Introduction

van Gils, L.; de Jong, I.; Kroon, C.

Introduction

Lidewij van Gils, Irene de Jong and Caroline Kroon

1 War Narrative

War has been a prominent theme in art since the earliest cultures.[1] Most recently, the War on Terror has led to a new body of literature, including the use of new genres such as 'blogs', but we also find poetry, drama, short stories, novels, journals, diaries, memoirs, letters, graphic novels and comics expressing war experiences. For ancient times, the genres most connected to the topic of war are epic and historiography, but in tragedy, lyric and the ancient novel, too, war is never far away or, when it is, peace is emphatically praised as if to confirm the exceptionality of its presence.

Each war may have its specific features in terms of weapons used, types of conflict, and cultures and landscapes involved, but the most dramatic aspects of war are psychological and, therefore, universal: human frailty and heroism, suffering and sacrifice, loyalty and betrayal, love and hatred, reasons for wanting to live or die, beliefs in luck or fate, and, of course, the continuous presence of all-permeating fear. The universality of these themes explains why war literature of ancient times continues to appeal to modern audiences, even literature without a particular interest in the historical context of a conflict. Stories about the Trojan war, the revolt of Spartacus or the battle of Thermopylae still inspire filmmakers, and translations of and monographs about these war narratives attract many readers.[2] They are still worth telling as great historical events or as personal or national tragedies.

The long-lasting practice of writing war literature has produced canonical texts for particular wars and has led to literary topoi for various aspects of warfare.[3] Modern examples of canonical war literature are, for instance, Hem-

---

1 See e.g. Calloway 2015 for an overview of scholarship on war literature.

2 Famous movies about ancient battles are, for instance, *Spartacus* (1960, directed by Stanley Kubrick), *Troy* (2004, directed by Wolfgang Petersen) and *300* (2006, directed by Zack Snyder). The battle of Cannae is known as the biggest defeat of the Roman army, but in spite of its cinematic potential, Hollywood has not yet proved susceptible to the attraction of its story.

3 See e.g. McLoughlin 2009; Sherry 2005; and (for ancient war narrative) Bakogianni & Hope 2015.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2019 | DOI:10.1163/9789004383340_002

ingway's *A Farewell to arms* and Remarque's *Im Westen nichts Neues* for World War I and *the Diary of Anne Frank* for World War II. For ancient examples, the Trojan War as immortalized by Homer immediately springs to mind, for the Greco-Persian Wars in the fifth century BC including the legendary battle of Thermopylae Herodotus, and for the Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage, including the famous defeat at Cannae, Livy. These canonical texts and their depictions of war may be seen as part of our collective memory or, at least, of the literary tradition of war narrative which continues to influence our thinking about this both glorifying and horrifying aspect of human society.

The paradox of war narrative as the expression of one of the most horrific experiences in human existence and one of the richest artistic practices has been frequently noted. In fact, one of the literary topoi of war literature is that the atrocities of war cannot and maybe should not be rendered in words.[4] On the other hand, we may find a variety of reasons why war literature needs to be written and read. War literature may aim at informing the reader about great historical events, at sharing with the audience the personal histories involved, or at entertaining the reader with an exciting story. Some texts have been written to cope with personal experiences, others to prevent new wars and still others to explain how a war should be organized or endured. Of course, one aim does not exclude the other, and, as has long been recognized by both historians and literary scholars, it is essential to take into account why and for whom a particular war narrative is written.

Another question with regard to ancient war narratives is to what extent they are truthful. Here, the notions of historicity and realism should be distinguished. Historicity in the modern sense of historical truthfulness is not necessarily the highest aim in ancient historiography. Rather, a coherent, likely, persuasive and even pleasant story was demanded. In order to achieve this goal certain literary elements, techniques or topoi were commonly employed (in the case of war narrative for instance a general's exhortation speech or the portrayal of the enemy), and a lack of reliable sources was no reason to dispense with such elements.[5] Realism, on the other hand, is a highly relevant concept, since it concerns the question of whether a war narrative depicts events in such a way as to allow readers to recognize things and hence consider a narrative

---

4   See McLoughlin 2009: 15 for a discussion of the inadequacy of depicting war because of such factors as complexity, first-hand experience and ethics.

