RHETORICAL INTENT IN ANCIENT HISTORIOGRAPHY: HERODOTUS AND THE BATTLE OF MARATHON

RICHARD LEO ENOS

Throughout history the credibility of Herodotus’s account of the Persian wars has been reviewed with skepticism by both ancient and modern scholars. Yet, such criticism, particularly that of contemporary researchers, has refused to consider rhetoric as a possible explanation for Herodotus’s historiography. Drawing from his account of the Battle of Marathon, this study indicates how Herodotus’s bias against the Persian Empire prompted a pro-Athenian perspective. Most importantly, Herodotus’s intent, evident throughout his account of the Battle of Marathon, was to unobtrusively establish a construct of values that would function as a standard for the diverse views of Hellenic civilization. Herodotus initiated a tradition of a persuasive style of historiography that would be of impact to such historians as Isocrates, Ephoros, and Theopompos, who would consciously incorporate principles of rhetoric into their writings for the purpose of fostering panhellenism. In this respect, Herodotus can be considered not only the father of history, but also the father of rhetorical historiography, for the perspective of his account reveals the first conscious attempt by a major Greek historian to relate events in such a manner that they direct individuals toward adopting a predetermined attitude.

“Several individuals,” wrote Plutarch, “have been thoroughly deceived by the style of Herodotus... but even more people have suffered through his character” since his writing “is the pinnacle of malice.” Throughout history the credibility of Herodotus’s account of the Persian wars has been reviewed with skepticism similar to Plutarch’s by critics of no less eminence than Thucydides and Diodorus Siculus. Criticism of Herodotus’s work has not been limited to ancient scholars, for contemporary researchers have often regarded much of his geographical, statistical, and historical accounts as spurious. Yet, scholars have been reluctant to consider rhetoric as a possible explanation for Herodotus’s historiography. H.R. Immerwahr, for example, has argued that as an archaic historian, Herodotus would have been...
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unaware of the rhetoric which influenced the later classical period. In fact, the consensus is best summarized by the Greek historian G.T. Griffith, who argued that "Rhetoric in the normal sense of the word as it applied to Greek prose writers, passed him by — thank goodness." If, contrary to the notions of Immerwahr and Griffith, rhetoric can have meaning other than formulaic techniques employed to attain stylistic eloquence, and can be considered more an intentional use of language to secure conviction of a certain perspective, then rhetoric can provide insight of theoretical import in understanding ancient works.

Such perplexing observations as those indicated above have summarily ignored a possible explanation for Herodotus's style; namely, that he wrote with a rhetorical intent which permeates his entire work. Herodotus wrote his histories decades before the formulaic devices of rhetoric would direct literary and oral expression; yet, the historiography of Herodotus reveals an intent and purpose which is rhetorical in the most generic sense. Herodotus was not so much attempting to persuade his listeners of the authenticity of his accounts, as to synthesize historical events into a perspective which would prescribe and direct a compelling course of action. Herodotus's accounts are lessons which entail guidelines for directing future action, and it is in this sense which Herodotus's works can be considered rhetorical. An understanding of this viewpoint will not only provide new insights to Herodotus's objectives, but will illustrate how rhetoric was employed. In brief, the implications of this study are intended to indicate that rhetorical intent and strategies can be found in works which were previously excluded from examination. Such an examination will aid in acquiring a more complete knowledge of the pervasiveness which rhetoric enjoyed in all modes of expression in antiquity. Such a perspective is nowhere more evident than in Herodotus's account of the Battle of Marathon.

Herodotus's rhetorical intent is best understood by examining the nature of his historiography and world view. Herodotus developed and transmitted his historiography from the Ionian alphabetic script which evolved out of an oral tradition. As a lecturer, Herodotus traveled throughout Greece, reviving, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus affirms, the epic tradition which characterized Homeric literature. As a beneficiary of the tradition of early Ionian logographers, Herodotus continued the custom of transmitting and preserving his account by recording "tales" or "speeches" [kóyoi] within his writings. Such an orally based tradition was certainly understandable, as early Greeks habitually read literary works aloud. In effect, the written script of the Greek phonetic alphabet, which evolved from Phoenician sources, primarily developed in Ionia. In fact, the Ionic alphabet, which such Eastern Greek historians as Herodotus used, was officially adopted in Athens during the archonship of Euclides in B.C. 403. For more detailed observations consult: Alfred Fairbank, The Story of Handwriting: Origins and Development (New York: Watson-Guptill Publications, 1970), pp. 36, 39; Maurice Pope, The Story of Archaeological Decipherment: From Egyptian Hieroglyphs to Linear B (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), pp. 181-183; Berthold Louis Ullman, Ancient Writing and Its Influence (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1969), pp. 23-31.
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fect, Herodotus consciously incorporated oral techniques, which received their philological genesis from Homeric bards, into his accounts.

