Journal of Hellenic Studies 132 (2012) 23–40 doi:10.1017/S0075426912000031

XENOPHON'S *ANABASIS* FROM CHARACTER TO NARRATOR

JONAS GRETHLEIN
*University of Heidelberg**

Abstract: Xenophon participated in the March of the Ten Thousand, but in the *Anabasis*, instead of parading his autopsy, he keeps his narratorial persona separate from his character. This separation, however, is subtly blurred when, on the one hand, the narrator adopts the perspective of the character, who is by far the most prominent focalizing instance in the narrative, and, on the other hand, the character appropriates narratorial functions: Xenophon the character comes to the fore as embedded narrator and commentator of the events. Furthermore, his references to the past can be read as meta-historical, i.e. they shed light on the commemorative act of the *Anabasis*. While the choice of a hetero-diegetic narrator helps Xenophon to enhance the credibility of the account of his deeds, the intricate entanglement of narrator and character contributes to the characterization of himself as the privileged agent in the March of the Ten Thousand.

Keywords: Xenophon, *Anabasis*, Greek historiography, narrative

> It is necessary to gather the deeds themselves not just as it happens, but to research about the same again and again in a laborious and toilsome process, and most of all to witness and see them directly (Luc. *Hist. conscr.* 47).

The high esteem for autopsy which we find in Lucian can be traced back to the very beginning of Greek historiography. Herodotus frequently backs up his narrative by references to what he has seen himself, and Thucydides, who notes that the sights of ruins can be deceptive (1.10.3), nonetheless emphasizes that he reports what he has seen himself or heard from eyewitnesses (1.22.2–3).[1] Xenophon does not provide us with explicit reflections on his method, but there is no reason to assume that he did not share his predecessors' trust in eyewitnesses. The introduction to the *Symposium* rather suggests a similar appreciation of the stance of the eyewitness: 'I want to reveal the events at which I was present from which I know these things...'. Accordingly, the account of Cyrus' death in the *Anabasis* is backed up by a reference to Ctesias who was present (1.8.27). It is also worth considering whether in Xenophon's historiographic works characters voice his own conviction when they emphasize their status as eyewitnesses or criticize the absence of direct experience in others.[2] Seen from this perspective, it is striking that Xenophon does not draw attention to his status as an eyewitness in the *Anabasis*. Although Xenophon participated in the march of the Ten Thousand through Asia and back to Ionia, and although he played a major role in it (if we believe his account!), the *Anabasis* is told by a hetero-diegetic narrator.[3]

* jonas.grethlein@skph.uni-heidelberg.de. The translations of the *Anabasis* are taken, with slight modifications, from Waterfield and Rood (2005). I thank my Heidelberg colleague Bill Furley, the journal's two anonymous readers and editor for their stimulating comments and suggestions.

[1] See, for example, Nenci (1955); Schepens (1980).

[2] See, for example, *Hell*. 6.2.31, where Iphikrates mistrusts the news about Mnasippus' defeat 'because he only heard what had happened to Mnasippus, but nobody had seen it'. *Cf.* Gray (2003) 116, n.23.

[3] Unlike a homo-diegetic narrator, a hetero-diegetic narrator is not part of the action, *cf.* Genette (1972) 155–56. The narratorial personae of ancient historians have attracted much attention lately, see, for example, Dewald (1987); (2002) on Herodotus; Gribble (1998) on Thucydides; Grethlein (2006) on Sallust. See also Marincola (1997), particularly 63–216.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Caesar's *Commentarii* on the Gallic War parallel the *Anabasis* in that the author chooses a hetero-diegetic narratorial persona for a narrative in which he figures as a central character.[4] However, while Caesar published *Bellum Gallicum* under his own name, it is disputed how the *Anabasis* was published. In his *Hellenica*, Xenophon refers to a work on the march of the Ten Thousand written by Themistogenes (3.1.2), and since elsewhere this name is only mentioned in the *Suda*, many scholars assume that it is the pseudonym under which the *Anabasis* circulated.[5] Jacoby, on the other hand, insists that the *Anabasis* was an anonymous publication and that the reference to Themistogenes in the *Hellenica* was not more than a 'momentous fiction'.[6] No matter which view we adopt, the use of a hetero-diegetic narrator makes the narrative look unbiased in general – Lucian hails Xenophon as a συγγραφεὺς δίκαιος (*Hist. conscr.* 39) – and in particular lends credibility to the presentation of his own role in the expedition. Plutarch already noted that Xenophon had attributed the *Anabasis* to Themistogenes 'in order to be trustworthier when referring to himself as if to another' (*De glor. Ath.* 1, 345E).[7] In the words of a modern scholar, Xenophon's 'works recognise the value of a mostly impersonal narrative told in a style largely free of rhetorical adornment, in achieving credibility. It is no coincidence that for the ancients and (until recently) moderns, his work was considered very reliable'.[8]

In this paper, I would like to take a fresh look at the relation between Xenophon the narrator and Xenophon the character in the narrative. As commentators since Plutarch have pointed out, the two are clearly separate, but I shall argue that the separation gets subtly blurred when, on the one hand, the narrator adopts the character's perspective and, on the other, the character appropriates narratorial functions.[9] I shall investigate the relevance of Xenophon's perspective in the narrative (I), his role as embedded narrator (II), his function as internal commentator (III) and the meta-historical dimension of some of his reflections (IV). Finally, I will suggest that while the separation of narrator and character serves the purposes of the former's self-fashioning, the complex interaction between the two contributes to the characterization of the latter (V). For the sake of clarity, in the following all unqualified references to Xenophon will signify the character in the *Anabasis*.

I. Xenophon as instance of focalization and beyond focalization[10]

The *Anabasis* is written from the viewpoint which Lucian has aptly called the perspective of the Homeric Zeus (*Hist. conscr.* 49). This means that the narrator has insights into more or less all aspects of the action which, in the case of the *Anabasis*, seems to present itself without

[4] Marincola (1997) 197 notes that the use of the third person by Caesar is unusual and deems it possible that it is modelled on the example of Xenophon. On the hetero-diegetic third-person narrator in Caesar, see Görler (1976); Reijgwart (1993); Riggsby (2006) 150–55.

[5] See, for example, Breitenbach (1967) 1645; Higgins (1977) 93; Gray (2003) 111, n.2; Tuplin (2003) 154. Waterfield (2006) 190 suggests that Themistogenes may have been a friend of Xenophon. See also Dorati (2007) 105–06.

[6] *FGrH* II D 349.

[7] For further assessments of Xenophon and his style, from the early empire, see Rutherford (1998) 64–79.

[8] Marincola (1997) 10. See also Gray (2004) 129–30. On third-person narrative in historiography in general, see Kraus (1994) 139.

[9] This has already been noted in passing by Gray (2004) 132; Purves (2010) 194. From a different angle, see Dorati (2007), who emphasizes the insights given into Xenophon's consciousness and concludes that the narrator of the *Anabasis* is only formally hetero-diegetic, but actually homo-diegetic. However, Dorati underestimates the liberty which ancient historians take in reporting the thoughts and feelings of their characters in general – this makes the internal focalization through Xenophon in the *Anabasis* less unique than he thinks – and tends to mix up the level of diegesis with the notion of focalization.

[10] De Jong's pioneering applications (1987; 1991) have made Bal's (1985) concept of focalization very popular in classical studies. However, as for example Nelles (1990) and Rood (1998) show, Bal's very wide concept, which also subsumes the narratorial instance under focalization and attributes to each narratorial stance a stance of focalization, is questionable. I shall therefore stick with Genette's system (1972), according to which 'focalization' refers to perception ('qui voit'), while voice signifies the level of utterance ('qui dit').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mediation. If we leave aside the evaluations of Cyrus (1.9) and the Greek generals whom Tissaphernes traps and kills (2.6), Xenophon largely abstains from narratorial intrusions.[11] At the same time, much of the narrative is internally focalized through the characters. In many passages, the narrator adopts the viewpoint of his characters and narrates the action from their perspectives. Not bound to a single character perspective, he alternates between the viewpoints of different characters and presents the action through the lenses of various Greek characters as well as, occasionally, those of their enemies. The dominating focalizing instance though is Xenophon whose prominence in books 3–7 is thrown into relief by his virtual absence in the first two books.[12] To illustrate his role as focalizing instance, I will briefly discuss the passage in which the narrator elaborately introduces him after mentioning him only in passing in the first two books.[13]

After Tissaphernes has killed the majority of the Greek generals whom he had lured into his camp through an invitation to a dinner party, the Greek mercenaries are seized by confusion and despair (3.1.3). In this seemingly aporetic situation, the narrator brings Xenophon onto his stage with the formula ἦν δέ τις ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος ('There was in the army a man called Xenophon, from Athens') (3.1.4).[14] He then reports how Xenophon came to join the Greek army (3.1.4–11). Admittedly, Xenophon does not appear in too positive a light when Socrates rebukes him, since he consults the Delphic Oracle about which god would grant him a safe journey instead of asking whether or not to join Cyrus' army at all.[15] Nonetheless, the one-page flashback adds weight to the new character whose prominence is enlarged further when the narrator continues with a dream.