5   See e.g. Fornara 1983 for an introduction to the genre of ancient historiography and White 1973, 1978, 1987 for the modern historian's use of narrative devices.

persuasive.[6] Ancient historiographical works do convey such a sense of realism, precisely because they include the last words of a general or the thoughts of an enemy (which to a modern audience are unhistorical elements).

2   Two Case Studies: Thermopylae and Cannae

This multidisciplinary volume discusses two canonical war narratives from antiquity: the battle of Thermopylae in Herodotus' *Histories* (book 7, sections 138–239) and the battle of Cannae in Livius' *History of Rome* (book 22, sections 34–61). The narratives about these battles have had an impact which almost surpasses the impact of the battles themselves.[7] Who does not know of the three hundred Spartans led by Leonidas who were killed by a massive Persian force under Xerxes' command at the pass of Thermopylae in 480 BC? Yet, the defeat at Thermopylae did not decide the confrontation between Greeks and Persians. Similarly, the famous Roman defeat in the war against the Punic general Hannibal at Cannae in 216 BC did not lead to Carthaginian rule over Rome.

These two war narratives are especially interesting since they both concern defeats. The authors had to present painful yet well-known events from history and this called for particularly creative writing. While all narrators generally employ 'textual strategies', as we call them, in these instances Herodotus' and Livy's narrative strategy was particularly called for. They had to decide, for instance, whether to tell from a distance or to immerse their readers into events, what details to include about the landscape and material aspects of the battle, which events to select and how to order them in order to stress or cover up strategic behavior by characters, whether to portray their characters as individuals or as stereotypes and, finally, how to explain—and partly soften—the disastrous outcome of the battles.

The aim of this volume is to bring together philological, historical, narratological and linguistic perspectives on these two battle narratives, in an attempt to uncover the various textual strategies employed by their authors. Individual chapters offer close readings and comparisons of the battle narratives of Thermopylae and Cannae. On the one hand, the chosen texts merit such an in-depth analysis because of their significance for their original recipients and

---

6 See for ancient views on realistic storytelling for instance Quint. *Inst.* 2.3.4, *Rhet. ad Herr.* 1.13, Cic. *Inv.* 1.27, as discussed in Woodman 1988.

7 For recent literature on Thermopylae see, for instance, Cartledge 2006; Foster & Lateiner 2012; Matthew & Trundle 2013; Priestley 2014. Recent publications on Livy's narrative of Cannae include Daly 2002; Levene 2010; and Mineo 2015.

their impact on later historical and literary versions of these battles. We thus aim at offering classicists and other readers of these ancient texts new material and ideas which can enrich their own interpretation. On the other hand, the focus on two passages may bring to the fore the strength of the various perspectives and may test whether they can complement and reinforce each other. We hope the example we set here will lead to more combined efforts to investigate ancient texts.

A first attempt to broaden the perspective from the genre of ancient historiography to other classical genres (e.g. epic), and from Thermopylae and Cannae to other battles, can be found in the last part of this volume. The strategies to tell about war in classical epic partly overlap with those of ancient historiography but, most interestingly, they also differ. The observations in this last subset of chapters both sharpens our view of what might be typical for the two selected battles and for ancient historiography and stimulates discussion on potentially universal aspects of representing war in textual forms of art.

3   Narratology, Discourse Linguistics and Classics

The study of classical texts has a history which is as old as the texts themselves. Each generation interprets texts anew, inspired by contemporaneous phenomena or new methodologies. The new methodologies which are central in this volume are narratology, which studies the structural features of narratives, and discourse linguistics, which looks at the function of language as communicative act. The introduction of these theories has led to new questions, and, we hope and believe, will lead to new observations and interpretations of the classical texts.