Herodotus's techniques or "oral" historiography also convey his world view, and aid in understanding the objectives of his rhetorical intent. The implicit rhetorical intent of Herodotus lies with his perception of the forces which dictate events, and one of the dominant forces of causality is the course and intent of human conduct. Thus, it is in the portrayal of human causality, and the proper code of conduct, that Herodotus reveals his rhetorical intent, for his objective is to define persuasively the parameters of laudable human action which will function as a construct of societal values.

As a historian, Herodotus was recounting events which were of first-hand familiarity to many of his contemporaries, and those listeners who fought at Marathon would certainly inhibit an unbridled distortion of events. In fact, Herodotus's opening statement attempts to define the province of his work; specifically, "that the great and won- drous accomplishments demonstrated by the Greeks and Barbarians, and particularly that the reason for their confrontation, may not go unnoticed." Herodotus flourished during the popularity of the First Sophistic, and may even have been an associate of Protagoras, but no indication of their cultural relativism is evident in his works. Rather, Herodotus persists as an archaic historian with the readily apparent Homeric characteristic of praising moral worth on either side of the battlefield. Ethics, law, and custom were not transitory to Herodotus, and laudable conduct by Persians is dutifully acknowledged. Yet, to assume that overt praise of Persian action indicates a lack of bias would retard recognition of both his perspective and his rhetoric; for, despite the appearance of objectivity, Herodotus's intent is concealed by an unobtrusive rhetoric.

The intent and perspective of Herodotus's accounts are more fully realized through an awareness of his personal experiences with the Persians, for the life of Herodotus provides grounds for an established bias against "Barbarians." Herodotus was born into a noble family at the colony of Halicarnassus, but strife under the tyrant Lygdamis caused Herodotus to flee the Eastern despotism which oppressed his native city. Furthermore, Lygdamis ordered the murder of Panyassis, a relative of Herodotus; an action which doubtlessly influenced Herodotus's decision to help expel Lygdamis from his homeland. One of the most recurrent themes in Herodotus's account of the Persian wars is the antithetical portrayal of Eastern despotism and Greek freedom. For Herodotus, the Persian domination and enslavement of Ionian Greeks violated the right of autonomy and compelled retribution by Greek brethren. Herodotus's portrayal of these diametrically opposed cultures clearly establishes the Persians as tyrannical anti-models and makes apparent the need for retaliatory action, since all Greeks would choose democracy over "Barbarian" despotism.

The bias of Herodotus extended beyond his animosity toward Eastern despotism, the hallmark of the Persian Empire, for his Hellenic ties weighed heavily toward Athenian
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culture. Herodotus considered Athens as not only the parent state of all oppressed Ionians, but also a model city which had overthrown its own despotic tyrants and replaced them with a system which provided genuine freedom for all citizens. In fact, Herodotus believed that it was only after Athens managed to establish a free political system that she began to manifest her true greatness.

Herodotus's identification of the linguistic and cultural similarities shared by the Ionian Greeks and the Athenians, as well as Athens's emerging hegemony, eliminates any wonder why Herodotus would state that "anyone who says that the Athenians became the saviors of Hellas is not departing from the truth." For Herodotus, Persian tyranny threatened to enslave not only all Ionia and Athens, but all Greece.

