Classical Quarterly **53.1** 111–123 (2003) *Printed in Great Britain*

INTERVENTIONS AND CITATIONS IN XENOPHON, *HELLENICA* AND *ANABASIS*

Herodotus and Thucydides have benefited from the impetus that narratology has given to the analysis of historical narrative,[1] and Xenophon deserves this too, not least because his first-person interventions into his narratives and his citations of 'what people say' are, in the absence of prefaces for either *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*, the only evidence he gives us of his historical programme and his use of sources.[2]

The most recent discussion considers his interventions 'the closest thing that *Hellenica* offers to programmatic content', but concludes that 'their unhelpfulness is manifest' in establishing it, and that the anonymity and uneven distribution of the citations reduces them to a mere 'stylistic quirk'.[3] This paper argues that his interventions and citations do reveal a coherent programme and method and that this addresses the historian's requirement to narrate 'great deeds that provoke wonder'.[4] Xenophon used these techniques to similar effect in *Cyropaedia*. Their analysis offers insights into his narrative techniques and his historiography.

FIRST-PERSON INTERVENTIONS

Most of Xenophon's first-person interventions are evaluations for praise and blame, which are recognized as one of his characteristic contributions to historical writing. Most of them address the leadership of individuals, though some also evaluate the actions of whole communities. They have been called digressions, but many of them are an integral part of the main narrative, which is written entirely to support them.[5]

[1] For example, D. Gribble, 'Narrator interventions in Thucydides', *JHS* 118 (1998), 41–67, on interventions in Thucydides; I. J. F. de Jong, 'The anachronical structure of Herodotus' *Histories*', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics* (Oxford, 2001), 93–116, on the structure of Herodotus. I am indebted to narratology, but do not consistently use its terminology, preferring 'historian' and 'audience' to 'narrator' and 'narratee'. I restrict my enquiry to interventions in the first person because these have been the focus of debate, but there is a fine line between these and those which do not use the first person; I call these others 'virtual' first-person interventions where I do address them.

[2] Perhaps he wrote no prefaces in order to give his audiences an impression of unmediated historical objectivity; Gribble (n. 1), 41–3 indicates that historians can promote belief in their narratives by removing themselves from them or by engaging with the audience through them. It is certainly to objectify the account of his own achievements that he attributes Anabasis to 'Themistogenes' (*Hell.* 3.1.2); Plut. *Mor.* 345F; M. MacLaren , 'Xenophon and Themistogenes', *TAPA* 65 (1934), 240–7; J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Greek Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 186; and he presents *Hellenica* as a continuation of Thucydides to the same end (ibid., 237–8). However, this investigation of his interventions and citations will show that he is not as completely absent from his narrative as suggested by Marincola (ibid.), 10: 'The narrator in Xenophon . . . is not only unintrusive; he is practically anonymous. His works recognize the value of a mostly impersonal narrative told in a style largely free of rhetorical adornment, in achieving credibility.' Ibid., 69: 'Xenophon, as so often, leaves his methodology to be inferred from the text.'

[3] C. Tuplin, *The Failings of Empire* (Stuttgart, 1993), 36–41, with n. 91.

[4] Marincola (n. 2), 34–9 addresses this as a major task of the historian, but without reference to Xenophon.

[5] Marincola (n. 2), 174 locates praise and blame after Thucydides 'mainly in digressions removed from the basic narrative'. This is true of Xenophon's evaluation of Cyrus and the Greek

They have been supposed to defend content that Xenophon acknowledges to be 'unworthy of account' because it addresses ethical concerns that are new to history,[6] but, to be more precise, they define great virtue or vice in ways that are new, sometimes in content which is also new to history; they often take into account the circumstances in which the qualities are shown or the status of those who exhibit them, or reveal more important qualities than those that are apparent. Xenophon thus reflects the interests of his teacher Socrates in ethical definitions (*Mem.* 1.1.16; 3.9.1–3, 14–15). Narratives had always revealed the qualities of their participants, but the definition of what constituted greatness was open to debate.

Narratology emphasizes the engagement between the historian and his audience and holds that interventions can address tensions in the reader–narrator relationship caused by unusual presentations or interpretations of events, or present confrontations between the time of narration and the time of the event in order to point to themes and improve the reader's understanding.[7] Xenophon's interventions often address tensions caused by the reader's superficial evaluation of the narrative as unworthy of record, acknowledging their impression that the events have nothing worthy of narration in them, but then uncovering a greatness that is not immediately apparent. They confront readers' ignorance about what is worthy of praise or blame, and encourage them to question appearances and assumptions.[8] They also direct their attention to narratives that exhibit a special kind of magnitude.

The pattern is illustrated in the evaluation of Theramenes (*Hell.* 2.3.56), the first intervention in that work (with the first citation). He 'is said' to have made jokes as he was led away to his death. Told that he would suffer if he was not silent, he responded, 'Will I not suffer even if I am silent?' And he tossed out the dregs of the poisonous hemlock with the toast, 'This to the lovely Critias!' Xenophon then intervenes: 'I am not unaware that these sayings are *οὐκ ἀξιόλογα*, but I judge this admirable in the man, that with death at his side neither his wit nor playfulness deserted his soul.' No historian needed to defend the inclusion of 'sayings' in history, but he might have to defend his inclusion of jokes to a reader of a serious disposition. It helps to know that Xenophon wrote *Symposium* precisely to re-evaluate playfulness; his introduction calls play as 'worthy of memory' as serious achievements (1.1) and he recorded Socrates' own courageous playfulness as he was also led away to death (*Ap.* 27–8). His comment on Theramenes introduces this new definition into historical narration, acknowledging that the reader may think the jokes unworthy of narration, but uncovering, with greater perception, the self-control that lay behind them and was so remarkable in the circumstances in which they were made. He made no such comment on the saying of Pasimachus (*Hell.* 4.4.10), perhaps because, in the context of battle, he did not consider the reader likely to misinterpret its worth, but he makes Theramenes use one when he reveals the hidden significance of his action in clinging to the altar; he acknowledges that it will not protect him (this is the reader's superficial impression), but that his removal from it will demonstrate the impiety of his persecutors (*Hell.* 2.3.51–2).

