University. His books include *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (2000), *Plutarch and History* (2002), and commentaries on Plutarch's *Antony* (1988), *Philopoemen and Flamininus* (in Italian, 1997), and *Life of Caesar* (forthcoming). He has also edited and co-edited volumes on *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (1990), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (with D. C. Innes and H. M. Hine, 1995), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (1997), and *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (with C. S. Kraus and J. Marincola, 2010).

CATHERINE RUBINCAM has taught at the University of Toronto since 1969. She served as Editor of *Phoenix*, Journal of the Classical Association of Canada, 1992–7, and of the *Phoenix Supplementary Series* 1992–2002, and in succession as Vice-President, President, and Past President of the Classical Association of Canada 2000–6. She has published extensively on Greek historiography, particularly Herodotus, Thucydides, and Diodorus Siculus. Her current major project (funded by a series of grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) involves developing a database of all the numbers in a selection of ancient Greek historical narratives, and of comparable modern narratives. A monograph tentatively entitled, 'Quantifying Mentalities: Numbers in Ancient Greek Historiography', will contain a distillation of the results of this work.

RICHARD B. RUTHERFORD has been Tutor in Greek and Latin Literature at Christ Church, Oxford since 1982. Among his publications are *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: A Study* (1989), a commentary on books 19 and 20 of Homer's *Odyssey* (1992), *The Art of Plato* (1995), *Homer (Greece and Rome New Surveys 26, 1996)*, and *Classical Literature: A Concise History* (2005). A book on the style and language of Greek tragedy is forthcoming. He has a long-standing interest also in historiography, above all Herodotus and Thucydides.

IRIS SAMOTTA received her PhD at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany. She is currently researching the ancient slave trade under the auspices of the *Gerda Henkel Stiftung* (Düsseldorf). Her main areas of interest are the social and political history of archaic and classical Greece and the Roman Republic, and Greek and Roman historiography. Her publications include *Das Vorbild der Vergangenheit: Geschichtsbild und Reformvorschläge bei Cicero und Sallust* (Stuttgart, 2009) and *Demosthenes* (Tübingen, 2010).

CARLO SCARDINO studied ancient Greek, Latin, ancient history, and Islamic sciences at the Universities of Basel and Freiburg im Breisgau. He is author of *Gestaltung und Funktion der Reden bei Herodot und Thucydides* (2007), which examines the use and function of direct speeches in the two ancient historians. At the moment he is conducting research under the aegis of the Swiss National Foundation Project Iulius Africanus, *Kestoi*, in Basel, as well as for the University of Marburg, where he focuses on the transmission of lost Greek agricultural texts preserved in Arabic.

PHILIP A. STADTER is Professor of Classics Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he has taught since 1962. He has published extensively on Greek historical authors. His books include *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (1965), *The Public Library of Renaissance Florence: Niccolò Niccoli, Cosimo de' Medici and the Library of San Marco* (1972, with B. L. Ullman), *The Speeches in Thucydides* (1973), *Arrian of Nicomedia* (1980), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (1989), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (1992), and *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the time of Trajan (98–117 A.D.)* (2002, with L. van der Stockt). He has written numerous articles on Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch, and other topics.

HANS-PETER STAHL is Andrew Mellon Professor of Classics at the University of Pittsburgh. Earlier work on the beginnings of propositional logic in Plato was followed by articles on Greek and Roman literature and historiography. He is the author of *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War': Individual and State under Augustus* (1985) and the editor of *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (1998; pb 2009). *Thucydides: Man's Place in History*, a revised and enlarged English edition of an earlier work, appeared in 2003 (pb 2009).

At present, he is preparing a major study of Vergil's *Aeneid*. Two essential foci of his research are the logic of authors and the political anthropology manifested in works of ancient prose and poetry.

# Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xi
1. Introduction	1
<i>Edith Foster and Donald Lateiner</i>	
PART I: METHODS OF REASONING	
2. Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography	13
<i>Richard B. Rutherford</i>	
3. Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus	39
<i>Philip A. Stadter</i>	
4. Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides	67
<i>Carlo Scardino</i>	
5. The 'Rationality' of Herodotus and Thucydides as Evidenced by Their Respective Use of Numbers	97
<i>Catherine Rubincam</i>	
PART II: COMMON THEMES	
6. Herodotus and Thucydides on Blind Decisions Preceding Military Action	125
<i>Hans-Peter Stahl</i>	
7. Oaths: Theory and Practice in the <i>Histories</i> of Herodotus and Thucydides	154
<i>Donald Lateiner</i>	
8. Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background	185
<i>Edith Foster</i>	
9. Thucydides on Themistocles: A Herodotean Narrator?	215
<i>Wolfgang Blösel</i>	
10. Persians in Thucydides	241
<i>Rosaria Vignolo Munson</i>	

## PART III: RECEPTION

11. Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i> , the <i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i> , and the Speeches in Herodotus and Thucydides <i>Christopher Pelling</i>	281
12. A Noble Alliance: Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon's Procles <i>Emily Baragwanath</i>	316
13. Herodotus and Thucydides in Roman Republican Historiography <i>Iris Samotta</i>	345
<i>Index Locorum</i>	379
<i>Index Nominum</i>	393
<i>Topic Index</i>	395

## Introduction

*Edith Foster and Donald Lateiner*

When earlier classicists and ancient historians read Thucydides, they were mindful of the Herodotean templates. For instance, the continental exponents of scientific philology in the nineteenth century took for granted that the two historians could not be interpreted separately. Thus, Ernst Friedrich Poppo (following the example of his predecessor, K. W. Krueger), begins his commentary on Thucydides (written between 1875 and 1886) with a remark on Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, his treatment of the introductory chapters of Thucydides offers many further references to Herodotus, both as a paradigm for Thucydidean prose, and also because the text of Herodotus offers relevant remarks on the historical events.<sup>2</sup> To these observations one might object that the beginning of Thucydides' *History* treats ancient history, and that therefore the relation between Thucydides and his predecessor is exceptionally evident in these passages; however, if we examine Poppo's remarks on Thucydides' plague narrative, a passage often considered to represent Thucydides

<sup>1</sup> *Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε*: Simpliciter veterum qua solent nomina sua in principiis scriptorum commemorare exemplis illustrent interpretes, ex quibus unum Herodoteum *Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησσοῦ ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἥδε* proferimus . . . (Scholars elucidate the direct style of the ancient writers, in accordance with which they were accustomed to memorialize their own names, by comparison to the most important examples, from which I bring forward only Herodotus . . .).

<sup>2</sup> Further notes to Herodotus in Poppo's commentary on the first ten chapters of Thucydides' *Archaeology*: as a prose example, ad loc. 1.1.2, 1.2.4, 1.7, 1.9.2, and 1.9.4; for historical background, ad loc. 1.2.6, 1.3.3, 1.4, 1.6.3, 1.8.1. For further Herodotean passages in the *Archaeology*, cf. Hornblower (1996), 138–9; On the close relation of the historians' prose style, cf. Dover (1997).

at his most 'scientific', approximately the same density of cross-references to Herodotus is revealed.<sup>3</sup>

An assumption that there was a close connection between the two authors informed these commentaries despite the fact that they were formulated during a period in which some readers held the elder historian suspect as the 'Father of Fables', and crowned the younger with the laurels of 'scientific history', so that the two became heroic opponents, the figures of an antithesis in which Thucydides' impersonal and analytical text shone incandescent light upon Herodotus' rambling incapacity. Disqualification of Herodotus was *de rigueur*, especially among scholars studying Thucydides, and, if anything, the contrast gained in unjustified sharpness during the early twentieth century. For example, Abbott (1925), 10: 'Herodotus has been called the "Father of History"; in truth he is only the father of story-telling: the first and most lively of our special correspondents . . . 21: his celebrated *Logoi* . . . further vitiated by careless inaccuracy, love of exaggeration, addiction to entertaining anecdote, and indiscriminate acceptance of ancient lore—all of which properly belongs to a rudimentary age,' or Cochrane (1929), 46: 'When Thucydides wrote, there lay before him the researches of Herodotus, a panorama, so to speak, of all varieties of political experience . . . full of keen and penetrating observation, but so interlarded with the picturesque and the metaphysical that, while they provided the material for intelligible classification, they did not approach the point of classification itself.'