The personal misfortune which Herodotus experienced under the shadow of Persian rule was a direct antithesis to the freedom and encouragement which he later received from Athens. When Herodotus fled Halicarnassus, a leading Ionian city, he settled in the Athenian colony of Thurii, and soon developed an affinity with the mother city. As an intellectual center of Greece, Athens attracted the most prominent Hellenic scholars. Lecturing in Athens, Herodotus gained recognition as a prominent educator, developed a friendly relationship with Sophocles, and became one of the city's eminent "honorary citizens." Herodotus's historical accounts, which were primarily written in the Ionic dialect, are believed to have been presented to Athenian listeners at the Panathenaea in B.C. 446/445. In brief, it is difficult to imagine how Herodotus could be objective when comparing Athenians with Persians, especially since, as John L. Myres argued, "Herodotus neither spoke Persian nor travelled much, if at all, in Persia." Herodotus's personal experiences with Eastern despotism, the likelihood of his intellectual affiliation with Athens, his possible unfamiliarity with the Persian language, the Athenian audience to whom the work was at least partially directed, and his knowledge of Greek literature all indicate grounds for an established bias in favor of Athens. Moreover, it would be only natural that Herodotus should isolate and give primacy to the Athenians as the representatives of Hellenism. In contrast to the diversity of Greek cities, where mores were modified with every polis, the Persians presented a relatively well-defined social structure. Through his account of Athenian action against Persian despotism, however, Herodotus was able to portray Athens as a model for all Hellas. Thus, the Battle of Marathon, which isolated an almost pure Athenian-Persian confrontation, provided Herodotus with an opportunity to persuasively present his assessment. Herodotus's observations of these two cultures are presented throughout his work and reveal values that aid in determining the perspective and direction of his rhetorical intent.

Herodotus drew sharp contrasts between the political sophistication of Athens and Persia. When the Athenian runner Philippides beseeched the Spartans to aid against the oncoming Persian invasion, the herald pleaded "not to permit the most time-honored city in all Greece to be betrayed into slavery by a barbarian culture." "Bar-
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barian" became a constant synonym for the Persian governmental structure. Although the Persian Darius emerged as a king in a society that held vacillating desires toward democracy, oligarchy, and monarchy,26 his autocratic rule could not be favorably regarded by a Greek who was well aware of the oppression of tyrants. It is no wonder that A. Andrewes wrote that "even a good ruler, like Darius I, who appreciated the quality of the Greeks, could never become their friend as Croesus had been."27 The Greek Herodotus could see little dignity in a political structure which allowed a king to be chosen by stroking a horse,28 and "held counsel on the most serious matters while intoxicated."29

Herodotus's dislike for Persian rule was noticeably contrasted with his high regard for the Athenian political system; in fact, his description of Athens's political structure reveals his rhetorical intent. "Athens, which had once been great," wrote Herodotus, "gained even further greatness when the tyrants were deposed."30 It was this freedom from autocratic rule that compelled Herodotus to regard Athens as "by far the foremost" in political sophistication, and enabled him to clearly define the protagonist and antagonist.31 The Persians were despotic, materialistic, conquering relentlessly and crushing Ionian revolts ruthlessly. Athens, however, threw off this type of oppression over her own society, and rose up to liberate Greece from the threat of similar subjugation. For Herodotus, this act "clearly demonstrates that when they [the Athenians] were suppressed they allowed themselves to become cowardly, since they served a despot, but once they attained their freedom each one eagerly desired to accomplish as much as he could."32 It was in the Battle of Marathon that these two political ideologies and cultures clashed in what Herodotus called a question "either to be free or to be enslaved."33

The implications of this confrontation became apparent when the Athenian general Miltiades hit upon the political stasis of the Battle during his attempt to persuade the polemarchos Callimachus to attack the Persian forces: "if they [the Athenians] should submit to the Medes, they will surely suffer, since they will be surrendered to [the despot] Hippias, but if they prevail the city will come to be regarded as the foremost city of Greece."34 Both Persians and Athenians regarded the office of general as military and political.35 In the Persian military state the generals were appointed and suspended by Darius,36 while in Athens, Miltiades could emerge as a general "by the election of citizens."37 Prior to the Battle, the ten tribal Athenian generals, or strategoi, were divided as to whether to risk a battle with the powerful Persian forces. At the time of such a stress-filled situation, with the awesome Persian forces only a few miles away, one might expect either an illegal seizure of power by one of the generals or desertions by the tribes. Yet, through persuasion, Miltiades could take his case to the polemarchos and win the deciding vote to fight. Even more incredible is that with this decision each one of the strategoi, even those "who wished to assume command," immediately yielded his command privileges to Miltiades.38

Herodotus's account reveals that the atmosphere and act of resolving differences and securing a course of action fostered a persuasive climate. A course of action which was established in a crisis situation was arrived at through the acceptance of the most credible opinion. In brief, the spirit of free choice was upheld and encouraged even in dire circumstances. For Herodotus, the Athenian mentality assumed that parity need not
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be sacrificed to authoritarian submission for the sake of expediency. Moreover, even with the supreme command, Miltiades would not attack until the day of his generalship arrived — such a situation would be unheard of within the Persian ranks. Herodotus's point is clear: Darius's argument for the supreme command of one man rested on what he considered to be the inherent value of expediency in an autocratic state.

