Note also that *bello Persico* is not followed by the adjective *secundo*, since Roman historians usually considered the first Persian War to be a background or prelude to the second (main) Persian War (cf. Moggi, *Guerre* 13‒4; the expression *Bello Medico primo* at Amm. 27. 1. 3 is an historical mistake, as Ammianus apparently confused the Ionic Revolt with the first Persian War).

**Xerxes:** son of Darius I and King of Persia from 486 to 465.

**et mari et terra:** rarer than *terra marique*. It is attested only in Nepos (*Them.* 2. 4; *Alc*. 1. 2;6. 2 with *neque*; *Ham.* 1. 2; *Hann.* 10. 3) and Seneca (*epist.* 101. 4; cf. Lupus 75 and Levi 373‒4, Nepos uses *terra marique* only at *reg.* 1. 3).

**bellum universae inferret Europae:** on *bellum inferre*,cf. *Milt.* 3. 1. After the Battle of Salamis, the second Persian War began to be regarded not only as a war of ʻrevengeʼ against Athens because of Dariusʼ defeat at Marathon but also as an attempt to conquer the whole of Europe beginning with Athens and Greece (cf., as a preliminary survey, Cassola 13‒4).

**cum tantis copiis, quantas...habuit quisquam:** a vexed passage. The most authoritative manuscripts *Dan.* P A have *cum tantis copiis quantas*, accepted by modern editors with the exception of Malcovati, who preferred *cum tantis eam copiis invasit* of R F. This last reading seems, however, a *lectio facilior* since it simplifies the structure of the whole period. The perfect indicative *invasit* interrupts, in fact, the long sequence of three narrative clauses (*cum...inferret*; *cum...esset perlata et...dicerentur*) by arranging two shorter periods: the first from *Nam cum Xerxes* to *quisquam*, the second from *huius de adventu* to *de rebus suis* (an aside on the size of Xerxesʼ army, from *huius enim* to *milia fuerunt*, interrupts the narrative linearity in both the traditions). Sequences of two or more *cum* clauses are well attested in Nepos (e.g. *Paus.* 5. 1; *Pelop.* 2. 5).

**tantis copiis, quantas:** a correlative structure which Nepos uses elsewhere at *Att.* 20. 5.

**neque ante nec postea:** rare temporal expression (both *ante* and *postea* are here adverbs). It elsewhere recurs only at Plin. *nat.* 26. 61; 27. 79; 28. 184; 30. 87 (without *neque*); Flor. *epit.* 1. 61.

**2. 5. (huius enim classis mille et ducentarum…quam duo milia…sequebantur:** according to Nepos, the Persian fleet had 1,200 warships (on *navium longarum* cf. following note) and 2,000 transport vessels (cf. above n. 2. 5 to *onerarium*), an approximation of the 1,207 ships recorded both by Aesch. *Pers.* 341‒3 and Herod. 7. 89. 1; 184. 1. Herodotus recorded (7. 184. 3) that the Persian fleet also had 3,000 penteconters. The same tradition was followed by Lysias (2. 27; cf. Todd 235), who recorded 1,200 warships, and by Isocr. 4. 93; 97; 118 (but cf. 12. 49, where the warships increase to 1,300 units, cf. Marzi 196 n. 98). Diodorus Siculus argued that the sum of Persian warships exceeded 1,200 (11. 3. 7: νῆες δὲ αἱ σύμπασαι μακραὶ πλείους τῶν χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων; Diodorus also provides a catalogue of ships according to nationalities, but with several inconsistencies highlighted by Haillet 123 n. III. 4). Beside this fleet, Diodorus recorded (11. 3. 9) 3,000 triaconters (in contrast to the penteconters mentioned by Herod. 7. 184. 3), and 850 vessels for the transport of horses. Ctesias of Cnidus recorded 1,000 triremes (fr. 13. 27 Lenfant), whereas Plato cited more then 1,000 (*Leges* 3. 699b). These differences indicate that the size of Xerxesʼ fleet was already a vexed issue among Greek sources, and it remains impossible to deduce which figure is the most plausible. Neposʼ source was very likely Ephorus based on similarities with Isocrates, who, according to tradition, was Ephorus’ teacher, …

