CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

XENOPHON OF EPHESUS

J.R. MORGAN

In many important respects Xenophon's handling of time is like Chariton's (→). For the most part this is a straightforward narrative in chronological order, but the author's ambition to cram as much sensational incident into as short a compass as possible has led to some difficulties and oddities. It must remain an open question to what extent if any this is due to the status of the text that we have. Arguments that our version of the *Ephesiaca* is an epitome have been vigorously rebutted, but the sense remains for many readers that something fuller and more satisfactory lurks behind the extant text.¹

The narration is subsequent, but further precision is impossible. Whereas Chariton (→) locates his story at a fairly precise date in the past and links it to historical figures, Xenophon's is in temporal free-fall. There is no attempt to set a dramatic date: some institutions appear to belong to the imperial period, but probably represent no more than a default-setting reflecting the world familiar to author and his readers.² Rome is conspicuous by her absence, even when the action briefly moves to Italy. There is no reference to any historical figure or event. The narrator never speaks of his own time as distinct from that of the story.

The total time span covered by the story is similarly vague. Hägg has counted sixty days identifiable by temporal markers.³ In a few cases the days are clearly marked as consecutive,⁴ but most of the action takes place on single-day units separated by unspecified periods of time. In

¹ The fullest statement of the epitome theory is Bürger 1892; for rebuttal see Hägg [1966] 2004.

² The presence of an *eirenarch*, police officer (2.13.3; 3.9.5), is conventionally used as evidence for the date of composition, but cf. O'Sullivan 1995: 4–9. Xenophon's Egypt is governed by an *archon* who seems a bit like a Roman prefect, but who has a relative with a Greek name.

³ Hägg 1971: 58–59. I am greatly indebted to the whole of his discussion.

⁴ So e.g. *tei deuterai* ('on the next day', 1.12.3).

only a few cases is a precise length of time mentioned, such as the ten days it takes Habrocomes and Hippothous to travel to Mazacus (3.1.2), or the thirty days for which Perilaus promises to keep his hands off Anthia and whose expiry is marked at 3.3.7. Generally Xenophon will cover these intervening periods with a formula such as ‘for many days’ (*pollais hēmerais*, e.g. 2.7.1) or ‘for a long time’ (*epi polu*, e.g. 1.5.2) or ‘as time went on’ (*khronou dielthontos*, e.g. 5.7.1). In this way, the whole time span of the story is covered, but, as the action is for most of the novel divided into two separate narrative strands, there are frequent temporal gaps in each of them, during which action must occasionally be presumed to have taken place.⁵

The story mostly follows the order of the corresponding part of the fabula, although, as we shall see, Xenophon’s technique for handling simultaneous or parallel narrative produces some vagueness at transitions. We are told nothing of the lives of the protagonists before the story begins.⁶ Two (heterodiegetic) analeptic narratives delivered by secondary characters must relate to a time prior to the beginning of the story, with which neither has any organic connection. The first is Hippothous’ account of his youthful love for Hyperanthes (3.2.1). The period separating these events and the narration of them is altogether unclear: there is no indication of Hippothous’ current age. The second is the story of the fisherman Aegialeus, in which he recounts his elopement with the woman whose embalmed corpse he keeps in his bedroom (5.1.4–11). These events took place while he was an ephebe and are narrated when he is an old man, and so his narrative extends the fabula back a generation before the beginning of the story. The end-point of both story and fabula of the novel is provided by the following closure:

They [Anthia and Habrocomes] themselves hereafter were living [*dižgon*], leading their life together as a festival. Leucon and Rhode shared everything with their companions; and Hippothous too decided to spend the rest of his life in Ephesus. He now erected a great tomb for Hyperanthes in Lesbos, and adopting Cleisthenes as his son, he was living [*diēgen*] in Ephesus with Habrocomes and Anthia.⁷ (5.15)

⁵ So at 3.9.2 Habrocomes’ journey from Mazacus to Tarsus has been made unnarrated during the preceding section focussed on Anthia.

⁶ Anthia’s narrative of a traumatic experience in a graveyard is a fiction to account for the epilepsy she feigns to avoid service in a brothel (5.7.4–9).

