

# Themistocles' Exhortation before Salamis: On Herodotus 8.83

*Vasiliki Zali*

**I**N THE COURSE of Book 8 of Herodotus' *Histories* and after the battle at Artemisium, the Greek fleet puts in at Salamis at the Athenians' request. There the Greeks, sparked by fear and indecisiveness, conduct successive discussions about the most suitable location to face the Persian invaders. Soon enough they find themselves surrounded by the Persian forces—as a result of Themistocles' ploy—and are thus forced to fight the enemy at Salamis. Herodotus goes on to report the speech with which Themistocles encourages the Greek troops before the battle (8.83):<sup>1</sup>

ἠώς τε διέφαινε καὶ οἱ σύλλογον τῶν ἐπιβατέων ποιησάμενοι, προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλῆς, τὰ δὲ ἔπεα ἦν πάντα (τὰ) κρέσσω τοῖσι ἥσσοσι ἀντιτιθέμενα, ὅσα δὴ ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσι καὶ καταστάσι ἐγγίνεται· παραινέσας δὲ τούτων τὰ κρέσσω αἰρέεσθαι καὶ καταπλέξας τὴν ῥῆσιν, ἐσβαίνειν ἐκέλευε ἐς τὰς νέας. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐσέβαινον ...

At daybreak they held an assembly of the fighting men and Themistocles alone of them all foretold victory. He spent the whole of his speech contrasting all the better and the worse aspects of human nature and condition, and encouraging the men to choose the better course; he ended by sending them off to their ships. And the men were going aboard ...

This is all the information Herodotus grants us about The-

<sup>1</sup> I use C. Hude, *Herodoti Historiae* (Oxford 1927) for Herodotus. Translations are adapted from J. A. de Sélincourt, *Herodotus: The Histories*, rev. with notes by J. Marincola (London 2003), and R. Waterfield, *Herodotus: The Histories*, introduction and notes by C. Dewald (Oxford 1998).

mistocles' speech: a few short sentences in indirect discourse. Themistocles' speech belongs to the genre of exhortation<sup>2</sup> that pits nobility against pragmatism and praises the former in order to bolster the soldiers' morale before a military engagement.<sup>3</sup> The nature of hortatory motifs<sup>4</sup> brings this kind of rhetoric closer to the epideictic genre, but it presents affinities with the deliberative genre as well.<sup>5</sup> Exhortation finds precedents in Homer and acquires a standard and more elaborate form later in Thucydides.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> On Themistocles' speech as exhortation see H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland 1966) 282 n.127; A. M. Bowie, *Herodotus. Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge 2007) 172; J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158, at 143.

<sup>3</sup> There is a whole debate over the historical and literary nature of the battle exhortation (i.e. whether it is an actual rhetorical genre rather than a few popular commonplaces or constructed by the historians). For the historical aspect see W. K. Pritchett, *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam 1994) 27–109, and *Ancient Greek Battle Speeches and a Palfrey* (Amsterdam 2002) 1–80; C. T. H. R. Ehrhardt, "Speeches before Battle?" *Historia* 44 (1995) 120–121; M. Clark, "Did Thucydides Invent the Battle Exhortation?" *Historia* 44 (1995) 375–376; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides II* (Oxford 1996) 82–83. For the literary aspect see M. H. Hansen, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography. Fact or Fiction?" *Historia* 42 (1993) 161–180, and "The Little Grey Horse. Henry V's Speech at Agincourt and the Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography," *ClMed* 52 (2001) 95–116; C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983) 162; cf. M. A. Flower and J. Marincola, *Herodotus. Histories Book IX* (Cambridge 2002) 134.

<sup>4</sup> On exhortation *topoi* in the historians see T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (Chicago 1902) 212–213 (based on selected speeches); J. Albertus, *Die Parakletikoi in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Strassburg 1908) 37–93; Pritchett, *Essays* 102–105 (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius).

<sup>5</sup> Burgess discusses the close relation of epideictic to deliberative oratory (*Epideictic Literature* 91–103) and considers battle exhortation part of epideictic literature (209–214). For a discussion of the mixing of diverse strands of rhetorical argument in exhortation, from Thucydides to the imperial-age rhetoricians, see Iglesias-Zoido, *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158.

<sup>6</sup> On Homeric exhortation see B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden 1968); E. Keitel, "Homeric Antecedents to the *Cohortatio* in the

Given the largely stock character of exhortation, critics have attempted to reconstruct the content of Themistocles' speech,<sup>7</sup> while the meaning of the rather ambiguous phrase προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλέης has also been the subject of debate.<sup>8</sup> This is as far as scholarly enthusiasm for the speech goes. Such discussions are undeniably useful but do not go far toward furthering our understanding of the textual function of the speech.

The use of indirect discourse and the brevity of the passage arguably justify the relatively limited focus that the speech has received. Recent scholarly work, however, has pointed out that factual—including historical—and fictional narratives operate under similar rules.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, it has been shown with in-

---

Ancient Historians," *CW* 80 (1987) 153–172 (specifically on its affinities to historiographical harangue). On Thucydidean exhortation see O. Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Leipzig 1942); R. Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik. Eine Untersuchung zu den Feldherrnreden des Thukydides* (Stuttgart 1985); Iglesias-Zoido, *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158.

<sup>7</sup> R. W. Macan, *Herodotus: The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books* I.2 (London 1908) 488; H. Stein, *Herodotos VII–IX* (Berlin 1881) 64; A. Masaracchia, *Erodoto. Le Storie, libro VIII*<sup>2</sup> (Milan 1990) 198.

<sup>8</sup> For an overview of the differing translations see A. J. Graham, "Themistocles' Speech before Salamis: The Interpretation of Herodotus 8.83.1," *CQ* 46 (1996) 321–326, who suggests the version "Themistocles alone of them all foretold victory." Bowie (*Herodotus* 173) follows Graham in translating εὖ ἔχοντα as "good fortune/victory." I also adopt Graham's translation here as it seems to me more accurate than the alternatives given in A. D. Godley, *Herodotus* IV (Cambridge [Mass.] 1946): "Themistocles made a harangue in which he excelled all others"; de Sélincourt, *Herodotus*: "Themistocles gave the finest speech there"; Waterfield, *Herodotus*: "Themistocles put things better than anyone else"; and R. B. Strassler, *The Landmark Herodotus*, transl. A. L. Purvis (London 2008): "of all the commanders, Themistocles issued the most effective orders."

