"There was a river on their left-hand side" : Xenophon's Anabasis, arrival scenes, reflector narrative and the evolving language of Greek historiography

Autor(en): **Huitink, Luuk**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **65 (2019)**

PDF erstellt am: **15.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-984751

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.
Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.
Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Ein Dienst der *ETH-Bibliothek*
ETH Zürich, Rämistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich, Schweiz, www.library.ethz.ch

http://www.e-periodica.ch

V

LUUK HUITINK

"THERE WAS A RIVER ON THEIR LEFT-HAND SIDE"

XENOPHON'S *ANABASIS*, ARRIVAL SCENES, REFLECTOR NARRATIVE AND THE EVOLVING LANGUAGE OF GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY

ABSTRACT

This contribution is concerned with the use of 'reflector mode narrative' in arrival scenes in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, in which landscape descriptions are filtered through the consciousness of characters inside the story. Intended as a broader contribution to the 'grammar of narrative voice' in Greek prose, it establishes the linguistic characteristics of this mode of narration, contrasts it with other ways of telling stories in Greek historiography, the 'teller mode' and 'zero grade' narrative, and suggests that Xenophon's use of it in the *Anabasis* is more sustained, calculated, and linguistically grounded than that of his predecessors. Finally, it briefly considers the relation between modern theorizing on reflector mode narrative and ancient reading habits, as encapsulated by the term ἐνάργεια.

> Il n'était resté enfant que sur un point: ce qu'il avait vu était-ce une bataille, et en second lieu, cette bataille était-elle Waterloo? Pour la première fois de sa vie il trouva du plaisir à lire; il espérait toujours trouver dans les journaux, ou dans les récits de la bataille, quelque description qui lui permettrait de reconnaître les lieux qu'il avait parcourus à la suite du maréchal Ney, et plus tard avec l'autre général.
> (Stendhal, *La Chartreuse de Parme*, 1839, Part I, Ch. 5)

In Stendhal's masterpiece, *La Chartreuse de Parme*, the young and naïve Fabrice Del Dongo more or less accidentally stumbles

onto the battlefield at Waterloo. After he runs into troops of Marshal Ney and joins them, he experiences what he – and, thanks to Stendhal's skill in presenting the narrative through Fabrice's eyes, the reader as well – perceives as an incomprehensible and chaotic series of seemingly unrelated incidents, which ultimately leave him wounded in his leg. Some time later, in order better to understand what happened to him, Fabrice starts consulting historiographical accounts of the battle, which detail what took place where, and so might enable him one day to return to Waterloo and identify the places where he fought on that fateful day.[1] At the same time, Stendhal (who was himself a veteran of several Napoleonic campaigns) no doubt intended his readers to reflect on how historiographical accounts tend to distort the actual experience of battle, making it all seem much 'cleaner', logical, and inevitable than it appeared to the participants at the time. Stendhal, it has been argued, makes clear that the "static and impersonal description" of battle often found in historiography is incapable of conveying its realities – in contrast, of course, to Stendhal's own "dynamic, vivid and living narrative".[2]

If this is so, Stendhal engages with a debate about the aims and methods of history writing whose roots stretch back to Antiquity. As Jonas Grethlein has shown, ancient historians were keenly aware of, and variously negotiated, the competing claims of 'experience' and 'teleology'.[3] Some, that is, were more concerned with transmitting something of 'what it was like' to live through certain past events (this does not mean, of course, that their view of 'what it was like' is not the result of historical reconstruction), while others adopted a more analytical and explanatory stance, imposing a clear order and evaluation on

[1] Cf. Fabrice's wish (Part I, Ch. 9): "je voudrais, avant de mourir, aller revoir le champ de bataille de Waterloo, et tâcher de reconnaître la prairie où je fus si gaiement enlevé de mon cheval et assis par terre".

[2] Coe (1985) 18; see also the brilliant chapter, "Fabrizio at Waterloo", by Chiaromonte (1985) 1-16.

[3] Grethlein (2013); see now also Domainko (2018).

things with the benefit of hindsight – though most historians did both at various points. Indeed, Lisa Hau claims that one defining trait of Greek historical narratives is that they alternate between "two narratorial modes, one of them remote and giving an illusion of transparency, the other personal, involved and strongly argumentative".[4] On a more fine-grained linguistic level, both Albert Rijksbaron and Rutger Allan have recently argued that one concrete way in which Greek historians (among them Thucydides and Xenophon) effect a quality of 'experientiality' or 'transparency' is by means of inserting passages of 'substitutionary perception', in which the narrator momentarily substitutes the perception of a character for that of himself – much as Stendhal does when he filters the Waterloo narrative in *La Chartreuse de Parme* through the eyes of Fabrice.[5]

The present chapter takes up the notion of 'substitutionary perception' as introduced by Rijksbaron and Allan and develops it in four ways in order to make a point about the style, texture, and novelty of Xenophon's *Anabasis* (which will be my main corpus) and to make a multifaceted methodological contribution to 'the grammar of narrative voice' in Greek.[6] First, I will set 'substitutionary perception' in the wider context of Franz K. Stanzel's narratological concept of 'mediacy' and its subcategories, the 'reflector' and 'teller' narrative modes (the former being more or less equivalent to 'substitutionary perception'); 'mediacy' seems to me to be a particularly useful tool in describing the various ways in which Greek historians shape

[4] HAU (2014) 259.

[5] RIJKSBARON (2012) = (2018) 133-169; ALLAN (2013) 377-382. The term 'substitutionary perception' derives from a classic essay by FEHR (1938). There is also BAKKER's (1997), (2007) distinction between a 'mimetic' and a 'diegetic mode' of narration in Thucydides, as chiefly determined by the use of the imperfect or aorist as the main narrative tense. Bakker's 'mimetic' mode, however, cannot be equated with 'substitutionary perception', but is a different way of heightening the experiential dimension of narrative, which I will leave to one side; see the remarks of ALLAN (2013) 383-384.

[6] The term is WILLI's (2017) 233: "so far, we do not have anything that could be described as a 'grammar of narrative voice' in Greek".

their stories. Secondly, I will analyse the main linguistic features of the reflector and teller modes by tracing their manifestations in one specific context, namely 'arrival scenes' in Xenophon's *Anabasis*. Arrival scenes, which describe how an army on the march reaches a stopping place, are one of the 'stock events' that make up much of Greek historiographical discourse.[7] My focus on arrival scenes serves to make a broader point, which I will elaborate in the third part of the chapter: by making one of the recurring stock events the basis of linguistic analysis it becomes possible to compare different articulations of it in a fairly systematic way, both synchronically and diachronically. In the fourth section, I will consider the historical dimension of reflector narrative from a different angle, by reading it against the background of the ancient rhetorical concept of ἐνάργεια. It seems to me that the conclusions drawn by modern linguists and narratologists gain force if it can be shown that they are not entirely alien to what we know about ancient reading habits.

1. 'Mediacy' and narrative's *Nullstufe*

While many narrative theorists define narrative in terms of sequences of events, Stanzel introduced the concept of 'mediacy' (*Mittelbarkeit*) to underline the crucial fact that narratives are *represented* sequences of events and as such by definition mediated through a given (usually verbal) medium.[8] 'Mediacy' furthermore focuses attention on the fact that the representation is inevitably shaped by the agency of whoever is doing the representing. Narrative, that is, is a way of organizing data into

[7] Others might be 'crossing a mountain', 'deployment of troops', 'scattered foragers being attacked', etc. For this way of approaching Greek historiographical narrative, see HAU (2014) (she provides a catalogue of 'stock events' on pp. 246-250); LENDON (2017).

[8] See STANZEL (^{8}2008) 15-21. See also the explication of the concept by ALBER / FLUDERNIK in *The Living Handbook of Narratology*.

a chain of cause and effect, of selecting and drawing connections between narrated events, and of explaining, interpreting, and evaluating them; 'mediacy' is the signature of this activity. In the account of Stanzel's pupil, Monika Fludernik, narrative operates through the projection of a 'consciousness'; for her, narrative is in the first place the result of a perceptual activity that represents and explains human experience.[9]

Building on earlier well-known distinctions such as those between 'telling' and 'showing' or between *vision après* and *vision avec*, Stanzel distinguishes two basic ways in which 'mediacy' may manifest itself in narrative; these are best understood as ideal types, with actual narratives usually displaying mixed forms.[10] Either the story is mediated by a narrator who openly acts as the teller of the tale ('teller mode') or it is filtered through a 'reflector character' who does not so much seem to tell and interpret, as to directly perceive and experience the happenings in the storyworld ('reflector mode'). Stanzel suggests that the 'reflector mode' invites the reader to perceive the narrative existents and events through the eyes of the reflector character and to that extent produces a veiled mediacy or, rather, 'the illusion of immediacy' ("die Illusion der Unmittelbarkeit").[11] In Fludernik's model of narrative as built on the mediating function of a 'consciousness', 'teller mode' narratives are mediated by the consciousness of a narrator and 'reflector mode' narratives by that of a protagonist.[12]

Before elaborating on this point, it will be helpful to point out that Stanzel distinguishes different gradations of 'mediacy'. He uses book summaries, chapter headings, and outlines to establish a 'zero grade' (*Nullstufe*) of 'mediacy' and hence of narrative.[13] Examples of such texts are "In the *Iliad* Hector kills Patroclus and Achilles kills Hector", or, from the table of

[9] FLUDERNIK (1996).
[10] STANZEL (1981) 5-7, (^{8}2008) 21-24.
[11] STANZEL (^{8}2008) 16.
[12] FLUDERNIK (1996) 12, 50.
[13] STANZEL (^{8}2008) 39-67.

contents of Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, "Chapter ii. – In which Mr Jones receives many friendly visits during his confinement; with some fine touches of the passion of love, scarce visible to the naked eye". Texts like these do not necessarily lack sequentiality or logical connections between events, but they do lack most signs of a mediating instance at pains to establish such connections. In a sense, they are mere lists of events, while cancelling the dynamics of 'mediacy', that is, the sorts of organizing/perceptual activities that turn the bare backbone of a story into an interesting narrative. Importantly, an (apparently universal) marker of summaries and related text-types is the use of the present tense. Stanzel plausibly interprets the present as marking the absence of 'mediacy': in summaries, events are established or referred to in a factual or general way (as something "sachlich-allgemein Existierendes", in Stanzel's words), but they are not *narrated*. The present tense is a sign that we are dealing with a 'story-minus-mediation'.[14]

As it happens, the consequences of a lack of mediacy can be beautifully illustrated with reference to the earliest Greek prose authors of whom we have knowledge: most of the extant longer fragments of the early mythographers present stories that come close to the 'zero grade' of narrative; consider for instance the following passages from Acusilaus of Argos (*fl. ante* 490) and Pherecydes of Athens (*fl. c.* 465):[15]

> Καινῆι δὲ τῆι Ἐλάτου μίσγεται Ποσ<ε>ιδ<έ>ων· ἔπειτα (οὐ γὰρ **ἦν** αὐτῆι ἱερὸν παῖδας [[τ]] τεκὲν οὔτ' ἐξ ἐκείνου οὔτ' ἐξ ἄλλου οὐδενός) ποιεῖ αὐτὴν Ποσε[ι]δέων ἄνδρα ἄτρω[το]ν, [ἰ]σχὺν ἔχοντα [με]γί[σ]τ[η]ν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τότε, καὶ ὅτε τις αὐτὸν κεντοίη σιδήρωι ἢ χαλκῶι, **ἡλίσκετο** μάλιστα χρημάτων. καὶ γίνεται βασιλεὺς οὗτος Λαπιθέων καὶ τοῖς Κενταύροις **πολεμέεσκε**. ἔπειτα στήσας ἀκόν[τιον ἐν ἀγορῆι τούτωι κελεύει θύειν, θεοῖ]σι δ' οὐκηε | κε[...]. Ζεὺς ἰδὼν αὐτ[ὸν τα]ῦτα ποιέοντα ἀπειλεῖ καὶ ἐφορμᾶι τοὺς Κενταύρους· κἀκε[ῖ]νοι αὐτὸν

[14] Stanzel (^{8}2008) 42-43.