generals (*An.* 1.9, 2.6), and the praise of the Phliasians (*Hell.* 7.2), but not the praise of Teleutias (5.1.4), Iphicrates (6.2.32), and Epaminondas (7.5.19).

[6] Marincola (n. 2), 21–2: 'Xenophon, interested in ethical questions, seems to chafe at the restrictions of political history.'

[7] Gribble (n. 1), 49, 50–1.

[8] Xenophon's virtual first-person interventions have this same function; for example, *Hell.* 5.1.19–24 confronts and corrects a reader's impression that it was foolish for Teleutias to sail into Piraeus with only twelve ships.

Theramenes sets the pattern for subsequent interventions. *Hellenica* 5.1.4 acknowledges the apparent lack of 'worthy expenditures, perils and stratagems' in the preceding scene of farewell for Teleutias, but then uncovers the secret of great leadership that lay behind it. The evaluation of Iphicrates (6.2.32) acknowledges that there is apparently nothing special about his preceding preparations, but defines a focus of greater praise: that he combined preparation with speed. His choice of his enemies as colleagues (*Hell.* 6.2.39) also uncovers hidden worth; the choice seems to be against his better interests and no cause for praise, but the intervention reveals the immense confidence or immense good sense that the choice revealed. *Hellenica* 7.5.8 acknowledges that the campaign of Epaminondas was unlucky, but praises him for his foresight and daring, showing that great qualities can be found even in unsuccessful actions. *Hellenica* 7.5.19 acknowledges that there is nothing special in his ambition, but praises as greater how he prepared his troops to fulfil it. *Anabasis* has fewer interventions of this sort, but 1.9.24 also redefines greatness in the same way:

> It is no cause for wonder that Cyrus outdid his friends in doing them more service, because he was more powerful; but it was a cause for wonder that he outdid them in caring for them and in showing a keenness to do them favours [which do not depend on power].[9]

The evaluation of the achievements of the Phliasians (7.2.1) acknowledges that it is more usual for an historian to praise the fine achievement of the large polis, but finds greater cause for praise in the many fine achievements of the small polis, because their small size made it extraordinary. Other evaluations redefine greatness with the virtual first-person. So Agesilaus 'won repute' for an action that is acknowledged to be 'small' but whose greatness lay in being 'timely'; for it restored the morale of the army whose presence on the heights ensured the capture of the Heraion (*Hell.* 4.5.4). *Hellenica* 4.4.19 acknowledges that 'it is possible to say without doubt' that he was courageous, but adds, to reveal even greater courage, that there was a safer way open to him, which he did not take; this encourages reflection that courage is greater when voluntary.

Hiero 2.3–5 indicates that Xenophon's ability to see through appearances distinguishes the philosopher from the ignorant majority. Dionysius of Halicarnassus admired the same discrimination in Theopompus, who also exhibited it in his own evaluations: 'not only to see and mention in each event what is apparent to the many, but to search out the hidden causes of deeds . . . and the passions of the soul, which are not easy for the many to know, and to unveil the mysteries of seeming virtue and unseen vice'.[10] Xenophon's acknowledgements of the unworthy appearance of his material anticipate what this unperceptive 'majority' might think without the philosopher's intervention.[11] He is of course constructing the reader's beliefs and may exaggerate their superficiality, but his construction allows him to advertise his discrimination in contrast and to overcome any resistance his real audiences may in fact feel.[12] His interventions also demonstrate a discriminating persona that gives him the authority

[9] *Cyr.* 8.2.13 evaluates the same quality in Cyrus the Great in the same way.

[10] D.H. *Pomp.* 5.

[11] Narratologists identify these readers as 'narratees': G. Prince, 'An introduction to the study of the narratee', in J. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader–Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism* (Baltimore, 1980), 7–25. The technique of negating their views is as old as Homer: de Jong (n. 1), 61–8.

[12] S. Hornblower, 'Narratology and narrative techniques in Thucydides', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994), 131–66, at 152–8 has various interpretations of negation in Thucydides.

as an historian that he might have more overtly claimed in a preface. Their characterizing function is made explicit in the evaluation in *Agesilaus* 2.7, where he says that if he praised Agesilaus merely for joining forces with fewer and weaker troops, he would show himself to be 'a fool' in praising such recklessness, and Agesilaus to be 'witless'.[13] More discriminatingly he admires how Agesilaus had, with equal discrimination, prepared his troops to be the best possible. His discrimination may guard against the charge of prejudice, which became a serious problem for later historians,[14] because it was supposed to make them distort the facts.[15] Xenophon was the contemporary of those he evaluates, and contemporaries were particularly liable to the charge,[16] but Lucian calls him 'just' in his evaluations.[17] Lucian also says that the historian should be a 'stranger in his own works' to guard against the charge,[18] but discriminating intervention achieved the same end.