<sup>9</sup> See G. Genette, *Fiction and Diction* (Ithaca 1993) 54–84. For history as literature see esp. H. White, "The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory," *History and Theory* 23 (1984) 1–33; R. Barthes, *The Rustle of Language* (Oxford 1986) 127–140; cf. S. Hornblower, "Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides," *Thucydidean Themes* (Oxford 2011) 59–99, at 61–62.

creasing frequency that, in fictional as well as factual texts, the choice between direct and indirect discourse is a matter of authorial preference; hence it is contingent on stylistic purposes. The use of direct speech is not necessarily a sign of reliability or importance; nor does the use of indirect speech automatically point to fabrication, authorial scepticism, or insignificance.<sup>10</sup>

Brevity and the choice of indirect discourse thus generate further questions about Herodotus' narrative technique and his purposes in embedding the passage in its present form in the *Histories*. One major question is: why does Herodotus assign Themistocles such a brief indirect speech when this seems to be the perfect chance for the historian to include a long direct speech by the 'master of rhetoric' *par excellence*, and just before a critical battle which results in one of the most illustrious Greek victories of the Persian Wars? Herodotus could have composed and inserted here an exhortation in direct discourse before the description of the battle at Salamis, as he does with Dionysius of Phocaea before the battle of Lade (6.11.2–3) and Harmocycles in view of a Persian attack against his Phocian contingent (9.17.4), but he did not.

In this article I shall attempt to offer some possible answers. By drawing attention to the effects of the actual form of the speech, I shall argue that we are here faced with a startling case of 'silence', which can be viewed as a conscious and calculated authorial choice: the speech is conducive to the economy of the narrative; it indicates that Herodotus engages with the tradition

<sup>10</sup> See A. Laird, *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford 1999) 116–152 (he uses Latin literature as his main test case). For Herodotus see D. Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley 2007) 243 n.28; T. Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford 2000) 25–30, 248–250; J. D. Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* (Chapel Hill 2003) 145; M. P. de Bakker, *Speech and Authority in Herodotus' Histories* (diss. Univ. Amsterdam 2007) 36–48, 160–178; I. J. F. de Jong, "Herodotus," in I. J. F. de Jong et al. (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2004) 101–114, at 109.

and the contemporary use of hortatory/epideictic motifs and addresses his readers; and, if contextualized, it contributes to, and further complements, Themistocles' characterization. What is more, the speech may add to the function of other, direct speeches as Herodotus may also be seen here to assume a critical position against internal Greek conflicts and, consequently, against current rhetorical uses of epideictic arguments, and to make his own work stand out in relief. My discussion aims to propose for consideration new ways of reading the speech, ways which make the most of its form and narrative context and bring out more clearly the ingenuity of Herodotus' narrative art.

Acceleration of the narrative pace<sup>11</sup> is an important reason for the brevity of the speech.<sup>12</sup> A longer speech would further delay the narration of the battle of Salamis. Among other passages, the catalogue of the Greek forces (8.42–48), the divine signs (64–65), and the exchanges between Themistocles and Aristides (79–80) have already held up the battle for quite some time. It is, however, mostly the Greek and Persian debates that significantly slow down the narrative.<sup>13</sup> Herodotus avails himself of the chance to explore freely the dynamics of deliberation in Greece and Persia before a crucial engagement. We experience recurring debates among the Greeks regarding where the fight should take place;<sup>14</sup> while on the Persian side, Herodotus relates Xerxes' inquiry into the opinions of his generals on whether a battle with the Greeks would be expedient,

<sup>11</sup> On narrative pace/duration (the relationship between discourse time and story time) see G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca 1980) 86–112, and *Fiction and Diction* 63–64. On Herodotus' handling of time see T. Rood, "Herodotus," in I. J. F. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2007) 115–130.

<sup>12</sup> On the importance of regulating narrative pace for the choice of different speech modes in Herodotus see de Bakker, *Speech and Authority* 39–44.

<sup>13</sup> Narrative retardation is typical of Herodotean battle narratives. It occurs at Marathon, Thermopylae, and Plataea.

<sup>14</sup> See Hdt. 8.49 (resumed at 56), 59–63, 74, 78 (resumed at 81).

and Artemisia's lengthy speech in response (8.67–69).

The retardation of the narrative has also increased the suspense for the reader—a technique Herodotus inherited from Homer and is particularly fond of.<sup>15</sup> While the Greeks seem to be unable to make up their minds and are constantly wavering between Salamis and the Isthmus, and while Themistocles is operating backstage (secretly communicating with the Persians), readers are left wondering whether the Greeks are ever going to agree, whether Themistocles' plan to entice the Persians into surrounding the Greeks at Salamis will prosper, and whether—and if so when—an actual battle will take place.<sup>16</sup> It is finally time for some action, and now the focus turns fully to the battle. Another long piece of rhetoric at this point would be wearisome. Herodotus' choice serves the economy of his narrative<sup>17</sup> and speeds things up, while making sure that readers do not lose interest. Homer demonstrates a comparable concern for narrative pace in his use of indirect discourse.<sup>18</sup> In the

<sup>15</sup> On suspense in Homer see A. Rengakos, "Spannungsstrategien in den homerischen Epen," in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of D. N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart 1999) 308–338; J. V. Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection. False Predictions in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor 1992); cf. I. J. F. de Jong, "Homer," in *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* 17–37, at 22–28. For Herodotus see A. Rengakos, "Epic Narrative Technique in Herodotus' *Histories*," *SemRom* 4 (2001) 253–270, at 261–268, and "Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides," in *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Geneva 2006) 183–209, at 191–207 (Hdt. Books 7–9); I. J. F. de Jong, "Aspects narratologiques des *Histoires* d'Hérodote," *Lalies* 19 (1999) 217–275, at 242–251 (specifically in the story of Adrastus at 1.34–35).

<sup>16</sup> Rengakos, *SemRom* 4 (2001) 266–268, and in *La poésie épique grecque* 199–202, emphasizes fear of the Persians as another central motif that contributes to suspense in all major battle narratives, including Salamis.

<sup>17</sup> According to de Bakker, *Speech and Authority* 36–38, Herodotus' concern with narrative economy is best demonstrated by his using indirect speech when referring to speeches already quoted in direct discourse earlier in the work.

