

Stoic Echoes and Style in Xenophon of Ephesus

KONSTANTIN DOULAMIS
University College, Cork

1. Introduction

‘Clumsy’, ‘unsophisticated’, ‘incompetent’: this is how several modern scholars have described Xenophon of Ephesus, leaving little room for interpretative work on his novel *Ephesiaca*.¹ Xenophon’s critics have based their views upon the simplicity that is evident in all aspects of his novel: from the plotline and the sequence of episodes, through character portrayal and characterisation, to the relatively plain language and style employed throughout.²

The ‘epitome theory’, according to which all or part of the surviving text of the *Ephesiaca* is the abridged version of a longer, lost work, provided Xenophon’s critics with a convenient explanation for the novelist’s literary ‘shortcomings’, but has come under attack in recent years. Hägg has refuted, convincingly in my view, the main arguments of the ‘epitome theory’;³ and, more recently, Ruiz Montero⁴ and O’Sullivan⁵ have also shown that the ground upon which this theory was based is rather uncertain. O’Sullivan, on the one hand, argues that the *Ephesiaca* is strongly characterised by the compositional technique of oral story-telling and that Xenophon’s novel as a whole is closer to oral than literary practice.⁶ Ruiz Montero, on the other hand, sees Xenophon’s narrative style as contrived and argues that his work

¹ Rattenbury 1950; Schmeling 1980; and Anderson 1982, ch. 7, and 1984, esp. 144–148.

² For a concise review of the main views of Xenophon’s critics see O’Sullivan 1995, 9–16.

³ Hägg 1966, translated in Hägg 2004, 159–198.

⁴ Ruiz Montero’s 1982 examination of the use of connectives in the *Ephesiaca* strongly suggests that the narrative sections of this novel are characterised by the styles of *apheleia* (simplicity) and *glykýtēs* (sweetness).

⁵ O’Sullivan 1995, 100–139 has devoted a whole section to this matter, in which he reviews Bürger’s theory and persuasively responds to his arguments one by one.

⁶ O’Sullivan 1995, esp. 69–98.

is ‘the product of a rhetorical *mimesis* which adapts an oral style to oral material and which is inscribed in a particular literary tradition’.⁷

Ruiz Montero’s work in this area has raised important questions about Xenophon’s artistic ability and his relationship to the literary discourse of his time,⁸ which, however, have not received further scholarly attention. There is one aspect of Xenophon’s novel which can be revealing in that respect: its Stoic colour. The presence of Stoic echoes in the *Ephesiaca* has long been noted,⁹ but these echoes have received little attention since. A notable exception to this is Judith Perkins, who correlates Chariton, Xenophon, and Achilles Tatius with the Stoic teaching of the Roman period and argues that, despite ‘their difference in tone and surface details’, the Greek novels have a lot in common with the Stoic works of the Roman Empire, which she attributes to the ideas ‘circulating in the ideological environment of the period’.¹⁰ This, she suggests, accounts for the fact that a number of narrative *topoi* in the novels find close parallels in the Stoic teaching of the period.¹¹

In this article I want to examine the presence of Stoic echoes in the *Ephesiaca* in connection with Xenophon’s style. First I shall focus on passages which may reflect Stoic ideas and I shall look more closely at their structure and style, with a view to bringing out the subtle rhetorical character of these sections. I shall then explore the possibility that the two points (the style of these passages and the presence in them of Stoic ideas) might be associated. Lastly I shall consider briefly the implications that such a link might have for our understanding of Xenophon’s literary persona and work.

2. Stoic echoes in the *Ephesiaca*

An area which appears to be privileged when it comes to the presence of Stoic ideas in the *Ephesiaca* is the discourse of the primary couple. Anthia and Habrocomes, like the protagonists of the other ‘ideal’ Greek novels, go through numerous ordeals that threaten their chastity, loyalty, and well-

⁷ Ruiz Montero 2003, 60; cf. Ruiz Montero 1982.

⁸ The chronology of the Greek novels, including Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca*, remains problematic and highly controversial. I agree with Bowie’s excellent observations about the chronology of the earlier novels (Bowie 2002, esp. 47–58), and I take the end of the 1st century – beginning of the 2nd century A.D. to be the most likely date for Xenophon.

⁹ In his edition of Xenophon’s novel, Dalmeyda 1926 identified (mostly in footnotes) a number of Stoic ideas in key passages.

¹⁰ Perkins 1995, 77.

¹¹ Perkins 1995, esp. 77–103.

being, before they are reunited at the end of the novel. Given the plotline, perhaps it is not surprising, then, that the Stoics' celebrated life-formula ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου ('endure and renounce') and other Stoic ideas about withstanding hardship with dignity should find their way into those sections of the novel where the protagonists' ability to endure adversity is severely tested.¹² This is exemplified in the following passages, which I discuss below: the parallel laments of Habrocomes and Anthia when they realise they have been struck by love (1,4,1–7); Euxeinus' speech of entreaty addressed to Habrocomes on behalf of Corymbus (1,16,3–6); Habrocomes' and Anthia's symmetrical response to the pirates' double proposition (2,1,1–6); Habrocomes' response to Manto's proposition communicated by Leucon (2,4,3–6); Manto's letter of entreaty to Habrocomes and Habrocomes' reply (2,5,1–4).

It should be made clear at this point that I am not trying to construct a case for direct dependence between Xenophon and any Stoic philosopher, nor am I arguing that the entire composition of Xenophon's novel can be explained by an appeal to Stoic philosophy. And I am not sure that the Stoic element in this novel is strong enough to substantiate the view that the *Ephesiaca* actively promotes Stoic ideology. Nevertheless, it is difficult to ignore the Stoic colour of the passages identified above, to which I now turn.

2.1 Habrocomes and Anthia

In Bk.1, Habrocomes and Anthia realise that they have been struck by love at first sight and lament their love-suffering in parallel terms. In an attempt to resist his overwhelming feelings of passion for Anthia, Habrocomes reminds himself that his mind has the ability to remain uninfluenced by what his eyes perceive as irresistible beauty, provided that he has the necessary willpower to achieve this: 'To your *eyes*, Habrocomes, Anthia is beautiful; but not to *you*, if your will holds firm'.¹³ In Habrocomes' *logos paramythētikos* we find three of the best-known maxims of Stoicism: first, the fundamental distinction between the true nature of things and our judgement or perception of them; secondly, the *proairesis*, defined as the deliberate choice or purpose, which, when at work, does not allow physical experiences to affect the real 'self' of the individual; and, thirdly, the distinction between

¹² Cf. Perkins 1995, 80 ff., who argues that 'the phrase 'endure and refrain' captures the very essence of the romances of Chariton, Xenophon and Achilles Tatius'.

