THEMISTOCLES' SPEECH BEFORE SALAMIS: THE INTERPRETATION OF HERODOTUS 8.83.1

With the dawn of the day of the Battle of Salamis in ch. 83 of Book 8, Herodotus heightens the tone of his language. An unfortunate result of his more elaborately worked writing has been failure to understand his words, and hence much misplaced editorial intervention.[1] In particular, the words at 8.83.1, προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλέης, have regularly been mistranslated. Powell even wanted to rewrite the Greek here to read: ἠγόρευε μὲν πρὸ πάντων Θεμιστοκλέης ('And Themistocles was chosen to pronounce the exhortation').[2] Few would wish to follow such a drastic and arbitrary alteration of the transmitted text, but the conjectural emendation highlights the difficulty of understanding Herodotus' words at this point.

The normal modern rendering of the words in question is: 'Themistocles spoke well, better than all the others';[3] 'per tutti parlò in modo acconcio Temistocle';[4] 'Thémistocle, entre tous, prononça une belle harangue';[5] 'Themistocles made an harangue in which he excelled all others';[6] 'speeches were made to them, of which the best was that of Themistocles'.[7] The earliest example of a translation along these lines that I have found is that of P. E. Laurent: 'Themistocles made an harangue, the most encouraging of all the captains'.[8] Before that there was more variety, e.g. 'Themistokles stellte ihnen in einer Rede vor, was jetzt das beste unter allen sei',[9] which I render literally as 'Themistocles presented to them in a speech what now was the best among all things'; and 'Themistocles remonstra que les affairs estoient en tresbonne disposition, et qu'on avoit tresbien pourveu à tout',[10] which we may translate as 'Themistocles demonstrated that their affairs were in a very good state and they had very well provided for everything'. Valla's Latin translation runs thus: 'Themistocles ex omnibus quae expedirent praecipiebat'.[11] This seems to me ambiguous in detail, since *omnibus* could be masculine or neuter, and *expedirent* could mean what was or what would be expedient. Of all the translations I have found,[12] Isaac Littlebury's stands out as something distinctly different: 'Themistocles, having first declar'd the Hopes he had of a prosperous Event, fram'd all his Discourse etc.'.[13]

It is clear from these renderings and the variations among them that there are three Greek phrases or words of which the meaning is doubtful, ἐκ πάντων, εὖ ἔχοντα, and προηγόρευε. I take them in turn.

---

[1] This is clear from Hude's text and apparatus in the *OCT*, but, for an egregious example, see especially J. E. Powell's edition, *Herodotus Book VIII* (Cambridge, 1939).

[2] Ibid. The only justification offered was the suggestion that 'the corruption arose from dittography of -ευε'. The translation is Powell's own; see his *Herodotus* (Oxford, 1949).

[3] David Grene, *The History, Herodotus* (Chicago, 1987).

[4] A. Masaracchia, *Erodoto. La Battaglia di Salamina. Libro VIII delle Storie* (Milan, 1977).

[5] Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Histoires. Livre VIII Uranie* (Paris, 1953).

[6] A. D. Godley, *Herodotus* (Loeb, London and Cambridge, MA, 1925).

[7] G. Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus* (4th edition; London, 1880).

[8] *The Nine Books of the History of Herodotus* (Oxford, 1827).

[9] J. E. Goldhagen, *Herodotus. Neun Bücher der Geschichte* (Lemgo, 1756), but cited from *Klassiker des Altertums*, H. Conrad (ed.) (Munich and Leipzig, 1911), Vol. 2, p. 296.

[10] *Les Neuf Livres des Histoires de Herodote ... traduict ... Pierre Saliat* (Paris, 1556), p. CXCVII retro.

[11] Cited from the printed edition, *Herodoti ... Libri Novem ... interprete Laurentio Valla* (Coloniae, 1562), p. 232.

[12] I do not discuss those which are manifestly inaccurate, or too loose to reveal how the Greek was taken.   [13] *The History of Herodotus* (London, 1709), Vol. II, p. 320.