**2. 7. Id responsum quo valeret cum intellegeret nemo:** double anastrophe, the first between *id responsum* and *quo*, and the second between the indirect interrogative and the narrative. According to Herod. 7. 142, the Athenians provided two divergent interpretations of the oracle. Some of the *ecclesia* argued that the Pythia was suggesting that they barricade themselves inside Athens, because the ξύλινον τεῖχος referred to the old palisade that surrounded the Acropolis. Conversely, other members of the *ecclesia* explained the oracle as an exhortation to prepare the fleet. Themistocles was the one who tipped the balance in favour of this second reading, since he gave a more persuasive interpretation of the last two lines of the Delphic oracle, which referred to Salamis: ὦ θείη Σαλαμίς, ἀπολεῖς δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν / ἤ που σκιδναμένης Δημήτερος ἢ συνιούσης. The episode is also recorded by Plut. *Them.* 10, but Plutarch ‘desacralizes Herodotusʼ account, attributing the success of Themistoclesʼ interpretation not to his wisdom in understanding the oracle, but to his ability to manipulate the godʼs words to meet his own goalsʼ (so Stadter 87; see also Dempsey 85‒90; Musnick 55‒63; Fontenrose 124‒8; Piccirilli‒Carena‒Manfredini1 244; Kindt 167‒8).

**consilium esse Apollinis, ut in naves se suaque <omnia> conferrent:** the inelegant syntagm *consilium esse* + *ut*/*ne* is well attested since Ter. *Phorm.* 934 (*TLL* V col. 444, 67‒74). Guillemin2 prefers *navis* of Q, a late *testimonium*, so as to follow Neposʼ taste for archaisms, but here the variant is not adequately supported by the manuscript tradition or by the context (same situation at *Them.* 2. 8). The sequence *se suaque*, with alliteration, is also attested at *Them.* 2. 8; *Epam.* 4. 4; 8. 1, and it mainly occurs in Caesar (nine times) and Livy (seven occurrences). The *iunctura* with *confero* elsewhere recurs only in Caes. *Gall.* 2. 13. 2; 3. 28. 2; 6. 10. 2 (*TLL* IV col. 183, 36‒7). The semantic similarities between these two parallels suggest the disappearance of *omnia* from Neposʼ text, and it seems confirmed also by the parallelism with *Them.* 2. 8, where the same syntactic structure and context occurs: *suaque omnia, quae moveri poterant...deportant*.

**eum enim a deo significari murum ligneum:** *significare* here has the particular meaning of ʻto show, recommendʼ (OLD pp. 1758‒9 *s.v.*; Cortese 171). According to *TLL* IV col. 444, 58‒66, it is introduced by the previous *consilium esse*, following a common syntactic structure already attested at Plaut. *Epid.* 163; *mil.* 344; *most.* 866, but a *variatio* with the previous *ut in naves se suaque conferrent* suggests that *significari* might be taken with *persuasit*.