¹³ 1,4,3. I have used the English translation of Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* by Anderson in Reardon 1989, with occasional modifications.

the vulnerability of the body and (mental) willpower.¹⁴ These three closely linked Stoic ideas are prominent in the teaching of Epictetus, who is recorded by Arrian as having stated: ‘My wretched body is nothing to me; its parts are nothing to me’,¹⁵ and in his *Encheiridion* says:

Sickness is an impediment to the body, but not to the faculty of choice (*proairesis*), unless that faculty itself wishes it to be one... and say the same to yourself with regard to everything that befalls you; for you will find it to be an impediment to something else, but not to yourself.¹⁶

When Habrocomes instructs himself to treat Anthia’s beauty as merely his eyes’ perception at 1,4,3, he evokes Epictetus, who, as reported by Arrian, advises his readers to treat difficult situations as the judgement of an event (*Ench.* 7) or a mere impression of it:

Practise, then, from the start to say to every harsh external impression ‘You are an impression and not at all the thing you appear to be’. Then examine it and test it by these rules which you have, and firstly, and chiefly, by this: whether the impression has to do with the things which are up to us, or those which are not; and, if it has to do with the things that are not up to us, be ready to reply, ‘It is nothing to me’.¹⁷

Further, Habrocomes’ reminder to himself that Anthia’s beauty is merely a perception of his eyes, cited above, evokes Epictetus’ advice to his readers always to remind themselves of the true nature of things, as opposed to their perception of them:

In the case of everything that delights the mind, or is useful, or is loved with fond affection, remember to tell yourself what sort of thing it is, beginning with the least of things. If you are fond of a jug, say ‘It is a jug that I am fond of’; then, if it is broken, you will not be disturbed. If you kiss your child, or your wife, say to yourself that it is a human being that

¹⁴ Cf. Perkins 1995, 80–82 and 92.

¹⁵ Arr. *Epict.* 3,22,21. For Epictetus’ *Discourses* as reported by Arrian and *The Manual*, I have used the English translation in Gill – Hard 1995.

¹⁶ Epict. *Ench.* 9.

¹⁷ *Ench.* 1. See the discussion of Epictetus and examining impressions in Long 2002, 129–136 and Gill 2006, 379–381 and 389–390.

you are kissing; and then you will not be disturbed if either of them dies.¹⁸

The same idea is repeated in the *Discourses*:

...some things are in our own power, others not. In our own power are choice, and all actions dependent on choice; not in our power, the body, the parts of the body, property, parents, brothers, children, country, and, in short, all with whom we associate.¹⁹

Anthia's parallel monologue, in which she wonders about the limits of her desire and the end of the evils brought about by her passion, may also be read as coloured by Stoic ideas. The heroine's rhetorical question 'Where will this desire end and what will end my misery?' may be seen as evoking Epictetus' ideas and teaching on the limitations of passion and on coping with desire and temptation.²⁰

2.2 *Euxeinus and Habrocomes*

Another section of Xenophon's novel where we encounter Stoic echoes is Euxeinus' speech of entreaty to Habrocomes in Bk.1. In an attempt to win Habrocomes over on behalf of his fellow-pirate Corymbus, Euxeinus points out to the captive hero that he now has an opportunity to change his life for the better and regain happiness and freedom:

You must put everything down to fortune, accept the fate that rules over you, and be friends with those who have become your masters. You must know that it is in your power to recover your happiness and freedom if you are willing to obey your master, Corymbus...²¹

The idea that people can bring about change in their life through their actions, a form of which is contained here in Euxeinus' advice to Habrocomes, is central to Stoicism. And because it is up to the individual to change his circumstances through his actions, Epictetus, in particular, advises against

¹⁸ *Ench.* 3.

¹⁹ Arr. *Epict.* 1,22,10.

²⁰ 1,4,7; cf. Arr. *Epict.* 3,12,7–9; 4,4; and Epict. *Ench.* 1–4.

²¹ 1,16,3; τύχη ('fortune') is Hemsterhuis's correction of ψυχῆ ('soul') in the sole manuscript of Xenophon of Ephesus, rightly adopted by O'Sullivan.

blaming others for one's misfortunes, which, he says, is a sign of not being a *pepaideumenos*:

It is the action of an uneducated person (*apaideutou*) to lay the blame for his own bad condition upon others; of one who has made a start on his education to lay the blame on himself; and of one who is fully educated (*pepaideumenou*), to blame neither others nor himself.²²

It seems that in Xenophon the pirate Euxeinus is employing an argument which he thinks is likely to appeal to a refined *pepaideumenos* such as Habrocomes, whose *paideia* and nobility are stressed from the start of the novel.²³

However, despite Euxeinus' attempt to appeal to Habrocomes' *paideia*, the latter is repulsed by the idea of abandoning his wife and selling himself to his captor, and rejects the pirate's proposition. His reaction has a Stoic colour: 'I could not submit to Corymbus. I will die first and prove my chastity with my own dead body!'²⁴ Habrocomes' declaration that he would rather die chaste than shame himself by gratifying Corymbus, implies that he regards death (either by committing suicide or by letting his captor kill him) as a way of avoiding immoral behaviour in a situation involving a powerful figure who is forcing him to act shamefully. Resorting to death when to go on living would be inappropriate is a well-known Stoic idea,²⁵ and, as Sandbach points out, 'the irruption of autocrats who try to force men to shameful actions' and 'avoiding the commission of immoral acts' were two major reasons for committing suicide recognised by the Stoics.²⁶ In the Xenophon passage cited above Habrocomes does not mention anything about taking his own life, but, rather, talks about death as a way out of his plight. This seems to point especially to Epictetus, who is concerned with death in general as a means of preserving one's 'proper character',²⁷ rather than, say, Seneca, who glorifies suicide.²⁸

²² *Ench.* 5.

²³ Habrocomes is first introduced as follows: 'For he acquired culture (*paideia*) of all kinds and practised a variety of arts' (1,1,2).

²⁴ 2,1,4–5.

²⁵ See Rist 1969, 238–255; Sandbach 1975, 48–52.

²⁶ Sandbach 1975, 50; cf. Reydams-Schils 2005, 46.

²⁷ *Arr. Epict.* 1,2; 2,1,19; and 3,22,21–22.

²⁸ On the Stoics' attitude towards suicide, especially that of Seneca and Epictetus, see Reydams-Schils 2005, 45–52; cf. Long 2002, 203–204. See also Perkins 1995, 93–103, who argues that Epictetus' teaching on death provides a context for understanding the at-

Corymbus promises freedom (*eleutheria*) to Habrocomes, who had suddenly been reduced to a slave from a free citizen. His appeal, however, falls on deaf ears because Habrocomes appears to have a different and rather ‘Stoic’ view of slavery and freedom, as we see in the episode between Habrocomes and Manto to which I now turn.

2.3 Manto and Habrocomes

In Bk.2, Leucon approaches Habrocomes on behalf of Manto and informs him that she is infatuated with him. Habrocomes’ response to Leucon, in which he rejects Manto’s advances outright, is centred upon the contrast between being enslaved in body but free in soul: ‘I am a slave, but I know how to keep vows. They have power over my body, but my soul is still free’.²⁹ According to the Stoics, ‘true freedom depends on the disposition of the wise person’s soul ...; this state of soul has a twofold effect on the person’s behaviour: internally, the one who is free is master of his passions; externally, the one who is free cannot be bribed or blackmailed into actions which he does not want to perform’.³⁰ The concept of ‘true freedom’ is central to Epictetus’ teaching, in particular, where it is frequently contrasted with slavery.³¹ According to Epictetus, truly free, even if he is a slave, is

... [the man] who lives as he wishes; who can be neither compelled, nor hindered, nor constrained; whose impulses are unimpeded, who attains his desires and does not fall into what he wants to avoid.³²

In the Xenophon passage cited above, it is this type of freedom that Habrocomes claims to possess. He continues in the same defiant tone:

Now let Manto threaten me if she pleases – with swords, the noose, fire and everything that the body of a slave can be made to bear, for she

tempt of several novelistic characters to commit suicide, and discusses several examples from Chariton, Xenophon, and Achilles Tatius.