<sup>18</sup> See S. Richardson, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville 1990) 79: "But when the words are irrelevant and a directly quoted speech would distract from

context of the Funeral Games in *Iliad* 23, Diomedes encourages Euryalus and wishes him victory in his fight against Epeius (23.681–682), but we are not given the content of his speech because, as Richardson observes, “[s]uch a speech at this point in his narrative would be intrusive and slow down the progression of the scene ... The scene is centered on the boxing match, not on any conversations about it.”<sup>19</sup>

Despite the shortness of the passage, Herodotus may still be playing with readers’ expectations and creating a feeling of suspense in a more implicit manner. A closer look at his narrative habits can help elucidate this point. He sometimes provides indications of the content of a speech in the narrative by way of preparation for the ensuing version of the speech in direct discourse.<sup>20</sup> He does so, for example, in the case of the Spartans when they call on their allies to support the reinstatement of Hippias in Athens (5.91–92), as well as the Athenians when they openly ask for Spartan help (9.7). Along similar lines, since the historian singles out Themistocles’ speech and briefly delineates its essence, a reader alert to the subtleties of Herodotus’ narrative strategy might perceive this as a sort of introduction to a direct speech to follow.<sup>21</sup> But such potential anticipation is swiftly disappointed, as what comes straight after is the long-awaited actual fighting (8.83.2).

Herodotus’ decision to present a compact version of Themistocles’ exhortation, which accelerates the pace of the nar-

---

the flow of the scene, he informs us only of the intended meaning of the speech, that the character swore or commanded or praised. The report of speech is one of a battery of summaries that the narrator has in store to keep the action flowing continuously without going into detail.”

<sup>19</sup> Richardson, *Homeric Narrator* 79.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the Homeric strategy of using indirect speech to prepare for the direct speech which follows, e.g. *Il.* 20.364–372. On this narrative ploy see I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987) 117; Richardson, *Homeric Narrator* 74.

<sup>21</sup> Note also that the word ἔπεια, albeit accompanied by τότε, is sometimes used to introduce a direct speech, e.g. *Hdt.* 3.21.1, 128.4; 5.56.1.

rative,<sup>22</sup> points to and is facilitated by his and the audience's familiarity with hortatory and similar epideictic motifs. It is generally accepted that Thucydides inaugurates the genre of battle exhortation, but most of the arguments and motifs are already there in Homer, martial elegy,<sup>23</sup> tragedy,<sup>24</sup> and also Herodotus (e.g. 6.11.2–3; 9.17.4). Despite the scarcity of evidence for contemporary oratory, we do come across a few epideictic examples from the fifth century: Antiphon's *Tetralogies* (mid-fifth century; blend of epideictic and judicial oratory), Gorgias' *Palamedes* and *Helen* (also blends of epideictic and forensic elements) as well as the *Funeral Oration* (all three most likely dating to the last third of the fifth century), the fragments of Pericles' Samian funeral oration in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle (440/39 B.C.), and Pericles' funeral oration in Thucydides (431 B.C.). Most importantly, Loraux has argued that the funeral oration took its official form in the 460s and underwent only minor changes from the fifth into the fourth century.<sup>25</sup> We also know that in the context of the democratic city, opportunities for epideictic as well as the other kinds of oratory multiplied.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Note that the pace was already accelerated with ποιησάμενοι (with no finite verb), on which see Bowie, *Herodotus* 173: "the plural participle seems to be hanging, but H. writes as if a number of speakers were about to be listed and their performances judged (note the position of μέν after εὖ ἔχοντα not προηγόρευε), but does not consider them worth mentioning."

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Tyrtæus frs.10–12 W. and Callinus fr.1 W. For elegy and its relation to Homer see J. Latacz, *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios* (Munich 1977); E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge 2005) 22–29, 35–62.

<sup>24</sup> There are exhortations embedded in long battle descriptions in messengers' speeches or in choral lyric, e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 400–405, Eur. *Heracl.* 824–829. On exhortation in tragedy see J. de Romilly, *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide* (Paris 1956) 116–123.

<sup>25</sup> N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1986) 56–76.

<sup>26</sup> See C. Carey, "Epideictic Oratory," in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford 2007) 236–252, and briefly S. Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford 1999) 349–352.



Herodotus and his audience then must have been well versed in these kinds of arguments.<sup>27</sup> Starting with Thucydides, the historians acknowledge that elements inherited by tradition constitute the raw material on which every harangue is built and are still current in similar circumstances.<sup>28</sup> Thucydides famously recognizes the themes as commonplaces when, reporting Nicias' hortatory speech at 7.69.2, he comments: "he said other things too, the things that men can be expected to say when they are actually on the edge of the event and do not bother to avoid giving the impression of using conventional language (ἀρχαιολογεῖν); instead they bring forward the kind of appeals that can generally be used on all occasions." In a similar vein, Polybius frequently uses the expression τὰ πρέποντα τῷ καιρῷ/τοῖς καιροῖς, "words suitable to the occasion" (usually with παρακαλῶ),<sup>29</sup> just as Diodorus employs expressions like τοῖς οἰκείοις λόγοις, "the appropriate words" (with παραθαρσύνω, παρακαλῶ, etc.).<sup>30</sup>

Themistocles' speech under consideration here is a key example of a corresponding level of awareness in Herodotus. Summarizing the content of the speech, Herodotus states that it foretold victory; that it was a comparison of the better and worse in human nature and condition; and that Themistocles eventually urged the Greeks to choose the better. Readers are merely told that the speech was built upon a series of antitheses, but no further detail is given as to what those better and worse aspects are. In fact, any extra piece of information

<sup>27</sup> On Herodotus' familiarity with epideictic topics see e.g. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* 198; E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* II (Halle 1899) 219–222; W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* II (Oxford 1912) 198; J. B. Bury, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (New York 1909) 63–64; Flower and Marincola, *Herodotus* 152–153.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Pritchett, *Essays* 106.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Polyb. 1.60.5; 2.64.1. T. Rood, "Polybius," in *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives* 147–164, at 161, summarily reviews this expression in speeches in Polybius as a technique to avoid including secondary narratives.