In this introductory chapter we offer a basic overview of narratological and discourse linguistic research in the field of Classics and introduce some basic concepts and theses which underly the analyses in chapters to follow. In view of the multidisciplinary readership of this book, it seems useful to explain some of the more technical vocabulary. It is precisely the merit of both narratology and discourse linguistics to offer clearly defined concepts with which to analyse texts. These concepts make it possible to critically observe, compare and discuss the textual strategies underlying war (and other) narratives.

3.1   *Narratology and Classics*
Narratology is very much an offspring of formalism and structuralism and has become one of the most influential literary-critical theories introduced into classics in the twentieth century. Central to the development of narratology

have been Stanzel 1979, Genette [1972] 1980; Bal [1988] 1997; Fludernik 1996; and Herman 2009. The narratological apparatus enables a systematic investigation of narrative texts and includes topics such as the types and functions of narrators and narratees, the temporal aspects of a story, setting, characterization, perspective (focalization), and the representation of speech. Narratology has been introduced in classics by Winkler 1985 in a study of the narrator in Apuleius and by De Jong 1987 in a study of narrators and focalizers in Homer. Since then, a great number of narratological studies have appeared on virtually all narrative genres in antiquity,[8] a multi-volume narratological history of ancient Greek literature is being written (De Jong, Nünlist & Bowie 2004; De Jong & Nünlist 2007; De Jong 2012; Van Emde Boas & De Temmerman 2018) and comprehensive discussions of narratology and classics are given in Grethlein & Rengakos 2009 and De Jong 2014.

3.2   *Discourse Linguistics and Classics*

In the field of linguistics, classical scholarship has been strongly influenced by the functional theories of language which were developed from 1970 onwards, in particular the theory of Functional Grammar (Dik 1978; Dik 1997) and its successor Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). These functional frameworks have as their main theoretical principle that language is an instrument for communicative interaction within a specific communicative context. As a consequence of this principle, classicists started to study all kinds of linguistic phenomena that had been more or less neglected in the sentence-based form of analyzing syntax current until then. Landmarks in this development are Rijksbaron 1984 on Ancient Greek, Pinkster 1984/1990 on Latin, and Kroon 1995 on Latin discourse particles. This last study, and a number of articles by the late Machtelt Bolkestein,[9] introduced into classical scholarship the use of discourse linguistics, a field of research concerned with the organization of language 'beyond the level of the sentence'. It is precisely this broad focus on text and context which brings discourse linguistics close to literary analysis in a shared effort to enhance the interpretation of classical texts.[10]

---

8   Overviews can be found in Schmitz [2002] 2007: 55–75; and De Jong 2014: 6–15.
9   See, for instance, Bolkestein 1987, 2000, 2002.
10   Illustrations of the importance of linguistic analysis for literary interpretation can for instance be found in volumes edited by Bakker 1997; Allan & Buijs 2007; and Bakker & Wakker 2009. See also Rijksbaron 1991; Risselada 1993; Buijs 2004; Adema 2008; Van Gils 2009; Rose 2013; Van der Keur 2015; Adema 2017; Van Emde Boas 2017; and a number of articles by Kroon (2002; 2004; 2007; 2012).

3.3   *Joined Forces*

Over the course of the last three decades, and as a result of the development within Greek and Latin linguistics to study language from the perspective of discourse rather than individual sentences, Dutch classical linguists and literary scholars have started to explore their common ground, as well as the strength of the complementarity of their approaches. Classical texts are approached with a toolbox that contains both linguistic and narratological instruments, in the expectation that in this way fruitful contributions can be made to existing philological disputes or new aspects of texts can be detected. The present volume can be seen, among other things, as a test to explore how far the cooperation of narratological and linguistic classicists has progressed, and whether we are indeed able to detect new aspects in and provide new perspectives to, in this case, famous Greek and Roman war narratives.[11]

3.4   *Historiography and Narratology*

The two central texts in this volume belong to the historiographical genre. A question discussed by both literary theorists and historians is whether historiography may be analyzed with the same critical instruments as those employed for the study of fictional narrative.[12] After all, both the purported content (nonfiction) and the primary goal (didactic) of historical texts differ from fictional narrative. However, ancient historiography was traditionally seen, already in antiquity, as very much a literary genre and the opposition therefore is less strict than in modern historiography.