[15] In relevant passages I print **imperfects/pluperfects** in bold, underline presents/perfects, and italicize *aorists*.

κατακόπτουσιν ὄρθιον κατὰ γῆς καὶ ἄνωθεν πέτρην ἐπιτιθεῖσιν σῆμα, καὶ ἀποθνήσκει. (Acus. fr. 22, iii, 56-83 *EGM*, with adjusted supplement ἀκόν[τιον ... θεοῖ]σι by Grenfell / Hunt)

"Poseidon sleeps with Kaine, the daughter of Elatos. Next (for it was not permitted by law and custom for him to have children from him or from anyone else), Poseidon turns her into a man, one who cannot be wounded and with the greatest strength of all men then alive, and whenever someone attacked him with iron or bronze, he was always utterly destroyed. And this man becomes king of the Lapiths and fought regularly with the Centaurs. Next, having set up a spear in the market-place he orders that sacrifices be made to it. But the gods (did not allow/like it?). Having noticed that he is doing these things, Zeus threatens him and incites the Centaurs against him. And they hammer him upright down into the earth, and put a rock over him as a marker, and he dies."

ὁ δ' Ἡρακλῆς ἕλκεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ τόξον ὡς βαλῶν, καὶ ὁ Ἥλιος <δείσας> παύσασθαι κελεύει. ὁ δὲ {δείσας} παύεται. Ἥλιος δὲ ἀντὶ τούτου δίδωσιν αὐτῶι τὸ δέπας τὸ χρύσεον, ὃ αὐτὸν **ἐφόρει** σὺν ταῖς ἵπποις, ἐπὴν δύνηι, διὰ τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ τὴν νύκτα πρὸς ἑώιην, ἵν' ἀνίσχει {ὁ ἥλιος}. ἔπειτα πορεύεται Ἡρακλῆς ἐν τῶι δέπαϊ τούτωι ἐς τὴν Ἐρύθειαν. καὶ ὅτε δὴ **ἦν** ἐν τῶι πελάγει, Ὠκεανὸς πειρώμενος αὐτοῦ κυμαίνει τὸ δέπας φαντα-ζόμενος· ὁ δὲ τοξεύειν αὐτὸν μέλλει· καὶ αὐτὸν δείσας Ὠκεανὸς παύσασθαι κελεύει. (Pherec. Ath. fr. 18a *EGM*)

"Heracles aims his bow at him [Helius] in order to shoot him, and Helius, afraid, orders him to desist. He desists. In return, Helius gives him the gold goblet, which used to carry him and his horses, after he sets, through the Ocean by night to Dawn, where [the sun] rises. Then Heracles travels in that goblet to Erytheia. And while he was at sea, Oceanus, testing him, tosses the goblet on the waves, making a big show. He is on the verge of shooting him with his bow, and Oceanus, afraid, orders him to desist."

I will here forego discussion of earlier stylistic analyses of this skeletal prose, which have tended to cast the early mythographers as unworthy inheritors of the epic tradition and insignificant predecessors to Herodotus. I can do so all the more easily because Robert Fowler has in recent years opened the way to a fresh appreciation of the mythographers' achievement as *sui*

genereris.[16] Using the tools of register studies and narratology, Fowler persuasively argues that we should conceive of their work as written, not oral or performed, texts. The mythographers produced what are essentially the first reference works or encyclopaedias, whose primary purpose is to communicate information to audiences at a distance (for instance, tragic poets in search of a plot). In so doing, they pioneered a "pragmatic, just-the-facts style" for telling myth, in which its content was given in the form of bare stories and "isolated from everything else that went with it in Greek society: the gathering of people, the intimate links with ritual, the mimetic performance of poets and actors, the authority of Muse and tradition".[17]

Fowler points out several broadly stylistic features in support of his analysis, which can easily be understood in terms of 'mediacy' or, rather, a lack thereof.[18] Many elements which turn mere sequences of events into proper narratives are almost entirely absent from the longer fragments of the mythographers. There are, for instance, few signs of a narrator who orders and evaluates events. First-person narratorial interventions and stance-taking devices, such as που "I think" or λέγεται "it is said", are a hallmark of Greek historiography, but they are virtually absent from this earliest prose.[19] In addition, events are on the whole told in a strictly chronological order, with few substantial analepses or prolepses; exceptions that confirm the rule are the 'anticipatory' γάρ-clause at Acus. fr. 22,[20] and the undermarked analepsis ὃ αὐτὸν ἐφόρει... at Pherec. Ath. fr. 18a, which soon peters out into a general statement about the course of the sun: ἐπὴν δύνῃ, ... ἵν' ἀνίσχει. More generally, the genealogical structure of works of mythography imposes a linear order on the material, which sets them apart from the later

[16] FOWLER (2006), (2013) 706-710.
[17] FOWLER (2013) 707 and (2006) 44, respectively.
[18] This and the following paragraph rely especially on FOWLER (2006) 40-43.
[19] For a rare exception, see PHEREC. SYR. fr. 68 Schibli φασιν.
[20] According to DENNISTON (^{2}1954) 70, 'anticipatory' γάρ is itself an archaic feature, more characteristic of Homer and Herodotus than of later prose.

Greek tradition of historiography "that is obsessed with causation".[21] To a large extent, then, these seem to be texts without a narrator.

Furthermore, most running fragments of early Greek mythography do not present sequences of events on a broader canvas of settings (spatial and temporal) and accompanying circumstances, nor do they present them in terms of characters' perceptions, emotions, plans, deliberations and so on. Thus, most fragments display a rapid pace; scenic narrative, which evokes detailed and life-like ('vivid') mental representations of persons, objects, spaces, and actions, is almost entirely avoided. One can easily imagine how a more leisurely narrative would elaborate the single word φανταζόμενος (Pherec. Ath. fr. 18a) into a gripping *ekphrasis* of a storm or analyse Zeus' actions ἀπειλεῖ and ἐφορμᾶι τοὺς Κενταύρους (Acus. fr. 22) into component parts, including directly reported speeches (perhaps delivered through a divine messenger as in Homer) and the protagonists' reactions to those speeches. In fact, these stories on the whole confine themselves to reporting successive actions, while characters' reasons or motives for undertaking those actions do not receive much attention. Directly reported speeches, which give the impression that we hear the characters speak and get to know what is on their minds, are very rare in the extant fragments; the non-mimetic forms of indirect speech or bare speech mention (e.g. Acus. fr. 22 ἀπειλεῖ) are preferred, and even these seldom occur.[22] Moreover, while a character's perceptions or emotions are occasionally briefly mentioned (Pherec. Ath. fr. 18a δείσας (×2) and, a bit more elaborately, Acus. fr. 22 ἰδών αὐτ[ὸν τα]ῦτα ποιέοντα), full-blown clauses of what Mabel Lang has called "participial motivation" ('*X* did *Y*, thinking/seeing/hoping/etc. that *Z*'), which are absolutely characteristic of subsequent Greek historiography, are almost completely absent.[23]

[21] HAU (2014) 257.
[22] Cf. FOWLER (2006) 41-42.
[23] See LANG (1995) for such structures. The only two full-blown instances in early mythography are PHEREC. ATH. frr. 22a, 135 *EGM*.

Most importantly, the synoptic nature of the fragments is shown by the fact that the main vehicle for expressing successive events is the present tense. Where it is *not* used, this is because minimal forms of 'mediacy' enter the synopses. Examples are brief explanations (Acus. fr. 22 οὐ γὰρ ἦν), repeated events (ὅτε … κεντοίη …, ἡλίσκετο: the perception of repetition requires retrospection and so mediation), analepses (Pherec. Ath. fr. 18a ὃ αὐτὸν ἐφόρει: the imperfect is selected to prevent the reader from taking ἐφόρει as the next main event on the storyline) and settings (ὅτε δὴ ἦν ἐν τῶι πελάγει). Interestingly, the observed patterns are very much like those seen in the chiefly present-tense *hypotheseis* of tragedies, which are of course undoubtedly summaries.[24] This interpretation of the prevalence of the present tense in the extant fragments has been anticipated by Willi's analysis of the 'historic present' as a marker of what Émile Benveniste termed *discours* as opposed to *récit*.[25] That analysis was also in part intended to replace earlier scholarly attempts to get to grips with the present in early Greek

[24] Cf. e.g. hyp. I SOPH. *OC*: Ὁ ἐπι Κολωνῷ Οἰδίπους συννημμένος πώς ἐστι τῷ Τυράννῳ. τῆς γὰρ πατρίδος ἐκπεσὼν ὁ Οἰδίπους ἤδη γεραιὸς ὢν ἀφικνεῖται εἰς Ἀθήνας, ὑπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀντιγόνης χειραγωγούμενος. **ἦσαν** γὰρ τῶν ἀρσένων <αἱ θήλειαι> περὶ τὸν πατέρα φιλοστοργότεραι. ἀφικνεῖται δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας κατὰ πυθόχρηστον… [all other verbs also in present] "The *Oedipus Coloneus* is somehow connected to the *Tyrannus*. For having been exiled from his fatherland, Oedipus, who is by now an old man, arrives in Athens, led by the hand by his daughter, Antigone. For his daughters were more affectionate towards their father than his sons. He arrives in Athens at the injunction of the Pythian oracle…". The single imperfect crops up in an explanation of the background (γάρ). Also hyp. III SOPH. *Ant.*: …οἷς [those guarding Polynices' body] ἐπαπειλεῖ θάνατον ὁ Κρέων, εἰ μὴ τὸν τοῦτο δράσαντα ἐξεύροιεν. οὗτοι τὴν κόνιν τὴν ἐπιβεβλημένην καθάραντες οὐδὲν ἧττον **ἐφρούρουν**. ἐπελθοῦσα δὲ ἡ Ἀντιγόνη καὶ γυμνὸν εὑροῦσα τὸν νεκρὸν ἀνοιμώξασα ἑαυτὴν εἰσαγγέλλει "… Creon threatens them with a death sentence, if they wouldn't find the perpetrator. After clearing away the dust that had been sprinkled on top [of the corpse], they continued to guard it with the same effort. Antigone walks on and after finding the corpse bare she gives herself away by uttering a cry of lamentation". The imperfect refers to a repeated/continuous action that is not one of the main 'events' of the play.