Most of Xenophon's interventions are for praise, but he also presents new reflections on what is worthy of blame. *Hellenica* 5.3.7 acknowledges that when a master attacks slaves in anger, he suffers for it; but when a commander such as Teleutias attacks the enemy in anger, his status makes him even more blameworthy; his 'complete error' caused not only his own death but the destruction of the useful part of his army (5.3.6), and gave the enemy a new confidence that required the dispatch of a second army (5.3.8). *Hellenica* 6.5.51 finds the blame for Iphicrates' bad generalship greater 'in that crisis' because success on the occasion in question would have achieved so much; the vulnerability of the opposing forces is spelled out in the preceding narrative. *Hellenica* 5.4.1 reveals that the gods blamed the Spartans for their impiety in transgressing their oaths about autonomy, and the tyrants they installed for their injustice in enslaving their people; for they were both overthrown by inferior numbers, the Spartans by those alone whom they had wronged, and the tyrants by seven exiles, and such inexplicable outcomes had to have divine causes. The blame of the gods then marks these particularly great transgressions, rather than the merely human blame of the narrator.

Hellenica 5.4.1 introduces a narrative with a statement of blame and *Hell.* 5.3.7 closes one with a similar statement. Another category of first-person interventions announces the beginning of a narrative in which greatness is then subsequently redefined for the reader.[19] So the introductory description of the battle of Coronea as 'unlike any other in our times' (*Hell.* 4.3.16) anticipates the new evaluation of Agesilaus' courage. *Hellenica* 4.8.1 announces: 'I will record those events that are worthy of memory and pass over those not worthy of report',[20] and then has Dercylidas define worth in a new way in the first episode it narrates about the loyalty of the men of Abydos, using the form of evaluation that Xenophon uses of Epaminondas: that there

[13] Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1.1 indicates that the technique comes from rhetoric, where belief derives from the character that the speaker projects and how he disposes the audience to believe what he says.

[14] Marincola (n. 2), 158–74 defines the problem; Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 39–41.

[15] Marincola (n. 2), 61.

[16] Cf. Lysias 12.62–78 on the contemporary controversy about Theramenes. *Hell.* 1.6–7 paints a fairly black picture, which is balanced by the courage of his death.

[17] Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 39. Xenophon shows this justice in blaming Proxenus even though he was his friend (*An.* 2.6.16–20), and in *Hellenica* where he both praises and blames Teleutias (praised: 5.1.4, blamed: 5.3.7) even though he was a half-brother of Agesilaus, and gives Iphicrates the same treatment (praised: 6.2.32 and 39, blamed: 6.5.49–50), showing his even-handedness toward Spartans and Athenians.

[18] Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 41.

[19] *Hell.* 4.2.16, 4.8.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.3, 7.5.27 and *An.* 2.3.1.

[20] Herodotus uses this announcement too (1.177), but without redefinition.

is 'no wonder' in loyalty in good fortune, but loyalty in misfortune is 'worthy of memory' for all time (4.8.4).

Some other interventions order the narrative without evaluations (cf. 3.2.31 and 3.3.11), but two major instances open and close digressions on the overthrow of great tyrants by very small numbers. These are similar in their content to 5.4.1 and seem to draw attention to praise for actions that are all the greater for being achieved by smaller numbers, just as the deeds of small poleis are greater as those of larger ones (cf. 7.2.1). *Hellenica* 6.5.1 closes the account of the assassination of Jason, who is called the greatest man of his times, at the hands of a mere seven youths (cf. 32) and of his tyrant brother at the hands of his wife and brothers-in-law; another introduces the assassination of the tyrant Euphron at the hands of a few exiles, and their acquittal (*Hell.* 7.3.4). Other introductory interventions draw attention to actions in which the praise or blame is very great for other reasons. The virtual first-person intervention: 'the disaster to the regiment happened in the following way' introduces an account in which carelessness and incompetence secure the defeat of an entire regiment of hoplites by light-armed peltasts (*Hell.* 4.5.11). *Hellenica* 7.5.27 closes the entire narrative with a concluding evaluation of the indecisiveness of the final struggle, which so confounded all expectation, and introduces a narrative yet to be written of an even 'greater anarchy' to come, which the writer passes on to another to record.

There is also a category of very brief interventions that occur within episodes to mark great numbers and superlative reputations. So *Hell.* 4.2.16 'I shall reveal the masses on either side' highlights the great numbers who fought at Nemea; a citation then validates the especially large numbers of the Argives, who 'were said to be' 7,000. So *An.* 1.2.5 refers back to 'the numbers I have mentioned' of men that Cyrus had gathered—large enough to worry Tissaphernes (1.2.4). Interventions such as 'I think' mark Cyrus' superlative reputation for giving and receiving of gifts (1.9.22), and his superlative popularity (1.9.28); in the latter, citation reinforces intervention: 'from what I hear [i.e. people said], I judge no man to have been loved by more people'. Interventions (2.6.6) in combination with citations (2.6.1) also mark Clearchus' superlative reputation for love of war.[21] *Anabasis* 2.3.1 also refers back to 'what I said earlier' about the great fear of the Great King of Persia at the approach of the Greeks; his fear is made all the greater by the intervening description of how Clearchus controlled equal fear in the Greek camp. *Hellenica* 3.4.8 has the same arrangement; Xenophon says that Agesilaus controlled his anger, but showed it later; in the meantime he punished the person who angered him; but Agesilaus' anger was less remarkable than the king's fear and draws no comment.