Despite his worries, Xenophon manages to catch a bit of sleep and sees a lightning bolt strike his father's house and set it on fire. On the one hand, this seems to him a good sign, 'since a great light from Zeus had appeared in the midst of trouble and danger' (3.1.12). On the other, the dream instils fear in him that, just as the fire burns in a circle, he will not be able to leave the country of the Persian king. Not only does the ancient belief that dreams were signs from the gods mark Xenophon as a special character,[16] but the narrator also presents the following narrative as an explication of the dream (3.1.13): 'But the true meaning of a vision such as this can be judged by the events which followed the dream'. It is hard to tell if 'the events which followed the dream' only acts to introduce Xenophon's first consultation with the *lochagoi* or if it refers to the entire narrative of the *Anabasis* which unfolds the numerous hindrances encountered by the Greeks on their way back to Ionia.[17] In the latter case, the entire account of the Greeks' retreat would be presented under the auspices of Xenophon's dream. If this seems too far-fetched, it is nonetheless noteworthy that the narrator focalizes this turning point in the plot through Xenophon and conveys his thoughts in an interior monologue, a rare form in Greek historiography:[18]

[11] Bradley (2001) 70 notes that most of the narratorial intrusions can be found in the first two books, an observation to which I shall return in section III. On narratorial interventions in the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*, see Gray (2003).

[12] In *Bellum Gallicum*, on the other hand, the perspective of Caesar is imposed more strongly on the narrative at the beginning, *cf.* Görler (1976) 103–12. On the increasing prominence of Xenophon in the *Anabasis*, see Bradley (2001).

[13] 1.8.15; 2.4.15; 2.5.37–38. Some manuscripts also read Xenophon in 2.1.12, where, however, the majority has 'Theopompus'. Erbse (1966) 500 sides with the main tradition, but sees in 'Theopompus the Athenian' a cipher for Xenophon. On the elaborate introduction of Xenophon into the narrative, see Dillery (1995) 72–73.

[14] On the Homeric ring, see Tuplin (2003) 126–27.

[15] Rood (2004a) 322; Gray (2004) 131.

[16] *Cf.* Dillery (1995) 73. See Rinner (1978) for the argument that Xenophon's dream evokes Agamemnon's dream in *Iliad* 2.

[17] While Dillery (1995) 73 relates the portent only to the mobilization of the demoralized troops by Xenophon, Ma (2004) 336 also sees in it a reference to his exile.

[18] *Cf.* Dorati (2007) 108–09.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Why am I lying here? The night is passing and at dawn the enemy will probably arrive. If we fall into the king's hands, we'll inevitably die inglorious deaths, after witnessing all the most ghastly scenes one could possibly imagine and suffering the full range of the most gruesome tortures. Yet no one is showing the slightest interest in defence or doing anything practical about it... From what other city do I expect a general to come and organize things? Why am I waiting? How old do I have to be? I won't get any older at all if I just surrender to the enemy today (3.1.13–14).

The narrator thus approaches Xenophon gradually, moving from the past to the present, from the outside to the inside, from indirect to direct presentation of his thoughts: he first gives his prehistory, then views him among the other Greeks before he reproduces his thoughts in a narratorial report that blends into a direct presentation of Xenophon's thoughts. The artful introduction of Xenophon as directing the focus of the narrative adumbrates the crucial role that he is to play in the further plot.

There are many more passages in which the action of the *Anabasis* is internally focalized through Xenophon, among them the narrative's probably most famous scene, when the Greeks reach Mount Theches and, after seeing the sea, erupt into shouting 'Thalatta, thalatta!'. This scene, one of the numerous false closing scenes after which yet other toils await the Greek mercenaries, is narrated from the perspective of Xenophon who leads the rearguard. Hearing some noise (4.7.21: κραυγή), Xenophon and his men first suspect an attack. When the noise becomes louder and more articulate, a shout goes up (4.7.23: βοή *bis*) and the men begin to rush towards the mountain – Xenophon conjectures 'that something of special significance was happening' (4.7.23). Finally, they can make out the words 'The sea, the sea'. The focalization through Xenophon and the rearguard serves as a retarding moment and helps to build up suspense. Moreover, it is striking that the narrative renders a visual experience primarily through aural perception. In some codices, the narrator mentions the viewing of the sea once at the very beginning of the passage (4.7.21). Recent interpreters tend to adopt the reading of the codex Parisinus in which these three words are missing – in which case, there is no direct reference at all to the view itself.[19] Besides enhancing the retardation, the narrative focus on aural signs aligns the historical agents with the reader of the *Anabasis* in that both only hear about the event. Paradoxically, the absence of a reference to the visual experience itself throws into relief the view, leaving a blank to be filled by the reader's imagination. The focalization through Xenophon and the gradual disclosure, conveyed through sounds instead of sight, contribute much to the prominence of the passage.

Instead of discussing further examples of Xenophon's prominence as instances of focalization, I now turn to a passage which is not directly focalized through him, but in which subtle interactions between his perspective and the narrative can be observed. When the Greeks are at the Pontus, Xenophon is enamoured by the plan to found a colony. However, the seer Silanus, who has made sacrifices to figure out the chances of such an enterprise, is against this plan and spreads the rumour that 'Xenophon wants the army to stay and wants to found a city for his own fame and power' (5.6.17). By slyly emphasizing Xenophon's desire to gain glory and power for himself, Silanus puts Xenophon's plan in a negative light.[20] He succeeds, the mercenaries are upset and Xenophon cannot realize his aspirations as an *oikistes*. While here Silanus gets the better of Xenophon, the narrator gives the latter a belated moral victory by adding the reason why Silanus was so eager to prevent a colony. Silanus, he points out, wanted to return as fast as possible for he had kept the 3,000 darics which Cyrus had given him as a reward for an accurate prediction (5.6.18, *cf.* 1.7.18). The narrator's observation suggests that the personal motives of which Silanus accuses Xenophon are the very reason for his own intrigue.

[19] *Cf.* Waterfield and Rood (2005) 213; Purves (2010) 189, n.74.

[20] Silanus' reproach contradicts the presentation of the narrator, who does not mention Xenophon's desire for personal glory, but says that he was intrigued by the idea of 'acquiring extra land and resources *for Greece*' (5.6.15, my italics).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although the narrator reports later rumours that Xenophon continued to pursue his plan of founding a colony (6.4.4, 6.6.3), he does not vouch for the truth of these allegations and even has Xenophon deliver a speech against the accusation that he has corrupted the seers and tried to force the mercenaries to stay through failing sacrifices (6.4.12–13). Nonetheless, the narrator takes up Xenophon's interest in a colony when he devotes a long passage (6.4.3–7) to an area around Lake Calpe which 'is large enough to accommodate ten thousand people' (6.4.3). There is no indication that this description is focalized through Xenophon, but the enthusiastic as well as detailed report about all the advantages of the land – harbour, fountain, wood, fertility – corresponds to Xenophon's interest in the land and planting a colony. Thus, Xenophon not only guides the narrative as a focalizing instance, but his perspective also intrudes on the narrative in a more subtle way.