   This having been said, it needs to be acknowledged that the 'story world' of a historical narrative somehow relates to an actual world which may be known from other sources. The existence of such sources, whether of a written or material form, has led (some) narratologists to add another layer, called *material*, to the three well-known narratological layers *fabula-story-text* (see Table 1.1).

   The abstract layer of *fabula* represents the chronological series of events such as narratees can reconstruct when reading a narrative. In historiography, it is relevant to relate this series of events to the layer of the *material*: the in principle endless number of events which together constitute history and which

---

11   The development of combining literary and linguistic models is not exclusively found in the field of Classics, but part of a broader movement. See, for instance, Banfield 1982; Prince 1982; Ehrlich 1990; Fleischman 1990; Fludernik 1993, 1996, 2000; Tolliver 1990; Emmott 1997; Semino & Culpeper 2002; more recently e.g. Dancygier 2012; Harrison et al. 2014; Burke 2014; Toolan 2016.

12   See, for instance, Barthes [1967] 1981; White 1973; Genette 1991; Cohn 1999; Walsh 2003; De Jong 2014: 167–195.

TABLE 1.1   Narratological layers

Material	historical events such as are recoverable from sources
Fabula	chronological series of events
Story	presentation of events in certain order and from a specific point of view by a focalizer
Text	wording by a narrator

are (partly) recoverable from sources such as texts, oral history, and physical objects. The *material* may be referred to by the narrator, when he refers to his sources or includes autoptical testimonies. In the present volume, these concepts are highly relevant to the discussions of Van Wees, Oakley and De Bakker who all compare the Thermopylae and Cannae narratives with other versions of the events which Herodotus and Livy may have used as their sources. In the case of intertextual relations, too, the domain of literary sources may be seen as part of the *material* and two chapters operate mainly at this particular layer, viz. those by Rademaker and De Bakker & Van der Keur.

At the narratological layer of the *story*, three more points are at issue: order, rhythm and focalization. Where order is concerned, historiography is assumed to display a functional use of analepsis ('flashback') and to employ mainly a summarizing rhythm as opposed to fictional narratives in which analepses are used for 'aesthetic concerns or formal experimentation' and the default rhythm is scenic.[13] This difference is of course not absolute, in particular not where the highly literary form of ancient historiography is concerned. In this volume, Tsakmakis, De Jong, and Kroon & Van Gils analyze time and the use of tenses in war narratives.

With regard to focalization, one could question the relevance of the concept of focalization by a character for historiography, since it is hardly imaginable that a historian could know what went on in a historical character's mind. In ancient historiography, however, we find many examples of embedded focalization by a character and here, as in many other respects, the foundational role of the Homeric epics as the model *par excellence* for historians seems a decisive factor.[14] Aspects of focalization used as part of particular textual strategies are dealt with in this volume by Allan, De Jong, Van Gils, Buijs, Adema, Harrison, and Van der Keur.

---

13   Cohn 1999: 116.
14   Strasburger 1972.

At the narratological layer of the *text*, even in the case of historiography the narrator should not be equated with the author, because Herodotus and Livy, too, construct a narratorial persona. The narrator, his purposes and the narratee are treated in this volume in the chapters by Tsakmakis, Allan, Rademaker, Pausch, Harrison, and Van der Keur.