²⁹ 2,4,4.

³⁰ Bobzien 1998, 340.

³¹ This notion of freedom is discussed at Arr. *Epict.* 4,1 and also at 1,12; 2,1,24; and 2,2,13. Cf. Perkins 1995, 95. On freedom as a core concept in Epictetus’ philosophy, see Long 2002, 27–29 and 196–198; cf. Bobzien 1998, 330–345 on the Stoics’ notion of freedom, esp. 341–343 on freedom in Epictetus. On the freedom-slavery antithesis as a theme central to Epictetus’ philosophy, see Long 2002, 11–12.

³² Arr. *Epict.* 4,1,1.

could never persuade me to do wrong against Anthia of my own free will.

Developing the paradox of being a free slave, Habrocomes now refers to free will and the power of deliberate choice, which is prominent in Stoic teaching. Epictetus makes very clear the distinction between the body and deliberate choice (*proairesis*)³³ and illustrates this point with an example about a situation involving a fear-provoking tyrannical figure, reminiscent of Habrocomes' predicament:

No one is master of another's choice, and it is in choice alone that good and evil lie. No one, therefore, has the power either to procure me good or to involve me in evil; but I alone have authority over myself with regard to these things. Since these, then, are secure for me, what need have I to be troubled about externals? What tyrant can intimidate me? What disease? What poverty? What obstacle?³⁴

Moreover, Habrocomes' defiance of Manto's power echoes the type of response that Epictetus advises his students to practise on a daily basis:

'Then I will fetter you.' What are you saying, man? Fetter *me*? You will fetter my leg; but not even Zeus himself can get the better of my choice. 'I will cast you into prison.' My wretched body, rather. 'I will behead you.' Did I ever tell you that I alone had a head that cannot be cut off? These are the things that philosophers ought to study; it is these that they should write about each day; and it is in these that they should exercise themselves.³⁵

The same idea is repeated at 1,9,12–16:

'Epictetus, we can no longer bear to be fettered to this paltry body, feeding and resting and cleaning it, and, because of it having to associate with these people and those. Are these things not indifferent, and nothing to us, and is not death no evil? Are we not akin to god, and did we not

³³ See especially Long's discussion of *proairesis* (which he translates as 'volition') in Long 2002, 27–31 and 207–222, and cf. Gill 2006, 96–99 and 372–374.

³⁴ Arr. *Epict.* 4,12,7–9; cf. *Epict.* 1,19,7–15 and see the discussion of this passage in Long 2002, 196–198.

³⁵ Arr. *Epict.* 1,1,23–25; cf. Perkins 1995, 92–93.

come from him? Suffer us to go back again to the place from which we came; suffer us, at last, to be delivered from these fetters, that are fastened to us and weigh us down. Here thieves and robbers, and courts of law, and those who are called tyrants, are thought to have some power over us, because of our poor body and its possessions. Suffer us to show them, that they have power over nobody.³⁶

Later in Bk.2 Manto writes a letter of entreaty to Habrocomes in which she confesses her infatuation, promises him wealth and prosperity if he gives in, and threatens to take revenge on him and his advisors if he rejects her advances.³⁷ Here too the contrast between free and slave and the idea of death as an option are both present in Habrocomes' reply, which is perfectly consistent with his earlier 'Stoic' response to the pirate's entreaty and to Manto's proposition conveyed by Leucon:

Mistress, do as you will and use my body as the body of a slave; and if you want to kill me, I am ready; if you want to torture me, torture me as you please. But I could not come to your bed, nor would I obey such a request even if you ordered me.³⁸

If we accept that the passages discussed above evoke Stoic ideas, then we must also endeavour to provide an explanation for the presence of Stoic echoes in Xenophon's novel. First, these could be taken as consciously allusive to Stoic philosophy, in which case they might be used to support a critique of the widespread view that Xenophon is immune to allusion; or, secondly, they could be interpreted as reflections of what may be described as an indirect influence of Stoic philosophy on Xenophon, who may have 'borrowed' some of the main ideas of Stoicism from the literary background of his era. After all, the teaching of philosophers such as Epictetus and Seneca was particularly influential and could easily have generated the kind of influence that is neither direct nor immediate,³⁹ and if Xenophon is to be dated to around the turn of the first and second centuries A.D.,⁴⁰ the link between his novel and Stoicism becomes both possible and attractive. It is, of course, extremely

³⁶ Cf. Perkins 1995, 96.

³⁷ 2,5,1–2.

³⁸ 2,5,4.

³⁹ A similar kind of influence is claimed by Musurillo 1979, app. V for Cynic ideas on the *Acta Alexandrinorum*. Cf. Gill's discussion of elements that evoke Stoic ideas in Virgil's *Aeneid* in Gill 2003, 57.

⁴⁰ Bowie 2002, 47–58. See note 8 above.

difficult to prove that Xenophon's use of these ideas owes more to philosophical than to literary sources. Either way, this evidence suggests that Xenophon may not have been unaware of the literary or philosophical background of his era.

3. *Rhetorical elements in 'Stoic' passages*

That Xenophon's novel is generally characterised by simplicity is, I think, undeniable. The question that needs to be addressed, however, is whether beneath this apparent simplicity there are signs of sophistication or literary self-consciousness which might throw fresh light on Xenophon's relationship with his contemporary literary discourse and could show him to be a lot closer to the approach of the Second Sophistic than modern critics have been willing to accept. Is the simplicity of the *Ephesiaca* the unavoidable result of artlessness or a deliberate choice, and, if so, to what extent? And is Xenophon totally oblivious to rhetoric or, as has recently been suggested, are we dealing here with an author who is not unable but merely unwilling to indulge in a heavily ornate rhetorical style?⁴¹

In his 1926 edition of the *Ephesiaca*, Dalmeyda notes briefly the use of several rhetorical techniques in this novel, such as rhetorical questions, enumeration of ordeals, vows, invocation, apostrophes to people as well as objects, and references to the protagonists' 'evil beauty'.⁴² Ruiz Montero's examination of Xenophon's use of connectives, especially καί, has shown that the narrative parts of the *Ephesiaca* combine *apheleia* (simplicity) with *glykytēs* (sweetness) and imitate the traditional style of Ionic prose.⁴³

Xenophon's knowledge of ancient oneirocritic theories and the way in which he constructs and presents dreams in his novel show literary self-consciousness and prove that he is not without literary aspirations.⁴⁴ Even O'Sullivan, who attributes the surviving text of the *Ephesiaca* to an oral tradition of story-telling, admits that the presence of certain rhetorical elements in Xenophon, however sporadic, is undeniable, although he sees them

⁴¹ Kytzler 1996, esp. 350–351 on language and style.

⁴² Dalmeyda 1926, xxxi–xxxiii.

⁴³ Ruiz Montero 1982, esp. 318–321. Cf. the section on the language and style of *Daphnis and Chloe* in Hunter 1983, 84–98, who shows that *katharotēs* (clarity), *apheleia* (simplicity), and *glykytēs* (sweetness) have been consciously chosen for certain sections of Longus' novel.