⁷ The translation used is that of G. Anderson in Reardon 1989.

Even here there is indeterminacy: the two imperfects *diēgon* and *diēgen* terminate the fabula at an unspecified point shortly after the end of the story, while their life together is still continuing, but stop short of including the whole of their lives.

Order

For the most part the narrative is chronological. The single significant anachrony is worth discussion. At 2.13.8 Anthia extracts an oath from Perilaus to wait thirty days before the marriage to which she has been forced to agree. After a passage centred on Habrocomes, the text returns to Anthia with the comment that ‘the thirty days had passed and Perilaus was making preparations for the wedding’.⁸ At this point the narrator introduces a new character:

While Anthia, taken from the robbers’ lair [*lacuna*], an old doctor from Ephesus called Eudoxus arrived in Tarsus. He had been shipwrecked on a voyage to Egypt. This Eudoxus went round all the local aristocracy of Tarsus, begging for clothes or money and describing his misfortune; among them he approached Perilaus in turn and told him that he was an Ephesian and a doctor by profession. Perilaus took him and brought him to Anthia, thinking she would be glad to see someone from Ephesus. She was sympathetic to Eudoxus and tried to find out whether he could tell her anything about her own family. But he told her that he knew nothing, since he had been away from Ephesus for a long time. But Anthia was still pleased to see him, since he reminded her of the people back home. And so he had become a familiar visitor to the household and came to see Anthia each time, enjoying every comfort and always asking her to send him back to Ephesus, for he had a wife and child there. (3.4.1–4)

It is clear that Eudoxus arrived at Tarsus and became familiar with Anthia during the thirty-day period which was formally concluded in the previous chapter, and that this is therefore a narratorial completing analepsis. The next chapter begins with more analeptic pluperfects:

⁸ 3.3.7. The pluperfect *parelēluthesan* (‘had passed’) and imperfect *parekeuazeto* (‘was preparing’), re-establishing Anthia’s situation by looking back into the period when her strand of the story has been out of camera shot (and in the case of the imperfect introducing a new piece of information), are characteristic of Xenophon’s technique for handling transition between the two story-lines.

Now when Perilaus had made all the preparations for the wedding, and the day had arrived, a sumptuous dinner was ready for them, and Anthia had been dressed in a bridal dress. But she did not stop weeping night or day, but always had Habrocomes before her eyes (3.5.1)

It seems that the day which has now arrived is not the expiry of the thirty-day delay but the end of a further period of preparation, during which Anthia has been weeping continually. The pluperfects look back into a time span which has been occluded by the analepsis about Eudoxus. The anachronicity of this section is unparalleled in Xenophon, and seems to serve no particular purpose. As it could easily have been avoided by narrating the arrival of Eudoxus in its ‘proper’ place, we may be looking at a careless piece of work by an epitomator who was slow to realise the importance of Eudoxus and had to insert an explanation of his identity and presence.

Analepses

This novel lacks the extended narratorial repeating analepses so prominent in Chariton (→). The most important function of narratorial analepsis is to effect transitions between and co-ordinate the separate narrative threads. The characteristic procedure (already glimpsed in the passage about Eudoxus) is to end a section of narrative with a brief repeating analepsis, summarising the position in which the one protagonist is about to be left, and to begin the next with another brief repeating analepsis, with the verb in either the pluperfect or the imperfect tense, summarising the position in which the other protagonist was left at the end of the last section but one. This technique is treated in more detail in the section on *simultaneity* below.