ἐκ πάντων is an example of ἐκ with a partitive sense.[14] In most of his seventeen uses of the combination ἐκ πάντων/πασέων, Herodotus associates it with a verb of choosing or implied choice, and the one(s) qualified by ἐκ πάντων/πασέων is (are) either the object of that verb or else the subject of a passive verb, e.g. 6.29.1: ... ὡς δὲ ἡ κυρίη ἐγένετο τῶν ἡμερέων τῆς τε κατακλίσιος τοῦ γάμου καὶ ἐκφάσιος αὐτοῦ Κλεισθένεος τὸν κρίνοι ἐκ πάντων ('when the appointed day arrived of both the marriage feast and the announcement by Cleisthenes himself whom he chose out of them all'); 7.40.2: προηγεῦντο μὲν δὴ ἱππόται χίλιοι ἐκ Περσέων πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι· μετὰ δὲ αἰχμοφόροι χίλιοι, καὶ οὗτοι ἐκ πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι ('There led the way a thousand horsemen chosen from all the Persians; after them a thousand spearmen, these too chosen from all'). In such cases the meaning is not in doubt. There are three instances, apart from that at 8.83.1, where the pattern is different: 1.159.1, ἀπικομένων δὲ ἐς Βραγχίδας ἐχρηστηριάζετο ἐκ πάντων Ἀριστόδικος ἐπειρωτῶν τάδε ('when they arrived at Branchidae, out of them all Aristodicus consulted the oracle, putting the following question'); 3.128.1, Δαρεῖος μὲν ταῦτα ἐπειρώτα, τῶν δὲ τριήκοντα ὑπέστησαν, αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἐθέλων ποιέειν ταῦτα. ἐρίζοντας δὲ Δαρεῖος κατελάμβανε κελεύων πάλλεσθαι· παλλομένων δὲ λαγχάνει ἐκ πάντων Βαγαῖος ὁ Ἀρτόντεω ('Darius asked this question, and thirty of the men undertook (the task), each one wishing himself to do it. As they were disputing, Darius restrained them, telling them to cast lots. When they cast lots, out of them all Bagaeus, son of Artontes, won'); 4.139.2, ταῦτα μὲν προσέθηκαν τῇ γνώμῃ, μετὰ δὲ ἐκ πάντων ὑπεκρίνατο Ἱστιαῖος τάδε λέγων ('They added these things to their decision, and afterwards out of them all Histiaeus replied, saying the following'). In all these cases too the meaning is perfectly clear: the words ἐκ πάντων go with the subject of the verb, who is selected 'from all the others'. Since the words at 8.83.1 have the same shape as these three passages, we may definitely conclude that here too πάντων is masculine, and the phrase means 'of all the speakers', 'of all the generals' etc., i.e. 'Themistocles, alone of them all'.

εὖ ἔχοντα is an example of ἔχω meaning 'to be' with an adverb.[15] Herodotus can use the combination of εὖ and the participle of ἔχω quite generally for 'being well', 'being in good condition' etc. So in Darius' speech at 3.82.5 we have πατρίους νόμους μὴ λύειν ἔχοντας εὖ ('not to abolish traditional customs when they are working well'); and at 9.39.1 ὁ δὲ μαθὼν τὴν παραίνεσιν εὖ ἔχουσαν ('and he, perceiving that the advice was well judged'). There are, however, three uses of the expression in 9.26 and 27 which show that the combination can have a more specific sense in a military context. This is the description of the dispute between the Tegeans and the Athenians before the Battle of Plataea about which of them should be stationed on the left wing. (1) The Tegeans state at 9.26.7 πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ εὖ ἔχοντες πρὸς ὑμέας ἡμῖν, ἄνδρες Σπαρτιῆται, ἀγῶνες ἀγωνίδαται, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους (literal translation: 'many contests which were well have been fought by us against you, men of Sparta, and many against others'). (2) The Athenians say at 9.27.4 ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν ἔργον εὖ ἔχον καὶ ἐς Ἀμαζωνίδας τὰς ἀπὸ Θερμώδοντος ποταμοῦ ἐσβαλούσας κοτὲ ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικήν (literal translation: 'another action of ours which was well was against the Amazons, those from the Thermodon river, when they once invaded the land of Attica'), and (3) at 9.27.5 ἡμῖν δὲ εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶ ἀποδεδεγμένον, οἷσπερ (ὥσπερ codd.) ἐστὶ πολλά τε καὶ εὖ ἔχοντα εἰ τέοισι καὶ ἄλλοισι Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἔργου ἄξιοί εἶμεν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας ἔχειν (literal translation: 'but if nothing else had been performed by us, who, if any others of the Greeks, have