[25] WILLI (2017) 237-244 – though I disagree with his claim (p. 244) that the present is a marker of "oral (direct)" communication; in my view, it does not signal the presence, but the absence, of a narrator communicating with a narratee.

mythography on the basis of the standard view of the 'historic present' as underscoring 'dramatic' turning points or lending narrative an 'eyewitness' feel.[26]

2. Arrival scenes in teller and reflector modes

Historiographers like Herodotus and Thucydides occasionally revert to the *Nullstufe* of narrative and the synoptic use of the present tense to reel off quick genealogies or summarize events that are off the main story-line.[27] Xenophon, meanwhile, makes extensive use of 'zero grade' statements in articulating Cyrus' march inland in the first book of the *Anabasis*:

> ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμοὺς δύο παρασάγγας δέκα ἐπὶ τὸν Ψάρον ποταμόν, οὗ **ἦν** τὸ εὖρος τρία πλέθρα. ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμὸν ἕνα παρασάγγας πέντε ἐπὶ τὸν Πύραμον ποταμόν, οὗ **ἦν** τὸ εὖρος στάδιον. ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμοὺς δύο παρασάγγας πεντεκαίδεκα εἰς Ἰσσούς, τῆς Κιλικίας ἐσχάτην πόλιν ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάττῃ οἰκουμένην, μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα. ἐνταῦθα *ἔμειναν* ἡμέρας τρεῖς· καὶ Κύρῳ **παρῆσαν**… (Xen. *An.* 1, 4, 1-2)
>
> "Thence he marches two stages, ten parasangs, to the Psarus river, the width of which was three plethra. From there he marches one stage, five parasangs, to the Pyramus river, the width of which was a stadium. From there he marches two stages, fifteen parasangs, to Issus, the last city in Cilicia, a place situated on the sea, and large and prosperous. There they remained three days; and there came to Cyrus…"

[26] Cf. e.g. LILJA (1968) 111 on ACUS. fr. 22, entirely *ad hoc*: μίσγεται "merely states a fact"; ποιεῖ "describes a crucial event with far-reaching consequences"; γίνεται βασιλεύς: a "significant fact"; ἀπειλεῖ κτλ. "bring before the reader's eyes the complicated sequence of events which proved fatal to Caineus". See also DOVER (1997) 67-68, who despairingly comments that the early Greek prose authors "mix aorist, imperfect, and present in narrative in such a way as to preclude explanation of the tense of any given verb-token in semantic or rhetorical terms". FOWLER (2001) 113-114 is ill at ease with the 'eyewitness' interpretation, arguing that we should not conclude from the present tense that the mythographers "pretended that the gap [between past and present] was not there".

[27] Cf. e.g. HDT. 6, 71 (genealogy of Leotychidas); THUC. 1, 136-137 (the post-Salamis career of Themistocles).

It has often been observed that Xenophon uses present-tense ἐξελαύνει not so much vividly to highlight dramatic turning points, but to structure the narrative into discrete episodes; Willi felicitously compares Xenophon's ἐξελαύνει-statements to chapter headings.[28] They convey the length of the journey and the place where Cyrus and his army arrive and stop, after which the narrative proper is picked up and filled out in flexible ways, for instance, by offering more or less brief descriptions of the place which the army has reached (τὸν Ψάρον ποταμόν, οὗ ἦν κτλ.) or a more elaborate account of what happened there (ἐνταῦθα ἔμειναν κτλ.).

In order to illustrate the 'teller' and 'reflector' modes, I will now focus on arrival scenes which are filled out with descriptive material. Here is first an example of the teller mode:

> ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμοὺς τρεῖς παρασάγγας εἴκοσιν εἰς Κελαινάς, τῆς Φρυγίας πόλιν οἰκουμένην, μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα. ἐνταῦθα Κύρῳ βασίλεια **ἦν** καὶ παράδεισος μέγας ἀγρίων θηρίων πλήρης, ἃ ἐκεῖνος **ἐθήρευεν** ἀπὸ ἵππου, ὁπότε γυμνάσαι βούλοιτο ἑαυτόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἵππους. διὰ μέσου δὲ τοῦ παραδείσου ῥεῖ ὁ Μαίανδρος ποταμός· αἱ δὲ πηγαὶ αὐτοῦ εἰσιν ἐκ τῶν βασιλείων· ῥεῖ δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς Κελαινῶν πόλεως. ἔστι δὲ καὶ μεγάλου βασιλέως βασίλεια ἐν Κελαιναῖς ἐρυμνὰ ἐπὶ ταῖς πηγαῖς τοῦ Μαρσύου ποταμοῦ ὑπὸ τῇ ἀκροπόλει· ῥεῖ δὲ καὶ οὗτος διὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὸν Μαίανδρον· τοῦ δὲ Μαρσύου τὸ εὖρός ἐστιν εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε ποδῶν. ἐνταῦθα λέγεται Ἀπόλλων ἐκδεῖραι Μαρσύαν νικήσας ἐρίζοντά οἱ περὶ σοφίας, καὶ τὸ δέρμα κρεμάσαι ἐν τῷ ἄντρῳ ὅθεν αἱ πηγαί· διὰ δὲ τοῦτο ὁ ποταμὸς καλεῖται Μαρσύας. … ἐνταῦθα *ἔμεινε* Κῦρος ἡμέρας τριάκοντα. (Xen. *An.* 1, 2, 7-8)

> "Thence he marches three stages, twenty parasangs, to Celaenae, an inhabited city of Phrygia, large and prosperous. There Cyrus used to have a palace and a large park full of wild animals, which he used to hunt on horseback whenever he wished to give himself and his horses exercise. Through the middle of this park flows the Maeander river; its sources are beneath the palace, and

[28] WILLI (2017) 240; see also SICKING / STORK (1997) 150; RIJKSBARON ([3]2002) 24. For a wide-ranging account of Xenophon's various formulas for travel and distances in *An.*, see ROOD (2010).

> it flows through the city of Celaenae also. There is likewise a palace of the Great King in Celaenae, strongly fortified and situated at the foot of the Acropolis over the sources of the Marsyas river; the Marsyas also flows through the city, and empties into the Maeander, and its width is twenty-five feet. It was here, according to the story, that Apollo flayed Marsyas, after having defeated him in a contest of musical skill; he hung up his skin in the cave from which the sources issue, and it is for this reason that the river is called Marsyas. ... Here Cyrus remained thirty days."[29]

What is typical of the 'teller mode' is that the description of Celaenae has the character of an excursus, in which the narrator communicates with the narratees behind the characters' backs, so to speak. The description is clearly set off from the surrounding narrative by anaphoric ἐνταῦθα, which is repeated when the story is resumed after the pause. The narrator then first comments with hindsight on Cyrus' palace and normal pursuits in Celaenae in durative and iterative imperfects (βασίλεια ἦν ..., ἐθήρευεν, ὁπότε ... βούλοιτο) – states of affairs which ceased to exist after Cyrus' death (to be narrated later on). He next shifts to the omnitemporal/generic present tense – and, as διὰ μέσου shows, a bird's-eye perspective – to relate information about the city's main sights.[30] Finally, he adds a mythical story related to the place, introduced by a 'source reference' (λέγεται), which conventionally marks mythical and other material in need of corroboration by independent authorities (here presumably the well-known mythical story any educated Greek could tell you), and he throws in an explanation of the name of the River Marsyas, introduced by the equally formulaic

[29] All translations from the *Anabasis* are taken from BROWNSON / DILLERY (1995), with occasional modifications. All translations from other texts are my own.

[30] For this use of the present, see RIJKSBARON ([3]2002) 10. 'Omnitemporal' should be taken to mean that these presents refer to states of affairs which obtained in the past (including the time at which the story is set), obtain now, and presumably will continue to obtain in the future. However, it is fair to say that the present tenses first and foremost *profile* the existence of the described features of Celaenae in the present of the narrator and narratees.

καλεῖται. Now, the features mentioned were no doubt also there during the visit of Cyrus that is described in the *Anabasis*, but that is not how the narrator frames things: what matters is that, should you care to visit, they are still there to be found in the present. It is not at all made clear whether Cyrus or the soldiers in the army were aware of any of the things on which the historian focuses our attention – and that may just be the point: if only Cyrus had paid more attention to stories such as that of Marsyas, which deals with people challenging their betters…

I now turn to two arrival scenes from the *Anabasis* that are told in the reflector mode:

> ἐντεῦθεν δ' *ἐπορεύθησαν* οἱ Ἕλληνες διὰ Μακρώνων σταθμοὺς τρεῖς παρασάγγας δέκα. τῇ πρώτῃ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ *ἀφίκοντο* ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν ὃς **ὥριζε** τὴν τῶν Μακρώνων καὶ τὴν τῶν Σκυθηνῶν. **εἶχον** δ' ὑπὲρ δεξιῶν χωρίον οἷον χαλεπώτατον καὶ ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς ἄλλον ποταμόν, εἰς ὃν **ἐνέβαλλεν** ὁ ὁρίζων, δι' οὗ **ἔδει** διαβῆναι. **ἦν** δὲ οὗτος δασὺς δένδρεσι παχέσι μὲν οὔ, πυκνοῖς δέ. ταῦτ' ἐπεὶ *προσῆλθον* οἱ Ἕλληνες **ἔκοπτον**, σπεύδοντες ἐκ τοῦ χωρίου ὡς τάχιστα ἐξελθεῖν. (Xen. *An.* 4, 8, 1-2)
>
> "From there the Greeks marched through the country of the Macronians three stages, ten parasangs. On the first of these days they reached the river which separated the territory of the Macronians from that of the Scytheni. There they had on the right, above them, an exceedingly difficult bit of ground, and on the left another river, into which the boundary stream that they had to cross emptied. Now this stream was fringed with trees, not large ones, but of thick growth, and when the Greeks came up, they began felling them in their haste to get out of the place as speedily as possible."
>
> διελθόντες δὲ τρεῖς σταθμοὺς *ἀφίκοντο* πρὸς τὸ Μηδίας καλούμενον τεῖχος, καὶ *παρῆλθον* εἴσω αὐτοῦ. **ἦν** δὲ ᾠκοδομημένον πλίνθοις ὀπταῖς ἐν ἀσφάλτῳ κειμέναις, εὖρος εἴκοσι ποδῶν, ὕψος δὲ ἑκατόν· μῆκος δ' **ἐλέγετο** εἶναι εἴκοσι παρασάγγαι· **ἀπεῖχε** [M, *ἀπέχει* c, *ἀπέσχε* f] δὲ Βαβυλῶνος οὐ πολύ. ἐντεῦθεν δ' *ἐπορεύθησαν*… (Xen. *An.* 2, 4, 12-13)
>
> "After travelling three stages they reached the so-called wall of Media, and passed within it. It was built of baked bricks, laid in asphalt, and was twenty feet wide and a hundred feet high; its

length was said to be twenty parasangs, and it was not far distant from Babylon. From there they marched..."

These descriptions have quite a different 'feel' to them. This is because, in contrast to the Celaenae passage, the information about the land of the Macronians and the Median Wall is tied to the point of view of the Greeks as they arrive at these localities. Several features help to convey this impression. First and foremost, the descriptions are cast in the imperfect of 'substitutionary perception'. As Rijksbaron suggests, owing to their imperfective aspectual value these verb forms present the states of affairs which they express as 'on-going', and so they can be 'hit' by the gaze of a character in the story; this interpretation is available in particular if the presence of a perceiving character (or group of characters) has been explicitly mentioned in the context preceding 'substitutionary perception' (as here, through ἐπορεύθησαν and ἀφίκοντο).[31] I add that the evocation of a story-internal point of view is markedly reinforced by the striking use of past tenses for states of affairs that can in principle be assumed to be still valid (this holds at least for ὥριζε and ἐνέβαλλεν in the first passage and ἦν and ἀπεῖχε in the second): the past tenses profile the relevant 'omnitemporal' states of affairs, not as they exist in the present of the narrator and narratee, but as they obtained at the time of the story. This promotes an interpretation of these imperfects as representing, not simply states of affairs, but the perception of those states of affairs in the past. In the case of ἐλέγετο in the second passage, there is an additional effect: whereas present-tense λέγεται refers to some sort of external source which the historian had at his disposal, ἐλέγετο is most naturally taken as referring to what local guides said *at the time*; note in this respect that the length of the wall could not directly be perceived by the Greeks on the spot.[32]

[31] RIJKSBARON (2012) 340-341 = (2018) 140-142; see also ALLAN (2013) 377.