CITATIONS

As indicated above, first-person interventions are sometimes found alongside citations of what others have said, about the superlative reputation of Cyrus (*An.* 1.9.28), and the large numbers at Nemea (*Hell.* 4.2.16–17). The first citation in *Hellenica* is also found alongside the first intervention in the evaluation of Theramenes (2.3.56); so that while the citation validates his witty words (λέγεται . . . ἔφασαν), the

[21] The first-person also introduces material of special significance for the praise of Cyrus in *Cyropaedia*, e.g. the super enthusiasm of his men (3.3.59), his excellence as a commander (8.2.6), his remarkable generosity (8.2.12). *Cyropaedia* also marks the disposition of such material, clustering in the arrangements that Cyrus made for his empire: 8.1.17, 40, 48; 8.2.2, 7, 8.3.1, 8.4.5, 8.5.2, 8.6.16–17.

intervention points to the self-control they revealed. Xenophon has at his disposal a range of narrative devices to mark what is worthy of report, and in particular, in the case of citations, to validate it for the reader.

Autopsy was a powerful source of validation in historical writing. Xenophon makes no overt claims to his own autopsy,[22] or that of his witnesses, but he evidently values it; he has his characters endorse it,[23] claims it in his other works,[24] bases his assessments of Cyrus and Clearchus on the universal agreement of those who had experience of them,[25] and cites Ctesias where his medical autopsy counted.[26] This makes it likely that that those he cites for details of his information are witnesses. Their anonymity has deprived them of authority, and their irregular distribution has reduced them to a stylistic feature of *Hellenica*.[27] Yet their appearance in *Anabasis* makes them more than a stylistic feature; and Homeric speakers already give the anonymous voices of 'those who have seen or heard' the authority of witnesses.[28]

The major function of citations is to validate content that the reader might find too great to be believed. The writer engages with his reader to authorize: excessively large or small numbers,[29] sensational deaths,[30] significant reputations,[31] great impiety or the

[22] *Anabasis* is the product of his own autopsy and probably also *Hell.* 3.1–4.7. D.L. 2.51 says that Xenophon returned to Asia with Agesilaus; he probably continued to serve him until the end of the Corinthian War.

[23] Agesilaus' indication that Dercylidas would give the Greeks in Asia the 'finest' report of the battle of Nemea ἐπεὶ παρεγένου (*Hell.* 4.3.2) is not as positive about eye-witness as Marincola (n. 2), 69, n. 31 suggests, since Agesilaus may expect him to give an exaggerated account of the battle to impress the Asiatic Greeks (as participants customarily do: *Hiero* 2.15–16); Iphicrates is a better paradigm; he does not believe that Mnasippus has been defeated because αὐτόπτου μὲν οὐδενὸς ἀκηκόει, and he suspects deceit until he finds such witness (*Hell.* 6.2.31); he shows the same respect for autopsy in his campaign against Anaxibius (*Hell.* 4.8.36); he is blamed indeed for devoting too many forces to the task of eye-witness (*Hell.* 6.5.51).

[24] *Oec.* begins 'I once also heard him . . .'; *Symp.* begins 'I want to reveal the events at which I was present from which I know these things'; *Ap.* cites Hermogenes, an eye-witness, for the events surrounding Socrates' death; the claims to have heard or been present punctuate the conversations of *Mem.* too: e.g. 1.4.2, 4.3.2.

[25] *An.* 1.9.28: 'from what I hear'; 1.9.1, 20: 'agreed by all those who seem to have experience of Cyrus': cf. 1.9.5, 23; cf. 2.6.1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15 for Clearchus.

[26] R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, 1973), 103–16: Ctesias was the physician of Artaxerxes and wrote a history of the period covered by Xenophon's *Anabasis*, but giving a Persian perspective and continuing the story down into the 390s B.C. Xenophon does not introduce him as the historian, however, but 'the doctor' who was 'at the king's side' and he limits his evidence to his witness as a doctor, such as wounds and casualties (*An.* 1.8.26–7).

[27] Tuplin (n. 3), 39, n. 91.

[28] De Jong (n. 1), 237–8 discusses φᾶσι in Homer; *Od.* 7.322 and 19.383 demonstrate that such voices are witnesses; *Od.* 3.184, *Il.* 4.374–5 use them to supplement the speaker's autopsy. *Od.* 8.487–91 describes the effect of the convincing story, told 'as if' present as a witness or hearing it from one who was.

[29] *Hell.* 3.2.27 (said to measure out silver by the bucket), 5.3.2 (said to have killed 80 men single-handed), 6.2.16 (said to have a lot of money), 6.4.12 (the small numbers of the line at Leuctra), 6.2.30 (the tithing of the Thebans), 6.4.29 (the huge numbers of sacrificial animals), 6.5.29 (huge numbers of released helots); probably also the 'great' silence and depression in the camp of the Thebans (3.5.21); *An.* 1.10.1 (the four stades of flight 'through his own camp' underlines the cowardice of Ariaeus and his men), 1.10.18 (the large numbers of supply wagons), 1.2.12 (another large amount of money).

[30] *Hell.* 3.1.14, 4.4.10, 5.3.2, 5.4.7, 6.4.37; *An.* 1.6.11 (the disappearance of Orontas' body), 1.8.24, 26, 28, 29.