Yet, Herodotus demonstrated that free men, even in a battle situation, could still exercise the expediency required, but within the construct of a society devoid of tyranny.

The Persians and Athenians differed not only in political sophistication but also in culture. Possessing no images of their gods, temples, or even altars, the Persians dismissed the human characterization of Athenian gods as pure folly. Persian culture emphasized horsemanship, archery, and a superiority to the rest of mankind. Furthermore, the Persians often drank excessively, adopted foreign customs readily, and believed the most disgraceful acts were telling a lie and owing a debt. Through a herald named Tomyris, the Persians are portrayed as expansionistic and militaristic, and a people who "will do anything rather than be at peace." In essence, Herodotus portrayed Persian culture as an imperialistic and militarily oriented society which was subject to the dictates of an absolute ruler who encouraged an attitude of arrogant superiority over other cultures.

Conversely, Herodotus's account portrayed an Athenian culture which markedly emphasized a different set of social norms; norms much more akin to his Hellenic listeners. Herodotus contrasted this Athenian-Eastern standard in the first book when the sage Solon met the Lydian King Croesus. Solon's explanation to Croesus of why Tellus of Athens was the "happiest" man allowed Herodotus to present a construct of the Athenian value system. In the words of the Athenian lawgiver, Tellus was the "happiest" man because:

Tellus's city was well off and his children were beautiful and virtuous, and he saw all these children give birth and become fully established; but this man, having as prosperous a life as any of us, culminated his life in a most magnificent manner, for during a battle between the Athenians and the neighboring Eleusinians, he hastened into battle and put the enemy to flight; after which, he died most honorably and the Athenians gave him a public burial and greatly honored him at the very site where he fell.

Generations later, Aristotle would praise Solon in the Ethica Nicomachea for his superior analysis of these intellectual and moral virtues which constitute "happiness." A superiority which, for Herodotus, escaped the Persian mentality.

Through this speech by Solon, and Herodotus's praise of the Athenian lawgiver, we are offered an insight to the values praised by the author. Admittedly, other value systems, such as the "Persian," were described throughout his work, but these alien cultural systems were presented by Herodotus as curious behavior. Only when alien values such as wisdom and bravery, were lauded in Athens, were they openly praised by Herodotus. Analyzing Herodotus's account of the Athenian role in the Battle of Marathon demonstrates the author's perspective. First, even though Sparta was unable to give support because of a religious festival and Aegina had submitted to the Persian forces, Athens became "directly motivated." It was Athens which temporarily assumed the role of protector and, according to Andrew Robert Burn, literally rushed twenty-six miles to answer the battle cry. Second, although Herodotus gave no figures regarding the size of the two armies, he did imply that the Athenians...
nians were decidedly outnumbered. The disproportionate odds, compounded by a succession of Persian victories, due to their alleged military superiority, provided a suitable arena for the Athenians to practice their values. It is no wonder that Herodotus wrote that “prior to this, the Greeks shuddered at even hearing the name ‘Medes.’”

The complete victory of the Athenians at Marathon fulfilled Solon’s expressed ideal values. As in Solon’s earlier description of Tellus, the Athenians at Marathon came to the assistance of their state when threatened, and succeeded in routing the enemy. The Athenians were equally quick to label those whom they thought would side with the Persians, as in the case of the Aeginetans, as traitors to Greece. Like Tellus, “many other famous Athenians” gloriously perished in battle and were highly honored; in this case the honor came from the late-arriving Lacedaemonians. To their own credit, the same battle-weary Athenians marched from Marathon to the defense of their city immediately after the fight. Herodotus’s description of these Athenian soldiers exemplified many of Solon’s qualifications that lead to “happiness.” In contrast, the materialistic “Barbarians,” routed and killed in flight by the disciplined Athenian forces, presented little for Herodotus to praise.