While the theme of colonization silently creeps from Xenophon's perspective into the narrator's account, another theme that implicitly resonates in the narrative is pointed out explicitly by Xenophon. Tim Rood notices that the *Anabasis* contains some subtle allusions to Herodotus' account of the Persian Wars, for example the juxtaposition of barbarian ἄνθρωποι and Greek ἄνδρες which is reminiscent of Xerxes' recognition that 'there are many ἄνθρωποι, but few ἄνδρες' when the first attempts to take Thermopylae fail (Hdt. 7.210.2). By the same token, the noun στόλος and the motif of the crossing of a river (1.2.5) may evoke Xerxes' march to Greece as a foil for the expedition of the Ten Thousand.[21] The comparison is ambiguous: on the one hand, the Persian Wars afford an example of Greek superiority; on the other, as invaders the Greek mercenaries resemble the Persians attacking Greece. The implicit and subtle references to the *Histories* are buttressed by the explicit juxtaposition of the current expedition with the Persian Wars which Xenophon voices in the first assembly of the army after the killing of the generals by Tissaphernes (3.2.11–13). Xenophon recalls both the first Persian invasion which the Athenians and Plataeans successfully fought off and the second 'when Xerxes raised an incalculably huge army and attacked Greece' (3.2.13). These triumphs of Greeks over Persians, he claims, ought to instil confidence in the Greek mercenaries that a safe return was possible (3.2.11). Again, the narrator and Xenophon engage in a tightly knit cooperation; this time, the character makes explicit the theme on which the narrator's voice only touches. Beneath the overt separation, narrator and character are closely entangled.

II. Xenophon as narrator

Xenophon's references to the Persian Wars lead us to a second point: his speeches.[22] Xenophon not only stands out through the great number and length of his speeches, but the speeches interact with the authorial narrative in manifold ways and thereby blur the borderline between character and narrator. The privileging of Xenophon as speaker is particularly striking when he is juxtaposed with other speakers. To return to a passage that I have already discussed, after Xenophon has dreamt about the lightning striking his father's house, he gathers the *lochagoi* of Proxenus and assesses the situation (3.1.15–25). Deceived by the Persian king, the Greeks are now on their own and must try to find their way back by themselves. All officers agree and ask Xenophon to take the lead; one, however, Apollonides by name and speaking in Boeotian dialect, opposes his advice and argues that rescue is only possible with the help of the Persian king (3.1.26). In a rejoinder, Xenophon brushes off his objection and recalls once more Tissaphernes' scheme (3.1.27–30). His concluding words about Apollonides, 'for this one disgraces his fatherland and the whole of Greece, since, despite being Greek, he is like this' (3.1.30), gain special meaning when one of the men reveals that Apollonides is not a Greek, but a Lydian (3.1.31). Xenophon's

[21] Rood (2004a) 310–11. Xerxes' invasion of Greece also comes up when the narrator mentions the palace at Celaenae which Xerxes built when he returned from Greece (1.2.9).

[22] On Xenophon's speeches in the *Anabasis*, see Rood (2004a).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opinion carries the day, which marks the beginning of his ascent in the army and prominence in the narrative. His superiority and leading position are formally reinforced: whereas the narrator presents Apollonides' intervention in indirect speech, Xenophon is granted direct speech. Through this distribution of voice, the narrative representation expresses formally the balance and outcome of the situation; in other words, the discourse mirrors the story. Such a privileging of one character's voice is not unusual in historiography, which often shifts between direct and indirect speech, but the privileging of Xenophon is emblematic of the prominent role his voice will play in the further course of the narrative.

Xenophon's voice is endowed with special authority by correspondences to the narrator's voice. A striking echo can be found in the discussion of how far the Cyreans should go in their attempts to appease the Spartan Cleandrus who, angered by Dexippus, threatens to appeal to Greek cities not to take in the army. Unlike some who deem Cleandrus insignificant, Xenophon is aware of Sparta's influence (6.6.12): 'The Spartans are the masters of Greece'. His point echoes a narratorial statement and is thereby corroborated (6.6.9): 'At that time all Greeks were ruled by the Spartans'. The personae of character and narrator are strictly separate, but what the former says ties in nicely with the view of the latter.

In some cases, Xenophon refers to past events covered by the preceding narrative. For instance, in his speech to the *lochagoi* of Proxenus, Xenophon recalls that the king 'is the man who mutilated the corpse of his full brother by cutting off his head and his hand, and who then impaled them on a stake' (3.1.17). Since the narrator has previously mentioned the mutilation of Cyrus' body (1.10.1), Xenophon's point constitutes an internal homo-diegetic analepsis.[23] Xenophon, however, does not merely repeat what the narrator has already mentioned, but adds a new detail, namely that the limbs were exhibited, thereby underlining the ghastly nature of the deed and buttressing his point about the king's unreliability.

A more extensive internal analepsis voiced by Xenophon can be found in 5.8.1–26.[24] Xenophon is accused of *hubris* since he has beaten soldiers. When he interrogates the first of his accusers, it turns out that the beating took place while the army was marching under the most adverse circumstances – the mercenaries were famished, snowed under and being pursued by enemies. The soldier had been ordered to lead an exhausted comrade on a mule and was caught by Xenophon when he tried to bury him alive. In his interrogation, Xenophon elegantly turns the tables so that in the end the anonymous soldier is in need of a justification. Asking if, after all, Xenophon's intervention has saved the exhausted soldier from dying, he is silenced by Xenophon's witty rejoinder (5.8.11): 'Yes, we are all going to die, but does that mean that we have to be buried alive?'. When the crowd shouts that he has not received enough of a beating, Xenophon continues to justify the violence which he applied to unruly (5.8.13), exhausted (5.8.14–15) and resting soldiers (5.8.16).

The incident of the beating obviously falls into the turbulent crossing of the Hini valley which the narrator reports in 4.5.7–22. As Xenophon mentions, the army was short of food (5.8.3~4.5.21) as well as under pressure from attacking enemies (5.8.3~4.5.12). Some soldiers were so exhausted and demoralized that they refused to march on (5.8.3~4.5.15). More specifically, Xenophon's explanation that he had to stir up soldiers because those resting were in danger of freezing and losing their toes (5.8.15) harks back to the narrator's report that some soldiers lost their toes and that only permanent movement saved the others from this fate (4.5.12–13). However, the specific episode under scrutiny in 5.8.1–12 is not part of the narrative which contains only a general reference to Xenophon's attempts to discipline his men (4.5.16): 'When

[23] The analepsis refers back to an event which falls in the time of the main narrative (internal) and belongs to its main plot (homo-diegetic); *cf.* Genette (1972) 90–92.

[24] On this passage, see Rood (2004b) 210, who points out that it undercuts the triumphalism of the journey back.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Xenophon came by with the rearguard and saw them, he begged and implored them, using every device and resource at his disposal, not to fall behind'. The narrator does not explicitly mention physical violence, but it is obvious that it falls under the 'devices and resources at his disposal'. We can thus say that, in providing new details, the character's analepsis fleshes out the summary of the main narrative – it is a completing internal homo-diegetic analepsis.[25]

In some cases, Xenophon narrates events that do not figure in the narrative at all. A striking example comes right before the passage that I have just discussed. Ironically, the accusation against which Xenophon has to defend himself is part of a set of tribunals for which Xenophon himself has paved the way. After rejecting rumours that he intends to lead the army back to Phasis, Xenophon alerts the soldiers to the dangers of anarchy and relates an incident that took place at Cerasus (5.7.5–33): without anybody knowing, Clearetus and his messmates tried to conquer one of the places of the Cerasuntians nearby. They failed, however, and only a few managed to escape. The survivors then lynched three elders sent to Cerasus to inquire about the incident. After that, ambassadors from Cerasus came to the Greek army and informed them about what had happened. While they were discussing the burial of the dead Greeks, a group of soldiers in turmoil, shouting 'Beat, beat, throw, throw', passed, and, given their experiences in Cerasus, the ambassadors retreated to the ships. As Xenophon figured out, the core of the shouting soldiers were upset about the *agoranomoi* and others, for reasons of their own, had joined them. When they saw the *agoranomos* Zelarchus go to the sea, they stormed towards him and thereby further scared the Cerasuntians who thought that they were the object of the aggression. Their fear, it turned out, was not unjustified – finally, they were attacked and some of them drowned. Xenophon's plea to end this sort of anarchy and to re-establish law and order leads to the tribunals in which he himself is accused.