[31] *Hell.* 3.1.8 ('called Sisyphus'), 3.3.8 (most beautiful), 5.4.57 (very beautiful); *An.* 1.10.2 (beauty again), 1.10.7–8 (Episthenes), 4.3.4 (Hyrcanians) 6.4.2 (validates the sensational brutality of the Thracians), 7.4.15 ('they say that they use clubs to chop the heads off spears' validates

activities of gods,[32] significant sayings,[33] and that which is generally excessive.[34] *Cyropaedia* uses them in the same way.[35]

Those who speak to the writer as sources do need to be distinguished from those who speak within the narrative to other characters.[36] The latter are more common and provoke reactions from within during the action, but sources comment after the event. The present tense might indicate a source, but there is a mixture of present and past reports on Theramenes' sayings and the present tense 'they say' can refer vividly to the past as well as to the narrator's own times. The distinction sometimes calls for fine judgement, but the very need to make the distinction shows how closely sources are engaged in the action as eye-witnesses.[37] For this reason, they include other historians only where they were also participants; this is why Xenophon calls Ctesias 'the doctor' rather than the historian and limits his evidence to what he saw as a participant (see below).

The citations do not authorize entire stories, only details in a larger story that the narrator tells in his own voice, but this is also true of Homer's. The strength of the device would be lost if it applied to the entire story, and a story in which every detail was sensational would certainly be beyond belief. So, Xenophon tells most of the story of Mania in his own voice, but cites others for her strangulation; her son-in-law Meidias 'is said' to have done it (*Hell.* 3.1.14). The detail that exceeds ordinary belief is in this case the shocking betrayal of the woman's trust in a family member. *Hiero* 3.7 shows that such relationships were normally the most secure. He does not use citations where his own knowledge falls short, or because he disbelieves the report, or for any other straight research reason. It is to anticipate the disbelief of shock about Mania's strangulation that the narrator reminds the reader of his engagement with witnesses. He vouches in his own voice for other detail that was just as inaccessible to outsiders as

more of their extreme brutality). Homer's voices also confirm reputations: de Jong (n. 1) as her category B3.

[32] *Hell.* 6.4.7–8 (the report of an atheistic view) 6.4.30 (impiety), 7.1.31 (divine signs), 7.5.12 (divinely inspired madness), also 1.4.12 and 5.4.17 (omens); *An.* seldom mentions gods in the narrative, but 1.4.18 wrongly credits the fall of a river level as homage to the future king.

[33] *Hell.* 2.3.56, 4.4.10, 7.1.30.

[34] The enthusiasm of the troops and the tears of the hierarchy in the Tearless Battle (*Hell.* 7.1.31–32), bribery (*Hell.* 5.4.20), drinking (*Hell.* 6.2.6, 6.4.8), and extra-marital sex (*An.* 1.2.12). The enthusiasm of troops attracts comment throughout Xenophon's works (*Hell.* 7.5.19, *Cyr.* 3.3.59, *An.* 1.5.8).

[35] For example, reputations (1.2.1, 3.2.7, 4.6.11, 8.2.13–14, 8.5.28); things divine (1.6.1, 4.2.15); and the tears that prove the excessive and almost romantic love of the young Cyrus (1.4.25–8); cf. above the tears of the Tearless Battle; a good range of things excessive in other ways are: Cyrus' subjugation of all the races that fill the earth (8.6.20) and his enjoyment of perpetual springtime (8.6.22).

[36] De Jong (n. 1), 114–18; S. Richardson, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, 1990), 70–82 defines such short reported utterances as 'speech-acts' or 'speech as action'.

[37] For example, what 'they said' at *Hell.* 4.8.34 is part of the action, whereas what 'was said' at 4.8.36 may be a source or a report that Iphicrates heard. An anonymous referee of this paper brought several examples to my attention which could fall into either category. Those who 'said that' many soldiers turned up before Iphicrates, and 'blamed him' for his delay (*Hell.* 6.5.49) look like reports that were made in the course of the action; Iphicrates reacts to them when he ceases to delay. The ambassadors give the reports about Epaminondas to their assembly (*Hell.* 7.4.40); the Heracleots similarly report Lycon's threats to their assembly (*An.* 6.2.8). The characters who have crossed the river receive the reports about its source (*An.* 4.5.2). *Hell.* 3.5.21 looks like a possible report from the opposing camp ('they thought they were in great danger again and they said that there was great silence and depression in their camp'); otherwise the Thebans report on their own mood.

the strangulation, but not sensational enough to require validation, such as her interviews with Pharnabazus. Similarly, he vouches for most of the invasion of Laconia, but marks with citations the 'near-miss' that almost prevented the invasion, as well as the huge numbers of the helots freed in that invasion. The comment on the significant near-miss, 'if Ischolaus had gone forward . . . they said that none would have got through this pass' (*Hell.* 6.5.26), validates a very significant turning point. The subsequent narrative makes it plain that the Thebans would not have been emboldened to burn and plunder if the Arcadians had not penetrated the pass and killed Ischolaus' force. The narrative can draw attention to the area of disbelief in various ways, including its language. *Hellenica* 4.2.22 highlights a turning point in a battle which gave the Spartans a victory with no casualties: 'as the first polemarch was preparing to engage the enemy face to face, someone, to their surprise (ἄρα) is said to shout the command to let the first ranks pass'. The particle registers how unusual this was in such a disciplined army.