⁴⁴ Plastira-Valkanou 2001, esp. 147–148.

as qualities that any talented story-teller may possess without necessarily being a literary artist.⁴⁵

3.1 Structural design

A closer look at the passages with a ‘Stoic’ colour identified above shows that they are not entirely unrhetoical. On the contrary, despite the simplicity that characterises them, they display evidence not of clumsiness but of artistic self-consciousness. First, Xenophon’s concern for symmetry and balance is evident at the level of structure. This can be illustrated sufficiently if we look at Habrocomes’ and Anthia’s parallel laments in Bk.1.

It has already been demonstrated that throughout the *Ephesiaca* the two protagonists have similar experiences, find themselves in similar dangers, and react in a similar manner to the challenges and obstacles that Fate throws in their way, and that this is largely reflected in the symmetry of their expression at the level of structure, theme, and language.⁴⁶ The protagonists’ parallel monologues provide an excellent example of their symmetrical discourse.

Both speeches open with the same rhetorical question: τί πέπονθα δυστυχής (‘what has befallen me, wretched that I am?’) wonders Habrocomes at 1,4,1; τί ... ὃ δυστυχής πέπονθα, asks Anthia at 1,4,6. Then, each speaker begins by identifying himself/herself: Habrocomes is ὁ μεχρὶ νῦν ἀνδρικός Ἀβροκόμης (‘Habrocomes, till now a man’), while Anthia identifies herself as παρθένος (‘a maiden’). Next, each briefly explains his/her plight with a statement constructed around a series of short clauses connected with καί: ἔάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι καὶ παρθένω δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι (‘I have been captured and conquered and am forced to be the slave of a girl’) is how Habrocomes outlines his situation, while Anthia explains that παρ’ ἡλικίαν ἐρῶ καὶ ὀδυνῶμαι καινὰ καὶ κόρη μὴ πρέποντα (‘I am in love too young and I feel pain that is strange and not proper for a maiden’). Both speakers then proceed to underline the difficulty of their situation with a series of rhetorical questions. Habrocomes asks himself οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν; οὐ μενῶ γεννικός; οὐκ ἔσομαι κρείττων Ἔρωτος; (‘Shall I not be firm now? Shall I not remain noble? Shall I not be stronger than Eros?’),⁴⁷ while Anthia wonders καὶ τίς ἔσται ὁ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὄρος καὶ τί τὸ πέρασ τοῦ κακοῦ; ... τίνα βοηθὸν λήσομαι; τίني πάντα κοινώσομαι; ποῦ δὲ Ἀβροκόμην ὄψομαι;

⁴⁵ O’Sullivan 1995, 97–98.

⁴⁶ This idea was elaborated by Konstan 1994, esp. 14–59, following Fusillo 1989, 189–196.

⁴⁷ 1,4,2–3.

(‘Where will this desire end, what will end my misery? ... Whom shall I find to help me? To whom shall I confide everything? Where shall I see Habrocomes?’).⁴⁸ Habrocomes continues with an apostrophe to Eros, while Anthia’s discourse ends here.

In addition, there are obvious analogies at the lexical level: both speakers use the adjective *καλός/καλή* to describe their beloved. Habrocomes’ rhetorical questions begin with anaphora of *οὐ*; Anthia’s with anaphora of *τίς*. In each case, the rhetorical questions contain verbs in the future tense: *καρτερήσω*, *μενῶ*, *ἔσομαι* in Habrocomes’ speech; and *ἔσται*, *λήψομαι*, *κοινώσομαι*, *ὄψομαι* in Anthia’s.

Some of the lexical analogies between these parallel monologues have been explained as recurring formulaic words/phrases, similar in function to the formulae found in the Homeric epics, and taken as an indication of oral composition.⁴⁹ While repetition may indeed be interpreted as a sign of oral composition, it should be noted that, despite their many common features, the two laments are not identical. In fact, there are important differences in the choice of detail. Each speech has an individual character, dictated by the distinct identity and personal circumstances of the speaker. This is clearly reflected in the way the speakers introduce themselves, where we find a variation on the theme of time and change, depending on the speaker’s personal perspective: the hero is described as ‘the hitherto virile Habrocomes’, who has unexpectedly found himself enslaved by Eros, while Anthia is a maiden too young to be in love.

It is evident throughout his speech that Habrocomes perceives and deals with the new experience of erotic desire in the light of his imaginary strife with Eros (consistent with the general portrayal of his character in Bk.1 of the *Ephesiaca*),⁵⁰ which also accounts for the fact that the vocabulary chosen for his discourse is borrowed from the military world. This also justifies Habrocomes’ final apostrophe to Eros, which Anthia’s speech lacks. The heroine’s lament, on the other hand, presents her love experience as some sort of unknown sickness. The image of love as a strange *nosos* is, of course, a well-known *topos* encountered in all of the surviving novels, as well as other roughly contemporary texts.⁵¹ Of special interest is the fact that this

⁴⁸ 1,4,7.

⁴⁹ O’Sullivan 1995, Appendix III; cf. 16–20). Cf. Scobie 1983, 31–34 and Hägg 1994, 64.

⁵⁰ Cf. 1,1,5 and 1,3,1.

⁵¹ Cf. Ach. Tat. 1,4,4, Chariton 1,1,6, and Hld. 3,5,6. The idea of love as a disease is central to *Daphnis and Chloe*, with frequent occurrence of the noun *νόσος* to describe lovesickness, as well as various forms of the verbs *πάσχειν* and *ἀλγεῖν*. For the physiological symptoms of love see Maehler 1990; and for the relationship between lovesickness and

motif is Sapphic in origin⁵² and as such is particularly suitable for a girl rather than for a male character:⁵³ the Sapphic tradition is an important resonance in the depiction of Anthia's love-sickness. In this scene the hero, then, is assigned a trait – competitiveness – that is traditionally linked with bravery and heroism in the ancient world and very often ascribed to male characters, while the heroine is depicted in a way more appropriate for a female character.⁵⁴ In other words, the emphasis on the competitive nature of Habrocomes and on the naïve and fragile character of Anthia in this particular scene of the *Ephesiaca* articulates the gender of the protagonists (which also accounts for the different style of rhetorical questions that we have in each speech). This gendered distribution of characteristics implies conscious authorial effort to shape each address according to the identity and circumstances of the speaker, despite the fact that both passages are constructed upon a generally symmetrical basis.

Closer analysis of Euxeinus' speech of entreaty to Habrocomes shows that here too we are dealing with a carefully constructed speech, which makes use of well-known motifs of amatory rhetoric from the Greek and Roman tradition.⁵⁵ The address opens with a pair of stark antitheses which present emphatically to Habrocomes his unfortunate fate: he has become a slave after being a free man, and poor after being rich.⁵⁶ The pirate's argument is that Habrocomes ought therefore to be friendly to (*agapan*) his new masters. The verb *agapan* ('be well disposed to') is carefully chosen, and distinguished from *eran*, which denotes erotic desire and is employed later on in the same speech, when Euxeinus reveals Corymbus' infatuation with Habrocomes.⁵⁷ The word *despotēs* ('master'), which has so far been used to

melancholy see Toohey 1992. The physiological and psychological effects of love in the Greek novels are listed in Garzón Díaz 1993, 52–53.

⁵² Cf. 31 LP (= 2 D), where Sappho describes in detail the erotic symptoms that she suffers at the sight of her beloved, including sweating, shaking, paleness, and general weakness; in 1 LP (= 1 D) the poet's erotic desire is described as 'intense pain and grief of the heart' inflicted by Aphrodite.

⁵³ Cf. the use of the same *topos* in A.R. *Arg.* 3,288–289.