Actorial analepses are much more frequent, in both direct and indirect speech.⁹ They often have a clear argument function, when action is motivated by the communication of information from one character to another. So, for example, when, in search of Anthia, Habrocomes comes to

the estate where Anthia had been living with Lampon the goatherd, who had been given her as a wife by Manto, he took him along the shore and asked Lampon to tell him if he knew anything about a girl from Tyre. The goatherd said that her name was Anthia; he told him about the

⁹ These are fully discussed by Hägg 1971: 267–277.

marriage and how he had respected her; he told him about Moeris' love, the order to execute her, and the journey to Cilicia. And he said that the girl kept talking about someone called Habrocomes. Habrocomes did not say who he was but got up at dawn and rode for Cilicia, hoping to find Anthia there. (2.12.2–3)

This repeats material from the immediately preceding chapters, of which the primary narratee hardly needs reminding, but it motivates Habrocomes' trip to Cilicia.¹⁰

There are cases, on the other hand, where these actorial repeating analepses serve no particular argument function. For instance, at the beginning of the third book Habrocomes and Hippothous exchange narratives. Hippothous tells about his youthful love-affair in a long external analepsis. Habrocomes' reply is succinctly conveyed in indirect speech:

Habrocomes told him that he was an Ephesian and that he had fallen in love with a girl and married her; he mentioned the prophecies, the voyage, the pirates, Apsyrtus, Manto, his imprisonment, his flight, the goatherd, and the journey to Cilicia. (3.3.1)

The sense of shared misfortune cements the friendship between the two characters, but most of what Habrocomes says is a simple list, in chronological order, of the main points of his part of the action: it is not important for the plot that Hippothous should know these particular details.¹¹ Hippothous does now tell his new friend about the beautiful girl he had captured not long before, in whom Habrocomes immediately recognises Anthia, but there was nothing in Habrocomes' analepsis to prompt this revelation. It may be that these actorial analepses are intended to help the primary narratee keep track of the rapidly alternating plot strands. Hippothous' account of his encounter with Anthia is worth dwelling on. It repeats events recounted by the primary narrator in the second book, but with significant differences of focalization: most importantly he is ignorant of Anthia's identity. But Hippothous is the one character who features in both story-lines, and

¹⁰ On the other hand, the brief narratorial repeating analepsis identifying Lampon ('who had been given her as a wife by Manto'; verb in the pluperfect tense) looks slightly further back, across a short episode centred on Habrocomes to Anthia's forced marriage at 2.9.4. This clearly is a prompt for the primary narratee: possibly a feature of oral style; or a hint that there was once a version where the intervening episode was longer.

¹¹ In fact the same details tend to return stereotypically in these actorial analepses.

his role as a bridge between them is exemplified in the way that he conveys information here.

Another actorial analepsis that clarifies things for the primary narratee concerns the secondary characters Leucon and Rhode, servants of Habrocomes and Anthia, with whom Habrocomes is eventually reunited in Rhodes. Their account of their experiences is briefly expressed in indirect speech, but brings together widely separated episodes:

... and told their own story—their journey to Syria from Tyre, Manto's anger, the disposal, the sale to Lycia, their master's death, their wealth, their arrival in Rhodes. (5.10.11)

This is not quite in chronological order, since Manto's anger was the cause of their being sent to Syria and then disposed of for sale; this anger is already known to Habrocomes, and there is no reason for them to tell him about it.

The fullest analepsis occurs at the climax of the novel. The protagonists have been reunited and in bed Anthia tells Habrocomes of her experiences:

'I have found you again, after all my wanderings over land and sea, escaping robbers' threats and pirates' plots and pimps' insults, chains, trenches, fetters, poisons, and tombs. But I have reached you, Habrocomes, lord of my heart, the same as when I first left you in Tyre for Syria. No one persuaded me to go astray: not Moeris in Syria, Perilaus in Cilicia, Psammis or Polyidus in Egypt, not Anchialus in Ethiopia, not my master in Tarentum. I remain chaste, after practising every device of virtue.' (5.14.1–2)

Untypically, this review conspicuously does not observe chronological order. Its function is not to inform Habrocomes about her adventures; this has already taken place without much emphasis.¹² Nor at this stage does the primary narratee need a recapitulation of the story. The point is rather to establish Anthia's chastity and underwrite fidelity as the novel's primary value. The analepsis is rhetorically arranged (with rhetorical plurals) to build from the general to the specific, and hence to the most precisely imagined threat. Similar compromises with the principles of chronology can also be found in analeptic lamentations, as at 5.5.5:

¹² 5.13.5: 'there were many different stories from all of them: each of them told all that had happened to them and all that they had done'.