The persuasive potential in such voices is their autopsy, but also the narrator's ability to confirm or deny their reports and produce further conviction. Xenophon confirms what 'is said' of Theramenes with his intervention; he confirms the murder of Mania more obliquely when he adds that Meidias 'also killed her son'; he sometimes adds a confirming explanation ('they thought' that Agis was unwilling rather than unable to take Elis—'for' it had no walls: *Hell.* 3.2.27; 6.2.16: 'it was said' that Mnasippus was unwilling rather than unable to pay his soldiers—'for' most allies had sent cash); or presents the detail as the result of an account he has already given (the report that Mnasippus' mercenaries reached a very high level of luxury is the result of the preceding account of the richness of the land they plundered: *Hell.* 6.2.6); or presents confirming statements introduced by the particle combination δ' οὖν ('at any rate', restricting the proof to a single detail, as γ' οὖν does); 'Cyrus δ' οὖν then paid his troops' confirms the reports that the queen gave him a lot of money (*An.* 1.2.10–12). *Anabasis* 1.10.7–8 thus confirms what 'was said' of Episthenes' reputation as a clever commander: 'Tissaphernes δ' οὖν as if he was at a disadvantage, did not re-engage.' The universal agreement of those cited confirms the reputation of Cyrus, 'agreed by all those who seem to have experience of Cyrus' (*An.* 1.9.1, 20; cf. 1.9.5, 23, and of Clearchus (2.6.1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15). Very occasionally Xenophon dissents, for example from the view that the Theban leaders engineered the omens before Leuctra (*Hell.* 6.4.7–8). He states his own view elsewhere that the gods influenced the outcome (*Hell.* 5.4.1). Reports received by other characters confirm this, as does his comment δ' οὖν that everything was looking bad for the Spartans and good for the Thebans.

The account of Cunaxa (*An.* 1.8) has special interest because of this interaction and because it includes the only reference to a named source in *Anabasis* or *Hellenica*. Citations mark the great moments in the two main phases of the narration: how the Greeks survived the charge of the scythed chariots of King Artaxerxes, and how Cyrus fought in personal combat with his brother. The narrator frequently vouches for two stages of the action but leaves the third more sensational stage to other voices to validate. He describes how the Greeks sang a war-song and charged (1.8.18), but others say that they clattered their spears on their shields to frighten the horses. There seems no reason why he should vouch for the first two phases, but not the third, except to validate their audacious courage against the chariots, which were the major threat. He has an almost live debate with these other voices to confirm the sensational failure of the chariots to inflict any casualties at all (1.8.20). He asserts as if he were a witness that: 'There was a man overtaken, like one amazed at a horse-race.' Yet he adds that

'they said' that not even he was hurt, and as if bowing to their report, he denies all casualties from the chariots and accepts only the injury of a man who 'was said' to have caught an arrow on the left wing from the archers. He allows his sources to reject his own already minimal estimate of the numbers to maintain that the chariots caused none at all, and the only casualty was from the archers; this is his central conviction.

In the other phase of the battle, the account of the remarkable casualties that Cyrus inflicted, the narrator again vouches for two actions, but leaves the climactic third to a source. He vouches for Cyrus' charge against the King's forces, his victory and routing of the enemy, but Cyrus 'is said' to have killed their leader Artagerses with his own hand' (1.8.24). He vouches for Cyrus' pursuit, his sighting of Artaxerxes, and the words that he uttered as he charged, but 'Ctesias says' that he wounded him right 'in the chest and through the breast-plate', adding that he treated the wound himself (1.8.26). He describes the wound that Cyrus sustained 'under his eye' and the numbers of those who died on his side, but cites Ctesias for 'all those who' died around Artaxerxes. Cyrus dies, eight of the best die with him, and his trusted servant 'is said' to have died with him in a climactic act of devotion, unusual in a slave (1.8.28). In *Hellenica* too, the narrator vouches for Derdas' pursuit of the enemy over 90 stades (5.3.2), but his personal slaughter of 80 horsemen is vouched for by other voices; 'he is said' to have achieved this.

Ctesias has the same validating role here as other anonymous voices.[38] He is not cited for everything that he witnessed on the king's side,[39] only those features which challenged belief: the epic wound that Cyrus gave the king and the great numbers (ὁπόσοι) he slaughtered. His participation gives him his authority, and his authority is the stronger in that he is a hostile witness in the service of the king. Perhaps he exaggerated the seriousness of the wound or the numbers of the casualties in order to praise his own medical service, but Xenophon uses him to validate the power of Cyrus' blow against the king and the numbers that he killed. *Anabasis* 1.7.13 also uses hostile witness: 'what was said' about the numbers of the forces of the king came from deserters before the battle and was confirmed by captives after it. Xenophon doubly validates these numbers because they were so large. He may share the reader's initial disbelief, but confirms them with witnesses who agree from different conditions and loyalties.

Neither the citations nor the interventions are found very frequently. That would exhaust and destroy their power. On the other hand, their power is proven by their clustering in accounts of remarkable events. Teleutias' audacious naval attack on Piraeus, and Iphicrates' careful campaign to re-establish the naval power of Athens, attract two interventions each (*Hell.* 5.1.4 and 19, 6.2.32 and 39). Citations cluster in the account of Cunaxa above, and in *Hellenica* to mark the battle of Leuctra, where the Spartans met with a great disaster. The omens before Leuctra attract citation because they are one of the usual areas that strain belief. Other voices also describe the Spartan drinking that attended their last council of war, which attracts citation for its excessive indulgence, as well as the very small numbers of the Spartans, who lined up for battle in threes in their *enomotia* and (in continuing reported speech) produced a

[38] Herodotus also cites anonymous sources as well as named ones, for example in order to validate reports of the activities of the gods (Hdt. 6.94.1, 105.1–2, 117.2–3).