4   Historiography and Discourse Linguistics

It is especially at this narratological layer of the *text* (see above, table 1.1) that the narratological and discourse-linguistic approaches complement each other. In narratology, whenever the narratorial persona refers to himself or to the *hic et nunc* of himself and his narratee, these references are analyzed as signs of an overt (as contrasted to a covert) narrator.[15] Discourse linguists, by contrast, use the terms narrator and narrative in a more restricted way, in accordance with their linguistically based view that texts which may be called narrative on a comprehensive level, actually consist of a mix of various kinds of narrative and non-narrative textual components.[16] Thus, in cases where the narratologist would speak of an overt narrator, the discourse linguist would usually identify a non-narrative component in the text, characterized by a non-narrative text type (or discourse mode, see below).[17]

Discourse linguists define the strictly narrative parts of the text in terms of the temporal succession of (usually past tense) events and situations, which together constitute a particular *story-world*. This story-world can be seen as an alternative mental world, parallel to (but essentially distinct from) the communicative situation of the speaker and his audience. This latter 'world' comes to the fore most explicitly in the non-narrative parts of the text with which

---

15   For the terms overt and covert narrator see De Jong 2014: 27, 30.

16   These components may be as small as single words and as large as complete texts.

17   The discourse linguist views the narrator as one out of many possible roles the speaker or writer of a discourse may play. Whenever a speaker is found referring to the communicative situation he shares with the addressee (an overt narrator in narratological terms), the discourse linguist no longer analyzes that reference as narrative, and the speaker is not referred to as narrator anymore. The choice between types of narrator (overt versus covert) or types of discourse mode (narrative or non-narrative) may seem like a mere terminological issue, but it is not easy to choose for one or the other set of terms, as the different terminologies reflect differences in research interests; narratologists have developed a refined model of types of narrators for a large variety of typically narrative genres, whereas discourse linguists attempt to apply their methodological and terminological apparatus also to texts that are (predominantly) non-narrative.

the narrative parts tend to alternate. In these non-narrative parts we find, for instance, comments, evaluations, feelings, general information, or even promises or directives which are grounded in the communicative situation of the speaker and his addressee.

Linguistically, the non-narrative parts of the text behave differently from the text parts that are narrative in a strict sense. By paying attention to, for instance, tense, mood, pronouns, negation and particles, discourse linguists are able to uncover the more indirect and strategic ways in which historiographers and other 'story-tellers' let story-world and communicative situation intermingle and alternate in their texts, sometimes even within the scope of a single sentence.

Several chapters (Allan, Adema, Van Gils & Kroon) make use of two discourse-linguistic theories which, in combination, have proven to be especially fruitful for uncovering and understanding the subtle structuring and layering of historiographical and other narrative texts: a theory involving the prototypical structure of natural narrative[18] and a theory involving discourse modes.[19] The theory involving the prototypical structure of natural narrative is summarized in Table 1.2.

TABLE 1.2   Prototypical structure of a natural story or episode

Abstract	summary of the content or point of the narrative
Orientation	previous history; introduction of time, place, circumstances and main participants
Complication	a conflict arises, build-up of tension
Peak	Climax: the conflict is maximally tangible and near a solution
Resolution	the conflict is resolved, substituted by another conflict or remains permanently unresolved
Coda	summarizing bridge to time of narrating
Evaluation (any position)	evaluation of the narrative or of elements of the narrative, often conveying, or pertaining to, the point of the narrative

---

18   This theory was first designed by Labov 1972, in his sociolinguistic research of natural, spontaneous narratives; see for the application to classical texts e.g. Adam 1998; Allan 2009; and Kroon 2015.

19   For the linguistic concept of discourse mode, see especially Smith 2003; for its application to classical texts see e.g. Kroon 2007; Adema 2007, 2008; Allan 2007, 2009; Van Gils 2009.

Certain components typically pertain to the narratological layer of the *story* (see table 1.1 above), together building up the story-world: orientation, complication, peak and resolution. Together they form a sequence starting with a stable situation, which is unsettled by some form of incident or conflict, and consequently develops towards a climax (peak), followed by a new situation. In narratological terms, this is the plot structure at the level of the 'story'. In the abstract and coda the transition is made from the communicative situation to the story-world and vice versa. Clearly, not all narratives comply with this prototype, and this holds a fortiori for a genre like historiography. But precisely because in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic research the prototypical structure of natural narrative has proven to be a rather stable factor, it is relevant to point out variations or exploitations of this schema in historiographical texts, and point to their possible rhetorical effects.