<sup>30</sup> E.g. Diod. 13.98.1; 15.74.5; 19.81.6.

would be redundant precisely because the basic content of a harangue was familiar. Herodotus knows, therefore, that the audience can easily improvise the speech. In all probability, it involved the most common harangue antitheses, such as victory vs. defeat, freedom vs. slavery, bravery/glorious death/honour vs. cowardice/shameful death/disgrace. Herodotus' choice to withhold the details of the speech seems then to serve a triple purpose. First, hereby he admits knowledge of traditional and current exhortation and epideictic themes, and thus also establishes a link between his work and previous as well as contemporary literature and rhetoric. Second, he develops a kind of dialogue with his readers as they are, in a sense, invited to flesh out the exhortation for themselves. In this context, Macan's attempt to reconstruct the content of the speech<sup>31</sup> is perhaps the best example of reader engagement that Herodotus might have in mind. Third and relevant to narrative pace as discussed above, Herodotus spares his audience well-known *topoi* whose repetition would be tedious.<sup>32</sup>

Mindful of his readers' reaction, Herodotus deploys strategies that can engage their attention. Leaving it to his readers to make the connections and fill in the gaps, he implicates them directly in the process of signification and interpretation.<sup>33</sup> By indirectly drawing in other literary genres, Herodotus further invites readers to see the relationship between these genres and his own work, and encourages them to use other literature to better understand his work. It has become a *topos* of recent scholarship that Herodotus' work possesses dialogic qualities, to a variable degree, primarily on account of his juxtaposing diverse sources, voices, and viewpoints and thereby generating

<sup>31</sup> Macan, *Herodotus* 488, attempts to restore the general schema of the speech, spots omissions in it as it stands, and conjectures on its potential impact upon the audience.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 263.

<sup>33</sup> For other types of audience engagement in Herodotus see e.g. E. Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford 2008), on disclosing motivation.

a dialogue with his readers.<sup>34</sup> Herodotus' interaction with previous and contemporary rhetorical models, as well as the interaction with his readers in sketching out Themistocles' speech, reaffirms the dialogic character and openness of his narrative.

That Herodotus suppresses hortatory motifs in the speech of Themistocles does not mean that he avoids such motifs altogether. Similar *topoi* recur in the *Histories*, but the historian manipulates their use. Hortatory motifs have been employed earlier and will be employed later in the work:<sup>35</sup> Dionysius of Phocaea (6.11.2–3), Miltiades (6.109.3–6), Xerxes (7.53), Harmocydes (9.17.4), even the Tegeans and Athenians in their dispute before the battle of Plataea (9.26–27), all make use of hortatory *topoi*. Among others, appeals to courage, patriotism, and a common cause, references to the ancestors and the gods,

<sup>34</sup> On the dialogic nature of Herodotus' *Histories* see C. Dewald, "Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*," *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 147–170, "The Figured Stage: Focalizing the Initial Narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides," in T. M. Falkner et al. (eds.), *Contextualizing Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue. Essays in Honor of John J. Peradotto* (Lanham 1999) 221–252, "'I didn't give my own genealogy': Herodotus and the Authorial Persona," in E. J. Bakker et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden 2002) 267–289, and "Paying Attention: History as the Development of a Secular Narrative," in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 2006) 164–182, at 180–182; cf. D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989) 31; L. Kurke, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton 1999) 29; C. B. R. Pelling, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London 2000) 83; D. Boedeker, "Herodotus's Genre(s)," in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2000) 97–114, at 111–113, and "Pedestrian Fatalities: The Prosaics of Death," in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and his World. Essays for a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford 2003) 17–36, at 30–31; S. Goldhill, *The Invention of Prose* (Oxford 2002) 28, 30; E. T. E. Barker, "Paging the Oracle: Interpretation, Identity and Performance in Herodotus' *History*," *G&R* 53 (2006) 1–28, and *Entering the Agon. Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy* (Oxford 2009) 147–148, 201–202.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. K. H. Waters, *Herodotus the Historian* (London 1985) 10.

and the theme of slavery vs. freedom feature in all these rhetorical pieces of direct discourse.<sup>36</sup> Another direct speech displaying comparable arguments in a narrative already loaded with speeches would not serve the narrative economy and would sound overwhelmingly repetitive rather than luring readers into reading further.

Be that as it may, one might still think that Herodotus is missing here a very good chance to further develop Themistocles' characterization as an adept orator by putting forceful patriotic words into his mouth and amplifying the contrasts that his speech entailed.<sup>37</sup> I would make two points regarding this 'missed chance'.

First, a careful look at the wider context of the battle narrative shows that Themistocles has already uttered an old-

<sup>36</sup> E.g. 6.11.2, ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἢ εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἢ δούλοισι, "Men of Ionia, our affairs are balanced on a razor's edge; we can remain free or we can become slaves"; 6.109.5, θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων οἰοί τε εἰμὲν περιγενέσθαι τῇ συμβολῇ, "if the gods are fair, we can win the battle"; 7.53.1, ὦ Πέρσαι, τῶνδ' ἐγὼ ὑμέων χρηίζων συνέλεξα, ἄνδρας τε γενέσθαι ἀγαθοὺς καὶ μὴ καταισχύνειν τὰ πρόσθε ἐργασμένα Πέρσησι, ἐόντα μεγάλα τε καὶ πολλοῦ ἄξια ... ξυρὸν γὰρ πᾶσι τοῦτο ἀγαθὸν σπεύδεται, "Men of Persia, I have convened this meeting to ask you to prove your bravery and avoid disgracing the important and valuable achievements of our predecessors ... for the noble aim we are striving to achieve concerns everyone of us alike"; 9.17.4, κρέσσον γὰρ ποιεῦντάς τι καὶ ἀμυνομένους τελευτήσαι τὸν αἰῶνα ἢ περ παρέχοντας διαφθαρῆναι αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ, "it is better to die actively defending ourselves than to submit to the utter disgrace of presenting oneself meekly for slaughter."

<sup>37</sup> For the importance of speeches for characterization see e.g. L. V. Pitcher, "Characterization in Ancient Historiography," in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* I (Oxford 2007) 102–117, at 107–110, and the brief comments of Marincola, "Speeches in Classical Historiography," in *Companion* 118–132, at 119–120. On Herodotus' interest in characterization, including his use of speeches, see e.g. E. Badian, "Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences," in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford 1994) 107–130; J. Marincola, *Greek Historians* (Oxford 2001) 43–48; Flower and Marincola, *Herodotus* 9–16; cf. briefly S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (Baltimore 1987) 57.

fashioned speech where it would be most effective. He addresses it to Eurybiades in the council of the Greek generals, trying to persuade him of the suitability of Salamis for a naval battle against the Persians (8.60α-γ). The speech—itsself an interesting blend of deliberative and exhortatory argumentation—is framed by two hortatory motifs: it opens with an appeal to save Greece<sup>38</sup> and concludes with a reference to the gods. The argument from patriotism is also repeated halfway through the speech: “you will put the whole of Greece in danger.” A similar argument is involved in Themistocles’ appeal to the Ionians in the Persian fleet after the battle at Artemisium. The appeal takes the form of a message, inscribed on the rocks of Euboea, which invites the Ionians to remember their Greek origin and not to help subjugate Greece (8.22).