[32] See GRAY (2003) on Xenophon's use of story-internal sources as marked by past-tense predicates of 'speaking', suggesting that Xenophon does this to a

This brings us to other notable features. First, there is no bird's-eye perspective in these passages. This is not only made clear by ἐλέγετο in the second passage, but also by the designations "above them on their right" (ὑπὲρ δεξιῶν) and "on their left-hand side" (ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς) in the first. Secondly, the geographical information is not clearly set off from the narrative, but more tightly integrated with it; 'presentative' sentences ("there were...") reflect how each item presented itself as new to the Greeks, further reinforcing a 'substitutionary perception' reading of the imperfects.[33] Thirdly, whereas the narrator in the teller mode freely used names, such as that of the River Marsyas, and even explained those names, in the reflector mode names can be absent: thus, the Greeks encounter just "another river" (ἄλλον ποταμόν), of which they do not know the name. More generally, the quality of the information given is on the whole geared towards the knowledge, interests, and needs of the Greeks. For instance, the fact that the forest they pass through consists of trees that were "not thick, but dense" (παχέσι μὲν οὔ, πυκνοῖς δέ) is relevant to the Greeks, as they have to cut it down.[34]

3. Escaping the 'pull of the present'

Now we have analysed some relevant passages in detail, it is time to zoom out and set Xenophon's descriptive practices in the arrival scenes of the *Anabasis* in a broader context. It may first be observed that the teller and reflector modes are not used at random. In the Appendix I provide an overview of the distribution of present- and past-tense descriptions in the *Anabasis* as well as of present-tense λέγεται-statements. From this list it

greater extent than Herodotus and Thucydides. If ἀπεῖχε is the correct reading, the information about the wall's distance from Babylon probably still belongs to what the guides said (if the present is correct, we are dealing with a shift into the 'teller mode'; I will return to this in the next section).

[33] For 'presentative' sentences, see DIK (1995) 221-228.

[34] Similarly, in *An.* 1, 4, 1-2, cited above, the width of rivers is twice given in the imperfect, as those rivers have to be crossed; cf. ROOD (2012b) 171.

becomes clear that the present tense is used mostly in the first part of Book 1 and in Books 6-7, while descriptions in the reflector mode, as marked by the exclusive or predominant use of the imperfect, occur mostly in the large middle section of the narrative. The teller mode, then, operates in those parts of the story in which the Greeks march through territories familiar to, and settled by, Greeks (namely the Ionian and Black Sea coasts of modern-day Turkey), while Xenophon shifts to the reflector mode for parts that are set in the heartlands of the Persian Empire.[35] In this way, Xenophon skilfully (and no doubt with considerable exaggeration) suggests that those Persian territories are utterly unknown and normal frames of reference no longer apply: there is no outside authority capable of telling the narratees how things 'are' or 'look' in his own name; the near-absence of present-tense λέγεται-statements further underlines how there are no general Greek tales to draw on in order to make sense of the landscape. There is only the Greeks' experience to be reported: they are on a journey of discovery of sorts, and we, the readers, discover all those unfamiliar places *with* them. The reflector mode descriptions considerably heighten the uncanny and claustrophobic atmosphere of the Greeks' retreat. Above all, the effect is psychological: they make it possible for the reader to empathize with the Greeks as they come across ever new perceived dangers.[36]

Current analyses of perspectival phenomena in Greek literature to some extent obscure how novel Xenophon's handling of arrival scenes is. It is at least fair to say that the often rather static categories of structuralist narratological paradigms encourage a heuristic process whereby certain narrative devices are discovered to 'already' exist in ancient literature (preferably Homer). Rijksbaron's treatment of 'substitutionary perception'

[35] Cf. ROOD (2012b) 171-172.

[36] For a wide-ranging treatment of the function of space in the *Anabasis*, see PURVES (2010) 159-195. For some other ways in which the *Anabasis* shifts from being a fairly standard historiographical work into something much less conventional and more adventurous, see BRADLEY (2001); GRETHLEIN (2012).

is a case in point. He first gives a number of examples taken from modern fiction and then adduces a wide range of Greek passages, ranging from epic to the novel, which are said to exhibit important similarities with the modern ones. He includes one Homeric passage (*Od.* 7, 81-137, describing Odysseus' arrival at Alcinous' palace), which goes to show that the phenomenon "makes a quite spectacular entrance into European literature" already in Homer.[37] It is tempting to conclude that 'subsitutionary perception' as a mode of narration was available to Greek authors from the very start (indeed, that it is a universal category) and, especially given the "spectacular" nature of some of the early examples, was as much an aspiration of Greek as it unquestionably is of modern literature.[38] On a more abstract plane, this outcome comfortably fits a traditional narrative according to which ancient authors constantly hearkened back to great predecessors and the tradition as a whole resisted change (was "in the grip of the past").

In my view, this conclusion should be resisted. What is needed is a more dynamic and historically oriented perspective on narratology, which allows for the fact that literary traditions 'learn', that is, become increasingly effective in achieving existing communicative aims and may develop new ones, by expanding the repertoire of stylistic devices or by assigning new functions to existing ones.[39] In order to trace such developments, both qualitative and quantitative considerations need to be taken into account. While I do not deny that reflector narrative in Homer exists, it is not, I believe, a device used with the sort of self-conscious awareness and artistry as in the *Anabasis*. Let us take the passage adduced by Rijksbaron, in which Odysseus looks at Alcinous' palace.[40] First, as Rijksbaron himself notes,

[37] RIJKSBARON (2012) 356 = (2018) 153.

[38] See STANZEL (^{8}2008) 16.

[39] See in general FLUDERNIK (2003). ARNAUD (1998) presents the interesting test case of the use of the English progressive tense, which on a micro-level exemplifies both sorts of development.

[40] DE JONG (2001) 129 counts seven other descriptive passages containing imperfects in the *Odyssey*, none nearly as elaborate as that about Alcinous' palace.

the passage contains a lot of information which exceeds the perception of Odysseus and before long (at 7, 103) even shifts into the present tense and the teller mode.[41] Furthermore, although Odysseus is described as being affected by what he sees and as standing in wondrous admiration (7, 82-83 πολλὰ δέ οἱ κῆρ / ὥρμαιν', "much did his heart ponder"; 133 ἔνθα στὰς θηεῖτο, "standing there he gazed"), not all that much is made of this. Thus, awestruck as he may be, he is perfectly capable of making sense of what he sees; vague designations, like the nameless ἄλλον ποταμόν in the Xenophontic passage cited above, do not occur, nor is the description limited to elements which are of particular relevance to Odysseus. Irene de Jong is right, I think, to take the occurrence of 'substitutionary perception' in the first place as "an effective means of suggesting the unsurpassed splendour of the Phaeacian king's domicile, which makes even an experienced traveller like Odysseus stand in awe"[42] – that is, in contrast to reflector mode descriptions in the *Anabasis*, this one is ultimately more concerned with the perceived entities than with the perceiver.

We can usefully expand these observations from individual passages to groups of similar scenes. While I cannot here offer a complete survey of arrival scenes in Greek literature up to Xenophon, a few things can be mentioned in order to further corroborate my point. First, properly geographical descriptions in Homer are much more frequently given in the teller mode than in the reflector mode, as in the following passage:[43]

> μνηστῆρες δ' ἀναβάντες **ἐπέπλεον** ὑγρὰ κέλευθα,
> Τηλεμάχῳ φόνον αἰπὺν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ὁρμαίνοντες.

[41] RIJKSBARON (2012) 353-357 = (2018) 151-154; also DE JONG (2001) 176. The problems surrounding the various tenses used in the passage have recently been discussed afresh by XIAN (2018).

[42] DE JONG (2001) 176.

[43] KAHN (1973) 245-249 collects 11 Homeric instances of geographical 'expositional formulas' with ἔστι ("there is"); only one (*Od.* 22, 126) has the imperfect (probably because the item no longer exists in the narrator's now).

> <u>ἔστι</u> δέ τις νῆσος μέσσῃ ἁλὶ πετρήεσσα,
> μεσσηγὺς Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιό τε παιπαλοέσσης,
> Ἀστερίς, οὐ μεγάλη, λιμένες δ' <u>ἔνι</u> ναύλοχοι αὐτῇ
> ἀμφίδυμοι· τῇ τόν γε **μένον** λοχόωντες Ἀχαιοί. (Hom. *Od.* 4, 842-847)
>
> "The suitors embarked and sailed over the watery ways, pondering in their hearts sheer murder for Telemachus. There is a certain rocky island in the middle of the sea, in between Ithaca and rugged Samos, Asteris, of no great size, but there is a harbour in it where ships can lie, with an entrance on both sides. There the Achaeans were lying in wait for him."

The island Asteris is described in the teller mode, as existing independently from the characters perceiving or acting in it. To be sure, the passage has its own artistry, inasmuch as it suggests that the suitors sail to Asteris during the time it takes the narrator to describe it: they set sail as the description starts, and are lying in wait when it ends.

However that may be, when we next turn to prose and consider how Greek historians elaborate the 'zero grade' narratives of the early mythographers by inserting descriptive material, we see that they, too, on the whole adopt the teller mode (perhaps from Homer), not the reflector mode. The former is, as far as we can tell, the exclusive mode in which Hecataeus presents geographical information, and Herodotus follows suit, not least in the long narrative of Xerxes' march into Greece (7, 26-127, an important intertext of the *Anabasis*).[44] Thucydides, too, an author often praised for the psychological insight he provides into his characters' motives, mostly uses the present tense as the vehicle for imparting geographical

[44] Rood (2012a) 127-128 mentions the present tense as characteristic of the Greek 'geographical style' and of Herodotus. For Hecataeus, see e.g. *FGrH* 1 F 207: Ἑκαταῖος ἐν Ἀσίαι· "ἐς μὲν τοῦτο ἡ Βεχειρική, <u>ἔχονται</u> δ' αὐτῶν Χοί." καὶ πάλιν· "μέχρι μὲν τούτων Χοί." καὶ πάλιν· "Χοῖσι δ' <u>ὁμουρέουσι</u> πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα Δίζηρες" "Hecataeus in his *Asia*: 'Becheirike extends to that point, the Choi border on them'; and again: 'The Choi extend as far as them'; and again: 'The Dizeres border the Choi to the east'".

information, even in passages in which one might expect otherwise. Consider:

> οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ξυνοικιζομένης τὸ πρῶτον *ἔδεισάν τε καὶ ἐνόμισαν* ἐπὶ τῇ Εὐβοίᾳ μάλιστα καθίστασθαι, ὅτι βραχύς ἐστιν ὁ διάπλους πρὸς τὸ Κήναιον τῆς Εὐβοίας. (Thuc. 3, 93, 1)
>
> "When this city was being founded, the Athenians were at first alarmed and they believed that it was being set up especially against Euboea, because the passage from Caeneum, a promontory of Euboea, to there is short."

> ἀντιλεγόντων δὲ κατὰ τύχην χειμὼν ἐπιγενόμενος *κατήνεγκε* τὰς ναῦς ἐς τὴν Πύλον. καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης εὐθὺς **ἠξίου** τειχίζεσθαι τὸ χωρίον (ἐπὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ξυνεκπλεῦσαι), καὶ **ἀπέφαινε** πολλὴν εὐπορίαν ξύλων τε καὶ λίθων, καὶ φύσει καρτερὸν ὂν καὶ ἐρῆμον αὐτό τε καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς χώρας· ἀπέχει γὰρ σταδίους μάλιστα ἡ Πύλος τῆς Σπάρτης τετρακοσίους καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ ποτὲ οὔσῃ γῇ, καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Κορυφάσιον. (Thuc. 4, 3, 1-2)
>
> "While they were making objections, a storm happened to come on and carried the fleet to Pylos. Demosthenes at once urged them to fortify the place (for, he said, that was why he had sailed with them), and he showed them that there was plenty of timber and stones, and that the position was naturally strong and, together with much of the surrounding country, unoccupied. For Pylos is about four hundred stadia distant from Sparta and is situated in what was once the territory of Messene; the Spartans call it Coryphasium."