Xenophon's speech offers a gripping account as well as a sharp analysis of the consequences of lawlessness for communities,[26] but what interests me most here is that Clearetus' enterprise and the ensuing events do not form part of the authorial narrative. Xenophon does not merely add details to events covered by the narrative, but his internal analepsis fills a paralipsis left by the narrator.[27] In other words, the narrator employs Xenophon as an internal narrator for events that he does not report. The use of embedded narrators is quite common in ancient historiography, but has a special ring in the *Anabasis*, as the extensive narratorial function of Xenophon subtly and implicitly undermines the strict separation of the narratorial persona from Xenophon the character.

This share of narrative labour has a further twist which comes to light if we look at the paralipsis. As Xenophon remarks, Clearetus goes on his expedition when the Greeks are about to leave Cerasus. At Cerasus, the Greeks make a body count, which lets the narrator give a very brief summary:

> While they were there, they conducted a review of the men under arms and found, on counting them, that there were 8,600 in total. These were the men left alive, while the rest had been killed by their enemies, by the snow and in a few cases by illness (5.3.3).

[25] On the categories, see Genette (1972) 90–92. Gray (2004) 143 offers an intriguing interpretation for the new information given by Xenophon: 'The primary narrator had no need for such defence and this perhaps shows the degree to which he is objective about Xenophon'.

[26] Dillery (1995) 59–98, who suggests reading the *Anabasis* as 'a study of the evolution and decay of what was an ideal Xenophontic community or a utopia' (63), calls it a 'textbook case' (82). On the *Anabasis* as a reflection on community, see also Howland (2000), who compares it with Plato's *Republic*; on the Ten Thousand as a *polis*-like community, see Nussbaum (1967); Dalby (1992); Hornblower (2004), who views them against the background of what we know about other armies in Classical Greece.

[27] *Cf.* Rood (2007a) 161–62. Genette (1972) 92–93 defines a paralipsis as an omission not of a whole episode, but of certain aspects of an episode which itself is covered by the narrative.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This retrospective is followed by a prolepsis, as the spoils prompt the narrator to map out Xenophon's future life (5.3.5–13). Part of the tenth he invested in a votive dedication at Delphi to honour Apollo, while he left the rest, destined for Artemis, with her priest at Ephesus,[28] before he joined Agesilaus. After his return, the Spartans gave him some land in Scillus where he erected a *temenos* for Artemis, modelling the temple after the Artemis temple at Ephesus. Besides giving us insights into Xenophon's life, this passage has important functions in the narrative. The description of Scillus, its rich vegetation and wealth of domestic and wild animals, and the bucolic life, including festivals and hunts, sets up a stark contrast to the toils of Xenophon and his men on their retreat.[29] Moreover, the idyllic setting conveys the feeling of tranquillity and home for which the Greeks strive – in vain, as their desire for a *nostos* encounters ever new hindrances and is not even fulfilled at the end since the conclusion remains open.[30]

Taken together with Xenophon's report of Clearetus' disaster, the Scillus-*ekphrasis* illustrates the close entanglement of the narrator with Xenophon. The place where Xenophon's report of Clearetus' disaster would belong in the narrator's account is taken by a far-reaching prolepsis into the life of Xenophon. Xenophon thus fills a gap in the narrative that the narrator used to inform the reader about his future. The character's narratorial function complements, and is complemented by, the narrator's interest in the character. The relationship between historians and main characters has attracted some attention; it has been explored, for example, how in the *Histories* the scientific and historical interests of Eastern kings parallel Herodotus' inquiry.[31] While Herodotus accentuates differences that throw into relief his own practice, the interaction between Xenophon the character and Xenophon the narrator is tighter and more intense. It is particularly striking how the character supplements the account of the narrator.

III. Xenophon as commentator

Xenophon's prominence as embedded narrator is closely linked to his function as the central internal commentator. It is particularly this function that undermines the separation of character and narrator.[32] The Xenophontic narrator is similar to the Thucydidean narrator in his reticence about narratorial interventions and comments.[33] At the same time, in both authors' works the speeches offer assessments at the level of the action. Yet, while Thucydides confronts his reader with complex debates evading clear-cut answers, the reader of the *Anabasis* can rely on the evaluations given by Xenophon, as when, in the passage just discussed, he critically analyses the army's tendency towards anarchy (5.7.13–33). The prominence of Xenophon as a commentator is already felt right after his introduction into the narrative. Whereas the narrator gives only five paragraphs to Cheirisophus' speech (3.2.2–6), he grants 25 paragraphs to Xenophon to assess the situation in which the Greeks find themselves after the assault on their generals (3.2.8–32).

[28] Megabyzus is not an individual name, but the title of the priests of the Ephesian Artemis, *cf.* Lendle (1995) ad 5.3.5/6.

[29] Dillery (1995) 90 suggests further that 'perhaps the quiet and ordered life we see in this bucolic description is a capsule or miniature of the life he had hoped to lead as a prominent settler leader in Asia. Scillus, like Cotyora and Port Calpe, is described in glowing terms – a place blessed by nature'.

[30] *Cf.* Ma (2004) 334, who also points out that not even Scillus offers a stable place, since its description is in the past tense and the inscription which the narrator quotes at the end of the digression 'is curiously impersonal and periphrastic, and already implies future absence' (341).

[31] I am grateful to one of the anonymous readers for drawing my attention to this comparison. On Herodotus and Eastern kings, see Christ (1994); on Xerxes as a failed historian, see Grethlein (2009) 205–15.

[32] Gray (2004) 132 notes that 'sometimes we hear the Xenophon-character evaluating in the narrator's place', but she only mentions 6.5.18 and 7.7.23, and does not elaborate on this observation.

[33] *Cf.* Marincola (1997) 10. See, however, the qualifications of Gray (2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Later on, when the Greeks march through Armenia, they encounter Chalybes, Taochoe and Phasianoe. Instead of confronting them in an open battle, the Cyreans decide to capture the high ground quickly and surprise them. This strategy may seem less than heroic, but Xenophon wittily justifies it by calling it κλοπή and invoking the importance of κλέπτειν in Spartan education (4.6.14–15). Cheirisophus' reply, that 'Well, what I have heard is that you Athenians are skilled at stealing your public funds' (4.6.16), not only adds further wit, but also brings in the Sparta-Athens dichotomy, a theme that resonates in the narrative time and again. From the angle pursued here, it is noteworthy that the narrator has Xenophon voice a judgement on the strategy of the Greeks and thereby dissipate the reader's potential doubts about its heroic character. In addition to dominating the action, Xenophon also comes to the fore as commentator.

While in these examples Xenophon considers the current situation, there are other passages in which he comments on past events and thereby takes up a historian-like stance. Xenophon's first military action in the *Anabasis* is less than fortunate (3.3.6–11). After crossing the river Zapate, Mithradates and his cavalry attack the Greeks with bows and slings. Xenophon decides to pursue them, but the lack of horses renders their effort ineffective and, on their retreat, the Persians manage to hit further Greeks. Xenophon accepts the critique that he put his men at risk for no good reason and adds: 'We should thank the gods that they did not come with a strong force, but with few men, so that they did not hurt us too badly while showing us where our deficiencies lie' (3.3.14).

Of course, as the invocation of the gods reveals, this is first of all an expression of relief, but at the same time the comment draws the reader's attention to the danger of the situation. Had the enemies been more numerous, the consequences would have been disastrous. Such counterfactuals which elucidate other possible outcomes are typical of historians who use them to re-establish the openness of the moment for the historical protagonists, something that gets easily lost in retrospect.[34] To give an example from the *Anabasis*, after describing an unexpected attack by Kurds, the narrator adds: 'If the Carduchian band had been larger, a substantial number of men would probably have been killed' (4.1.11).[35] The lesson which Xenophon deduces for the future does not have a counterpart in the narrator's counterfactual and drives home the difference between character and historian, but the parallel musing on an alternative scenario nonetheless underscores how the comments and reflections which Xenophon makes at the level of the action are similar to those made by historians in their own voice.[36]

The most extensive evaluations given by Xenophon refer to his own actions. I have already discussed his defence against the accusation of *hubris* (5.8.1–26). After clarifying the accusation of the anonymous soldier, Xenophon justifies his beating of unruly, exhausted and resting soldiers in general. These disciplinary measures, he argues, were in the best interest of the beaten, who, only thanks to the chastisement, are now able to accuse him and who therefore should be as grateful to him as children are to their parents and teachers (5.8.17–18).