Second, even though Herodotus denies Themistocles an elaborate hortatory speech, the suppressed speech we get may still be construed as a piece of characterization which sustains Themistocles’ portrayal in the *Histories*. Herodotus depicts him as a skilled orator, clever and insightful, but also a master trickster, self-interested, and expert in rhetorical manipulation and backstage dealings; his personality is a mix of idealism/patriotism and individualism.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Themistocles’ words ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἐστὶ σῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα (“it is now in your power to save Greece”) with Miltiades’ ἐν σοὶ νῦν, Καλλιμάχαε, ἐστὶ ἢ καταδουλώσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ἐλευθέρας ποιήσαντα (“it is now in your power, Callimachus, either to enslave Athens or to make it free,” 6.109.3).

<sup>39</sup> On Themistocles’ ambivalent character and behaviour in the *Histories* see C. W. Fornara, *Herodotus. An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford 1971) 66–72. On his character as a reflection of Athenian character in the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars see Immerwahr, *Form and Thought* 223–225; D. Konstan, “Persians, Greeks and Empire,” *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 59–73, at 72; R. V. Munson, “Artemisia in Herodotus,” *ClAnt* 7 (1988) 91–106, at 99–102; W. Blösel, “The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: A Mirror of Fifth-century Athens,” in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001) 179–197, and *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 2004) (rather than a blend of positive and negative features, Blösel sees a change from positive to negative in Themistocles’

We can consider briefly how this picture is adumbrated. Twice before the Persian Wars, Themistocles persuades the Athenians of the soundness of his advice—which is eventually proved valuable: he convinces them to invest the money from the mines at Laurium in building a navy;<sup>40</sup> he then provides them with the most compelling interpretation of the oracle of the “wooden wall” with his suggestion that it refers to the fleet.<sup>41</sup> At Artemisium, the Euboeans bribe Themistocles to convince the Greeks to fight the enemy there. He achieves this by buying off Eurybiades, commander-in-chief of the Greeks, and Adeimantus, the Corinthian commander, making both think that the money comes from Athens—the greatest part of the money Themistocles keeps for himself (8.4–5). The Artemisium narrative provides still further evidence of his oratorical skills when he employs a strategy with two alternative ben-

---

attitude after the battle of Salamis). For a detailed exploration of Themistocles' complex motivation in the *Histories* see Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative* 289–322 (esp. 318: “The emerging impression of Themistocles' motivation is one of complexity and studied ambivalence, which encourages readers to engage with the issues and paradoxes involved”). Specifically on Themistocles' skilled use of speech in the debates before the battle at Salamis see de Bakker, *Speech and Authority* 107–113; C. B. R. Pelling, “East is East and West is West—Or are They? National Stereotypes In Herodotus,” *Histos* 1 (1997) 51–66, at 57, and “Speech and Narrative in the *Histories*,” in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006) 103–121, at 110–112. On Themistocles as a trickster figure in Herodotus see C. Dewald, “Practical Knowledge and the Historian's Role in Herodotus and Thucydides,” in M. H. Jameson (ed.), *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga 1985) 47–63, at 53–55.

<sup>40</sup> Hdt. 7.144.1, τότε Θεμιστοκλέης ἀνέγνωσε Ἀθηναίους τῆς διαίρέσιος ταύτης παυσαμένους νέας τούτων τῶν χρημάτων ποιήσασθαι διηκοσίας ἐς τὸν πόλεμον, τὸν πρὸς Αἰγινήτας λέγων, “Themistocles had persuaded them to drop this idea of sharing the money out and to use it instead to build two hundred ships for the war, mentioning the war against Aegina.”

<sup>41</sup> Hdt. 7.143.3, ταύτη Θεμιστοκλέος ἀποφαινομένου Ἀθηναῖοι ταῦτα σφίσι ἔγνωσαν ἀρετώτερα εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ τῶν χρησιμολόγων, “the Athenians decided that Themistocles' explanation of the oracle was much more preferable to that of the official interpreters.”

efits:<sup>42</sup> his message to the Ionians fighting with Xerxes (in summary: “either join us or remain neutral, and ask the Carians to do the same; if you cannot do either and you must fight against us, fight badly,” 8.22) aims at either making the Ionians unite with the Greeks or slandering them to Xerxes, whenever the message was reported to him, so that upon hearing it he would bar them from battle (8.22.3, cf. 8.19.1).

Themistocles’ rhetorical and advisory competence and his capacity for deception are fully unfolded at Salamis. When the Greek generals resolve to fight at the Isthmus and dissolve their meeting, the Athenian Mnesiphilus points out to Themistocles that Salamis is a better choice as it would forestall fragmentation of the Greek forces. Themistocles, appropriating Mnesiphilus’ advice for himself, convinces Eurybiades to convene another conference for the purpose of reconsidering their decision (8.56–58). In narrating that conference, Herodotus draws attention to how Themistocles adeptly substituted the argument about fragmentation with a more suitable, but equally important, argument for the strategic significance of the narrows of Salamis.<sup>43</sup> That Themistocles sets the pros of Salamis

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Bowie, *Herodotus* 113: “The use of inscriptions to communicate with the Ionians is a striking conceit, befitting the trickster Themistocles.” D. Steiner, *The Tyrant’s Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton 1994) 153, adds a different dimension to Themistocles’ trickiness in this passage. Identifying writing (in this case “written dispatch and letters”) with tyrannical power and Persia, Steiner argues that, in conveying his message publicly and in Greek terms while using a barbarian medium of communication, Themistocles cleverly exploits the links of his Ionian addressees with both the Greeks and the Persians, and uses barbarian technology against the barbarians and to the benefit of the Greeks.