⁵⁴ This, however, does not stop Habrocomes from displaying as high a level of passivity and hopelessness as the heroine in other parts of the novel, as it is pointed out by Schmelting 1980, 119–124.

⁵⁵ See Gross 1985, esp. ch. 2, 'The Rhetoric of Seduction'.

⁵⁶ 1,16,3.

⁵⁷ Despite the pederastic character of Corymbus' love for Habrocomes, which, as Garzón Díaz 1993, 50–51 notes, clearly distinguishes it from that between Hippothous and Hyperanthes, which is mutual, the same verb (*ἐρᾶν*) is used in both instances, probably because there is sexual desire involved.

describe Corymbus, is now applied to Habrocomes in order to stress that he too can achieve the same status and become a master if he gives in to Corymbus. In the last section of this speech, Euxeinus' plea becomes more emphatic and his tone more urgent, as reflected in the use of two imperatives (ἐννόησον and ἀπόρριψον) further reinforced by two rhetorical questions τί δέ σοι γυναικὸς δεῖ νῦν καὶ πραγμάτων; τί δὲ ἐρωμένης τηλικῶδε ὄντι; ('What need have you for a wife or domestic ties? Why should a man of your age need to love a woman?'), and by a final imposing statement πρὸς μόνον δεῖ σε τὸν δεσπότην βλέπειν, τούτῳ κελεύσαντι ὑπακούειν ('you must look only to your master and obey his command'). The notions of love, persuasion, and obedience, power, freedom, and wealth are predominant in this passage, where we find various forms of ἐρᾶν, πείθειν, δεσπότης, ἐλευθερία, and εὐδαιμονία⁵⁸ repeated and strategically placed in the speech.

We see, then, that Xenophon is well capable of employing structural parallelism, combined with *variatio*, as an artistic technique.

3.2 Rhetorical elements

The above observations suggest a certain degree of artistic design at the level of structure, and the very use of the lament-*topos*, discussed in § 3.1 above, shows that Xenophon is not unfamiliar with the rhetorical conventions of the genre.⁵⁹ There are, however, further rhetorical elements to be found in the passages with Stoic influence. Let us consider now another pair of speeches: Habrocomes' and Anthia's symmetrical responses to the pirates' double proposition.⁶⁰ In Habrocomes' reaction, the opening apostrophe is carefully balanced: ὦ πάτερ, ... ὦ μήτηρ, ὦ πατρίς φιλάτη καὶ οἰκίαι καὶ συγγενεῖς ('O father, ... O mother, O beloved homeland and household and family'). In the opening rhetorical question, words are linked by assonance, and the combination of harsh sounds underscores the speaker's plight. Note in particular the combination *b-rb-r-br* and the sequence *p-r-d-th-p-r-t* in ἐν γῆ βαρβάρων, ὕβρει παραδοθέντες πειρατῶν ('in a savage land, handed over to lustful pirates'). Note too the emphatic placing of the key verb ἐρᾶ at the start of that clause, followed by chiasmus: ἐρᾶ Κόρυμβος ἐμου, σοῦ δὲ Εὐξείνου ('Corymbus is in love with me, with you Euxeinus'). The insult

⁵⁸ Cf. Corymbus' speech of entreaty (on behalf of Euxeinus) to Anthia, narrated in the third person, at 1,16,7. On the symmetry between the two speeches, see Konstan 1994, 36–45.

⁵⁹ On laments as a rhetorical feature of the Greek novels see Birchall 1996, with examples from all five 'ideal' novels.

⁶⁰ 2,1,1–6.

caused by this double proposition, extended to both protagonists at the same time, is further underlined by the hyperbaton that follows, which allows emphasis to be placed on πρὸς ἑκατέρους positioned in the middle: ὦ τῆς ἀκαίρου πρὸς ἑκατέρους εὐμορφίας ('Our good looks are proving untimely for both of us!'). Further, Habrocomes' speech is dominated by a stark antithesis encapsulating his predicament, constructed around μέν and δέ: πόρνη μὲν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς γενομένῳ, ἀποστερηθέντι δὲ Ἀνθίας τῆς ἐμῆς ('reduced from a man to a prostitute, and deprived of my darling Anthia'). The ending of the speech is equally strong, with a pair of verbs in the future tense, which express Habrocomes' solid determination to die, symmetrically matched with isosyllabic phrases: τεθνήξομαι δὲ πρότερον καὶ φανοῦμαι νεκρὸς σώφρων ('I will die first and prove my chastity with my own dead body'). The idea that Habrocomes would rather die than give in to Corymbus is further emphasised through repetition of meaning in τεθνήξομαι and νεκρός.

Meanwhile, Anthia's parallel response is not entirely unrheterical either. The repetition of ταχέως at the start of successive clauses at the opening of her monologue places emphasis on the speed with which misfortune has befallen her and Habrocomes: ταχέως γε τῶν ὄρκων ἀνα<μνησθῆναι ἀνα>γκαζόμεθα, ταχέως τῆς δουλείας πειρώμεθα ('How quickly we are being forced to remember our oaths! And how soon we are experiencing slavery!'). The two clauses beginning with ταχέως are symmetrically constructed, but with different numbers of syllables. Furthermore, the repeated use of καί to link four infinitives in the next period (καὶ πείσειν ἐλπίζει <καὶ> εἰς εὐνὴν ἐλεύσεσθαι ... καὶ συγκατακλιθήσεσθαι καὶ ἀπολαύσειν <τῆς> ἐπιθυμίας; 'and is expecting to win me over and come to my bed ... and sleep with me and satisfy his lust') serves to underline the multiplicity of the pirate's indecent and unreasonable demands of Anthia.

A further rather striking rhetorical feature is the recurrence of rhythmical patterns in these passages; it is the *clausulae* of sentences where certain patterns are most marked, a characteristic found in elaborate Greek prose texts of the Roman period, such as Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.⁶¹ First, we find the pattern – υ – – υ x and – υ υ – υ x, which are consistently favoured by Xenophon throughout the *Ephesiaca*.⁶² Other recurring rhythmical patterns include – υ υ – – υ –, common at colon ends, – υ – x, and – – – υ x.

⁶¹ On *clausulae* in Longus see Hunter 1983, 84–85.

⁶² See Reeve 1971, 532–534; cf. *OCD* s.v. *prose-rhythm* 12, for a list of rhythmical patterns sought and avoided by Xenophon of Ephesus and other Greek authors, including Chariton.

3.3 *Contrived simplicity?*

So far we have seen that those sections of the *Ephesiaca* which may have been influenced by Stoic ideas are not artlessly plain but might be best described as ‘modestly rhetorical’. Ruiz Montero has persuasively argued that the apparent simplicity of the narrative sections of Xenophon’s work follows ancient prescriptions for stylistic *apheleia* and *glykýtēs* and that these sections subscribe to the literary tradition of Ionic story-tellers such as Herodotus. Are there any similar signs of stylisation in the passages coloured by Stoicism?