‘Were the tombs, murders, bonds and pirates’ lairs not enough?’¹³
(5.5.5)

Prolepses

The prolepses can be divided into a number of categories: a) narratorial prolepses; b) prolepses implied by the intentions of the divine; c) prophetic dreams and oracles; d) actorial prolepses; e) seeds. Unlike Chariton (→), Xenophon does not use intertextual analogies proleptically, beyond the obvious generic assumption that plots of this sort will have a happy ending.

a) Xenophon’s narrator is given very few prolepses. They are all internal and of relatively restricted extent. So when Perilaus defeats Hippothous’ robber gang,

he took Anthia and felt sorry for her when he found out the dreadful fate that had been about to overtake her. But his pity for her was the beginning of another terrible calamity. (2.13.5)

This looks no further forward than to the next sentence, when he falls in love with her and presses her to consent to marriage; we seem to be dealing with the ‘header’ technique. Another narratorial prolepsis simply confirms that a prophetic dream is in fact prophetic.¹⁴

b) Statements by the narrator about the intentions of the gods are similarly less frequent in this novel than in Chariton’s (→). The action is prompted by the anger of Eros, and for the first four chapters his agency in the protagonists’ inamoration is repeatedly stressed. After Habrocomes throws himself on the god’s mercy, we are told:

even after this prayer Eros was still angry and intended to take a terrible revenge on him for his arrogance. (1.4.5)

The implication is that something bad will happen, but at this point Xenophon loses interest in the vengeance of Eros, and it is not clear whether Eros’ revenge comprises all the ensuing adventures or only the

¹³ Xenophon’s laments are fewer and shorter than Chariton’s; cf. 3.5.3, 8.6–7; 5.1.13, 7.2, 8.7.

¹⁴ 1.12.4: ‘as soon as he dreamt this, he was in a panic and expected his dream to portend some dreadful outcome, and the terrible thing happened’, looking forward to the attack by pirates in the next sentence.

love-sickness that immediately follows. This confusion is compounded: the protagonists' parents seek the advice of the oracle of Apollo at Colophon, as a result of which the marriage takes place. But after the wedding night we are told that

they had forgotten even the oracle. But fate [*to heimarmenon*] had not forgotten, nor did the god who decided these things neglect them.

(1.10.2)

The god is not named, but Xenophon means us to understand Apollo, not Eros. The prolepsis here, then, guarantees that the words of the oracle will be fulfilled, but the agency of Eros is now conclusively superseded by that of Apollo. Here again the narrator loses interest in divine planning, and Apollo's agency is not mentioned again in the narratorial voice. When the protagonists attract the lust of a pair of pirates, Habrocomes himself exclaims:

‘The oracles are beginning to be fulfilled; the god is taking his revenge on me for my arrogance.’

(2.1.2)

He must mean Eros, but this is hardly the moment of revenge that Eros was said to be scheming; nor is there anything in the oracle that could easily be identified with this turn of events. These ‘divine’ prolepses then deliver an immediate effect of foreboding, but do not give an accurate or coherent view of the way that the plot will actually develop.¹⁵

c) Whereas Chariton eschews the literary device of oracles and predictive dreams, Xenophon makes prominent but puzzling use of it. I have already mentioned the consultation of the oracle at Colophon by the protagonists' parents, which kick-starts the adventure plot. The response they receive is this:

‘Why do you long to learn the end of a malady and its beginning?

One disease has both in its grasp, and from that the remedy must be accomplished.

But for them I see terrible sufferings and toils that are endless;

Both will flee over the sea pursued by madness;

They will suffer chains at the hands of men who mingle with the waters;

And a bedchamber shall be the tomb for both, and fire the destroyer;

And beside the waters of the river Nile, to Holy Isis

¹⁵ It is worth noting in passing that similar prolepses involving divine agency occur in embedded narratives by secondary narrators: 3.2.4; 5.1.6.