<sup>43</sup> Hdt. 8.60.1, πρὸς δὲ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην ἔλεγε ἐκείνων μὲν ἔτι οὐδὲν τῶν πρότερον λεχθέντων, ὡς ἐπεὰν ἀπαείρωσι ἀπὸ Σαλαμῖνος διαδρήσονται· παρεόντων γὰρ τῶν συμμάχων οὐκ ἔφερε οἱ κόσμον οὐδένα κατηγορεῖν· ὁ δὲ ἄλλου λόγου εἶχετο, λέγων τάδε, “to Eurybiades he used none of the previous arguments, that the fleet would disperse once they left Salamis, because it would have been unbecoming to accuse any of the allies to their very faces. Instead he tried a different approach.”

against the cons of the Isthmus (8.60α-γ) indicates his ability to employ antithetical arrangement effectively (ἀντίθετος γὰρ ἐκάτερον ἀκούσας). Met with Adeimantus' insults, Themistocles brings into play the threat of fragmentation by declaring the Athenians' determination to withdraw if the allies do not agree to fight at Salamis (8.62.2). Hereupon Eurybiades gives in to Themistocles and the debate is cut short. Soon, on hearing the news of the building of a wall at the Isthmus, the Greeks wish to revisit their decision in a new conference, at which point Themistocles secretly informs the Persians that the Greeks are planning to leave Salamis (8.74–75). Enclosed by the Persian fleet, the Greeks get ready to fight at Salamis.

After the battle, while the Greeks pursue the enemy, they debate about their next move at Andros. Themistocles argues for reaching the Hellespont and breaking the Persians' bridges, but, when the opposite opinion of the majority prevails, he shifts course (8.109.1, μεταβαλὼν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους) and tells the Athenians that this was his personal viewpoint all along (8.109.3–4). Herodotus comments that with this speech Themistocles was deceiving the Athenians (Θεμιστοκλῆς μὲν ταῦτα λέγων διέβαλλε, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπείθοντο), who readily trusted him because “he already had a reputation as a man of some ability, but now that his competence had been demonstrated beyond a doubt, and his advice had been proved sound, they were ready to do anything he said” (8.110.1). The author interprets this speech as Themistocles' attempt to “lay the foundation for a future claim upon Xerxes, in order to have someone to turn to in the event of his getting into trouble with the Athenians” (8.109.5). In addition to this, Themistocles sends Xerxes a deceitful message announcing that he himself stopped the Greeks from pursuing the Persian fleet (8.110.2–3). Herodotus goes on to relate that, later, Themistocles tried to extort money from Andros and other islands by threatening to lead the Greek fleet against them (8.111–112).

How does Themistocles' brief exhortation under scrutiny here contribute to his portrayal in the *Histories*? Regarding his rhetorical charisma, Herodotus provides us with hints which focus attention on Themistocles' ability to use diplomatic spin



and manipulate his audience.<sup>44</sup> First, other generals gave pep talks too, but Herodotus, in a very selective manner, singles out Themistocles' speech from the rest for including an argument which the other speeches did not, the prediction of victory (8.83.1, προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλήης). This also explains Herodotus' decision to report Themistocles' speech only. The mention of victory is a clever rhetorical choice as it can significantly contribute to encouraging the soldiers faced with such a formidable and numerically superior opponent. Themistocles clearly can choose the argument which is more likely to have the greater impact upon the particular audience. And even if we take the arguably hazy phrase εὖ ἔχοντα only to mean "the best/finest speech" or something along these lines,<sup>45</sup> or if we accept Macan's suggestion that ἐκ πάντων might signify that Themistocles "was chosen or allowed to speak out of and on behalf of all,"<sup>46</sup> this does not change the fact that Themistocles' speech is singled out in the narrative.

Next, Themistocles' use of antithetical arguments (8.83.1, τὰ δὲ ἔπεα ἦν πάντα <τὰ> κρέσσω τοῖσι ἥσσοσι ἀντιτιθέμενα, ὅσα δὴ ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσι καὶ καταστάσι ἐγγίνεται) is indeed typical of hortatory speeches, but it is also one of the most fashionable rhetorical trends in Herodotus' time and points to a sophistic type of argumentation<sup>47</sup> which further highlights

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative* 308: "When the time comes to address all the Greek fighters before the battle of Salamis, the admiral again displayed his skill at choosing the right speech for the occasion, excelling all others with the patriotic harangue which Herodotus summarizes (8.83)"; Macan, *Herodotus* 488: "it was no doubt a short speech, though not so short as this brief summary, or 'concept' thereof; but the speaker was evidently no mean orator ... The whole speech left upon the hearers' minds the sense of confidence, courage, ability, intellectual force."

<sup>45</sup> On the different interpretations see 463 above.

<sup>46</sup> Macan, *Herodotus* 487. Cf. Powell's translation, "Themistocles was chosen to pronounce the exhortation": J. E. Powell, *Herodotus II* (Oxford 1949).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of*

Themistocles' oratorical skills. Finally, the repetition of ἐσβαίνω (8.83.2, ἐσβαίνειν ἐκέλευσε ἐς τὰς νέας. καὶ οὔτοι μὲν δὴ ἐσέβαινον)<sup>48</sup> may be taken to emphasize Themistocles' ability to persuade: as soon as he orders the men to embark on the ships they obey him. Herodotus does not let anything intervene between Themistocles exhorting the men to board the ships and them doing so. And having seen Themistocles' rhetoric in action elsewhere in the work, readers can easily imagine here his use of similarly skilled rhetoric, whose style and content suit the audience and occasion.<sup>49</sup>

---

*Persuasion* (Cambridge 2000) 266: "An echo of the Protagorean claim to be able to make the weaker argument the stronger may perhaps be visible in Herodotus' description of Themistocles' speech in which he persuades the Greeks to fight: 'His speech throughout contrasted the greater features which occur in human nature and the human condition, with the weaker'"; and 249–269 on Herodotus' use of antithesis in relation to the scientists and sophists of his time. On the associations between Herodotus and his intellectual environment generally see R. Fowler, "Herodotus and his Contemporaries," *JHS* 116 (1996) 62–87, and "Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors," in *Cambridge Companion* 29–45; Thomas, *Herodotus in Context* 266, and "The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus," in *Cambridge Companion* 60–75; K. A. Raaflaub, "Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Times," in *Brill's Companion* 149–186; S. Scullion, "Herodotus and Greek Religion," in *Cambridge Companion* 192–208; J. Romm, "Herodotus and the Natural World," in *Cambridge Companion* 178–191; S. Forsdyke, "Herodotus, Political History and Political Thought," in *Cambridge Companion* 224–241. On Herodotus' relationship to the sophistic movement see A. Dihle, "Herodot und die Sophistik," *Philologus* 106 (1962) 207–220; V. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton 1982); F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus. An Essay on the Interpretation of the Other* (Berkeley 1988).