[14] J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge, 1938) s.v. ἐκ, V.
[15] Powell, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἔχω, B.2.a.

performed many things which were well, yet especially from the action at Marathon we are worthy to have this honour').[16] Since all these passages in fact refer to military victories, they are more accurately rendered in English as: (1) 'we have fought many victorious battles against you, men of Sparta, and many against others'; (2) 'another victorious action of ours was against the Amazons, those from the Thermodon river, when they once invaded the land of Attica'; and (3) 'but if nothing else had been performed by us, who, if any others of the Greeks, have many victories to show, yet especially from the action at Marathon we are worthy to have this honour'. So it appears that the phrase εὖ ἔχοντα κτλ. was an accepted form of understatement for victory, victorious etc. in battle. We may compare the words given by Xenophon to Cyrus in his speech before Cunaxa, at *Anab.* 1.7.7, ἂν εὖ γένηται ('if I am victorious'), and, for the opposite idea, what he is reported as saying a little earlier, at *Anab.* 1.5.16, κακῶς γὰρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐχόντων ('if our affairs go badly', 'if we suffer a defeat').[17] Another suggestive parallel is Pindar, *Ol.* 5.16-17: εὖ δ' ἔχοντες σοφοὶ καὶ πολίταις ἔδοξαν ἔμμεν.[18] This may be translated 'the victorious are thought to be wise even by fellow-citizens',[19] in accordance with the scholiast's οἱ εὖ δὲ ἔχοντες, ἤγουν οἱ εὐτυχοῦντες, τουτέστιν οἱ νικῶντες.[20] In view of these parallels, εὖ ἔχοντα at 8.83.1, in the context of the Battle of Salamis, should mean 'victory'.

We are left with προηγόρευε. Herodotus uses the word προαγορεύω in two senses, 'to foretell' and 'to order or proclaim'. Powell[21] only assigns two uses to the first category: 1.74.2, Thales' foretelling of the eclipse, and 1.91.4, Apollo's prophecy to Croesus. In both these cases the verb is followed by a future infinitive. The other eighteen uses of the verb in Herodotus, including that at 8.83.1, are all assigned to the second meaning, 'to order or proclaim'. These facts show that 'foretell' is certainly one meaning of προαγορεύω in Herodotus, as it is in other classical authors; e.g. Thuc. 1.68.2; Xen. *Symp.* 4.5, Arist. *Fragmenta* (ed. Rose, Leipzig, 1886) 10.[22] In

---

[16] R. Renehan has argued well and attractively that οἷσπερ should be read instead of ὥσπερ here; see 'Herodotean Cruces', *HSCP* 89 (1985), 25-35, at 29-30. It is certainly true that the use of ὥσπερ here is not parallel to the two other passages put with it in Powell's *Lexicon*, s.v. 1. These are 1.78.1 and 5.53, in both of which ὥσπερ can simply be translated 'as', and has no implication of 'although'. So I cite and translate this passage in accordance with Renehan's emendation.

[17] One may also compare what Clearchus is reported to have replied to Cyrus just before the battle: ὁ Κλέαρχος ... ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει ὅπως καλῶς ἔχοι ('Clearchus ... replied that he was seeing to it that they would be victorious'). Note also Xen. *Anab.* 5.8.26, where the better way to understand καὶ περιεγένετο ὥστε καλῶς ἔχειν is 'and he prevailed so as to be victorious'; cf. F. W. Sturz, *Lexicon Xenophonteum* (Leipzig, 1801-4; reprinted Hildesheim, 1964) s.v. περιγίγνεσθαι; though the erroneous interpretation, 'it turned out so that it was well', is often found; e.g. 'and in the end all was pleasant' (C. L. Brownson, Loeb).