These passages nicely show just how strong the 'pull of the present' is in supplying geographical information. In the former, the short crossing from the newly founded city Heraclea to Caeneum is the reason (ὅτι) for the Athenians' worries; yet, despite the fact that the Athenians' viewpoint is explicitly inscribed into the text with the phrase ἔδεισάν τε καὶ ἐνόμισαν, the remark about the distance between the cities is presented in the teller mode, in the present tense. In the second passage, a proper arrival scene, Demosthenes makes his fellow commanders see (ἀπέφαινε) the benefits of the spot where they have landed.

Among these, he points to the fact that the landing place and the country around it are unoccupied for a considerable distance (ἐρῆμον αὐτό τε καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς χώρας). But the reason for this (γάρ) is given in the teller mode, which uses the present tense and slips in some extra information about an alternative name for Pylos used in Sparta.

To be sure, the reflector mode is not entirely absent from Thucydides' geographical descriptions. Friedrich Sieveking, who was unfamiliar with the phenomenon of reflector mode narrative, but a shrewd analyst of Thucydides' descriptive practices, offers a summary overview of the occasional use of the imperfect in the relevant passages.[45] From this it appears, first, that substitutionary perception is not the chief reason for the use of the imperfect. Rather, it is used in the first place to describe things that no longer exist: e.g. 4, 8, 6 ἡ γὰρ νῆσος ἡ Σφακτηρία καλουμένη τόν τε λιμένα παρατείνουσα καὶ ἐγγὺς ἐπικειμένη ἐχυρὸν <u>ποιεῖ</u> ... ὑλώδης τε καὶ ἀτριβὴς πᾶσα ὑπ' ἐρημίας **ἦν** καὶ... "Now the island called Sphacteria makes the harbour safe, as it stretches along the mainland and lies close to it ... it was covered with woods and entirely without roads because it was uninhabited" – in anticipation of the burning down of the woods. Secondly, cases that do appear to mark the reflector mode are limited to single clauses and forms of ἦν: e.g. 4, 43, 3 οἱ δὲ ὑποχωρήσαντες πρὸς αἱμασιάν (**ἦν** γὰρ τὸ χωρίον πρόσαντες πᾶν)... "When they had retreated to a stone wall (for the ground was everywhere steeply sloping)...". It is clear, then, that Xenophon goes well beyond what his immediate predecessor did. He both uses the reflector mode in a more sustained way and he elaborates the form by including a broader set of devices (not just tense, but also perceiver-oriented deictics like "on their left hand", presentative sentences, 'vague' designations) as well as a wider variety of verbs. Indeed, a *TLG* Online search makes clear that ὥριζε and ἐνέβαλλεν, in the first reflector mode passage cited above, are the *only* imperfects of

[45] SIEVEKING (1964), especially 162-163.

these typically 'geographical' verbs in the required sense in extant classical Greek literature.

While further research into potential precedents is no doubt useful, I tentatively claim that the start of at least one type of 'reflector narrative', that in arrival scenes, lies with Xenophon. In turn – though that is another story – Xenophon's novel techniques probably exerted great influence on subsequent Greek literature, not in the least the novel. One thinks here, for instance, of Achilles Tatius' magnificent description of Alexandria (5, 1) in the reflector mode.[46] Yet, I end this section on a note of caution. My intention is not to claim Xenophon instead of Homer as the father of reflector mode narrative as it is used today, but merely to claim that he represents an important phase in the development of the style. To put it as clearly as possible, Xenophon was no Virginia Woolf. It is interesting to note in this respect that even Xenophon does not always escape the 'pull of the present', as appears from those instances in which present tenses appear in between imperfects in arrival scenes, as in:

> ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμὸν ἕνα παρασάγγας πέντε ἐπὶ πύλας τῆς Κιλικίας καὶ τῆς Συρίας. **ἦσαν** δὲ ταῦτα δύο τείχη, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἔσωθεν <τὸ> πρὸ τῆς Κιλικίας Συέννεσις **εἶχε** καὶ Κιλίκων φυλακή, τὸ δὲ ἔξω τὸ πρὸ τῆς Συρίας βασιλέως **ἐλέγετο** φυλακὴ φυλάττειν. διὰ μέσου δὲ ῥεῖ τούτων ποταμὸς Κάρσος ὄνομα, εὖρος πλέθρου. (Xen. *An.* 1, 4, 4)
>
> "Thence he marches one stage, five parasangs, to the Gates between Cilicia and Syria. These Gates consisted of two walls; the one on the hither, or Cilician, side was held by Syennesis and a garrison of Cilicians, while the one on the farther, the Syrian, side was reported to be guarded by a garrison of the King's troops. And in the space between these walls flows a river named the Carsus, a plethrum in width."

Apparently, it is simply *so* conventional to state that rivers "stream" through some place that the present tense is much the

[46] For that description, see MORALES (2004) 100-106. It is increasingly being acknowledged that the *Anabasis* was important to the development of the Greek novel; cf. TRZASKOMA (2011).

preferred tense to articulate the fact. In this light, most editors' preference for ἀπεῖχε δὲ Βαβυλῶνος οὐ πολύ at *An.* 2, 4, 12 (cited above) over the better attested (and indeed no doubt conventional) ἀπέχει may say more about modern tastes than about Xenophontic practice.[47] As a further example, consider once more the sentence which starts off the episode about the Macronians, cited above: ἐντεῦθεν δ' ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ Ἕλληνες διὰ Μακρώνων. In a truly sustained 'reflector narrative' the name Μάκρωνες would probably not appear, because the Greeks have no idea who the Macronians are. In fact, they find out only later on, when they question the inhabitants, who when asked, "said that they were Macronians" (4, 8, 5 οἱ δ' εἶπον ... ὅτι Μάκρωνες). From the perspective of modern readers, the opening sentence with hindsight even introduces a jarring note, as if the narrator had accidentally given the game away. A similar 'spoiler', many modern readers feel, mars the most famous passage of the *Anabasis.* The exhilaration felt by many readers at the famous cry of the Ten Thousand (4, 7, 24 θάλαττα θάλαττα, "the sea, the sea!") depends in large part on the fact that the whole scene is narrated through the eyes of the soldiers at the back, who cannot yet see the sea, so that the news comes as a surprise. However, in most manuscripts, the scene is introduced with a sentence in the teller mode, deriving from an omniscient narrator, which spoils the surprise:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους καὶ κατεῖδον τὴν θάλατταν, κραυγὴ πολλὴ ἐγένετο (Xen. *An.* 4, 7, 21)
>
> "Now as soon as the vanguard got to the top of the mountain and caught sight of the sea, a great shout went up."

[47] On the other hand – and this is another testimony of the 'pull of the present' – scribes were more prone to changing imperfects to presents than the other way round: see the Appendix below; Athenaeus (9, 390d; 14, 651b) also substitutes presents for imperfects in quotations of *An.* 1, 5, 3 and 2, 3, 14, but never the other way round. Some other mixed descriptions are discussed by RIJKSBARON (2012) 348-361 = (2018) 155-158, though not in terms of conventional frames of reference. See the Appendix for a full overview.

The offending words, καὶ ... θάλατταν, are left out by a single (though important) manuscript (C[1]). Editors who wish to follow suit need to decide if medieval scribes are likely to have been more or less sensitive to the subtleties of reflector mode narrative than Xenophon.

4. *Enargeia* and the reflector mode

In settling such issues, it would be useful if we could rely on secure knowledge of ancient reading habits. In this respect, recent work on the ancient stylistic concept of ἐνάργεια (usually rendered as "vividness") offers particularly promising new avenues of inquiry.[48] As it happens, one of the most elaborate definitions of ἐνάργεια to have survived from Antiquity concerns a comment on Xenophon's *Anabasis*. In his *Life of Artaxerxes* (8-13), Plutarch includes a lengthy report of the Battle of Cunaxa. While Plutarch focuses mostly on an evaluation of the protagonists – commenting, for instance, on Cyrus' recklessness and the Greek general Clearchus' undue caution – he refers readers looking for a more exciting account of the same events to the *Anabasis* (1, 8):

> τὴν δὲ μάχην ἐκείνην πολλῶν μὲν ἀπηγγελκότων, Ξενοφῶντος δὲ μονονουχὶ δεικνύοντος ὄψει καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς οὐ γεγενημένοις, ἀλλὰ γινομένοις ἐφιστάντος ἀεὶ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ συγκινδυνεύοντα διὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν, οὐκ ἔστι νοῦν ἔχοντος ἐπεξηγεῖσθαι, πλὴν ὅσα τῶν ἀξίων λόγου παρῆλθεν εἰπεῖν ἐκεῖνον. ὁ μὲν οὖν τόπος ἐν ᾧ παρετάξαντο Κούναξα καλεῖται καὶ Βαβυλῶνος ἀπέχει σταδίους πεντακοσίους. (Plut. *Artax.* 8, 1-2)

> "Since many writers have left reports of that battle, and since Xenophon brings it all but before our eyes and through his

[48] See especially the now classic work of WEBB (2009) 87-106; WALKER (1993) remains good on ἐνάργεια in historiography. Recently, ἐνάργεια and its effects have been approached from various cognitive angles, and discussed in terms of "immersion" (ALLAN / DE JONG / DE JONGE [2017]) and "embodiment" (GRETHLEIN / HUITINK [2017] 85-88; HUITINK [2019]). These various perspectives all emphasize the importance of intradiegetic points of view to a proper understanding of ἐνάργεια.

> vividness all the time places the reader, much affected and sharing in the dangers, near to the action, as if it had not been concluded, but is going on, it is folly to narrate it in full, except so far as that man has passed over things worthy of mention. Now then, the place at which the armies were drawn up is called Cunaxa and is five hundred stades away from Babylon."

Xenophon's narrative is designed, Plutarch claims, to produce in readers a largely prereflective, sensory and emotional, understanding of what the experience of living through the battle was like. Ἐνάργεια is here said to put readers in the position of an eyewitness to the battle, as Xenophon does not merely "tell" (cf. ἀπηγγελκότων), but "all but shows it to the eyes"; to elicit from them a phenomenal sense of being physically present in the plain of Cunaxa, as Xenophon "sets the reader near to the events";[49] and to make them experience the emotions of the actual combatants (the understood complement of συν- in συγκινδυνεύοντα) for themselves.

Plutarch does not tell us what passages of Xenophon's Cunaxa narrative or what exact linguistic/narratological devices struck him in particular as being conducive to ἐνάργεια. But given his description of ἐνάργεια's effects, it seems likely enough that he had passages of reflector mode narrative in view. Xenophon's account does indeed offer such passages, not in the least at the start of the relevant chapter, which describes the tense final moments just before the battle.[50] The Greek mercenaries have taken up their positions in the battle line and await the arrival of the enemy troops of Artaxerxes:

> καὶ ἤδη τε **ἦν** μέσον ἡμέρας καὶ οὔπω καταφανεῖς **ἦσαν** οἱ πολέμιοι· ἡνίκα δὲ δείλη **ἐγίγνετο**, *ἐφάνη* κονιορτὸς ὥσπερ νεφέλη λευκή, χρόνῳ δὲ συχνῷ ὕστερον ὥσπερ μελανία τις ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἐπὶ πολύ. ὅτε δὲ ἐγγύτερον **ἐγίγνοντο**, τάχα δὴ καὶ χαλκός τις **ἤστραπτε** καὶ λόγχαι καὶ αἱ τάξεις καταφανεῖς **ἐγίγνοντο**. καὶ

[49] Cf. LIDDELL / SCOTT / JONES (⁹1996) *s.v.* ἐφίστημι A.I.2 for the expression ἐφίστημι τοῖς πράγμασι "to let someone have a hand in affairs", which nicely suggests a still more actively involved reader.