The saviour you will afterwards offer rich gifts;
But still after their sufferings a better fate is in store.’ (1.6.2)

The text of these lines is corrupt, but even so there are serious difficulties.¹⁶ The ‘terrible sufferings and endless toils’ are sufficiently imprecise to cover most of the protagonists’ subsequent experiences. The ‘men who mingle with the waters’ are presumably the pirates who will shortly capture them. Habrocomes is thrown into chains by the pirate chief Apsyrtus at 2.6.4; but Anthia is enchained only by the land-bound robber Anchialus (4.5.3) and the jealous woman Rhenaea (5.5.4). The reference to pursuit by madness is difficult to interpret, and has been subjected to textual emendation; as it stands it might refer either to the madness of love, or else to the dream of Habrocomes at 1.12.3, which is introduced by the statement that the prophecies ‘began to take effect’, and which features a woman who might be Lyssa, the personification of Madness (though the text does not say so; see below). The bedchamber as tomb presumably relates to Anthia’s apparent suicide just before her marriage to Perilaus (3.6), and the destroying fire to the episode where Habrocomes is about to be burned at the stake (4.2.8–9). In that case we must write off the oracle’s prediction of these fates for both of them as poetic licence. The reference to the Nile is clearly a corruption, since in the next chapter the parents ask which river the oracle meant. Anthia prays to Isis in Memphis at 4.3.3, and takes refuge in the temple of Isis at 5.6.6, where she receives another oracle. The final reunion takes place at the temple of Isis in Rhodes, but the concluding celebrations do not take place beside the Nile, as the oracle suggests they will. There is clearly something amiss here, whether we ascribe the oddities to scribal corruption, epitomisation, later redaction, or authorial incompetence. We can say, however, that the oracle is designed to give a sense of unpleasant experiences leading to a happy ending, but in such an enigmatic fashion that the primary narratee has no real sense of the plot in advance.

The other oracle signals the imminent reunion of the protagonists. If the first oracle was hyper-enigmatic, this one leaves no room whatsoever for doubt. Having prayed to Apis for a true oracle about Habrocomes, Anthia comes out of the temple to hear the children playing in front of the precinct shout in hexametric chorus:

‘Anthia will soon recover her own husband, Habrocomes.’ (5.4.11)

¹⁶ Cf. F. Zimmermann 1949–1950; Hägg 1971: 228–231.

This message cheers her up, but she is not sufficiently in control of her own destiny to act on it. The prolepsis looks forward past her experiences in a South Italian brothel to the scene of reunion in Rhodes (5.13.4). The word ‘soon’ (*takhu*) covers an indeterminate length of time, which includes a voyage from Alexandria to Tarentum, a few days being rested after the brothel-keeper buys her, her spell in the brothel (possibly a single day), followed by a period of convalescence from her ‘epilepsy’, her purchase by Hippothous, a sufficiently long period of daily contact with Hippothous for him to fall in love with her, and a sea-voyage of a few days from Italy to Rhodes. This looks like an action-packed month or so, at least. So ‘soon’ is perhaps not so much a measure of time within the narrative as of the length of the narrative itself before the happy resolution is reached.

There are several predictive dreams in the novel, but they are enigmatic.¹⁷ Just before the first attack by pirates, Habrocomes

dreamt that a woman stood over him, fearful in appearance and superhuman in size, and dressed in a blood-red robe; and the vision seemed to set the ship alight; the rest perished, but he swam to safety with Anthia. As soon as he dreamt this, he was in a panic and expected his dream to portend some dreadful outcome, as indeed it did. (1.12.4)

This dream immediately precedes and predicts the first pirate attack; the red robe of the woman (*phoinikēn*) punningly predicts the Phoenician nationality of the pirates, though otherwise her identity is never made clear.

An even more puzzling dream is that at 2.8.2:

He [Habrocomes in Apsyrtus’ gaol] dreamt that he saw his father, Lycomedes, dressed in black, wandering over every land and sea, stopping at the prison, freeing him, and letting him leave his cell; and that he himself took the form of a horse, went through many lands in pursuit of a second one—a mare—and finally found her and became a man again. When he dreamt this, he leapt up and was a little more hopeful. (2.8.2)

The second half of the dream allegorically predicts Habrocomes’ search for and reunion with Anthia, after his release by Apsyrtus; perhaps the horses in the dream hint at the importance of *Hippothous* in the story.¹⁸ The first part of the dream is also not literal: the wandering of

¹⁷ For discussion of the dreams in the light of oneirocritical theory see Plastira-Valkanou 2001.