[18] This text is regularly emended; see W. Mader, *Die Psaumis-Oden Pindars (O.4 und O.5). Ein Kommentar* (*Commentationes Aenipontanae* XXIX, Innsbruck, 1990), 88-9; but Farnell's cautious and sensible defence of the tradition is persuasive and attractive; see L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar: Critical Commentary* (London, 1932) 39.

[19] Mader does not think that this gnome refers to the old idea that no one is a prophet in his own country; see 89-90. His reasons are that καί should not be overvalued and that the connection of *polis* and victor runs through the whole poem, but these seem slight compared with the evidence, which Mader himself gives, that πολῖται usually have bad connotations in Pindar, and with the requirement that the gnome have some point and meaning. Mader's commentary is no help on εὖ δ' ἔχοντες, because he accepts the emendation εὖ δὲ τύχοντες, and comments on that.

[20] E. Abel, *Scholia Recentia in Pindari Epinicia* (Budapest and Berlin, 1891), Vol. I, pp. 192-3.

[21] *Lexicon*, s.v.

[22] Compare also the meaning of the noun προαγόρευσις in Arist. *Poetics* 1454 b5: ἀλλὰ μηχανῇ χρηστέον ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, ἢ ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ γέγονεν ἃ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἄνθρωπον

these three examples, as in the two passages of Herodotus assigned to the meaning 'foretell' by Powell, the wording contains an expression of futurity. In choosing, therefore, between the meanings 'foretell' and 'proclaim' for προαγορεύω, the issue is whether the verb must be followed by an expression of futurity in order to bear the sense 'foretell'.

That is evidently what Powell decided, when he composed his *Lexicon*, yet his assignation of one of the Herodotean passages, 3.58.2, to the meaning 'order or proclaim' is certainly questionable. Herodotus' words are καὶ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ ἡ Πυθίη προηγόρευε τοῖσι Σιφνίοισι φυλάξασθαι τὸν ξύλινον λόχον κελεύουσα καὶ κήρυκα ἐρυθρόν. Many translators simply conflate the finite verb προηγόρευε with the participle κελεύουσα. Thus Rawlinson, for example: 'this was what the priestess had meant when she told them to beware of danger from a wooden host, and a herald in scarlet';[23] and De Selincourt: 'so that was what the priestess meant, when she warned the Siphnians to beware'.[24] Since, however, the sense of ordering is expressed by the participle, and since we are dealing with the Pythia, a perfectly possible rendering is that of Henry Cary: 'and this it was that the Pythian forewarned the Siphnians, bidding them beware';[25] and, paradoxically, of Powell himself: 'and this it was that the Pythia foretold the people of Siphnos, when she bade them beware'.[26] If we translate προηγόρευε as 'prophesied' here, which seems to me preferable, we note that it governs a simple object, the relative τό. That should make us chary of assuming that προαγορεύω in Herodotus must be followed by a future infinitive, if it is to mean 'foretell'. So should the usage of other Greek authors.