[50] See further GRETHLEIN (2013) 54-57.

> **ἦσαν** ἱππεῖς μὲν λευκοθώρακες ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐωνύμου τῶν πολεμίων (Τισσαφέρνης **ἐλέγετο** τούτων ἄρχειν), ἐχόμενοι δὲ γερροφόροι, ἐχόμενοι δὲ ὁπλῖται σὺν ποδήρεσι ξυλίναις ἀσπίσιν (Αἰγύπτιοι [δ'] οὗτοι **ἐλέγοντο** εἶναι), ἄλλοι δ' ἱππεῖς, ἄλλοι τοξόται. πάντες δ' οὗτοι κατὰ ἔθνη ἐν πλαισίῳ πλήρει ἀνθρώπων ἕκαστον τὸ ἔθνος **ἐπορεύετο**. πρὸ δὲ αὐτῶν ἅρματα διαλείποντα συχνὸν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὰ δὴ δρεπανηφόρα καλούμενα· **εἶχον** δὲ τὰ δρέπανα ἐκ τῶν ἀξόνων εἰς πλάγιον ἀποτεταμένα καὶ ὑπὸ τοῖς δίφροις εἰς γῆν βλέποντα, ὡς διακόπτειν ὅτῳ ἐντυγχάνοιεν. ἡ δὲ γνώμη **ἦν** ὡς εἰς τὰς τάξεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλθόντων καὶ διακοψόντων. (Xen. *An.* 1, 8, 8-10)
>
> "And now it was midday, and the enemy were not yet in sight; but when afternoon was coming on, there was seen a rising dust, which appeared at first like a white cloud, but some time later like a kind of blackness in the plain, extending over a great distance. As the enemy came nearer and nearer, there were presently flashes of bronze here and there, and spears and the hostile ranks began to come into sight. There were horsemen in white cuirasses on the left wing of the enemy, under the command, it was reported, of Tissaphernes; next to them were troops with wicker shields and, farther on, hoplites with wooden shields which reached to their feet, these latter being Egyptians, people said; and then more horsemen and more bowmen. All these troops were marching in national divisions, each nation in a solid square. In front of them were the so-called scythe-bearing chariots, at some distance from one another; and the scythes they carried reached out sideways from the axles and were also set under the chariot bodies, pointing towards the ground, so as to cut to pieces whatever they met; the intention, then, was that they should drive into the ranks of the Greeks as they advanced with the intention of splitting the opposing line."

Even a commentator as level-headed as Otto Lendle was impressed by this prose: "Man spürt dem Bericht Xenophons die Spannung an, mit welcher er das eindrucksvolle Manöver beobachtet hat, und muß die Anschaulichkeit seiner Darstellung bewundern".[51] As Michel Buijs has suggested, Lendle's observation about the "Anschaulichkeit" of Xenophon's narrative can be substantiated by tracing how the historian presents

[51] LENDLE (1995) 67.

the arrival of Artaxerxes' army through the eyes of the Greek soldiers.[52] The reflector mode narrative is shaped by a whole host of devices, including some we have not encountered in the arrival scenes discussed so far. Buijs points to the adverbial expressions ἤδη and τάχα δή, which refer to a character's experience of the story-now, the designation of the Persian army as οἱ πολέμιοι, which reflects the perceiving characters' point of view, and the deictic predicates οὔπω καταφανεῖς ἦσαν, ἐφάνη, ἐγγύτερον ἐγίγνοντο, and καταφανεῖς ἐγίγνοντο. These inscribe an intra-diegetic point of view into the text, as "appearing" and "moving closer" imply movement towards some perceiving entity located in the world of the story. In addition, one can point out that the negation οὔπω denies the expectations of the Greek soldiers (*they* thought the enemy would already be there), just as it is the Greeks who guess at their enemies' motive for taking scythe-bearing chariots with them (ἡ δὲ γνώμη ἦν…). Furthermore, after the initial ingressive aorist ἐφάνη, the description proceeds largely through imperfects (ὅτε δὲ … ἐγίγνοντο, ἤστραπτε, καταφανεῖς ἐγίγνοντο, etc.). Finally, it may be noted more generally that the details which the narrative provides about the army's appearance become ever more fine-grained as it approaches. A particularly nice touch is that, when it comes too close to take in as a whole, the information is divided over increasingly briefer anaphoric clauses (ἐχόμενοι δέ/ἐχόμενοι δέ; ἄλλοι δ'/ἄλλοι) and then an asyndeton (ποδήρεσι ξυλίναις ἀσπίσιν). These divisions convey the impression that the scene is scanned by observers ever more quickly moving their eyes and head from left to right in an effort to take it all in.[53]

It is likely that Plutarch was sensitive to at least some of the linguistic devices mentioned here. His remark stands as a testimony to ancient readers' appreciation of reflector mode narrative, which may have contributed to its further development. Yet, in

[52] Buijs (2005) 108.

[53] See Huitink (2019) 180-181, arguing that ancient critics, including Quintilian and Ps.-Longinus, were very much alive to such syntactic features and their 'embodiment' effects.

historiography it was always just one among a set of options from which the historian could choose. Plutarch reminds us of that, too. For all that he praises Xenophon, his comment is double-edged. For the deadpan continuation of his report (introduced by what I take as an ironically employed μὲν οὖν "well then") immediately points up a potential shortcoming of the sort of riveting narrative Xenophon wrote: apparently, the historian failed to mention even such a basic fact as that the celebrated Battle of Cunaxa took place at ... Cunaxa![54] Wishing to make his narrative match the experience of the Greek soldiers at the time, who probably did not know the name of the place, Xenophon did not use hindsight (the privilege of the historian) to supply it. And so, Plutarch implies, Xenophon's striving for ἐνάργεια comes at the expense of a complete and accurate report of events – that is of the historiographical virtue of ἀκρίβεια.[55] Plutarch's own report of Cunaxa is a useful and perhaps even necessary supplement to that of Xenophon (especially for any Fabrices del Dongo among the Ten Thousand), as it provides readers with an *ex post facto*, more intellectual sort of understanding of what happened (and where, how, and why) as well as with edifying insights into the historical actors' moral character.

5. Conclusion

In line with the purpose of the *Entretiens* to offer readers a synthesis of work done in an area of classical scholarship, I have tried in this chapter to indicate how some of the recent contributions to the fields of linguistics, narratology, ancient historiography, and ancient rhetorical theory may be combined in order

[54] Plutarch is right: the name "Cunaxa" does not occur in the *Anabasis*. In fact, it occurs only here; Plutarch probably derived the detail, along with much of the rest of his narrative, from Ctesias' *Persica*.

[55] On ἀκρίβεια, see MARINCOLA (1997) index *s.v.* "accuracy (ἀκρίβεια / τὸ ἀκριβές)".

to illuminate the nature of Greek historiographical prose, both synchronically and diachronically. I have also tried to suggest some future directions the sort of research presented here may take in order to arrive at a 'grammar' of ancient Greek narrative. Indeed, I am well aware that each section of my chapter could be expanded into a much fuller study, which I hope this programmatic piece may indeed inspire.[56]

Appendix:
Present- and past-tense descriptions in Xenophon's *Anabasis*

Present-tense descriptions: 1, 2, 7-9 Celaenae: ῥεῖ ὁ Μαίανδρος ποταμός, αἱ πηγαὶ εἰσιν, ῥεῖ, ἔστι βασίλεια, ῥεῖ καὶ οὗτος [Marsyas river] καὶ ἐμβάλλει, τὸ εὖρός ἐστιν, ὁ ποταμὸς καλεῖται Μαρσύας; **1, 2, 22** Cilician plain: πεδίον φέρει, περιέχει [περιεῖχεν C^{1}DV]; **1, 2, 23** Tarsus: διὰ μέσου τῆς πόλεως ῥεῖ ποταμὸς Κύδνος ὄνομα; **5, 3, 11-13** Scillus excursus: ἔστι δὲ ἡ χώρα κτλ.; **6, 1, 15** Sinope: Σινωπεῖς οἰκοῦσι, ἄποικοί εἰσιν; **6, 4, 1-6** Calpe Harbour: τὸ δὲ χωρίον τοῦτο ὃ καλεῖται Κάλπης λιμὴν ἔστι κτλ.; 7, **1, 24** Thracian Field: τὸ δὲ χωρίον οἷον κάλλιστον ἐκτάξασθαί ἐστι τὸ Θρᾴκιον καλούμενον; 7, 5, **12-13** Salmydessus in Thrace: τῶν πολλαὶ [*sc.* ships] ὀκέλλουσι καὶ ἐκπίπτουσι, τέναγός ἐστιν, οἱ Θρᾷκες λῄζονται.

Present-tense λέγεται statements: 1, 2, 8 (Celaenae, where Apollo flayed Marsyas); **1, 2, 8** (Celaenae, where Xerxes built a palace), **1, 2, 13** (Thymbrius, where Midas hunted down the satyr); **1, 2, 16** (καὶ λέγεται δεηθῆναι ἡ Κίλισσα Κύρου ἐπιδεῖξαι

[56] This chapter was written in the context of the "Anchoring Innovation" research programme of the Netherlands National Research School in Classical Studies (OIKOS), which is supported by a 2017 Gravitation Grant (Ministry of Education of the Netherlands, NWO); see <https://www.ru.nl/oikos/anchoring-innovation/>. Apart from my co-participants at the *Entretiens*, I would like to thank Jonas Grethlein for his incisive comments on an earlier version of this paper.

τὸ στράτευμα αὐτῇ, combined with two instances of ἐλέγετο nearby); **3, 4, 11** (Mespila, where the King's wife Medea took refuge; ἐλέγετο f); **3, 5, 15** (Susa and Ecabatana, where the King is said to spend part of the year);[57] **6, 2, 1** (Cape of Jason, where the Argo landed [often seen as an interpolation owing to geographical problems]); **6, 2, 2** (Acherusian peninsula, where Heracles went down to fetch Cerberus); **6, 4, 2** (Bithynian Thracians, who treat Greeks who fall into their hands badly). There are four more occurrences outside the main narrative, in the 'obituaries' of Cyrus and the generals (**1, 8, 14**; **1, 8, 28**; **1, 8, 29**; **2, 6, 29**).