Xenophon presents a second lengthy justification during the expedition with Seuthes (7.6.11–38). After subjugating parts of the coastline of the Propontis, the army camps north of Selymbria for nearly two months. Xenophon comes more and more under pressure, as Seuthes withdraws his favour and simultaneously the soldiers complain about not receiving their pay. In this situation, envoys from the Spartan general Thibron come and ask the mercenaries to join their expedition against Tissaphernes. When an assembly is gathered, an anonymous Arcadian

[34] On counterfactuals in Thucydides, see Flory (1988). Examples of this use of counterfactuals by modern historians can be found in Ferguson (1997) and Brodersen (2000), the latter on ancient history. On the importance of virtual history for historical explanation, see Pelling (forthcoming).

[35] For another counterfactual, see 1.3.2.

[36] The passages in which Xenophon emerges as a commentator also include his discussion with envoys from Sinope, in which he justifies the fact that his men violently entered their *apoikia* Cotyora (5.5.13–23).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

slanders Xenophon, who, he claims, is responsible for the army not having joined the Spartans a long time ago, but has instead brought the army here and been made rich by Seuthes while the soldiers have been waiting for their money in vain. On account of this, Xenophon deserves death through stoning (7.6.9–10).

Against this accusation, Xenophon delivers a lengthy speech in which he reviews the decision to join Seuthes and also his own conduct in general. At the beginning, he points out that he first rejected Seuthes' attempts to persuade him to lead the army to him (7.6.12) and that only when Aristarchus hindered them from sailing back to Asia did he have the army consider Seuthes' offer as an alternative to Aristarchus' order to go to the Chersonese. The Cyreans themselves decided to join Seuthes (7.6.14). The mention of his present uneasy relation with Seuthes then leads Xenophon to a vehement rejection of the claim that he has been corrupted by gifts from Seuthes (7.6.15–20). Xenophon's presentation essentially matches that of the narrative: when Seuthes first approaches him and offers him a reward if he leads the army over the Hellespont, Xenophon replies that he will do this anyway and that there is no need for gifts (7.1.5). Later, Seuthes approaches him a second time asking him to join his expedition, but Xenophon turns him down (7.2.12). Only when Aristarchus deprives the Greeks of the possibility of sailing back does Xenophon have the army decide on Seuthes' plan (7.2.15). A review of this chain of actions in the first actual encounter between Xenophon and Seuthes makes sure that it sticks in the reader's memory, who can thereby verify the truth of Xenophon's account (7.2.24–28). It diverges from the narrative in one minor point only. While he claims that Seuthes sent 'many envoys' to him, the narrator reports only a single embassy that tried to secure the services of the Greek mercenaries (7.2.10). It is hard to decide if Xenophon refers to further approaches which are glossed over in the narrative or if he exaggerates his steadfastness for rhetorical purposes, but even in this case the deviation is too slight to undercut his claims seriously.

Xenophon then defends the decision to join Seuthes (7.6.24–32). His arguments, notably the necessity to stay, the winter, the difficulties in providing food and the threat of a country full of enemies, correspond closely to the situation that we find in the narrative (7.3.5, *cf.* 7.2.15). What is more, these are the very reasons that prompted the soldiers to agree to join Seuthes:

> After this the floor was given to anyone who wanted to speak, and quite a few people voiced the same view, that Seuthes' proposals were exactly what they needed: now that it was winter, those who wanted to sail back home could not do so; there was no way they could survive in friendly territory if they had to buy the necessities of life; and it would be safer for them to spend time and get their food in hostile territory with Seuthes than on their own. The fact that they were going to get paid, on top of all these advantages, was generally held to be a lucky bonus (7.3.13).

Strikingly, the soldiers' point that they would benefit from a mere alliance with Seuthes and that pay was only a 'lucky bonus', is echoed twice by Xenophon:

> Since this was the predicament you found yourself in, even if I'd arranged an alliance with Seuthes without demanding any pay whatsoever, would you have thought that I was failing to take your best interests into consideration? ... Now, if the person who gave you this security didn't also pay you well for it, is that so terrible a disaster? (7.6.27–30).

In a further step, Xenophon draws attention to his services to the army in general. He sketches his present situation in sombre colours – he is slandered in front of the Spartans, despised by the army and an enemy of Seuthes (7.6.34–35) – and contrasts it with all his toiling for the army and their shared successes (7.6.36). Thanks to these, the soldiers are now free to go wherever they want to, by land or by sea, and have just been asked to join the powerful Spartans (7.6.37). Their present ingratitude towards him is thrown into stark relief by their attachment to him in tough times (7.6.38).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The two apologetic speeches of Xenophon are firmly embedded in the plot of the *Anabasis*. In both situations, Xenophon's leadership is forcefully challenged, and even his life is threatened. At the same time, the speeches offer the reader evaluations of Xenophon – a review of his conduct is integrated into the action of the *Anabasis*. This internal evaluation which is presented by Xenophon himself is corroborated by its persuasive power in the action as well as by correspondences with the preceding narrative. In the first scene, the crowd judges that the anonymous victim of Xenophon's beating deserved more (5.8.12) and, in the second, Xenophon receives support from the Spartan Charminus and the anger of the mercenaries is turned against Heraclides (7.6.39–41).

The narrative function of Xenophon's apologetic speeches as assessments of his person becomes even clearer if we take into account that they parallel the evaluations that the narrator gives of Cyrus (1.9) and the generals killed by Tissaphernes (2.6).[37] In both cases, the conduct of characters is retrospectively judged in the narrative. However, the apologetic speeches transfer the evaluation from the extra-diegetic to the intra-diegetic level and attribute it to the character himself.

The parallel between Xenophon's and the narrator's reviews is underscored by the focus on the same points. In his defence against the accusation of *hubris*, Xenophon justifies his way of disciplining soldiers (5.8.2–26). The treatment of soldiers is prominent in the narrator's assessments of Clearchus (2.6.9–10) and Proxenus (2.6.19–20). While the first was known for his toughness, the second was only able to handle exemplary soldiers, because he lacked the ability to punish. At first sight, Xenophon's attitude seems to be similar to that of Clearchus.[38] However, unlike Xenophon, Clearchus is said to have applied violence in anger, an accusation which Xenophon vehemently rejects (5.8.19). Moreover, their goals were different. Whereas the narrator states that Clearchus aimed at creating a general feeling of fear in the soldiers – 'a soldier had to be more frightened of his commanding officer than of the enemy' (2.6.10) – Xenophon claims to apply violence specifically to save his soldiers' lives (for example, 5.8.13, 5.8.16).

Despite these differences, both were popular with the troops in tough times, but lost their support when the soldiers fared well (2.6.11–12, 7.6.38, *cf.* 5.8.25). The same comparison, albeit with different accentuation, is used to express the soldiers' relation to Xenophon and Clearchus. Xenophon compares himself implicitly to a father or teacher when he argues that he should be held accountable for his beatings in the same way that parents or teachers are (5.8.18). Later he claims that in tough times the soldiers called him a father (7.6.38). In Clearchus' case, the relation between pupil and teacher is used to illustrate how the soldiers coped with his roughness when they were under pressure, but that, due to his unpleasant nature, he was unpopular in good times (2.6.12).

Another point addressed by Xenophon in his second apologetic speech that we also find in the narrator's assessment of the Greek leaders is interest in wealth. Xenophon emphasizes that he did not accept the generous gifts offered by Seuthes.[39] By the same token, the narrator notes that

[37] On the evaluation of Clearchus, see Roisman (1985/1988), who argues that there are tensions between Clearchus' role in the narrative and his evaluation, and Braun (2004) 97–107, who sees in him a 'dangerous liaison'. For a different take, see Tritle (2004). On the obituary for Cyrus, see Sage (1991), who explores its relation to the *Cyropaedia*, and Braun (2004) 107–30.