We are fortunate to have several fairly detailed treatments of *apheleia* from the Imperial period,⁶³ such as Demetrius’ *Peri hermēneias*, Hermogenes’ *Peri ideōn*,⁶⁴ and Pseudo-Aristides’ *Peri aphelous logou*.⁶⁵ These rhetorical treatises give us an invaluable insight into the style-markers that Xenophon’s roughly contemporary *literati* would have associated with contrived simplicity. And there seems to be a lot in Xenophon’s ‘Stoic’ passages identified above that points to the stylistic categories of *katharotēs* (‘purity’), *saphēneia* (‘lucidity’), and *apheleia*, all of which are linked to the ‘plain style of composition’. More specifically, we note the following features in Xenophon:

1. Diction is precise and language is free of ambiguous, unusual, or newly-coined words; this is what ancient theorists see as most appropriate

⁶³ These do not include Dio of Prusa, whose work lacks a systematic treatment of the simple style. In his *Peri askēseōs logou*, Dio briefly discusses the style of Xenophon of Athens, which he identifies as simple, easy to understand, and pleasing, and at the same time persuasive and powerful (*Or.* 18,14), a combination of features that Dionysius of Halicarnassus generally attributes to Lysias. However, Dio clearly states that he regards the style of Xenophon of Athens as ideal for the *anēr politikos*, and, therefore, he does not associate him with contrived simplicity in a way that would make Dio’s treatise relevant to the present discussion. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who also does not treat *apheleia* systematically anywhere in his works, refers to the style of Xenophon of Athens only to reveal that he finds it ‘sweet and pleasant’, but wanting in ‘sublimity and grandeur’ and that he therefore thinks of it as inappropriate for historiography (*Peri mimēseōs* 2,208). In his *Lysias*, Dionysius praises *apheleia* in passing references as one of the main Lysianic features of style, but he does not give his reader a detailed analysis of how simplicity is achieved. For a brief history of *apheleia* as a stylistic term, see Rutherford 1998, 66–67.

⁶⁴ For a discussion of Hermogenes’ ‘idea-theory’ in relation to other stylistic systems, its influence on later literature, and its advantages, see Rutherford 1998, 7 ff.

⁶⁵ The exact relation between these two works is uncertain; for discussion of the issue see Rutherford 1998, 8–9, and esp. ch. 5 and app. C.

for *apheleia* and *katharotēs*.⁶⁶ Yet we note that certain nuances, such as the distinction between *agapan* and *eran* in Euxeinus' speech noted above, are clearly marked in the *Ephesiaca*, which strongly suggests that Xenophon's simplicity of diction is probably not the result of artlessness. Besides, Xenophon's language has been found to coincide for the most part with the language of other sophisticated prose writers of the Graeco-Roman world, such as Pausanias.⁶⁷

2. The occurrence of words with combinations of harsh sounds in the passages in question is rare and sporadic.⁶⁸ When it does occur, it seems to be used in order to create a specific effect in the text, for instance **σφοδρόν** at 1,16,4, which reflects the intensity of Corymbus' desire for Habrocomes, and **μηδ' ὑπομείναι ὑβρισθεῖσα** ἰδεῖν τὸν ἥλιον at 2,1,6, which serves to convey Anthia's determination to reject the pirate's proposition (see also § 3.2 above).

3. Clauses that are short and self-contained in thought are favoured over longer periods.⁶⁹ Admittedly, this holds true for most of the text of the *Ephesiaca*,⁷⁰ but Habrocomes' and Anthia's parallel laments (1,4,1–7) and their joint response to the pirates' proposition (2,1,1–6) consist of strikingly short, cropped sentences.

4. Hiatus is admitted in several cases in Xenophon's 'Stoic' passages, especially in Euxeinus' speech to Habrocomes (1,16,3–6) and in Habrocomes' and Anthia's parallel response to the pirates' proposition (2,1,1–6) but avoided elsewhere in the *Ephesiaca*.⁷¹ Admitting hiatus freely is associ-

⁶⁶ Hermog. 309–312 and 203–204; cf. *Peri aphelous logou* 51, where it is stated that the plain style requires 'unemphatic diction'.

⁶⁷ Ruiz Montero 2003.

⁶⁸ This is regarded as an important style-marker of the simple style. See Hermog. 311–312, 323–327; cf. *Peri aphelous logou* 8 and 105.

⁶⁹ Hermog. 208; *Peri aphelous logou* 88; cf. *ibid.* 94, where short units are strongly recommended for the plain style; cf. also *ibid.* 96 and 104.

⁷⁰ On Xenophon's preference for short clauses, see Dowden's interesting study of sentence length in the Greek and Roman novels in Dowden 2006.

⁷¹ Reeve 1971, 534 concludes that overall, Xenophon tends to avoid hiatus. He also notes that hiatus is freely admitted by all Greek novelists after *καί*, between sentences, and before a group of words containing *δέ*, 'where the vowels are kept apart by a pause' (p. 516), which applies to some of the hiatus in Xenophon's 'Stoic' passages. For the case of elidable juxtaposed vowels, which accounts for some of the occurrences of hiatus in the passages in question, and whether these should be regarded as hiatus in prose, see Reeve 1971, 515–516 who points out that, contrary to what was common practice in the 4th century B.C., critics of the later period may very well have regarded as hiatus the juxtaposition of unelided vowels. On hiatus in Xenophon see also Ruiz Montero 1994, 1116.

ated with simplicity by ancient theorists, who do not recommend it, for example, for the ‘impressive’ or the ‘elegant’ style.⁷²

5. We have already mentioned the presence of rhythmical patterns in the passages under discussion (and elsewhere in the *Ephesiaca*) as a general rhetorical feature (see § 3.2 above). In addition, the passages influenced by Stoic ideas contain rhythmical patterns specifically associated with the plain style of composition. For example, the double trochee (– ∪ – ∪) occurs frequently in the middle of a sentence, and there are many sentence-ends that are either trochaic (– ∪ – x) or iambic (x – ∪ –).⁷³ Let us consider, for example, the pirate’s speech of entreaty (1,16,3–6):

– ∪ – x

a) δεσπότη Κορούμβῳ (trochaic)

– ∪ – x

b) τῶν ἑαυτοῦ (trochaic)

– ∪ – x

c) χαλεπὸν μὲν οὐδέν (trochaic)

x – ∪ –

d) δεσπότην ἐργάσῃ (iambic)

– ∪ – x

e) ἐν οἷς ὑπάρχεις (trochaic)

x – ∪ –

f) καὶ πραγμάτων (iambic)

– ∪ – x

g) τηλικῶδε ὄντι (trochaic)⁷⁴

⁷² Hermog. 208.

⁷³ Lending a trochaic or iambic rhythm to a text, by making the end or part of a sentence trochaic or iambic, is an important characteristic of plainness, according to ancient theorists, and is regarded as a factor contributing to stylistic clarity. See Hermog. 312 and 209–210; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1408b33–36. Aristotle remarks that all people often speak in iambs, ‘the diction of the many’, and seems to regard the iambic metre as more or less identical to the natural and everyday way of speaking, which he contrasts with formal speech. The double trochee (–∪–x) is favoured by Longus too according to Hunter 1983, 84–85, who links it with the ‘Asiatic’ school of oratory (pp. 90–91).

⁷⁴ This is a valid example of a double trochee only if it is taken as unelided; see n.71.

6. Lastly, we note several instances of repetition of roots or repetition of ideas through the use of synonyms, particularly in Euxeinus' speech (1,16,3–6) and in Habrocomes' and Anthia's joint response to the pirates' proposition (2,1,1–6).⁷⁵ In addition to those mentioned in § 3.1 and 3.2 above, we also note the following striking instances in Euxinus' speech:

a) ἐξ **ἐλευθέρου** γενόμενον ... καὶ **ἐλευθερίαν** ἀπολαβεῖν

b) ἀντ' **εὐδαιμόνος** ... ὡς ἔνεστί σοι καὶ **εὐδαιμοσύνην**

c) **ἐρῶ** γὰρ σοῦ σφοδρὸν **ἔρωτα**

d) various forms of the word δεσπότης are repeated six times in the passage.