<sup>48</sup> Note the climactic force of ἐσβαίνειν after καταπλέξας; the message of Themistocles' speech is now given in a nutshell.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Thucydides' selectivity in reporting certain speeches but not others; e.g. in the Mytilenean debate (3.46–49) he recounts only the speeches of Cleon and Diodotus. There are also cases when a single paradigmatic speech can stand in for other similar speeches, e.g. "Cnemus, Brasidas, and the other Peloponnesian commanders ... said the following" (2.86.6); cf. how Thucydides' one description of the plague enables readers to comprehend the other instances of plague that befell Athens, which he mentions

Oratorical skills aside, there is another way in which the speech may feed into the Herodotean picture of Themistocles. Not allowing Themistocles a longer speech might imply a tacit judgement on his character: while Herodotus recognizes and emphasizes that Themistocles is a successful orator and an insightful general, he cannot picture him as a great patriot and hence as the right person to encourage the troops. Themistocles is evidently responsible for maintaining the unity of the Greeks and putting an end to repetitive and protracted discussions which lead nowhere. But in doing so, he overrules free debate. He even communicates with the Persians repeatedly. This is his way, and, so far as Salamis is concerned, this is apparently the only way that can get things done.

‘Silencing’ Themistocles on this occasion brings out his attitude and backstage maneuvers at Salamis all the more, and provides a more dramatic result. His attitude is defined as one of blackmail, deceit, and coercion; and his speeches revolve around these themes. The narrative exposes Themistocles’ opportunism and calculating nature, which undercut patriotic arguments at every step: as soon as patriotism proves ineffective with Eurybiades and the Greeks, it is quickly replaced by a threat. Such words as freedom, honour, and bravery would have sounded at least suspect, if not meaningless, in the mouth of Themistocles, a man who is always thinking of his personal interest even when he is thinking of the common interest. In such pressing circumstances, just before Salamis, Herodotus might prefer not to fracture the high solemnity of the moment. At this point, despite all the difficulties and disagreement, the Greeks have finally managed to unite in order to fight the Persians. And it is primarily on account of their victory at Salamis

---

but does not describe. On his selectivity in reporting speeches see Hornblower, *Thucydides* 56, and *Commentary* I 225, II 221, 284; T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998) 137 and n.16; cf. E. Greenwood, “Making Words Count: Freedom of Speech and Narrative in Thucydides,” in I. Sluiter and R. M. Rosen (eds.), *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden 2004) 175–195, at 192.

that the Athenians became, in Herodotus' view, the "saviours of Greece" (7.139.5–6).

But Herodotus may be up to something else here too. He may well be touching on a wider theme which goes beyond Themistocles. In particular, I suggest that, in reporting Themistocles' speech, Herodotus may be taking a critical stance toward Greek infighting during and after the Persian Wars, and an agonistic stance toward contemporary rhetoric. Taking into account the earlier and contemporary conflicts among the Greeks, Herodotus could be criticizing the employment of high-minded arguments by Greeks in such circumstances. By exposing the largely artificial character of typical patriotic motifs time and again,<sup>50</sup> the narrative of the *Histories* shows how difficult it is for the Greeks to work toward a shared goal. I shall mention two indicative cases. The first is the Athenian definition of Greekness: ἀὐτίς δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὼν ὁμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα, "then there is the Greek nation, the community of blood and language, temples and ritual, and our common customs" (8.144.2). This definition sounds rather disingenuous, as it is framed by arrogant assertions; it only follows the proclamation of retribution for the burnt Athenian temples and divine statues, and it is part of a speech which reads very much like an encomium to Athens.<sup>51</sup> The second example comes from the narrative of the battle of Plataea. A range of epideictic motifs, in the form of paradigms taken from the remote and recent past, features in the speech of the Athenians to secure their precedence over the Tegeans in the battle line while at the same time showing off their devotion to the common Greek

<sup>50</sup> On ambiguity of motivation in Herodotus see Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative*. On the contested value of noble (esp. mythical) motivation in Herodotus see V. Zali, "Agamemnon in Herodotus and Thucydides: Exploring the Historical Uses of a Mythological Paradigm," *Electra* 1 (2011) 61–98 (<http://electra.lis.upatras.gr/index.php/electra/article/view/57>), at 63–80.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Bowie, *Herodotus* 235–236.

cause (9.26–27).

To return to Salamis, the opinions of the Greeks, guided by personal advantage, are divided between fighting at Salamis and at the Isthmus. Fear of the Persians makes them consider fleeing, and quite a few in fact do flee. Those who remain are held together not by any high values or ideals but by backstage dealings and coercion. Themistocles forces them to fight at Salamis and has the Persians encircle them with their ships. That the Greeks do not even trust Aristeides, the “best and most honourable man in Athens” (8.79.1, ἄριστον ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἐν Ἀθήνησι καὶ δικαιοτάτον), bringing the news of the Persian blockade, until his report is corroborated by Tenian eyewitnesses (8.79–83.1), is further suggestive of the problem of Greek unity.

Against this background of fragile Greek unity, lingering on patriotic slogans *just before* the battle of Salamis would not seem appropriate, while altruistic arguments would have perhaps struck readers as empty or at best dishonest. In that sense, Themistocles’ suppressed exhortation, placed at such a crucial narrative juncture, could be seen as complementing the function of other, longer pieces of direct discourse. This suppressed exhortation is for Herodotus an entirely different, and subtle, means of alerting his audience to the trickiness of rhetoric. It allows him to avoid drawing too much attention to Themistocles’ rhetoric while still exposing its tricky nature. The use of *παραινέσας*—the same verb that describes Harmocydes’ exhortation with its traditional motifs (9.17.4, 18.1)—may be a nudge to readers to observe the suppression of epideictic motifs here. Also relevant is the fact that there is not one proper exhortation before the other great battles of the Persian Wars, Marathon, Thermopylae, Plataea, and Mycale. These comparable cases of suppression of epideictic motifs demonstrate that, in the midst of disagreements and successive debates, there is neither time nor particular interest in haranguing the troops by recycling all too familiar honourable arguments of questionable sincerity.