[39] Plutarch, *Art.* 11 has him sustain the wound under his eye which Xenophon mentions, but then he wanders about the field, eventually to sustain a further wound in his thigh, rupturing a vein, and collapsing, not without also hitting his head on a stone. 'Such is the story of Ctesias, in which, as with a blunt sword, he is long in killing Cyrus, but kills him at last.'

line no more than twelve men deep (*Hell.* 6.4.12). His familiarity with the Spartans suggests that his own doubt about their numbers is not the reason for the citation; rather the remarkable thinness of their line challenged the belief of the reader.

The Tearless Battle, which re-established the pride of the Spartans, has four citations marking remarkable features: that Archidamus called on his men to recover their ancestral honour; that there was ominous lightning and thunder when he made the speech; that the men were so filled with energy that it was a job for the leaders to restrain them; that Agesilaus and the elders and the ephors cried at the news (*Hell.* 7.1.30–2). Similar clustering voices confirm the details of the enormous power of Jason: 'they said' that his demands on each polis were very moderate, yet produced a vast amount because there were so many poleis that he could call on; 'they said' that he intended to manage the festival and the games himself; the god 'is said' to have told enquirers that these were his concern. The narrator confirms the reports in calling him the greatest man of his times: *Hellenica* 6.4.27 (captured in the triple colon of 6.4.28), and in describing him δ' οὖν as 'being so great and having intentions so great and of this kind'. *Anabasis* uses similar clusters in the account of the relations between Cyrus and the Cilician Queen (1.2.12, 14). She 'was said' to have given him a large sum of money; he 'was said' to have slept with her; she 'was said' to have asked for an exhibition of the army. Women who act like men frequently do things that are 'hard to believe'. Mania is another; there is also Alexander's wife (*Hell.* 6.4.37).

It may be easily objected that source citation does not mark all content in a category. This is because other 'strategies of verisimilitude' are available.[40] Homer for example introduced an imaginary witness as a participant into the action being narrated.[41] Xenophon calls on such a witness to visualize Agesilaus' transformation of Ephesus into a 'workshop of war' ('it was possible to see . . . he made the whole polis worthy of sight . . . a man would have been cheered on seeing this': *Hell.* 3.4.16–20). Citation and visualization seem to be alternative ways of validating events: through the witness of others, or by making a witness of the reader.[42] He heightens visualization with the metaphor, and a rhetorical question. *Hellenica* 4.4.12 similarly draws attention to the role of the gods in a rhetorical question and visualizes the sensational numbers of the dead in the battle for Corinth: 'Men accustomed to gaze on heaps of corn or wood or stones then gazed on heaps of corpses.' The same use of visualization is found in *An.* 1.5.8, 4.7.13–14 and *Cyr.* 3.3.70, 7.1.38.

The narrator's choice of device lies in his judgement about the main focus of his material. Comparison shows that he reserves visualization for scenes where spectacle is central. The account of the reception of the news of Leuctra (*Hell.* 6.4.16) visualizes the paradoxical spectacle that the ephors produced: 'it was possible to see those whose relatives had died walking about in public looking sleek and gleaming, but you would have seen few of those whose relatives were announced as living, and these going around looking grim and humiliated'. The reaction to the Tearless Battle (*Hell.* 7.1.32) uses citation instead of visualization because the weeping is less visual than the contrasting appearances of the two groups of grieving relatives after Leuctra. The writer also uses the more argumentative techniques of the lawcourts, such as the *tekmerion*,

[40] T. A. Schmitz, 'Plausibility in the Greek orators', *AJP* 121 (2000), 47–77, at 50–1 cites *tekmeria*, probability and witnesses among a range of 'strategies of verisimilitude' in fictional and non-fictional writing

[41] De Jong (n. 1), 54–60 for 'vizualization' in Homer, *Il.* 4.539–42.

[42] Homer makes visualization an alternative to citation when he describes what 'you would *say*' (if you had seen it) (*Il.* 15.697–8).

for example to prove the early success of the Spartans at Leuctra: 'A man would recognize from this clear *tekmerion*' (that they were able to remove Cleombrotus' body from the field) that they prevailed in the first stage of the battle. This is not made into a spectacle and is different from citation in that the reader is more directly involved in establishing the truth from the evidence; *tekmerion* may be even stronger than citation, since it is so very rarely used (another instance at *Hell.* 5.2.6).

Xenophon's respect for autopsy makes it unnecessary to believe that his voices do not represent 'sources' in the real world of his research. Fehling believed that they were fictions in Herodotus (as in the poets), designed to lend the narrative the mere air of authority. This at least acknowledges their persuasive function.[43] But scholars have since presented his views as one extreme of a debate, in which Herodotus is nothing but a researcher, or is a complete liar. The debate should really be about two different kinds of authority, which co-exist: that of the real world of research, and that of the world created in the process of literary composition. The historian might have consulted many authorities in the real world, but when he organized their information, he determined where he would mark his narrative as 'sourced'. This is what happens in Xenophon. The research process ends with the historian in complete control of the compositional process. This shapes his material so much that there is little possibility of recovering the research process, which it overlies.

Xenophon goes beyond actual sources when he cites hypothetical reports of what people might say about: Agesilaus' courage (*Hell.* 4.3.19: 'it is possible to say'); the punishment of the Spartans (*Hell.* 5.4.1: 'a man could cite many other instances'); the Spartans' resistance against the Thebans (*Hell.* 7.5.12: 'it is possible to blame the gods, but also possible to say that none could resist madmen'). He also uses hypothetical alternatives without citation (*Hell.* 7.4.32: a god 'could inspire' such bravery in a day, but men would never achieve it without long training). Their potential expression does not rule out the idea that they were said as well as being possible to say, but seems to cast the reader as a source of the citation and engage him more actively in evaluating the event; the narrator again manipulates citations to shape his reader's reactions.