¹⁸ Habrocomes will travel on horseback in search of Anthia (2.12.3, 13.4), but the dream seems to predict more than this.

Lycomedes may signify his death, but it is difficult to understand how the father is involved in Habrocomes' release, even allegorically. The dream is never referred to again, and its function appears to be less to provide genuine prolepsis in the long term than to manage emotions in the short term. The final dream comes as the resolution of the novel is approaching, and again its prolepsis is coded. In Tarentum Anthia

dreamt she was with Habrocomes, and both were beautiful, and it was the time when they were first in love. Some other beautiful woman appeared and was dragging Habrocomes away from her; and at last, when he cried out and called to her by name, she started up and the dream came to an end. (5.8.6)

Given the generic presumption that dreams are in some sense predictive, it is easy to read the first part of this as a prolepsis of reunion. But the beautiful rival corresponds to nothing either in Habrocomes' past or in the remaining sections of the plot. This is more plausibly intended as a reflection of Anthia's waking concerns. The most interesting thing about this third dream is that Anthia engages in an act of interpretation, and reaches and acts on a pessimistic conclusion that the primary narratee knows to be an incorrect one.

d) As in Chariton (→), Xenophon's characters often think and speak about the future, and in much the same ways. The proleptic status afforded these thoughts by the primary narratee is often determined by generic conventions. So when a character looks forward to a happy ending, as when Hippothous says to Habrocomes,

'Now you, Habrocomes, will set eyes on your beloved and recover her in time', (3.3.2)

the primary narratee will see the words as a straightforward prolepsis, but more pessimistic thoughts will be read as ironic. Most of these actorial prolepses work over very short ranges. A common form is for a decision to be taken and then acted on: the most complex and far-reaching such instance is when the pirates 'decided to attack and kill those who resisted, but to sell the rest in Phoenicia with the booty' (1.13.2). Another frequent device is to give characters vague forebodings, which are then immediately fulfilled. For example, just before the lustful pirates Corymbus and Euxinus make their first approaches to the protagonists, Habrocomes and Anthia are 'full of apprehension', and 'suspected no good would come of it' (1.16.1–2).

e) seeds: there is one good example of a ‘seed’ in this novel. Before their adventures really begin, the protagonists make a splendid dedication at the Temple of Helios in Rhodes. The prominence afforded to this hints that it will be of importance later, and this is confirmed in the final book, when Habrocomes revisits the temple, and discovers that his faithful servants Leucon and Rhode have set up a supplementary dedication next to it. This precipitates the first stage in the climactic reunion.

Simultaneity and parallel storylines

The protagonists are separated for nearly two-thirds of the total text, often by wide geographical distances. The action switches between them more than thirty times. The temporal relationship between the narrative strands has been comprehensively analysed by Hägg, whose findings I paraphrase.¹⁹ In the majority of cases, the transition is effected by means of a *men ... de* antithesis, which leaves the temporal relationships imprecise.²⁰ In a few cases the transition is accompanied by a phrase that apparently connotes simultaneity.²¹ But on closer inspection it becomes clear that the simultaneity is only between the last sentence or so of the first section and the opening of the new one. In other words, the pattern seems to be the same as the ‘relay-race’ in Chariton (→) (and → Homer), with the episodes conceived as successive and in chronological order, rather than simultaneous with temporal backtracking at transitions. Each narrative thread in isolation then consists of sections of frantic action, alternating with static non-development while the focus is elsewhere. This impression is confirmed, for example, by the role of Hippothous, who appears in both narrative strands, sometimes in consecutive episodes, making clear that they are not simultaneous. Similarly there are at least two occasions when an episode ends with the beginning of a journey, which has been completed or nearly completed by the time the narrative focus returns to that particular thread. The journey is thus conceived as taking up the

¹⁹ Hägg 1971: 154–177.

²⁰ Translators often tend to import the word ‘meanwhile’ into such contexts, which implies a precision the Greek text does not possess.