Scholars have long acknowledged the competitive culture in

which Herodotus was writing, part of which was an on-going rivalry between his work and both literary models and contemporary intellectual developments.<sup>52</sup> As mentioned above, in the mid-fifth century and the time of Herodotus all types of rhetoric, and notably epideictic rhetoric, develop progressively. For Herodotus, who composed his work in this environment and was familiar with epideictic motifs, suppressing Themistocles' speech may be a way of positioning himself in relation to current oratorical practices to which near contemporary examples from poetry also testify. Herodotus may thus be seen here to comment on the nature of his own work and his role as a historian.

Grethlein has recently read the Syracusan embassy scene (Hdt. 7.153–163) and the exchanges between the Athenians and the Tegeans at Plataea (9.26–27) as metahistorical commentaries on the use of the past in deliberative and epideictic oratory that contrasts with Herodotus' own use of the past. In sum, Grethlein contends that “[t]he integration of speeches that reveal the deficiencies of their approach to the past helps to throw into relief the superiority of the *Histories*, which uses the past not so much to glorify and to legitimize but to shed critical light on the present.”<sup>53</sup> I would propose that the suppression of epideictic motifs in Themistocles' brief exhortation may contribute to a similar purpose, especially if the previous link between the speech and Greek interstate fighting is taken into consideration.

Contemporary epideictic oratory is limited to a specific context and intends to make an argument. The motifs employed are thoroughly filtered, carefully selected from a pool of *topoi* and adapted or manipulated accordingly. Epideictic oratory is

<sup>52</sup> See esp. G. E. R. Lloyd, *The Revolutions of Wisdom* (Berkeley 1987); Fowler, *JHS* 116 (1996) 62–87, and in *Cambridge Companion* 29–45; Thomas, *Herodotus in Context*, and in *Cambridge Companion* 60–75. On inter-generic competition see esp. Boedeker, in *Matrices of Genre* 103–108.

<sup>53</sup> J. Grethlein, *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge 2010) 158–187, quotation at 173.

distinctly one-dimensional and its purpose is not to open up but to close down readings. The audience is not given the chance to compare different arguments but is presented with one argument that cannot be challenged.<sup>54</sup> Herodotus' text, by contrast, does not address any specific circumstances, has a wide temporal and spatial scope, and does not have one particular purpose. His audience is invited to compare and contrast, and to work through the text in a variety of ways. At a metahistorical level, Herodotus may be suggesting that his history is both different from contemporary rhetoric and more valuable, in that it contests the sincerity and usefulness of epideictic motifs and uncovers their tricky nature. The *Histories* is likewise more helpful in that, being a dialogic text, it invites readers to discover for themselves the vagueness of such arguments and develop a more critical approach toward relevant pieces of rhetoric instead.

Given that Themistocles has been considered the embodiment of the Athenian ambivalent attitude during and after the Persian Wars, Herodotus may equally be targeting specifically Athenian funeral speeches whose emphasis on the Athenians' service to Greece is combined with the exaltation of Athens above all other Greeks to corroborate hegemonic claims.<sup>55</sup> This kind of understanding fits well with other rhetorical examples in the *Histories* where self-seeking comes before noble aspirations. Whilst demonstrating familiarity with and making use of epideictic themes, and whilst his purpose is partly epideictic in the sense that he is to an extent concerned with morality and with conferring praise or blame,<sup>56</sup> Herodotus envisages himself

<sup>54</sup> See e.g. S. Perlman, "The Historical Example, its Use and Importance as Political Propaganda in the Attic Orators," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7 (1961) 150–166; I. Worthington, "History and Oratorical Exploitation," in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London 1994) 109–129; Grethlein, *The Greeks and their Past* 105–125.

<sup>55</sup> See e.g. Isoc. *Panegyricus*.

<sup>56</sup> There is however a notable difference in Herodotus' and the orators' conferral of praise. The orators' praise is partisan and simplifying. In the

as offering his readers the chance to see through and beneath the use of epideictic rhetoric by setting the speeches against the narrative.<sup>57</sup>

To conclude, Themistocles' exhortation deserves more attention than it has so far attracted; when set in context, it presents us with a range of interpretative challenges. This piece of rhetoric helps move the narrative forward, arrests readers' attention, and involves them fully in the unfolding events. It also connects Herodotus dialectically both to past and contemporary literature and rhetoric, and to his audience who are encouraged to reinvent what Themistocles might have actually said. The speech even fleshes out Themistocles' characterization as a skilful orator and a shrewd and highly opportunistic individual. Read alongside other epideictic pieces of rhetoric in the *Histories* and against pieces of contemporary epideictic rhetoric, the speech may be taken as part of Herodotus' attempt to criticize the use and sincerity of epideictic motifs, particularly against the backdrop of inter-Greek fighting. Hereby Herodotus demarcates his own work and use of rhetoric as well as highlighting the merits of his own approach—a critical approach which he prompts his readers to imitate by allowing

---

*Histories* the bestowal of praise (patently reminiscent of Homeric *kleos*) is much more complicated and qualified, with commendable featuring alongside reprehensible attitudes and deeds, and with readers invited to move beyond a simple contrast between praise and blame. On praise and blame in Herodotus, especially in conjunction with motivation, see Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative*, esp. chs. 5–7.

<sup>57</sup> For other metahistorical readings see M. R. Christ, "Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry," *CLAnt* 13 (1994) 167–202, and J. Grethlein, "How Not to Do History. Xerxes in Herodotus' *Histories*," *AJP* 130 (2009) 195–218 (they juxtapose Herodotus' methods of investigating and reporting events with those of his monarchs); E. Baragwanath, "The Mythic Plupast in Herodotus," in J. Grethlein and C. B. Krebs (eds.), *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge 2012) 35–56 (Herodotus' use of the mythical plupast vs. that of his characters). For metahistorical readings of speeches in ancient historiography generally see the essays in *Time and Narrative* and in D. Pausch (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* (Berlin/New York 2010).



them to take an active part in extrapolating meaning. Pieces of rhetoric quoted in indirect discourse and as briefly as Themistocles' hortatory speech may still be handy instruments in Herodotus' narrative toolbox.<sup>58</sup>

*June, 2013*

Dept. of Greek and Latin  
University College London  
London WC1E 6BT, U.K.  
v.zali@ucl.ac.uk

<sup>58</sup> I wish to thank Steven Colvin, Simon Hornblower, Jessica Priestley, Tim Rood, and Ed Sanders for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. I am also indebted to the editors of *GRBS* and the anonymous referee whose sharp observations significantly improved the paper.