Xenophon occasionally leaves two reports unresolved, but these are not often mutually exclusive, as one would expect them to be if they reflected the problems of research (such as 'some say he strangled Mania, but others deny it'); they rather give complementary perceptions of a central truth which he endorses in his own voice (as he cites two sets of witnesses for the large numbers of the Persian army above). The shocking alternative motives for the murder of Alexander of Pherae by his wife (another case of a sensational family murder, like Mania's) characterize him as equally abusive in his personal relationships, homo- and heterosexual (*Hell.* 6.4.33–7).[44] This complements Xenophon's description of him as 'harsh' and 'unjust' in his public relations (6.4.35). In the *Anabasis* too, the reports about the heroic death of the slave Artapatas (1.8.29) project complementary perceptions of the slave's high worth: as one who was important enough to provoke a command from the Great King himself, or a slave who was paradoxically in free command of his own person.[45] 'Some say that the great king ordered someone to slaughter him on top of the body, others that he drew his sword and slaughtered himself; for he had a golden one.' The narrator supports the

[43] D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his Sources* (Leeds, 1989 [Berlin, 1971]). For the debate, see most recently R. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87..

[44] These alternatives are also found in Herodotus: D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989), 76–90.

[45] The slave is normally without free choice, but suicide is self-chosen (*Hell.* 6.2.36).

self-commanded death when he explains (γάρ) that he did have a sword. Cyrus had thus distinguished the slave as the 'best of the Persians' (*An.* 1.2.27, 1.8.29). The reports that those who killed the Theban tyrants were dressed either as the wives of prominent citizens, or as revellers (*Hell.* 5.4.7), both confirm that the tyrants enjoyed low pleasures, which Xenophon says was their central characteristic (5.4.4). The reports on how Menon's men died (*An.* 1.5.25): either massacred for plundering friends, or perishing after losing contact with the rest of the army, both present them as indisciplined, a characterization that Xenophon confirms elsewhere. The resolution of Lysander's two motives for remaining by the wall of Haliartus is also 'unclear', but both explain the central feature that is 'clear' and determines the course of the rest of the engagement, that the battle took place by the wall (*Hell.* 3.5.19).

The distribution of citations and interventions is irregular because of the irregular distribution of praise and blame and remarkable content. *Anabasis* 1 reveals a gradually increasing number of citations toward a concentration at Cunaxa, with interventions also culminating in the obituary of Cyrus (1.9). *Hellenica* has no interventions in 1 or 3, one in 2, the bulk in 4–7; no citations in 1, one in 2, an even spread over 3–4 and 7, with greater concentration in 5–6. Investigation of other devices with similar functions, such as visualization, might alter the pattern, but evaluations and citations should be representative. *Cyropaedia* has a similarly irregular distribution, with quite a few citations and interventions in 1, few in 2–6, but increasing over 7–8. The truly significant statistic remains that of *Hell.* 1–2, which lacks citations or interventions before the death of Theramenes (2.3.56). Anonymous voices do evaluate the homecoming of Alcibiades on the day when the statue of Athena was veiled from sight: 'which some said was an unhappy omen for him and the polis' (ὅ τινες οἰωνίζοντο ἀνεπιτήδειον εἶναι καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ πόλει: 1.4.12); this validates one of the usual categories that attract citation (the gods) and anticipates those who interpret the ominous wind for Cleombrotus in *Hell.* 5.4.17: καὶ οἰωνίζοντό τινες σημαίνειν πρὸ τῶν μελλόντων.[46] Yet this is an exception; the continuation of Thucydides (1.1.1 to 2.3.10) is (mostly) written on a smaller scale than what follows and has other variations. These have been attributed to an early phase of composition or the influence of Thucydides,[47] but other historians also connected fuller narratives back to where their predecessors ended by means of smaller-scale bridging narratives; the peculiar qualities of Xenophon's bridging narrative might not seem so peculiar if their work survived.[48]

CONCLUSIONS

Xenophon's interventions and citations authorize his narrative in his own voice and the voices of others. His interventions encourage readers to question assumptions and accept his views about what warrants great praise or blame, sometimes in material that is new to historical writing. Socrates had taught him that nothing was obvious; even injustice, which seemed an obvious vice, was a virtue when used against enemies, and against friends for their own good (*Mem.* 4.2.13–19). Interventions also structure his narrative, drawing attention to episodes where the praise or blame is

[46] Reports also validate premonitions of doom in *Il.* 12.125–6, 15.699–700.

[47] The statistics are set out in A. W. Gomme et al., *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides Vol. 5* (Oxford, 1981), 437–444; V. J. Gray, 'Continuous history and Xenophon *Hellenica* 1–2.3.10', *AJP* 112 (1991), 201–28 identifies some of the differences as normal within *Anabasis*.

[48] As argued by Gray (n. 47).

unusually great or capable of redefinition. His citations use the actual authority of eye-witnesses to validate details that would otherwise exceed the belief of the reader. They do this even in disagreement with each other or their author, and are part of an arsenal of other persuasive devices, which it would be useful to investigate in their entirety at another time and place.

University of Auckland VIVIENNE GRAY
v.gray@auckland.ac.nz