[38] There are further notable similarities between Clearchus and Xenophon. In 2.3.11–12 Clearchus not only punishes those mercenaries who are lazy, but 'at the same time, he would step into the mud himself and lend a hand, which shamed everyone into working just as hard as he did'. In the same vein, Xenophon jumps from his horse to march with his soldiers (3.4.47–48), and is the first to make fire when the Greeks are snowed under (4.4.12). Xenophon and Clearchus are also juxtaposed by the following echo. Cheirisophus praises Xenophon (3.1.45): 'I wish we had a lot more men like you'. In 3.2.31, Xenophon himself says: 'From today they will see not one but ten thousand Clearchuses, who will prevent the slightest infringement'.

[39] Azoulay (2004) 291–95 elaborates on the narrative efforts in the *Anabasis* to clear Xenophon of the accusation of bribery.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clearchus' interest in material gains was small compared to his infatuation with war (2.6.6), whereas Menon, who receives an extremely negative evaluation, is said to have had a strong desire for riches (2.6.21).

These similarities draw our attention to the parallel between the narratorial evaluations and Xenophon's justification speeches, and reveal that the latter, in addition to their function in the plot, offer the reader an assessment of the main character. It is striking that the evaluations by the narrator are in the first two books and therefore occur before Xenophon enters the plot. Xenophon thus not only becomes the main character of the rest of the narrative, but also takes over from the narrator the function of giving an evaluation of the main character(s). The strict separation of narrator and character is silently undercut by the narratorial functions fulfilled by Xenophon.

The simultaneous appearance of Xenophon and further retreat of the narrator from the surface of his narrative can also be noted in other regards. P.J. Bradley observes that the first-person interventions and other narratorial intrusions are nearly exclusively limited to the first two books.[40] He interprets the stronger visibility of the narrator at the beginning as the attempt to establish a narratorial persona. While Bradley ignores some narratorial intrusions,[41] his observation is right in general and ties in nicely with my interpretation of the evaluations. Strikingly, the four instances of narratorial *ego* which Bradley notes all come in the narrator's assessments of Cyrus and Clearchus. The stronger prominence of the narrator at the beginning not only serves to lay out the persona of the narrator, but his greater reticence in the following books may also be linked to the dominance of a character who takes over some of the functions of the narrator.[42]

The similarity of Xenophon as a commentator to the narrator is also striking in his long speech to Seuthes with which he persuades the Thracian king to fulfil his promises to the army (7.7.20–47). Xenophon emphasizes the need to reciprocate favours (7.7.23) and points out that trustworthiness and reliability pay off:[43]

> It's plain to me that the shifty words of untrustworthy men have no purpose, authority or value, whereas the words of those who are known for their cultivation of truth are as effective as the physical strength of others at getting them whatever they want (7.7.24).

Exactly the same appreciation of trustworthiness, connected with an emphasis on the benefits to be gained from it, can be found in the narrator's comment on Cyrus:[44]

> ... he demonstrated, first, that the quality he held most important when he was making a treaty or entering into a contract or making a promise was his own personal integrity. This is why the cities here trusted him and put themselves into his hands, and why individuals trusted him too (1.9.7–8).

[40] Bradley (2001) 70–72. See also Gray (2003) 111–15 on first-person interventions.

[41] For example, citations, as discussed by Gray (2003) 115–22, also constitute narratorial interventions. See, for example, 3.4.11, 7.2.5. However, the majority of the citations, most of which are anonymous anyway, come in the first two books. Another device which makes the presence of the narrator felt is the presentation of diverging accounts. See, for example, 7.1.14. For a discussion of what constitutes a narratorial intervention, see Gribble (1998) 47.

[42] To Bradley's claim that 'by muting the explicit "I" of his narratorial personality, the narrator removes a barrier between himself and the reader' (2001) 72, I would add that the character Xenophon takes over large parts of the mediating function.

[43] The emphasis on trustworthiness and reliability is balanced by the great role of deceit in the action. See, for example, Wencis (1977/1978) on ὑποψία.

[44] On parallels between Xenophon's justification and earlier judgements on characters in the narrative, see also Hirsch (1985) 35–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cyrus' generosity and his striving to return all favours and to support his friends are at the core of his obituary (1.9.20–28). The benefits of this attitude come to the fore even in his failed attempt to overpower the king: many Persians change from the king's camp to his camp, while conversely Orontas is the only Persian to betray him for the king. With the exception of Ariaeus, who commanded the cavalry, all his friends and followers die for him in the Battle of Cunaxa (1.9.29–31).

The similarity between Xenophon's reflections and the narrator's evaluation of Cyrus reinforces the juxtaposition of the two barbarian princes, who both engage Greek mercenaries for quick and clandestine operations in order to win what they consider to be rightfully theirs.[45] The parallel underscores the feeling that the army has moved in a circle.[46] For my argument, it is crucial that, once more, Xenophon makes comments reminiscent of those made by the narrator. Xenophon adds to his reflections on trust and reciprocity the following statement about values:

> It is my view, Seuthes, that there's no possession which brings greater honour and glory to a man, especially if he's in a position of leadership, than courage, justice and generosity. The man who possesses these qualities is rich not just because of all his friends, but because there are always others who would like to become his friends. If he does well, he's surrounded by people who share his pleasure, and if he meets with a setback, he's not short of people to help him out (7.7.41–42).

It is not difficult to see that Xenophon here voices the very value system that underlies the narrator's evaluations of Cyrus and the Greek generals – virtue, justice and nobility trump material possessions. The high degree of abstraction and its place at the end of the narrative make this statement, together with the reflection on trust and reciprocity, into something that is close to a concluding comment on the march of the Ten Thousand.[47] The fact that this comment is voiced by Xenophon is emblematic of a narrative in which this character has taken over significant narratorial functions, particularly the task of judging, from the retreating narrator.[48]

IV. Xenophon and history

In a final step, I would like to touch upon a parallel between Xenophon the character and Xenophon the narrator. A shared interest in the past adds another facet to the manifold interaction between narrator and character whose use of history, I suggest, can be read as meta-historical, i.e. as providing an implicit comment on how to read the *Anabasis*.[49] The entanglement of character with narrator may be less obvious than in Xenophon's activities as focalizing instance, narrator and commentator, but, given its intricacy, is at least worth considering.

It is striking how often Xenophon invokes the past, including both Greece's history in the fifth century BC and more recent events.[50] Xenophon also employs vocabulary that is typical of historians, for example when he refers to the victory of the Greeks over Xerxes:

[45] The similarities can be spelt out further. As Howland (2000) 882–83 points out, just as Cyrus does, Seuthes 'makes promises of pay and territory that he ultimately cannot (or will not) fulfil'. Moreover, both like to share their food (1.9.25–26, 7.3.22).

[46] *Cf.* Lossau (1990) 51; Howland (2000) 878; Ma (2004) 335.

[47] On the open closure of the *Anabasis*, see Bradley (2001) 81–83; Tuplin (2003) 129, who speaks of 'partial closure'; Purves (2010) 191.

[48] Rood (2007b) 61, elaborating on Xenophon and the advice he gives at the end of the *Anabasis*, notes that he sounds like a 'mouthpiece for the narrator Xenophon'.

[49] For similar interpretations, see the contributions to Grethlein and Krebs (2012): ancient historians often use references to the 'plu-past', that is a past anterior to the past narrated by the historian, to shed light on their own work. Meta-literary aspects in the *Anabasis* have already been noticed by Rood (2004a) 318.

[50] In addition to the examples discussed above, see the numerous passages from book 7: 7.1.26–27, 7.6.24, 7.6.37–38, 7.7.25–27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> The trophies still stand, as visible proof (τεκμήρια) of their prowess, but the most important evidence (μαρτύριον) is the freedom of the cities where you were born and raised (3.2.13).

Xenophon not only shares the historians' interest in proofs, but both τεκμήριον and μαρτύριον are firmly established terms for evidence in historiography, the former also being used by the narrator of the *Anabasis* himself (1.9.30; see also *Hell*. 5.2.7).[51] Of course, recalling the past in a speech or conversation is different from writing history, but the character's historian-like take on the past invites a comparison of his references to the past with the *Anabasis* as a historical account. Let us briefly look at two appeals made to the soldiers to recall past battles. I have already mentioned Xenophon's first speech in the assembly, which recalls to the mercenaries' minds the victories in the Persian Wars:

> I'm going to remind (ἀναμνήσω) you of the danger faced by our ancestors, because I want you to understand not only that you have to be brave, but also that, thanks to the gods, brave men survive even in extreme peril (3.2.11).