It must be stressed here that it is not my intention to establish a direct link between any one rhetorical treatise and Xenophon's style, or to argue that Xenophon was writing with a specific rhetorical handbook in mind. Nevertheless, a close examination of the passages with Stoic influence against the background of Xenophon's roughly contemporary rhetorical tradition suggests that the features of the text discussed above were elements which Xenophon's alert, rhetorically-trained readers were likely to associate with a deliberately simple (and not artlessly plain) style of composition. Besides, the presence of other rhetorical elements in Xenophon's 'Stoic' passages, noted in § 3.2 above, would make it difficult to attribute the apparent simplicity of style to clumsiness. In the following section, I will put forward a suggestion that links Xenophon's 'modest' use of rhetoric with the content of passages evoking Stoic ideas.

4. Stoicism and Rhetoric

It is widely accepted that the Stoics, whose primary aim was not to impress their audience with rhetoric but to encourage them to think and act in a certain way, were generally dismissive of rhetorical extravagances; conversely, they favoured the unadorned style and employed simple language in order to achieve their goal. Chrysippus stresses that 'plain adornment' (*aphelēs kos-*

⁷⁵ Ruiz Montero 1982, 316–317 argues correctly that the repetition of ideas through the use of synonyms is characteristic of the 'oral prose' style, such as that of Herodotus. However, it must be borne in mind that repetition was regarded by ancient theorists as a style-marker for the plain style and as such is frequently prescribed for lucidity and vividness. Demetrius, for example, employs the Greek term *dilogia* to describe repetition; see Demetr. 211–214 and 197; cf. *Peri aphelous logou* 96 and 101; see also Rutherford 1998, trans. of *Peri aphelous logou*, n. 41; cf. *ibid.* 113. The author of *Peri aphelous logou* maintains that equally important for the plain style is what he calls 'variation' (*epallagē*), which involves repetition of the root of a word (23 and 105).

mos) is one of the most important elements in rhetoric, which is confirmed by Plutarch in his *Stoic Essays*.⁷⁶

Diogenes Laertius, too, gives an account of the qualities that the Stoics valued in language, including two of the fundamental style-markers of the plain style of composition, lucidity (*saphēneia*) and conciseness (*syntomia*):

The excellences of a sentence are five: good Greek, clearness, conciseness, suitability, elegance... Clearness is a style which states that which is conceived in the mind in such a way that it is easily known; conciseness is a style which embraces all that is necessary to the clear explanation of the subject under discussion; suitability is a style suited to the subject.⁷⁷

It is widely recognised that Epictetus used the *Koinē* of his time and so he is often grouped with authors of the Imperial period such as Strabo, whose language reflected the Greek spoken in his own time.⁷⁸ Unlike Philostratus, for example, the Epictetus that we know from Arrian opposed the idea of reproducing an earlier form of Greek; instead, he opted for a style that was deliberately plain and refused to use elaborate figures in order to get his ideas across.⁷⁹ This is probably why in Epictetus' *Manual*, Arrian is at pains to discard the elaborate literary style that he employed for his own writings, and uses the contemporary Greek popular dialect in order to convey the words of Epictetus' philosophy convincingly.⁸⁰ The *Discourses* are written in *Koinē*, whereas Arrian's *Anabasis* and *Indika* are Atticising in style, and Stoicism hardly figures in them. As Dobbin observes,

... the discourses share in a kind of rhetoric that was anti-rhetorical in so far as it eschewed artifice and affected to be spontaneous, concerned with content to the exclusion of style... This became a style of rhetoric in its own right, one patronised especially by the Stoics, who were distrustful of traditional rhetoric.⁸¹

⁷⁶ *SVF* II, 297; Plu. 1047a.

⁷⁷ D.L. 7,59 (Zeno).

⁷⁸ On the language and style of Epictetus, see Dobbin 1998, xviii–xix.

⁷⁹ Stadter 1980, ch. 2, esp. 19–20; cf. Long 2002, 48–50 on Epictetus' style. See also Long 2002, 12–13 on Epictetus' level of education, which should not necessarily be assessed by 'what he chose to exhibit in his discourses' (p. 13).

⁸⁰ Stadter 1980, 26 ff.; cf. Horrocks 1997, 91–92 and Swain 1996, 29–30.

⁸¹ Dobbin 1998, xxii.

In Bk.2 of his *Discourses*, Epictetus stresses that, despite its power, rhetoric should not be regarded as more important than the ideas it expresses :

The faculty of eloquence has its value too, though not as great a value as the faculty of choice. When, therefore, I talk in this way, none of you should suppose that I would have you neglect eloquence, any more than I would have you neglect your eyes or ears or hands or feet or clothes or shoes. But if you ask me what is the most excellent of things, what am I to say? The faculty of eloquence? I cannot.⁸²

Elsewhere, he warns of the danger that a listener might be captivated by the impressive language and style of a discourse:

Because one must progress to perfection through the spoken word and what is passed on to you here in the school, and must purify one's choice, and rectify the faculty that deals with impressions, and because this knowledge must be transmitted by means of certain precepts, and in a particular style, making use of a certain variety and incisiveness in the expression of those precepts, some people are captivated by these very things and remain where they are, one captivated by the style, another by syllogisms, another by arguments... and there they remain and moulder away, as though amongst the Sirens.⁸³

He explains his attitude towards rhetoric as follows:

When I talk in this way to some people, they suppose that I am rejecting all study of rhetoric or general principles. Yet it is not this that I am rejecting, but the way in which people endlessly dwell on such matters, and place their hopes in them.⁸⁴

Seneca too often speaks in favour of a compressed rhetorical style, even though he may not always adhere to it himself. He sees a strong connection between style and the speaker's character: 'man's speech is just like his life', he says, and attributes this proverb to the Greeks.⁸⁵ He disapproves of un-

⁸² 2,23,25–27.

⁸³ 2,23,40–41.

⁸⁴ 2,23,46–47; see also the commentary on Stoic dialectic and rhetoric in Long – Sedley 1987, 188–190.

⁸⁵ Sen. *Ep.* 114,2.

usual, obsolete words employed in order to impress an audience and condemns the use of extravagant rhetorical figures.⁸⁶ He also recognises that style keeps evolving and stresses the need to employ a style that is contemporary, ‘familiar and in ordinary use’, a style that is neither ‘unreasonably elaborate’ nor ‘unreasonably negligent’.⁸⁷

5. Conclusion

Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca* is not the only Greek novel containing ideas that can be read as Stoic.⁸⁸ Consciously allusive to Stoicism or not, what is interesting about the passages with a Stoic colour in the *Ephesiaca* is that their style combines the simplicity that characterises much of Xenophon’s text with an understated rhetorical element. And, although the *Ephesiaca* may not be built entirely around Stoic ideas or aspire to function as a vehicle for Stoic philosophy, nevertheless the combination of simplicity and subtle rhetoric in certain sections of this novel provides a suitable stylistic environment for, and at the same time helps to bring out, the Stoic echoes in the discourse of certain characters. Thus, the Stoic colour of scenes in which such qualities as independence, freedom of spirit, strength of character, and willpower are attributed to the protagonists, receives further support from the style of these sections; a style which is entirely appropriate to their content.