This repetitive zero-sum style of critiquing the two first historians was a reflection of an ancient view we are about to discuss, and has now been largely abandoned.<sup>4</sup> Scholars now hypothesize a more

<sup>3</sup> Poppe refers to the Hippocratic corpus and the Lucretian translation, but cites Herodotus as a control for important and otherwise perhaps easily miscontextualized concepts. See, for instance, his remarks ad loc. 2.51.1: 'τὴν ἰδέαν non speciem, sed modum atque habitum significat, ut 4.55.2. Herod. 1.203, 2.71(τὴν ἰδέαν refers not to the appearance, but the manner and form [i.e. of the disease], as at 4.55.2, cf. Hdt. 1.203 and 2.71)', ad loc. 2.51.2, on Thucydides' famous quotation of Solonian wisdom (Hdt. 1.32.8: σῶμα ἐν οὐδὲν αὐταρκές . . .), or ad loc. 2.51.6, 'δὲ . . . οὐκ ἐπιλαμβάνεν . . . cf. Herod. 7.115 ἐπιλαβὼν λοιμὸς τὸν στρατὸν ἐφθειρε; ad loc. 2.52.2: οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ . . . Hac formula utuntur Herodotus, Procopius, alii rerum scriptores. Cf. 3.108.3, 7.23.3, 7.40.3, Herod. 3.113. . . .

<sup>4</sup> For further explication of 'the overriding view that Thucydides despised Herodotus, and treated his work almost as a travesty of history' (Rogkoti 2006, 58), and the recent about-face on this issue, cf. Rogkoti (2006). In addition, a useful and brief critique of the scholarship on Thucydides that most insisted on aligning him with modern historical positivism is provided in Stahl (2003), 13–15. As

positive relationship between Herodotus and Thucydides, just as they also recognize the important ancestry of Homer for both (see Chapter 2 below).

If this reassessment has taken a long time to emerge (as we now think), two problems must be kept in mind. First, ancient judgments on Herodotus made it easier throughout subsequent history to slight Herodotus' achievement. Thucydides, as Philip Stadter and Catherine Rubincam point out in Chapters 3 and 5, was Herodotus' first and most important successor in large-scale historiography; moreover, the similarity of their subjects and themes provoked him to stake out his own contrasting territory.<sup>5</sup> What good luck for Thucydides to have a predecessor he could emulate, and from whom he could take his bearings! What bad luck for Herodotus to have the historian whom subsequent history accepted as the paradigm of the genre for one's first epigone and critical reader!

Moreover, subsequent ancient critics frequently and explicitly expressed negative opinions about Herodotus—a feature absent from Thucydides' anonymous polemics. Well-known examples are found in Aristotle (*μυθολόγος*, *gen. anim.* 756b6), Plutarch (*de Herodoti malignitate*),<sup>6</sup> Josephus (*πολλὰ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον ἐλέγχει τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ὑπ' ἀγνοίας ἐψευσμένον*, *Ap.* 1.14), Lucian (*ὁ μὴ τὰ ἀληθῆ συγγεγραφώς*, *Ver. Hist.* 2.31), and Aulus Gellius (*Herodotus homo fabulator*, *Noct. Att.* 3.10.11). To these critical (and decontextualized) remarks should be opposed the positive assessments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. e.g. *Dem.* 41, *de Thuc.* 5 and 23), who also praises his countryman's subject, structure, and arrangement as superior to those of Thucydides in *ad Pomp.* 3 and 6.<sup>7</sup> In addition,