Pausanias writes at 8.10.5 οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ νίκην τε τοῖς Μαντινεῦσι προηγόρευσε καὶ αὐτός σφισι τοῦ ἔργου μετέσχεν ('this man both foretold victory to the Mantineans and himself shared in the action with them'). The meaning 'foretold' is assured by the immediately preceding information that the man in question was 'the Elian seer Thrasybulus'.[27] Plutarch writes at *Sulla* 27.6 (φησὶν) ὃ καὶ συμβῆναι τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἧς ὁ ἄνθρωπος προηγόρευσεν ('which also happened on the day that the man had foretold'). Here again the meaning is certain, because the man was 'in an inspired state' (Loeb: θεοφόρητον), and brought Sulla divinely inspired information about what was going to happen. Diodorus writes at 34/35.33.6 καὶ γὰρ ἐπικίνδυνοι δημαγωγίαι καὶ χώρας ἀναδασμοὶ καὶ συμμάχων ἀποστάσεις μεγάλαι καὶ ἐμφύλιοι πόλεμοι πολυετεῖς καὶ φοβεροὶ καὶ τἆλλα τὰ προαγορευθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκιπίωνος ἠκολούθησεν ('for in fact dangerous uses of demagogy, redistributions of land, great revolts of allies, terrifying civil wars, which lasted many years, and the other things foretold by Scipio followed'). Diodorus' passive use of προαγορεύω meaning 'foretell' here is precisely equivalent to the combination of the active with a direct object with the same meaning in the earlier passages. Writers on religion such as the Christian Fathers used the word προαγορεύω extremely frequently with a direct object to mean 'prophesy', as does Josephus at *A.J.* 1.284 (after God's prophecies are given): ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβῳ προαγορεύει ('these things then God prophesied to Jacob).

εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ὕστερον ἃ δεῖται προαγορεύσεως καὶ ἀγγελίας ('but a device should be used for the things outside the plot, either those things which happened before, which it is not possible for a human to know, or those things which happen later, which need foretelling and announcement').   [23] *History of Herodotus*, Vol. II, p. 456.

[24] A. de Selincourt, *Herodotus. The Histories* (Harmondsworth, 1954), p. 199.

[25] *Herodotus. A New and Literal Version* (London, 1849).

[26] *Herodotus* (Oxford, 1949).

[27] Note, incidentally, that Pausanias felt no need to employ the *meiosis* of εὖ ἔχοντα κτλ., but plainly writes the proud word νίκην.

There is thus no bar in usage or grammar to taking προηγόρευε at Hdt. 8.83.1 as 'foretold', governing εὖ ἔχοντα as a direct object. Since the correct understanding of ἐκ πάντων shows that there were other speakers,[28] Themistocles needs to have said something rather striking in order to be unique. It is not likely, therefore, that he, alone of them all, merely proclaimed things being well (that things were in good shape),[29] and we should prefer to translate 'Themistocles alone of them all foretold victory'. In choosing that rendering we revert to the general sense perceived by Isaac Littlebury ('Themistocles, having first declar'd the Hopes he had of a prosperous Event, fram'd all his Discourse etc.'), whose translation of Herodotus, it should be remembered, ruled the English-speaking world throughout the eighteenth century and beyond.[30]

We may now look again at the whole of the beginning of ch. 83 of Hdt. 8. Since the manuscript tradition preserves an acceptable and intelligible text, the Greek is presented here shorn of all emendations by modern scholars. The punctuation is that of Stein, which is satisfactory and straightforward.[31]

Τοῖσι δὲ ῞Ελλησι ὡς πιστὰ δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα ἦν τῶν Τηνίων ῥήματα,[32] παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς ναυμαχήσοντες. ἠώς τε[33] διέφαινε καὶ οἱ σύλλογον τῶν ἐπιβατέων ποιησάμενοι,[34] προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλέης, τὰ δὲ ἔπεα ἦν πάντα κρέσσω τοῖσι ἥσσοσι ἀντιτιθέμενα, ὅσα δὴ ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσι καὶ καταστάσι ἐγγίνεται· παραινέσας δὲ τούτων τὰ κρέσσω αἱρέεσθαι καὶ καταπλέξας τὴν ῥῆσιν, ἐσβαίνειν ἐκέλευσε ἐς τὰς νέας.

[28] As was seen by W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), ad loc.   [29] I owe this point to Dr Karl Maurer.

[30] See n. 13 above. 'A New Edition, corrected' was published as late as 1818 (Oxford), not to mention the reprint of the Third Edition (London, 1737) in 1976 (New York: AMS Press).

[31] *Herodotos erklärt von H. Stein*, 5th edition (Berlin, 1893: reprinted Dublin/Zurich, 1962); also in his *Editio Maior* (Berlin, 1884).