**2. 8. tali consilio probato:** the opening ablative absolute (common in Nepos, cf. n. on style) suggests that an assembly of citizens approved (*probare*) Themistoclesʼ plan (*consilum*) and made it official. The analysis of the nearly 40 occurrences of the syntagm *consilium probare* in the Latin literature, included the *locus parallelus* in *Dion.* 8. 3, apparently confirms this interpretation (cf. Muccioli 262‒3 n. 77). Neposʼ version is clearly an *unicum* among literary sources, since he is apparently the only ancient author (still preserved) to date the evacuation of Athens before the fall of Thermopylae. Nepos, moreover, is the first extant author to argue that Athenians sought refuge on Salamis and in the town of Troezen. These two destinations are recorded only by Ael. Arist. p. 2, 256 Dindorf = p. 192, 3–6 Jebb, who specifies that women and children were moved to Troezen, but old men to Salamis. Other ancient authors, however, differ: i) Salamis, Aegina, and Troezen in Herod. 8. 41. 1; ii) only Salamis in Ctesias *FGrHist* 688 F 13 (30); Lys. 2. 34; Isocr. 4. 96; Aeschyn. Socr. p. 34 Krauss; Lycurg. *in Leocr.* 68; Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 116; Diod. 11. 13. 4; Plut. *Arist.* 10. 7; *Schol.* Aristoph. *Equit.* 1040; *Schol.* Demost. 19. 303; iii) only Troezen in Demosth. *epist.* 2. 18‒9; Hyper. 3. 33; Cic. *off.* 3. 48; Ael. Arist. p. 1, 225‒6 Dindorf = p. 139, 19‒21 Jebb, that oddly contradicts what he has told in Ael. Arist. p. 2, 256 Dindorf = p. 192, 3‒6 Jebb; iv) Front. *strat.* 1. 3. 6 and Plut. *Them.* 10. 6 mention Troezen and other ʻunspecified placesʼ. The hypothesis that Nepos misunderstood his model and made an historical mistake is too simple and, maybe, uncritical. Neposʼ version, in fact, has several points in common with the so-called ʻDecree of Troezenʼ (EM 13300 = SEG 22:274), also known as ʻThemistoclesʼ Decreeʼ. It is a marble stele, broken at the bottom and partially damaged on the left side, conveying a text of at least 50 lines, that was found in 1959 by a local farmer probably on the site of the ancient ἀγορά of Troezen. It was moved to the National Archaeological Museum in Athens and first published in 1960 by M. H. Jameson. Some scholars, following Jamesonʼs hypothesis, argue that the decree is the adaptation of an original document of the fifth century BC, re-written in the late fourth century BC in order to celebrate a renewed alliance between Athens and Troezen. By contrast, other scholars assert that it is a forgery of the late fourth century BC, composed by combining extracts of texts from different sources and written to invoke a stronger political alliance between Athens and Troezen against a common enemy, probably Philip II in the Macedonian invasion (a summary of the copious bibliography is provided in Asheri‒Vannicelli1 368‒9). Nepos and the text of the decree agree on the following points: i) the proposal to evacuate is ascribed to Themistocles and voted by a popular assembly (*Them.* 2. 7/ll. 2‒3); ii) the Athenians moved to Troezen and Salamis (*Them.* 2. 7/ll. 8‒11); iii) the Athenian fleet comprised 200 ships (*Them.* 2. 8/ll. 14 and 37); iv) the announcement and the evacuation are dated before the naval battle of the Artemisium (*Them.* 3. 1/ll. 41‒4; a similar tradition also appears in Philochoros of Athens, an Attidographer of third century BC, who described the devotion of Xanthippusʼ dogs: they followed him by swimming close to the ship that was sailing to Salamis; cf. *FGrHist* 328 F 116). Nepos, however, does not mention any marble stele and he probably relies on an intermediary source that followed the same historical tradition also attested in the decree of Troezen. Several scholars have tried to identify Neposʼ source. Huxley G. proposed Kleidemos from Athens, an Attidographer of the fourth century BC, whereas Burstein 95 n. 11 supposed Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 116), mainly on the basis of the passage concerning Xanthippusʼ dogs. Hammond, *Themistocles* 91 proposed Damastes of Sigeum, Greek geographer and historian contemporary of Herodotus, pupil of Hellanicus of Lesbos. These hypothesis are all extremely compelling, but barely provable: Damastes, Kleidemos, and Philochorus never appeared in other passages of Neposʼ *Liber.* By contrast, Hignett 463, Maddoli, Braccesi 26, and Bradley persuasively argued that Nepos summarized Ephorus here. In fact, if we focus on the sources for Themistoclesʼ biography, we will note that each of the first six chapters of Themistoclesʼ biography are reliant mainly on an Ephorean tradition, whereas the remaining four strictly follow Thucydides.