The second linguistic theory which is especially prominent in current linguistic research of classical literature concerns text typological features of coherent discourse units, so-called *discourse modes*. This theory is based on the observation that texts are usually not monolithic, but commonly consist of alternations of different local text types. Ancient historiographers, for instance, do not only narrate, but may also describe, inform, or comment. An especially important distinction as to the genre of historiography is the distinction between a 'narrating' mode of presentation and a 'discursive' mode, initially drawn attention to by Weinrich 1964/1985 and Benveniste 1966, in the context of their studies on tense usage in narrative.[20] Later scholars have used a variety of other terms to refer to the same or comparable distinctions (see Table 1.3).[21]

In a 'narrating' discourse mode, the narrator creates a—usually past—story-world, which consists of successive events which are connected by a close temporal and/or causal relationship. This is the default mode in prototypical narratives: without it, there is no story. In a 'discursive' mode, the narrator may also refer to past events, but here the events are not necessarily sequentially related to one another within a particular, self-contained story world. Rather, the past events referred to are presented as currently relevant facts, which are each individually related to the actual communicative situation of the speaker/writer

---

20   The argument of Benveniste and Weinrich sets out from the linguistic observation that in order to give an adequate account of the use of tenses in e.g. French and German narrative texts, it is necessary to distinguish between two different systems of tense: 'discursive' tenses and 'narrating' tenses.

21   More recent linguistic scholarship has proposed a variety of additional discourse modes, and has also based its observations on non-narrative and non-literary texts. Smith 2003, for instance, also distinguishes an informative mode and a descriptive mode, in addition to a narrative and a report mode.

TABLE 1.3   Two main discourse modes in narrative texts

	'narrating' (pertaining to story-world)	'discursive' (pertaining to communicative situation)
Weinrich (1964)	erzählte Welt	besprochene Welt
Benveniste (1966)	histoire	discours
Chafe (1994)	immediate mode	displaced mode
Smith (2003)	narrative mode	report mode
Fludernik (2012)	story-telling mode	interlocutionary mode

and his audience, and may also be coordinated with present and future events. This type of telling is, for instance, characteristic of news reports: the journalist does not tell us a story, but reports a number of relevant events and situations which have obtained in the distant or recent past, may hold in the present, or will obtain in the future.

The 'discursive' discourse mode is also prominently present in the historiographical genre, sometimes in a quite explicit form, but more often in a form that is at first sight hardly distinguishable from the 'narrating' discourse mode. Careful linguistic and narratological analysis may help to detect these and other subtleties of the composition of the text, which—as a number of chapters in this volume will show—may also be highly interesting for the interpretation of the text in terms of its underlying values, morality and ideology. For instance, the combination of historical present tense, short and syntactically noncomplex sentences, visual detail, and embedded focalization is typical for a narrative peak, conveyed by the 'narrating' mode. Likewise, the co-occurrence of, for instance, interactional particles, perfect tense, and evaluative expressions is characteristic of the discursive mode and is typically found in evaluations.

In the chapters by Allan, Adema, and Kroon & Van Gils it is illustrated how an analysis along these mixed linguistic and narratological lines may clarify the rhetorical organization and presentation of the text, and as such may enhance its interpretation. This does not mean that we plead in this volume for the development of one overarching narratological-linguistic model of analysis. Such a model would probably be reductive rather than productive. We do think, however, that much is to be gained by the collaboration of narratologists and linguists.

5   Outline

The chapters in this volume are arranged into three subsets. The first subset focuses on the battle of Thermopylae, as presented (mainly) by Herodotus. *Van Wees* presents an overview of the main historical issues of this battle by comparing Herodotus' account with the quite different tradition found in other writers. This historical approach is complemented by *De Bakker* with a narratological analysis of the accounts in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. The next chapters continue exploring Herodotus' narrative techniques. *Tsakmakis* discusses the narrative devices used to create a glorifying image of the Spartans, while *De Jong* focuses on Herodotus' handling of (narratological) time in the Thermopylae narrative. As a last chapter in this subset, *Allan* provides a linguistic analysis of the 'distance' or 'immersion' allowed to the narratee.