[32] Many modern editors follow Stein's suggestion that ῥήματα be excluded; *Herodotos erklärt von Heinrich Stein*, first edition (Berlin, 1862) and all subsequent; also in *Editio Maior*. When Stein proposed this, he thought that someone had inserted the word who did not understand Herodotus' usage of a plain genitive for a speaker. He cited 4.32, where he then read the genitives ῾Ησιόδου and ῾Ομήρου instead of the datives which are correct. In later editions he merely cited 1.109.1, ἔφραζε τῇ ἑωυτοῦ γυναικὶ τὸν πάντα 'Αστυάγεος ῥηθέντα λόγον. This passage in fact rather supports the pleonasm of 8.83.1. Legrand subtly defended the text on the grounds that the word ῥήματα has the special meaning of affirmations accompanied by oaths (see the edition cited in n. 5 above, p. 78 n. 1), but the pleonasm hardly seems to need defence.

[33] Some editors prefer to write ἠώς τε δὴ διέφαινε on the basis of the reading τε δὴ ἔφαινε found in some manuscripts; see B. Hammer, *De τε particulae usu Herodoteo Thucydideo Xenophonteo* (Leipzig, 1904), 8, who prefers that reading both here and at 7.217.1. The τε certainly looks forward to responsive καὶ here (against Hammer), as is shown by the similar expression at 7.44.1, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπειρώτησιν τῶν χρησμῶν καὶ παραίνεσιν τὴν ἐκ Μαρδονίου νύξ τε ἐγένετο καὶ ἐς φυλακὰς ἐτάσσοντο. Compare also Xen. *Anab.* 3.2.1. But the responsive use of τε does not create asyndeton, since the particle can do double duty, serving both as a connective and as looking forward to καὶ, as Stein, note to 6.41.1, παραμείβετο τε τὴν Χερσόνησον καὶ κτλ., with many other examples, including 8.83.1, and Powell (n. 1 above) *ad* 8.64.1.

[34] The apparent anacoluthon, or hanging participle, here led Legrand to postulate a lacuna, but the transmitted text is correctly analysed by R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, Erster Band*, 3rd edition (Leipzig, 1898; reprinted Hannover, 1966), 288–9, as an example of concealed partitive apposition, in which the subject of the finite verb is the part, and the whole is expressed by a participle standing in the same case (here nominative). More Herodotean instances of this usage were assembled by I. A. Heikel, *De participiorum apud Herodotum usu* (Helsingfors, 1884), 124. There is a striking example of the same construction, also connected with public speaking, by Xenophon at *Hell.* 2.3.54: ἐκεῖνοι δὲ εἰσελθόντες σὺν τοῖς ὑπηρέταις, ἡγουμένων αὐτῶν Σατύρου τοῦ θρασυτάτου τε καὶ ἀναιδεστάτου, εἶπε μὲν ὁ Κριτίας ('they entered with their attendants, led by Satyrus, the boldest and most shameless of them, and Critias spoke'). Kühner-Gerth explain that at 8.83.1 Herodotus underemphasizes the other speeches at Salamis as irrelevant.

This may be closely translated as follows: 'Since the sayings that were spoken by the Tenians seemed trustworthy to the Greeks, they prepared to fight at sea. Dawn glimmered through and they held an assembly of the marines, at which Themistocles, alone of them all, on the one hand foretold victory. On the other[35] his words were all nobler things set against the base, so far as these things arise in the nature and condition of man. Of these things he exhorted them to choose the nobler, and, having concluded his oration, ordered them to go on board their ships.'

It has been noticed that Herodotus' account of Themistocles' speech before Salamis shows that it made a great impression and was preserved in the memory of the Athenians.[36] In a bold but stimulating attempt to reconstruct the speech, Macan stated that Herodotus omitted 'two points, which will hardly have been absent in the actual harangue: some estimate of the opponents and their chances, and some hints of the actual tactics to be pursued.'[37] The correct translation of the Greek shows that Herodotus did, if briefly, allude to both those matters.[38]

University of Pennsylvania   A. J. GRAHAM