Past-tense descriptions: **1, 4, 1** Psarus river: οὗ ἦν τὸ εὖρος τρία πλέθρα; **1, 4, 1** Pyramus river: οὗ ἦν [om. FM] τὸ εὖρος στάδιον; **1, 4, 6** Myriandus city: ἐμπόριον ἦν τὸ χωρίον, ὥρμουν ὁλκάδες; **1, 4, 9** Chalus river: full of fishes, οὓς οἱ Σύροι θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον καὶ ἀδικεῖν οὐκ εἴων, αἱ δὲ κῶμαι ἐν αἷς ἐσκήνουν Παρυσάτιδος ἦσαν εἰς ζώνην δεδομέναι; **1, 4, 11** at the Euphrates: πόλις αὐτόθι ᾠκεῖτο μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων Θάψακος ὄνομα; **1, 4, 19** at the Araxes river: ἐνταῦθα ἦσαν κῶμαι πολλαὶ; **1, 5, 10** Charmande city: τοῦτο [millet] γὰρ ἦν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ πλεῖστον; **1, 7, 14-15** towards Cunaxa: τάφρος ἦν ὀρυκτὴ, παρετέτατο ἡ τάφρος, [ἔνθα … ἔπεισιν del. edd.], ἦν πάροδος; **2, 4, 12** Median Wall: ἦν ᾠκοδομημένον πλίνθοις, μῆκος ἐλέγετο εἶναι εἴκοσι παρασάγγαι, ἀπεῖχε [M, ἀπέχει c, ἀπέσχε f] Βαβυλῶνος οὐ πολύ; **2, 4, 27** 'Villages of Parysatis': ἐνῆν δὲ σῖτος πολύς; **2, 4, 28** march τὸν Τίγρητα ποταμὸν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ ἔχοντες: πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ πόλις ᾠκεῖτο μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων ὄνομα Καιναί; **3, 4, 7-9** Larisa (= Nimrud): ἐνταῦθα πόλις ἦν ἐρήμη μεγάλη, ὄνομα δ' αὐτῇ ἦν Λάρισα, τοῦ τείχους ἦν τὸ εὖρος, ᾠκοδόμητο, κρηπὶς ὑπῆν, παρὰ ταύτην τὴν πόλιν ἦν [om. C^1] πυραμὶς λιθίνη; **3, 4, 10-11** Mespila (= Nineveh): ὄνομα δὲ ἦν τῇ πόλει Μέσπιλα, ἦν ἡ κρηπὶς λίθου, ἐπῳκοδόμητο τεῖχος; **4, 3, 5** heights in Armenia: αἱ ὄχθαι αὗται τρία ἢ

[57] Quite possibly an interpolation; see HUITINK / ROOD (2019) *ad loc.*

τέτταρα πλέθρα ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀπεῖχον, ὁδὸς μία ὁρωμένη ἦν; **4, 4, 2** march through Armenia: εἰς ἣν ἀφίκοντο κώμην μεγάλη ἦν, βασίλειον εἶχε, τύρσεις ἐπῆσαν, ἐπιτήδεια ἦν δαψιλῆ; **4, 4, 3** Teleboas river: οὗτος ἦν καλὸς μέν, μέγας δ' οὔ, κῶμαι πολλαὶ περὶ τὸν ποταμὸν ἦσαν; **4, 5, 25** villages in Armenia: αἱ οἰκίαι ἦσαν κατάγειοι; **4, 7, 1** Taochians: χωρία ᾤκουν ἰσχυρὰ οἱ Τάοχοι, τὰ ἐπιτήδεια εἶχον ἀνακεκομισμένοι; **4, 7, 15** Chalybians: οὗτοι ἦσαν ὧν διῆλθον ἀλκιμώτατοι; **4, 7, 19** city ἣ ἐκαλεῖτο Γυμνιάς; **4, 7, 21** a mountain: ὄνομα δὲ τῷ ὄρει ἦν Θήχης; **4, 8, 9** boundaries of the Colchians: ἐνταῦθα ἦν ὄρος μέγα, προσβατὸν δέ; **4, 8, 20** Colchian lands: τὰ δὲ σμήνη πολλὰ ἦν αὐτόθι; **5, 2, 3** Drilae: ἓν ἦν χωρίον μητρόπολις αὐτῶν (ὃ μ. α. ἐκαλεῖτο f); **5, 4, 15** a stronghold of the Mossynoecians: ᾠκεῖτο τοῦτο πρὸ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Μητροπόλεως καλουμένης; **5, 4, 27-29** stores of the Mossynoecians: ἦσαν ζειαὶ αἱ πλεῖσται, στέαρ ᾧ ἐχρῶντο οἱ Μοσσύνοικοι, κάρυα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνώγεων ἦν, τούτων πλείστῳ σίτῳ ἐχρῶντο, οἶνος ὃς ὀξὺς ἐφαίνετο εἶναι; **5, 4, 31** stronghold of the Mossynoecians: τοιάδε ἦν τῶν χωρίων, ἀπεῖχον αἱ πόλεις ἀπ' ἀλλήλων στάδια ὀγδοήκοντα, ὑψηλή τε καὶ κοίλη ἡ χώρα ἦν; **5, 5, 2** Tibarenians: ἡ τῶν Τιβαρηνῶν χώρα πολὺ ἦν πεδινωτέρα καὶ χωρία εἶχεν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ ἧττον ἐρυμνά; **7, 4, 14** Thynians: αἱ οἰκίαι κύκλῳ περιεσταύρωντο.

Mixed present- and past-tense descriptions ('no verb' (Ø) I take as *sc.* ἐστι/εἰσι): **1, 2, 5** Maeander river: τὸ εὖρος δύο πλέθρα Ø, γέφυρα ἐπῆν; **1, 4, 4** Gates between Cilicia and Syria: ἦσαν ταῦτα δύο τείχη, διὰ μέσου ῥεῖ ποταμὸς Κάρσος ὄνομα, εὖρος πλέθρου Ø [ἦν C[1]DBAE], τὸ μέσον τῶν τειχῶν ἦσαν στάδιοι τρεῖς; **1, 4, 10** Dardas river: οὗ τὸ εὖρος πλέθρου Ø, ἐνταῦθα ἦσαν τὰ Βελέσυος βασίλεια, παράδεισος ἔχων πάντα ὅσα ὧραι φύουσι; **1, 5, 1** plain in Arabia: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ ἦν μὲν ἡ γῆ πεδίον ἅπαν κτλ., τὰς ὠτίδας ἄν τις ταχὺ ἀνιστῇ ἔστι λαμβάνειν, πέτονται γὰρ κτλ., τὰ κρέα αὐτῶν ἥδιστα ἦν [ἐστι Athen. 9.390d]; **1, 5, 4** River Mascas: ἐνταῦθα ἦν πόλις, ὄνομα αὐτῇ Κορσωτή Ø, περιερρεῖτο αὕτη ὑπὸ τοῦ Μάσκα κύκλῳ;

1, 5, 6 Lydian market: ὁ σίγλος δύναται ἑπτὰ ὀβολούς, ἡ δὲ καπίθη δύο χοίνικας Ἀττικὰς ἐχώρει; **2, 3, 14** villages near Cunaxa: ἐνῆν [ἐν Athen. 14.651b] σῖτος, βάλανοι τῶν φοινίκων οἵας μὲν ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν; **2, 4, 25** Physcus river: ἐπῆν γέφυρα, ἐνταῦθα ᾤκεῖτο πόλις μεγάλη ᾗ [om. C^1] ὄνομα Ὦπις Ø; **4, 3, 1** border between Armenia and Carduchian territory at the Centrites river: ὃς ὁρίζει τὴν Ἀρμενίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν Καρδούχων χώραν, ἀπεῖχε τῶν ὀρέων ὁ ποταμὸς ἓξ ἢ ἑπτὰ στάδια.[58]

Works cited

ALBER, J. / FLUDERNIK, M., "Mediacy and Narrative Mediation", in P. HÜHN *et al.* (eds.), *The Living Handbook of Narratology* (Hamburg), <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/mediacy-and-narrative-mediation> [view date: 14 Nov. 2018].

ALLAN, R.J. (2013), "History as Presence: Time, Tense and Narrative Modes in Thucydides", in A. TSAKMAKIS / M. TAMIOLAKI (eds.), *Thucydides between History and Literature* (Berlin), 371-389.

ALLAN, R.J. / DE JONG, I.J.F. / DE JONGE, C.C. (2017), "From *Enargeia* to Immersion: The Ancient Roots of a Modern Concept", *Style* 51, 34-51.

ARNAUD, R. (1998), "The Development of the Progressive in 19th-Century English: A Quantitative Survey", *Language Variation and Change* 10, 123-152.

BAKKER, E.J. (1997), "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides", in E.J. BAKKER (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (Leiden), 7-54.

—— (2007), "Time, Tense and Thucydides", *CW* 100, 113-122.

BRADLEY, P.J. (2001), "Irony and the Narrator in Xenophon's *Anabasis*", in E.I. TYLAWSKY / C.G. WEISS (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Gordon Williams. Twenty-five Years at Yale* (New Haven), 59-84.

BROWNSON, C.L. / DILLERY, J. (1995), *Xenophon. 3, Anabasis* (Cambridge, MA).

[58] ὡρίζει F, which just might hide ὥριζε; it is the *only* clear-cut geographical pointer of the route in Books 3-5.

BUIJS, M. (2005), *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse. The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's* Hellenica *and* Anabasis (Leiden).
CHIAROMONTE, N. (1985), *The Paradox of History. Stendhal, Tolstoy, Pasternak, and Others* (Philadelphia).
COE, R.N. (1985), "The Anecdote and the Novel: A Brief Enquiry into the Origins of Stendhal's Narrative Technique", *Australian Journal of French Studies* 22, 3-25.
DENNISTON, J.D. ([2]1954), *The Greek Particles* (Oxford).
DIK, H. (1995), *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam).
DOMAINKO, A. (2018), *Uncertainty in Livy and Velleius. Time, Hermeneutics and Roman Historiography* (Munich).
DOVER, K.J. (1997), *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford).
FEHR, B. (1938), "Substitutionary Narration and Description: A Chapter in Stylistics", *English Studies* 20, 97-107.
FLUDERNIK, M. (1996), *Towards a "Natural" Narratology* (London).
—— (2003), "The Diachronization of Narratology", *Narrative* 11, 331-348.
FOWLER, R.L. (2001), "Early *Historiē* and Literacy", in N. LURAGHI (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford), 95-115.
—— (2006), "How to Tell a Myth: Genealogy, Mythology, Mythography", *Kernos* 19, 35-46.
—— (2013), *Early Greek Mythography.* II, *Commentary* (Oxford).
GRAY, V.J. (2003), "Interventions and Citations in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*", *CQ* 53, 111-123.
GRETHLEIN, J. (2012), "Xenophon's *Anabasis* from Character to Narrator", *JHS* 132, 23-40.
—— (2013), *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography. "Futures Past" from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge).
GRETHLEIN, J. / HUITINK, L. (2017), "Homer's Vividness: An Enactive Approach", *JHS* 137, 67-91.
HAU, L.I. (2014), "Stock Situations, *Topoi* and the Greekness of Greek Historiography", in D. CAIRNS / R. SCODEL (eds.), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh), 241-259.
HUITINK, L. (2019), "*Enargeia*, Enactivism and the Ancient Readerly Imagination", in M. ANDERSON / D. CAIRNS / M. SPREVAK (eds.), *Distributed Cognition in Classical Antiquity* (Edinburgh), 169-189.
HUITINK, L. / ROOD, T. (2019), *Xenophon, Anabasis Book III* (Cambridge).
DE JONG, I.J.F. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge).