The past serves as a model for the present in a normative as well as a descriptive way – the bravery of the ancestors obliges the Greeks and, at the same time, their success against the Persian masses illustrate that they have a chance of survival. In Bithynia, Xenophon addresses his men to prepare them for battle after crossing a ravine (6.5.23): 'Men, remember (ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε) all the major battles in which you have engaged the enemy and defeated them with the help of the gods and remember what happens to those who flee from their foes'. Xenophon here invokes the past of the Cyreans as a model for their performance in the present situation: they have become their own exemplum.

Needless to say, such appeals are a commonplace in the battle narratives of ancient historiography, but I think that they have special significance in the *Anabasis*. In 6.5.24, Xenophon closes his exhortatory speech: 'It is sweet that whoever says or does now something manly and beautiful creates a memory (μνήμην) of himself in the things he wants to'. After invoking the past as a model for the present, Xenophon envisages the memory of the Ten Thousand in times to come. His promise can be read as a metalepsis in which the narrator has a character (here unconsciously) refer to the narrative of which he is part – the *Anabasis* itself is the μνήμη of the march of the Ten Thousand.[52] The use of the same stem, μνημ-, for Xenophon's acts of memory and, implicitly, the *Anabasis*' narrative underscores their similarity and suggests a meta-historical reading: Xenophon's use of the past can be read as an implicit mirror of how the *Anabasis* ought to be read. Just as Xenophon evokes models of the past, the *Anabasis* offers exempla for emulation.

Such an interpretation seems to be confirmed by the reception history of the march of the Ten Thousand. The thesis that Xenophon wrote the *Anabasis* as a plea for a new pan-hellenic expedition to Asia may be open to challenge,[53] but the deployment of Xenophon and the Greek mercenaries as a positive model is well attested. In the *Hellenica*, for example, Lysander persuades Agesilaus to undertake an expedition to Asia, 'thinking that the Greeks would be superior on the sea, and taking into account the land force that had gone up country with Cyrus, how it was saved' (3.4.2).[54] Polybius starts his assessment of Alexander's decision to attack Persia (3.6.10): 'The first cause was the return of the Greeks with Xenophon from the upper satrapies, in which none of the barbarians dared to face them although they traversed the whole of Asia, which was hostile to them'. In Arrian's *Anabasis*, Alexander himself invokes Xenophon

[51] *Cf.* Gray (2004) 135.

[52] On metalepsis in ancient literature, see de Jong (2009).

[53] For a recent review, see Rood (2004a).

[54] See also Jason of Pherae in *Hell*. 6.1.12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and his men, who, without all the allies at his disposal, managed to defeat the Persian king (2.7.8–9). These passages do not directly reference the *Anabasis*, but, given the prominence which the work enjoyed in antiquity, it is not too fanciful to assume that they at least partly relied on its testimony. This use of the *Anabasis* parallels the way in which Xenophon in the *Anabasis* draws upon the past. As I have pointed out, Xenophon's way of invoking the past is hardly extraordinary, but the reception of the *Anabasis* along the lines of Xenophon's use of the past corroborates its meta-historical character.

This being said, Xenophon's attitude towards the past does not work simply as a mirror, but also throws into relief the character of the *Anabasis* through tensions. At the close of the speech with which Xenophon justifies the beating of soldiers, he complains about the selective memory of the soldiers who only recall negative experiences (5.8.26): 'And yet, it is right, just, holy and sweeter to remember good rather than bad things'.[55] Xenophon's emphasis on positive deeds as the object of memory chimes well with reflections found in the *Hellenica*. For example, when the author mentions the successful defence of the Phliasians against the siege of the Argives, he adds (7.2.1): 'All historians remember great cities, if they have achieved something. But it seems to me that, if a small city has done many great deeds, this is even worthier of presentation'.[56] Thus, the comment of the character seems to reflect the predilection of the narrator. At the same time, Xenophon's comment is pointedly placed after an elaboration that casts some of the mercenaries in a bad light.[57] Seen from this perspective, Xenophon's reflection contrasts with the *Anabasis* and throws into relief its complex narrative technique: while generally highlighting deeds worthy of emulation, the *Anabasis* also features questionable behaviour.[58] Ironically, in this case the negative material is introduced into the narrative by the character who argues in favour of remembering good deeds.

The relation between the *Anabasis* and Xenophon's comments on memory and the past is multi-faceted. While Xenophon's use of the past as a model for emulation prefigures the reception of the *Anabasis*, his thoughts on memory do not always map easily onto its narrative and provoke the reader to further reflection. The meta-historical significance for which I have argued adds a particularly complex point to the interaction between character and narrator that unfolds beneath their neat separation: one of the reasons why the function of the *Anabasis* is still discussed[59] is that it is very poor in explicit narratorial reflections.[60] At the same time, the character's use of the past and comments on memory provide an implicit discussion of the *Anabasis* and its commemoration of the march of the Ten Thousand.

V. Conclusion

Although he had participated in the march of the Ten Thousand, Xenophon chose for his account of it a hetero-diegetic narrator who is distinct from his own character and holds back with narratorial intrusions. Following Plutarch's lead, scholars have pointed out that the choice of a hetero-diegetic narrator makes the positive presentation of his own deeds more credible. My reading of the *Anabasis* can draw our attention to another aspect of its narratorial *persona*. I have argued that the perspective of Xenophon the character pervades the narrative through focalization and at a more subtle level, as when the narrator adopts his interest in potential places for a colony, and that, on the other hand, through embedded narratives, comments and meta-historical reflections,

[55] Rood (2007b) 55 notes the similarity with complaints of the Thucydidean Pericles about the selective memory of the Athenians.

[56] For further passages, see Gray (2003) 112–15.

[57] I owe this point to one of the anonymous readers.

[58] Gray (1989) 31–32, 47–48 notes Xenophon's tendency in the *Hellenica* to throw into relief good moral achievement through a contrast with negative cases.

[59] See, for example, on the apologetic tendency of the *Anabasis*, Dürrbach (1893); Erbse (1966); Waterfield (2006) 190. Rood (2004a) 322 notes a 'slight tension between the claim that Xenophon does exaggerate his influence and the claim that he is defending himself'. See also the discussion of Tuplin (2003) 154.

[60] *Cf.* Rood (2007a) 152.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Xenophon fulfils significant narratorial functions. This entanglement of narrator and character under the surface of the clean separation suggests that the unintrusive hetero-diegetic narrator not only serves to render the narrative credible, but also contributes to the characterization of Xenophon. There are some ambiguous aspects of Xenophon – in addition to Socrates' rebuke, the failure of his plans to found a colony and the final raid on a Persian nobleman may be named here[61] – but on the whole the portrayal is overwhelmingly positive.[62] The narratorial privileges of Xenophon as well as the absorption of his perspective by the narrator play an important role in creating this positive presentation of Xenophon. The narrator's tendency to adopt Xenophon's perspective endows him with authority, his echoes of narratorial statements underscore his reliability and his evaluations illustrate his superior judgement. Needless to say, these effects depend on the separation of character from narrator. It is the implicit blurring of the borderline between the two that contributes to the presentation of the character.

This reading ties in nicely with three observations. First, it is noteworthy that the *Hellenica* as well as the *Anabasis* is told by a narrator who rarely intrudes on the narrative, but that the narratorial reticence in the *Anabasis* is greater.[63] It would be hard to explain this by generic differences, but it makes good sense if we take into account the narratorial functions given to the main character in the *Anabasis*. In the account of the march of the Ten Thousand, Xenophon the narrator retreats further from the narrative to make room for Xenophon the character.

Moreover, as Bradley notices, most of the few narratorial interventions occur in the first two books of the *Anabasis*. The fact that the virtual retreat of the narrator after the first two books converges with the introduction of Xenophon into the plot underscores that Xenophon fills the gap left by the retreating narrator. This is illustrated by the parallels between Xenophon's justificatory speeches and the narrator's evaluation of Cyrus and the murdered generals for which I have argued in section III.