demonstrated by Poppo's treatment (cf. notes 1 and 2), the tendency to oppose the two historians, while common, was never universal. Cf. Macan (in high old age, cf. 419) in *CAH V* (1935), who gently demurred from this prejudice: 'The due appreciation of Herodotus and Thucydides as artists may have suffered sometimes from two contrary misconceptions; the one, regarding Herodotus as a mere child of Nature, creating indeed a great work, but almost in sport, unconscious of design and innocent of forethought: the other, regarding Thucydides as a sheer incarnation of science, or at least of the scientific spirit, and repudiating on his behalf the charge of literary artfulness, as derogatory to his conscience and his achievements' (*CAH V* 410). Cf. Strasburger (1955); but forceful condemnation of Herodotus continued, cf. e.g. Meiggs (1972), 287–8.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Lateiner (1989), ch.10, and Parke (1946), 80–92.

<sup>6</sup> However, cf. Pelling (2007) for a review of Plutarch's 'spectrum of different attitudes' (162) to Herodotus, some of which are very positive.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Momigliano (1966), 27: 'Dionysius is in fact the only ancient writer who never said anything unpleasant about Herodotus.'



Cicero, for whom Herodotus was the *pater historiae*, must be included among Herodotus' supporters, although he also has less flattering things to say.<sup>8</sup> Positive or negative, Cicero's remarks witness to Herodotus' fame; indeed, Lucian went so far as to posit that Thucydides responded as much to Herodotus' high reputation as to Herodotus' historical method (*Hist. consc.* 42).<sup>9</sup>

The contrast governing the reception granted the two historians is usually clear: both were famous, but Thucydides earned a reputation for trustworthiness (although his difficult style has always annoyed readers; cf. e.g. Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 30–2), and could therefore be named as a model by subsequent historians (e.g. Polybius, 8.11.3 and 12.25a, or Nepos, *Life of Themistocles* 1.1 and *passim*), and, as was customary among the ancients, even more often imitated than named (Sallust, Julius Caesar, Tacitus). Herodotus, as we have just seen, was critiqued on grounds of substance, although praised for his style (e.g. Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 23; Lucian, *Hdt.* 1). Ancient imitation of Herodotus, who became the preferred model for Hellenistic historiography (Hornblower 1995, especially 65), was therefore not as overt, despite the fact that it was probably as pervasive as imitation of Thucydides.<sup>10</sup> Overall, this meant that modern perception of Herodotus' importance lagged behind, while his reputation as a wonderful teller of tales undermined his respectability.

The relatively equal fame, but unequal reputation, of the two historians in modern times is visible from the period following the appearance of the Aldine text of Herodotus in 1502.<sup>11</sup> Henri Estienne's (=Henricus Stephanus) *Apologia pro Herodoto* of 1566, perhaps meeting the preconceptions resulting from ancient criticism, and perhaps also the criticisms of more recent times,<sup>12</sup> defends Herodotus as a pious author who did not knowingly lie to his

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Samotta (Ch. 13) and Stahl (Ch. 6) in this volume; Momigliano (1966), 127.

<sup>9</sup> In a formulation that responds to the previous paragraph (*Hist. consc.* 41), where Lucian has declared that historians should be fearless, incorruptible, and independent, he argues as follows: 'Ὁ δ' οὖν Θουκυδίδης εὖ μάλα τοῦτ' ἐνομοθέτησεν καὶ διέκρινεν ἀρετὴν καὶ κακίαν συγγραφικὴν, ὁρῶν μάλιστα θαυμαζόμενον τὸν Ἡρόδοτον ἄχρι τοῦ καὶ Μούσας κληθῆναι αὐτοῦ τὰ βιβλία. He saw both historians as desiring fame, cf. also the opening story of his *Herodotus*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Pelling (Ch. 11), Baragwanath (Ch. 12), and Samotta (Ch. 13) in this volume.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Kramer (1980).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Momigliano (1966), 139.