KAHN, C.H. (1973), *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek* (Dordrecht).
LANG, M.L. (1995). "Participial Motivation in Thucydides", *Mnemosyne* 48, 48-65.
LENDLE, O. (1995), *Kommentar zu Xenophons* Anabasis *(Bücher 1-7)* (Darmstadt).
LENDON, J. (2017), "Battle Descriptions in the Ancient Historians", *G&R* 64, 39-64 and 145-167.
LIDDELL, H.D. / SCOTT, R. / JONES, H.S. ([9]1996), *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a Revised Supplement Edited by* P.G.W. GLARE / A.A. THOMSON (Oxford).
LILJA, S. (1968), *On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose* (Helsinki).
MARINCOLA, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
MORALES, H. (2004), *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon (Cambridge).
PURVES, A.C. (2010), *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge).
RIJKSBARON, A. ([3]2002), *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction* (Amsterdam).
—— (2012), "The Imperfect as the Tense of Substitutionary Perception", in P. DA CUNHA CORRÊA *et al.* (eds.), *Hyperboreans. Essays in Greek and Latin Poetry, Philosophy, Rhetoric and Linguistics* (São Paulo), 331-375.
—— (2018), *Form and Function in Greek Grammar. Linguistic Contributions to the Study of Greek Literature* (Leiden).
ROOD, T. (2010), "Xenophon's Parasangs", *JHS* 130, 51-66.
—— (2012a), "Herodotus", in I.J.F. DE JONG (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Leiden), 121-140.
—— (2012b), "Xenophon", in I.J.F. DE JONG (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Leiden), 161-178.
SICKING, C.M.J. / STORK, P. (1997), "The Grammar of the So-Called Historical Present in Ancient Greek", in E.J. BAKKER (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (Leiden), 131-168.
SIEVEKING, F. (1964), "Die Funktion geographischer Mitteilungen im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides", *Klio* 42, 73-179.
STANZEL, F.K. (1981), "Teller-Characters and Reflector-Characters in Narrative Theory", *Poetics Today* 2, 5-15.
—— ([8]2008), *Die Theorie des Erzählens* (Stuttgart).
TRZASKOMA, S.M. (2011), "The *Anabasis* of Chaereas and Callirhoe", *Ancient Narrative* 9, 1-35.

WALKER, A.D. (1993), "*Enargeia* and the Spectator in Greek Historiography", *TAPhA* 123, 353-377.
WEBB, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Aldershot).
WILLI, A. (2017), "Towards a Grammar of Narrative Voice: From Homeric Pragmatics to Hellenistic Stylistics", in N.W. SLATER (ed.), *Voice and Voices in Antiquity* (Leiden), 233-259.
XIAN, R. (2018), "Zur Beschreibung des Alkinoos-Palasts (*Od.* 7,84-132)", *Philologus* 162, 189-207.

DISCUSSION

A. Cassio: The Acusilaus quotation in *P.Oxy.* 1611 (a series of excerpts of literary and mythographical nature) deals with the story of Caeneus (Καινεύς), the mythical king of the Lapithae, who was first a woman but was changed into a man by Poseidon, and rendered invulnerable. The actual quotation (fr. 1, iii. 56 ff.) starts with Poseidon having intercourse with Caene (not yet Caeneus), but since it was impossible for her to bear children he turned her into a man: Καινῆι δὲ τῆι Ἐλάτου μίσγεται Ποσ<ι>δ<έ>ων ἔπειτα (οὐ γὰρ ἦν αὐτῆι ἱερὸν παῖδας [[τ]] τεκὲν οὔτ' ἐξ ἐκείνου οὔτ' ἐξ ἄλλου οὐδενός) ποιεῖ αὐτὴν Ποσε[ι]δέων ἄνδρα ἄτρω[το]ν. It seems to have gone unnoticed that KAINHI is morphologically ambiguous, since it can be interpreted as both the dative of a feminine Καινή and the epic dative of Καινεύς (see Homeric Οδυσσῆι, Ὀϊλῆϊ, etc.). It is interesting to notice that the only accusative attested in Homer is Καινέα (*Il.* 1, 264 Καινέα τ' Ἐξάδιόν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον) and that all the forms of this name attested in Greek, apart from this one and a Καινῆος in the *Argonautica Orphica* 170, show the 'recent' declension Καινέως Καινεῖ Καινέα. This proves that Καινῆι was chosen on purpose in order to make the ambiguity possible.

L. Huitink: Thank you for this wonderful observation. In terms of the purposes of my paper, I think it highlights two important issues. First, your observation makes it more likely that our Acusilaus fragment offers us the beginning of a new episode (for there ambiguous KAINHI would have its fullest impact), while the end of the fragment also looks as if it gives us the actual end of the episode. Therefore, it now looks even more likely that this precious fragment gives us a fair impression

of the narrative manner of an early mythographer. Secondly, your observation underlines the fact that, for all that this early prose seems rather unprepossessing, it in fact is artfully and carefully shaped in order to produce certain effects. Of course, I did not mean to suggest that writing 'zero grade' narratives is at all easy or excludes all artistry – and Robert Fowler has in fact stressed the remarkable intellectual achievement that is early Greek mythography in the publications to which I refer.

F. Schironi: What about a comparison between early Presocratic prose and the early historians? As you say, the style of these historians is not narrative. Yet it reminds me of the 'encyclopedic', list-like style of certain Hippocratic works (e.g. *Epidemics*): so should we treat these early prose-writers more as belonging to another genre (the list/collections of data) rather than as the predecessors of historical narrative? In other words, they were compiling 'lists' of myths/histories, which then came to be expressed through narrative by later writers (i.e. Herodotus), while the list-like style was transferred to other 'drier' genres, like medical case studies.

L. Huitink: It would indeed be fascinating to take a look at what we know about early Greek prose as a whole. You are certainly right, I think, that doing so would illuminate both the practices of the early mythographers and of the early historians like Herodotus. After all, as Rosalind Thomas and others have shown, Herodotus is at home, and engages with, many different types of discourse, including Presocratic and Sophistic non-narrative literature. In that sense, Herodotus is the 'magpie'-like successor to a whole range of earlier Greek literature, not just the mythographers. Yet, I would maintain that writing narrative – which is so ubiquitous that we often take it for granted – has its own challenges, which are just as profound as those involved in writing, say, refined philosophical arguments. And here, Herodotus' predecessors in prose were the mythographers. I think that acknowledging that is also important. For

example, it is often said that Herodotus is 'still' in part an oral author. But actually, if Fowler is right to describe mythography as a written genre, it is fairer to say that Herodotus is oral 'again'. I mean that he may have realised that, in order to find ways to shape true narratives (taking into account perceptions, deliberations, etc.) he needed to look back to Homer and adopt epic (and so also oral) structures into his own prose narrative – though he did not to any large extent adopt the reflector mode that is latently present in Homer.

A. Willi: To read the historical presents in the early historiographers along your lines – indicating that there is no 'mediating presence' – strikes me as eminently sensible. But the fact that they can assume that function is also contextually conditioned as they are not placed within the framework of surrounding narrative. I think that historical presents in later authors, including the textbook example in Herodotus 1, 10, in some ways do the opposite as they disrupt the surrounding narrative flow and by this very fact draw attention to the existence of the historian's 'mediating presence': they do not so much pull the audience into the events, as is sometimes claimed, but signpost what the author wants to be perceived as key points.

L. Huitink: You are referring to the famous sentence, ὡς δὲ κατὰ νώτου ἐγένετο ἰούσης τῆς γυναικὸς ἐς τὴν κοίτην, ὑπεκδὺς ἐχώρεε ἔξω, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐπορᾷ μιν ἐξιόντα. The effect of this historical present in my view depends precisely on the fact that this present 'stands out' from the surrounding past tenses; it is perhaps this, as much as the present *per se*, which gives the reader a 'jolt', which I also would not necessarily describe in terms of 'being pulled in'. Of course, the present tenses in the mythographers are different precisely because they are the *main* tense; if anything, it is imperfects and aorists which give the reader a 'jolt'. Perhaps the sort of 'chapter heading' use we find in those ἐξελαύνει-passages I cite in Section 2 deserve further consideration as cases that may forge a connection between the

so-called 'annalistic' and the properly 'historic/dramatic' use of the present: being expanded by properly narrative passages, such 'chapter headings' become more and more stand-alone. This would very much fit in with examples which Fludernik in her 2003 paper gives of devices (*in casu* certain discourse markers) which change function over the course of a literary tradition.

A. Willi: I find the development you sketch for the early evolution of historiography very convincing, both as far as the nature and purpose of the mythographers' texts is concerned and where you identify Xenophon as the 'inventor' of reflector narrative. But this then makes me wonder to what extent it may be due to his literary *persona* being quite different from the literary *personae* of his predecessors – one might say that Herodotus presents himself as the 'academic researcher', Thucydides as the 'observer and analyst', but Xenophon is the first 'practicioner' historian, and the reflector narrative neatly helps to underline this role. If that were true, it would be interesting to know what later historiographers do: after all, they will operate in a historiographical context which already knows fully-fledged reflector narrative (thanks to Xenophon), but for example Polybius certainly does not present himself in a Xenophontian 'practicioner' role.

L. Huitink: The issue you raise is an important one and requires much more systematic research than I have been able to report for this chapter. I should like to emphasize that I do not see the various modes as successive. Once a fully-fledged reflector mode has formed, it is available for use by other authors, but not to the exclusion of the teller mode or indeed other ways of shaping narrative. Xenophon himself uses the reflector mode much more sparingly in the *Hellenica* and hardly ever in the *Cyropaedia* (though that may reinforce the link you perceive with the 'practitioner historian' – Plutarch, by the way, no doubt thought that Xenophon's ἐνάργεια was the result of Xenophon's autopsy). The case of Polybius is special,

I think. He both utters principled objections against ἐνάργεια (in the much-discussed chapter 2, 56) and he interrupts his narrative so often that there is hardly room for sustained reflector mode narrative to develop. Perhaps the more explicitly 'dramatic' Greek historiographers of the Roman Empire are better candidates. I am thinking first and foremost of Josephus' *Jewish War*.

S.D. Olson: I am very sympathetic to the idea that narrative is usefully conceived as a technology, and thus as something that can be refined through invention: Xenophon, you suggest, makes significant innovations in story-telling strategies, and those innovations are adopted by subsequent narrators, who incorporate and occasionally build upon what he has done. You present this developmental view as a rejection of an older one, which treats various narrative modes as something like a universal grammar of story-telling that is just as visible in modern texts as in ancient ones. The problem with this way of structuring the argument is that – as you yourself note – 'reflector narrative' is already apparent in *Odyssey* 7 and can scarcely be an innovation on Xenophon's part. But do you need to reject a deep 'universal grammar of story-telling' to insist on Xenophon's power as an innovator? Compare cooking: wet-cooking (boiling, stewing, and the like) and dry-cooking (roasting, frying, etc.) are universally available, basic technologies, but we do not prepare our food as people did in Homeric times or before, because one individual after another has found a clever variant on previously developed ways of doing things and passed it on to others. So too perhaps with the incremental but nonetheless admirable narrative advances of Xenophon.

L. Huitink: Perhaps I have played down the role of reflector narrative in the *Odyssey* a bit too much, although I would still maintain that it would not figure high on a list of things that are very 'typically' Homeric. I also would insist that it is useful if we can speak of different degrees and various shades in such

matters. I do like your 'cooking' analogy and take its basic point. Yet, it also raises questions. After all, there are forms of cooking, say, the currently fashinable 'molecular cooking', which have not always been universally available (though molecular cooking is a refined form of procedures available in both dry- and wet-cooking, I suppose). An equivalent in literature may be the (purposefully) weird and incoherent narrative techniques of certain post-modern novels. These, too, of course, are still somehow anchored in both earlier literary forms and ultimately in hard-wired cognitive processes. So, the question is what is 'basic' or 'universal' (or, to use Fludernik's term, 'natural'), and that, I feel, is a question that is difficult to answer. When do we speak of a 'device', which perhaps implies some degree of artistry and even some degree of awareness on the part of the reader that something can be read in a certain way? Is, for instance, the use of the imperfect enough to force an interpretation in terms of reflector mode narrative? Did Homer's contemporary audience read it this way or are we now conditioned to do so, reared on a diet of Stendhal, Flaubert, and others? A main purpose of my chapter is precisely to open up such questions, which seem to me not to have been given enough attention yet.