²¹ 2.12.1 (*en de toutois*); 4.4.1 (*en toutōi de*).

time covered by the intervening episode from the other strand, maintaining the chronological succession of the episodes.²²

Hägg identifies only one clearly anomalous passage.²³ At the end of 2.11 the goatherd to whom Anthia has been married disobeys Manto's orders to kill her and sells her to some Cilician merchants who set sail at nightfall (*nuktos epelthousēs*). They are shipwrecked and captured that night (*tēn nukta ekeinēn*) by Hippothous and his bandits. Attention then shifts to Habrocomes in Tyre. Meanwhile (*en de toutois*) a letter arrives from Manto with the lying news that she has ordered Anthia to be sold in Syria. Habrocomes sets off in search of her, comes to the goatherd and learns the truth; at dawn (*heōthen*) he sets off for Cilicia. At 2.13.1 we are back with Anthia on the same night (*ekainēs tēs nuktos*), and in the second half of the sentence a new day begins (*tēi de hexēs*). The extraordinary density of time-markers here signifies some special attention to time and synchronicity. Xenophon intends that Habrocomes' interview with the goatherd should be imagined as taking place directly after the sale of Anthia to the Cilician merchants, and at the very moment when she is being captured by Hippothous. The morning when Habrocomes sets off for Cilicia is the same as when Anthia is being prepared for sacrifice. Hägg is wrong, I think, to argue that the events of 2.12 'must cover several days'. However implausible we might find it in terms of real time, Xenophon has constructed a single day in the course of which Manto orders the goatherd to kill Anthia and then writes a untruthful letter; the goatherd is sufficiently moved to spare Anthia's life and sell her instead; Manto's letter is delivered and Habrocomes sets off in search of her; Anthia's ship is wrecked; Habrocomes talks with the goatherd and Anthia is captured by Hippothous.

Rhythm

In Xenophon we find the same alternation of summary and scenes as in Chariton (→). The effect is rather different, however, as Xenophon's narrative is very rapid and his scenes are seldom allowed to develop as they do in Chariton. Even Xenophon's most extended scenes, such as the protagonists' wedding-night (1.8–9), are small-scale by compar-

²² 2.13.1/2.14.1; 3.3.7/3.9.2.

²³ Hägg 1971: 177.

ison. It is thus not easy to demarcate between scene and summary. Xenophon makes far less use of direct speech than does Chariton, almost as if he is deliberately avoiding a scene that plays in ‘real-time’. A few scenes contain detailed description, and come close to making an actual pause in the narrative. The most prominent among these is the description of the tapestry in the protagonists’ bridal chamber:

The chamber had been prepared: a golden couch had been spread with purple sheets, and above it hung an awning with an embroidered Babylonian tapestry. Cupids were playing, some attending Aphrodite, who was also represented, some riding on Nabataean ostriches, some weaving garlands, others bringing flowers. These were on one half of the canopy; on the other was Ares, not in armour, but dressed in a cloak and wearing a garland, adorned for his lover Aphrodite. Eros was leading the way, with a lighted torch. Under this canopy they brought Anthia to Habrocomes and put her to bed, then shut the doors. (1.8)

Within this framework, however, there is nevertheless a marked difference between different parts of the novel. Book 4 is much shorter than the rest and each day/night unit occupies less textual space.

Frequency

As in Chariton (→), the narration mainly is singulative. Unlike Chariton, however, Xenophon does clearly mark out a few items as iterative. This applies especially to lamentations. At 3.8.7, for example, we have at first sight a single lamentation (with a verb of speaking in the aorist tense: *ephēse*) from Anthia on board of a ship on her way to Alexandria. But at the end of the direct speech, the narrator says that ‘she lamented in this fashion time after time’.²⁴

Conclusion

Xenophon’s handling of time is, like Chariton’s, rather simple, and for the most part time is not thematised or emphasised. In some aspects, such as prolepsis, there may also be issues of incompetence or epitomisation.

²⁴ *tauta hekastote edakrue*; the tense has changed to an iterative imperfect. Similar iterative laments at 4.5.3 and 5.8.3, both designated with the word *pollakis* (‘often’).