In the second subset, the battle of Cannae as presented by Livy is central. The first chapter by *Oakley* illuminates the main characteristics of Livy's account in a comparison with the version found in Polybius. Next, *Van Gils & Kroon* analyze, from a discourse-linguistic perspective, the narrative structure of the Cannae episode within the broader context of Livy's book 22. This is followed by a chapter in which *Pausch* explores the literary motif of *Punica fraus* in Livy's books 21 and 22, paying particular attention to its culmination in Cannae. *Van Gils* offers a narratological and linguistic analysis of space in the Cannae episode, with attention to the strategic uses of space and its role in characterization. *Buijs* discusses Livy's use of represented and reported speech for characterization and the thematic opposition of *ratio* and *fortuna*. Speech is also the subject of the contribution by *Adema*, whose analyses show how the various types of speech contribute to Livy's narrative aims in his account of the battles of Cannae and Zama.

The third and last subset of chapters deals with 'comparisons' although of two different natures: on the one hand we find two chapters comparing two battle narratives resulting in observations about phenomena related to intertextuality, genre and authorial choices. On the other hand, the stylistic device of a comparison, better known as *simile*, is discussed as a genre specific feature of war narrative in epic poetry. First, *De Bakker & Van der Keur* bring together the two battles under discussion in this volume by showing how Livy's narrative of the Roman defeat at Cannae can be seen in the light of the Greek tradition on Thermopylae. Second, Rademaker compares Herodotus' account of Thermopylae with Thucydides' narrative of the Spartan defeat at Sphacteria exploring the ways in which Thucydides' narrator persuades the narratee to accept his belittling of the Athenian victory over the Spartans. Next, *Harrison* discusses the function of similes in Vergil's *Aeneid* 10 and demon-

strates how the similes make an important contribution to its narrative texture. And finally, *Van der Keur* addresses the role of similes in establishing secondary plot lines, which guide the narratee's interpretation of the main narrative.

Bibliography

Adam, G., *Tense and Aspect in Roman Historiographic Narrative: A Functional Approach to the Prose of the Memoria Rerum Gestarum*, dissertation (Chicago 1998).

Adema, S.M., 'Discourse Modes and Bases in Vergil's Aeneid', in R.J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds.), *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden 2007) 42–64.

Adema, S.M., *Discourse Modes and Bases. A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid*, dissertation (Amsterdam 2008).

Adema, S.M., *Words of Warriors. Speech and Thought in Latin War Narratives* (Leiden 2017).

Allan, R.J., 'Sense an sentence complexity. Sentence structure, sentence connection, and tense-aspect as indicators of narrative mode in Thucydides' *Histories*', in Allan and Buijs (eds.), *The language of Literature. Linguistic approaches to classical texts* (Leiden 2007), 93–121.

Allan, R.J., 'Towards a Typology of the Narrative Modes in Ancient Greek: Text types and narrative structure in Euripidean messenger speeches', in S.J. Bakker & G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden 2009), 171–204.

Allan, R.J. & Buijs, M. (eds.), *The language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden 2007).

Bakker, E.J. (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (Leiden 1997).

Bakker, S.J. & Wakker, G.C. (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Greek* (Leiden 2009).

Bakogianni, A. & Hope, V.M. (eds.), *War as Spectacle: Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Display of Armed Conflict* (London 2015).

Bal, M., *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* ([1988] Toronto 1997).

Banfield, A., *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* (Boston 1982).

Barthes, R., 'The Discourse of History', *Comparative Criticism* 3 ([1967] 1981) 7–20.

Benveniste, E., *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale* (Paris 1966).

Bolkestein, A.M., 'Discourse functions of predications: The background/foreground distinction and tense and voice in Latin main and subordinate clauses', in J. Nuyts & G. de Schutter (eds.), *Getting One's Words into Line. On Word Order and Functional Grammar* (Dordrecht 1987) 163–178.