Finally, Rood observes that Xenophon 'progresses from the impetuous young Athenian who ignores Socrates' advice to the hardened general who is able to act as advisor himself'.[64] The impression that Xenophon develops in the course of the *Anabasis* is reinforced by his narratorial privileges which, as we have seen, increase at the end of the narrative. It is when the mercenaries are already back in Europe, during the expedition with Seuthes, that Xenophon gives the lengthy justification speech in which he reviews not only the decision to join Seuthes, but also his general conduct (7.6.11–38). Even later in the narrative comes the speech in which Xenophon reflects on reliability in a way that is strongly reminiscent of the narrator in Cyrus' obituary and makes a comment on virtues that reads like a conclusion to the narrative (7.7.41–42). The impression that Xenophon's personality has developed relies not so much on his role in the plot – after all, he loses more and more of the favour of the mercenaries and stands with his back to the wall – as on his increased activity as commentator. Building on, and subtly undermining, the overt separation of narrator and character, the narratorial privileges of Xenophon and the subtle penetration of the narration by his stance contribute much to establishing him as the central agent in the *Anabasis*. Through play with voice and perspective, Xenophon, while being only a historical agent, is endowed with some of the superiority that is reserved for historians, in this case Xenophon looking back to his own past experiences.

[61] As Dillery (1995) 91 notes on the latter point, 'one cannot resist noting that the episode represents the very kind of independent action aimed at profit that he earlier so often deplored'. For a more positive evaluation of the episode, see Azoulay (2004) 303. On critical aspects of Xenophon's presentation in the *Anabasis*, see Higgins (1977) 93–98.

[62] See, for example, Cawkwell (2004) 59.

[63] *Cf.* Gray (2004) 132. Another observation of Gray (2004) 136 also ties in with my thesis: the narratorial persona is more secular in the *Anabasis* than in the *Hellenica*, but 'his characters however, particularly Xenophon, acknowledge the role of the gods in their affairs instead'.

[64] Rood (2007a) 162. *Cf.* Howland (2000) 876. See, however, Tuplin (2003) 149, who is sceptical about the development thesis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bibliography

Azoulay, V. (2004) 'The ambitions of a mercenary', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 289–304
Bal, M. (1985) *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto)
Bradley, P.J. (2001) 'Irony and the narrator in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in E. Tylawsky and C.G. Weiss (eds), *Essays in Honor of Gordon Williams: Twenty-Five Years at Yale* (New Haven) 59–84
Braun, T. (2004) 'Xenophon's dangerous liaisons', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 97–130
Breitenbach, H.R. (1967) 'Xenophon', *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9.2, 1569–2052
Brodersen, K. (2000) *Virtuelle Antike. Wendepunkte der Alten Geschichte* (Darmstadt)
Cawkwell, G. (2004) 'When, how and why did Xenophon write the *Anabasis*?', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 47–67
Christ, M.R. (1994) 'Herodotean kings and historical inquiry', *ClAnt* 13, 167–202
Dalby, A. (1992) 'Greeks abroad. Social organisation and food among the Ten Thousand', *JHS* 112, 16–30
de Jong, I. (1987) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam)
— (1991) *Narrative in Drama: The Art of Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden)
— (2009) 'Metalepsis in ancient Greek literature', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of the Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin and New York) 87–116
Dewald, C. (1987) 'Narrative surface and authorial voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa* 20, 147–70
— (2002) '"I didn't give my own genealogy": Herodotus and the authorial persona', in E. Bakker, I. de Jong and H. van Wees (eds), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden) 267–89
Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the History of his Times* (London)
Dorati, M. (2007) 'Alcune ambiguità del narratore dell' *Anabasi*', *QUCC* 85.1, 105–13
Dürrbach, F. (1893) 'L'Apologie de Xénophon dans l'*Anabase*', *REG* 6, 343–86
Erbse, H. (1966) 'Xenophons *Anabasis*', *Gymnasium* 73, 485–505
Ferguson N. (ed.) (1997) *Virtual History. Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (London)
Flory, S. (1988) 'Thucydides' hypotheses about the Peloponnesian War', *TAPhA* 118, 43–56
Genette, G. (1972) *Figures* III (Paris)
Görler, W. (1976) 'Die Veränderung des Erzählstandpunktes in Caesars *Bellum Gallicum*', *Poetica* 8, 95–119
Gray, V. (1989) *The Character of Xenophon's* Hellenica (London)
— (2003) 'Interventions and citations in Xenophon, *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*', *CQ* 53.1, 111–23
— (2004) 'Xenophon', in I. de Jong, R. Nünlist and A.M. Bowie (eds), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden) 129–46
Grethlein, J. (2006) 'The Unthucydidean voice of Sallust', *TAPhA* 138, 299–327
— (2009) 'How not to do history. Xerxes in Herodotus' *Histories*', *AJPh* 130, 195–218
Grethlein, J. and Krebs, C. (eds) (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography. The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge)
Gribble, D. (1998) 'Narrator interventions in Thucydides', *JHS* 118, 41–67
Higgins, W.E. (1977) *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis* (Albany)
Hirsch, S.W. (1985) *The Friendship of the Barbarian. Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover)
Hornblower, S. (2004) '"This was decided" (ἔδοξε ταῦτα). The army as polis in Xenophon's *Anabasis* – and elsewhere', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 243–63
Howland, J. (2000) 'Xenophon's philosophic Odyssey. On the *Anabasis* and Plato's *Republic*', *American Political Science Review* 94.4, 875–89
Kraus, C.S. (1994) *Livy.* Ab urbe condita. *Book VI* (Cambridge)
Lendle, O. (1995) *Kommentar zu Xenophons* Anabasis (Darmstadt)
Lossau, M. (1990) 'Xenophons Odyssee', *A&A* 36, 47–52
Ma, J. (2004) 'You can't go home again: displacement and identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 330–45
Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nelles, W. (1990) 'Getting focalization into focus', *Poetics Today* 11, 365–82
Nenci, G. (1955) 'Il motivo dell'autopsia nella storiografia greca', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 3, 22–46
Nussbaum, G.B. (1967) *The Ten Thousand. A Study in Social Organisation and Action in Xenophon's* Anabasis (Leiden)
Pelling, C. (forthcoming) 'Historical explanation and what didn't happen: the virtues of virtual history', in A. Powell (ed.), *Hindsight* (Swansea)
Purves, A. (2010) *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge)
Reijgwart, E.J. (1993) 'Zur Erzählung in Caesars *Commentarii*', *Philologus* 137, 18–37
Riggsby, A.M. (2006) *Caesar in Gaul and Rome. War in Words* (Austin)
Rinner, W. (1978) 'Zur Darstellungsweise bei Xenophon, *Anabasis* III 1–2', *Philologus* 122, 144–49
Roisman, J. (1985/1988) 'Klearchos in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 8/9, 30–52
Rood, T. (1998) *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford)
— (2004a) 'Panhellenism and self-presentation. Xenophon's speeches', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 305–29
— (2004b) *The Sea! The Sea! The Shout of the Ten Thousand in the Modern Imagination* (London)
— (2007a) 'Xenophon', in I. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden) 147–64
— (2007b) 'Advice and advisers in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in D.J. Spencer and E.M. Theodorakopoulos (eds), *Advice and its Rhetoric in Greece and Rome* (Bari) 47–61
Rutherford, I. (1998) *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age. Idea-Theory in its Literary Context* (Oxford)
Sage, P.W. (1991) 'Tradition, genre, and character portrayal. *Cyropaedia* 8.7 and *Anabasis* 1.9', *GRBS* 32, 61–79
Schepens, G. (1980) *L'Autopsie dans la méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels)
Tritle, L.A. (2004) 'Xenophon's portrait of Clearchus. A study in post-traumatic stress disorder', in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and his World* (Stuttgart) 325–39
Tuplin, C. (2003) 'Heroes in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot and F.L. Gattinoni (eds), *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea* (Rome) 115–56
Waterfield, R. (2006) *Xenophon's Retreat. Greece, Persia, and the End of the Golden Age* (Cambridge MA)
Waterfield, R. and Rood, T. (2005) *Xenophon. The Expedition of Cyrus* (Oxford)
Wencis, L. (1977/1978) 'Hypopsia and the structure of Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *CJ* 73, 44–49

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426912000031 Published online by Cambridge University Press