The possible link with Epictetus’ teaching is particularly interesting. It may not be coincidental that in Xenophon, arguably the least intertextual of ancient Greek novelists, we have evidence suggesting a link not with just any Stoic philosopher but with Epictetus, whose work, as recorded by Arrian, is clearly pitched at a particular cultural level, and who represents what we might call a more popular, non-literary facet of Stoicism. An explanation of this may be that both Xenophon and Epictetus are predominantly addressing themselves to an audience of the same cultural standing.⁸⁹

A thorough, in-depth analysis of the *whole* of the *Ephesiaca* against the background of its contemporary rhetorical theory, which remains a *desideratum*, will reveal the extent to which rhetoric is employed in Xenophon’s novel. And a close comparison of Xenophon’s use of rhetoric with that of

⁸⁶ Sen. *Ep.* 114,10–11.

⁸⁷ Sen. *Ep.* 114,14.

⁸⁸ Perkins 1995 argues for a strong Stoic presence in Chariton’s *Callirhoe* and Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* as well.

⁸⁹ See the interesting discussion of the actual and intended readership of Greek novels in Bowie 1996.

other similar texts belonging to the same genre, for example Chariton's *Callirhoe* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, will give us a better idea of the way in which stylistic categories are deployed in the *Ephesiaca*. For now, suffice it to say that Xenophon of Ephesus might be considerably more artful than he seems or than modern critics have been willing to recognise.⁹⁰

Bibliography

- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Birchall, J. 1996. 'The lament as a rhetorical feature in the Greek novel', *GCN* 7, 1–17.
- Bobzien, S. 1998. *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bowie, E.L. 1996. 'The ancient readers of the Greek novels', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), 1996, 87–106.
- Bowie, E.L. 2002. 'The chronology of the earlier novels since B.E. Perry', *AN* 2, 47–63.
- Bürger, K. 1892. 'Zu Xenophon von Ephesus', *Hermes* 27, 36–67.
- Dalmeyda, G. 1926 (ed.). *Xénophon d' Ephèse: Les Ephésiaques*, Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Dobbin, R.F. 1998 (ed. and trans.). *Epictetus: Discourses*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dover, K.J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*, London: Duckworth.
- Downen, K. 2006. 'A lengthy sentence: judging the prolixity of the novels', in: M. Paschalis *et al.* (eds.), *The Greek and Roman Novel: Parallel Readings*, *AN Suppl.* 8, Groningen: Barkhuis, 133–150.
- Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo greco: polifonia ed eros*, Venice: Marsilio.
- Garson, R.W. 1981. 'The faces of love in *Ephesiaca* or *Anthia and Habrocomes*', *Museum Africum* 7, 47–55.
- Garzón Díaz, J. 1993. 'El amor en la novela griega', *Memorias de Historia Antigua* 13–14, 43–76.
- Gill, C. 2003. 'The school in the Roman Imperial period', in: B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 33–58.
- Gill, C. 2006. *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gill, C. – Hard, R. 1995 (trans.). *The Discourses of Epictetus*, London – Rutland, Vermont: Everyman.
- Gärtner, H. 1967. 'Xenophon von Ephesos', *RE* 2. ser. 9, 2055–2089.
- Gross, N.P. 1985. *Amatory Persuasion in Antiquity: Studies in Theory and Practice*, London – Toronto: Associated University Press.
- Hägg, T. 1971a. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.

⁹⁰ A version of this paper was first presented at the Celtic Conference in Classics 2006 (University of Wales, Lampeter) and it has benefited from the discussion that followed. In particular, I would like to thank Stephen Harrison for his very useful comments, and Noreen Humble for discussing with me at a later stage some of the views presented in my paper. I am also very grateful to Christopher Gill for reading and commenting on this article.

- Hägg, T. 1971b. 'The naming of the characters in the romance of Xenophon Ephesius', *Eranos* 69, 25–59.
- Hägg, T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hägg, T. 1984. 'The Parthenope Romance decapitated?', *Symb. Osl.* 59, 61–92.
- Hägg, T. 1994. 'Orality, literacy, and the "readership" of the early Greek novel', in: R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 47–74.
- Hägg, T. 2004. 'The *Ephesiaka* of Xenophon Ephesius – original or epitome?', in: L.B. Mortensen and T. Eide (eds.), *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969–2004)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 159–198.
- Hernández Lara, C. 1990. 'Rhetorical aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias', *GIF* 42, 267–274.
- Hernández Lara, C. 1994. *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Caritón de Afrodísias*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Horrocks, G. 1997. *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*, London – New York: Longman.
- Hunter, R. 1983. *A Study of 'Daphnis and Chloe'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, R. 1996. 'Longus', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), 1996, 361–386.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kytzler, B. 1996. 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), 1996, 336–359.
- Long, A.A. 1986. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London: Duckworth.
- Long, A.A. 2002. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Long, A.A. – Sedley, D.N. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers, vols. 1 and 2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maehler, H. 1990. 'Symptome der Liebe im Roman und in der griechischen Anthologie', *GCN* 3, 1–12.
- Musurillo, H.A. 1979 (ed.). *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*, New York: Arno Press.
- O'Sullivan, J.N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: his Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.
- O'Sullivan, J.N. 2005 (ed.). *Xenophon Ephesius, De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*, Munich: K.G. Saur.
- Oldfather, W.A. (1925–1928) (ed.). *Epictetus: the Discourses as reported by Arrian, the Manual, and fragments, vols. I and II*, Cambridge, Mass. – London: Harvard University Press.
- Papanikolaou, A.D. 1973 (ed.). *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum libri V*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Perkins, J. 1995. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Plastira-Valkanou, M. 2001. 'Dreams in Xenophon Ephesius', *Symb. Osl.* 76, 137–149.
- Rattenbury, R.M. 1950. Review of Helm, R., *Der antike Roman*, Berlin 1948, in: *Gnomon* 22, 74–77.
- Reardon, B.P. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley etc.: University of California Press.
- Reeve, M.D. 1971. 'Hiatus in the Greek novelists', *CQ* 21: 514–539.
- Reydams-Schils, G. 2005. *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility and Affection*, Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.
- Rist, J.M. 1969. *Stoic Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ruiz Montero, C. 1982. 'Una interpretación del "estilo KAI" de Jenofonte de Éfeso', *Emerita* 50, 305–323.
- Ruiz Montero, C. 1994. 'Xenophon von Ephesos: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2, 1088–1138.
- Ruiz Montero, C. 2003. 'Xenophon of Ephesus and orality in the Roman Empire', *AN* 3, 43–62.
- Rutherford, I. 1998. *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: 'Idea'-Theory in its Literary Context*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sandbach, F.H. 1975. *The Stoics*, London: Duckworth.
- Schmeling, G. 1980. *Xenophon of Ephesus*, Boston: Twayne.
- Schmeling, G. 1996 (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York: Brill.
- Scobie, A. 1983. 'Oral literature, storytelling, and the novel in the Graeco-Roman world', in: A. Scobie (ed.), *Apuleius and Folklore*, London: The Folklore Society.
- Stadter, P.A. 1980. *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thomas, R. 1989. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toohy, P. 1992. 'Love, lovesickness and melancholia', *JCS* 17, 265–286.