The final contrasting Athenian-Persian value was the solidarity of purpose through unification. In this respect, the Athenians not only surpassed the Persians, but all other Greeks as well. Prior to the Athenian-Persian confrontation at Marathon every other Greek polis had failed to defeat the Persians. The underlying theme in each one of these events was the failure of the states to unite. This lack of unity was emphasized by Herodotus. The author considered Thrace, excluding the Indians, the largest group of people in the world, “and if they were ruled under one

individual or possessed a solidarity [of purpose] against their opponents, I believe that they would be invincible and would be considered the mightiest nation of all.” Yet, because these Thracians could not unite, they became easy prey for the Persian commander Megabazus. Like the Thracians, the Ionians failed to break the bonds of Persian control primarily because they lacked unity. The Samians and Ionians were also incapable of ordering their forces and, at the Battle of Lade, deserted in the face of the Persian fleet. Although submission to Persian forces was detested, Herodotus demonstrated that Greeks such as the Aeginetans lacked solidarity of purpose and were forced to give “earth and water to Darius” in submission. Even mighty Sparta suffered from a dual kingship based on maternal indecision. The result was that Sparta’s powerful army was often nullified and misdirected by strife; exemplified by the divided kingship of Cleomenes and Demaratus.

Herodotus, however, presented the Athenian forces as the unifying power against Persian despotism. Athens herself was not absolved from internal disunity, for the strife between the Alkmeonidai and Philaidae severely arrested the direction of the city during the crisis. There is little wonder that Andrew Robert Burn would write, “Everyone knew that there were divisions in Athens. The Alkmeonidai, jealous of Miltiades, were in touch with Hipparchos.” Yet, although the political strife at home may not have been completely resolved, it was to the credit of the Athenians that they alone were the first Greek state to present a substantially united force against the Persian army. The ability of the Athenian generals to cast aside their divided opinions and willingly unite against the Persians epitomized the Athenian solidarity of purpose which was instrumental in their victory. In the speech convincing the polemarchos Callimachus to cast his deciding vote to fight, Miltiades eloquently pleaded for the unified commitment which would bring victory: “if we engage them [the
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Persians] before any corruption can emerge in some Athenians, let the gods deal with us fairly and we will prevail in this encounter."

The solidarity of purpose seen in the Athenian forces was contrasted with Herodotus's portrayal of the Persian army. If the Persian army could be called united, the construct of their unity was established upon different premises than those of the Athenian forces. Where the Athenians had a vested interest in defending their homeland, the Persians and Ionians were compelled to fight because of the imperialistic design of their absolute ruler. Contrasted with the Persian allies, the Plataeans freely chose to ally with the Athenians at Marathon. Those Greeks who allied with the Persians, however, were often forced to fight against their brethren because of their submission to Persian tyranny. Herodotus explained that all Greeks were united by the common brotherhood of language, religion, and character, but, it was the solidarity of purpose exhibited by the Athenians that allowed them to gain the first major reversal in the war. In brief, Herodotus revealed an Athenian spirit of unity which manifested itself in a virtuous and united defense of freedom and ultimately emerged as one of the prime forces in their victory at Marathon.

Throughout Herodotus's works the Greek world witnessed the emergence of a unified Athenian power which checked the Persian threat and eventually led the Greek states to complete victory. At the conclusion of the work, the Spartans, regarded as the guardians of the Hellenic world, were anxious to return home and set sail for Greece. The Athenians, however, doggedly pursued the enemy until the Persians were completely vanquished. Out of Herodotus's account, the Battle of Marathon became not only the pivotal point of the war, but also an arena in which Athens could dramatize the most positive aspects and fundamental qualities for a coherent Greek value system. Herodotus's contrast between both the polis against the awesome Persian Empire and freedom against tyranny lauded Athens as the new emerging force of Greek unity.

Hellenic literature, consistent with its Homeric tradition, continually demonstrated a world view that emphasized shame and honor rather than guilt and grace; that is, self-perception was subordinated to the image perceived by others. Herodotus's intent, evident throughout his account of the Battle of Marathon, was to unobtrusively establish a construct of values that would function as a standard for the diverse world views of Hellenic civilization. In this respect, Herodotus demonstrated Athenian valor in such a manner that Athenian actions at Marathon could be perceived by Greek listeners as a personification of the panhellenic standard of excellence. In brief, Herodotus initiated a tradition of a persuasive style of historiography that would be of impact to such historians as Isocrates, Ephoros, and Theopompos, who would consciously incorporate principles of rhetoric into their writings for the purpose of fostering panhellenism. In view of these events, Herodotus can be considered not only the father of history, but also the father of rhetorical historiography, for the perspective of his account reveals the first conscious attempt by a major Greek historian to relate events in such a manner that they direct individuals toward adopting a predetermined attitude.
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