Bolkestein, A.M., 'Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin', in S.C. Herring, P. van Reenen & L. Schøsler (eds.), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages* (Amsterdam 2000) 107–137.

Bolkestein, A.M., 'Linguistic reflection of discourse structure in Latin', in A.M. Bolkestein, C.H.M. Kroon, H. Pinkster, H.W. Remmelink & R. Risselada (eds.), *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics. Selected Papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* (Amsterdam 2002) 17–28.

Buijs, M., *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse. The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis* (Leiden 2004).

Burke, M. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics* (London 2014).

Calloway, C., *War in Literature and Drama* (Oxford 2015).

Cartledge, P., *Thermopylae: the Battle that Changed the World* (London 2006).

Chafe, W., *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing* (Chicago 1994).

Cohn, D., ''I Doze and I Wake': The Paradox of Simultaneous Narration.' *Paper read at the Nice conference of the Society for the Study of Narrative Literature* (Nice 1991).

Cohn, D., *The distinction of Fiction* (Baltimore 1999).

Daly, G., *Cannae: the Experience of Battle in the Second Punic War* (London 2002).

Dancygier, B., *The Language of Stories. A Cognitive Approach* (Cambridge 2012).

Dik, S., *Functional Grammar* (Amsterdam 1978).

Dik, S., *The Theory of Functional Grammar* (Berlin 1997).

Ehrlich, S., *Point of View: A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style* (London 1990).

Emde Boas, E. van & Temmerman, K. de (eds.), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2018).

Emde Boas, E. van, *Language and Character in Euripides' Electra* (Oxford 2017).

Emmott, C., *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective* (Oxford 1997).

Fleischmann, S., *Tense and Narrativity* (Austin 1990).

Fludernik, M., *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* (London 1993).

Fludernik, M., *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology* (London 1996).

Fludernik, M., 'Genres, Text Types, or Discourse Modes—Narrative Modalities and Generic Categorization', *Style* 34.2 (2000) 274–292.

Fludernik, M., 'Narratology and Literary Linguistics', in R. Binnick (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford Handbooks online, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195381979.013.0002 (Oxford 2012)

Fornara, C.W., *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge 1983).

Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford 2012).

Genette, G., *Fiction et diction* (Paris 1991).

Genette, G., *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* ([1972] Ithaca N.Y. 1980).

Gils, L.W. van, *Argument and Narrative. A Discourse Analysis of Ten Ciceronian Speeches*, PhD thesis (Amsterdam 2009).

Grethlein, J. & Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin 2009).

Harrison, C., Nuttall, L., Stockwell, P. & Yuan, W., *Cognitive Grammar in Literature* (Amsterdam 2014).

Hengeveld, K. & Mackenzie, J.L., *Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-based Theory of Language Structure* (Oxford 2008).

Herman, D., *Basic Elements of Narrative* (Chichester 2009).

Jong, I.J.F. de, *Narrators and Focalizers: the Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (London 1987).

Jong, I.J.F. de, *Narratology and Classics. A Practical Guide* (Oxford 2014).

Jong, I.J.F. de, Nünlist, R., & Bowie, A. (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2004).

Jong, I.J.F. de & Nünlist, R. (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2007).

Jong, I.J.F. de (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2012).

Keur, C.M. van der, *A Commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 13. Intertextuality and Narrative Structure*, PhD thesis (Amsterdam 2015).

Koopman, N., *Ancient Greek Ekphrasis: Between Description and Narration* (Leiden 2018).

Kroon, C.H.M., *Discourse Particles in Latin. A study of nam, enim, autem, vero, and at* (Amsterdam 1995).

Kroon, C.H.M., 'How to write a ghost story? A linguistic view on narrative modes in Pliny *Ep.*7.27', in D. Shalev & L. Szawicky (eds.), *Donum Grammaticum: Studies in Latin and Celtic Philology and Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén* (Louvain-la-Neuve 2002) 189–200.

Kroon, C.H.M., 'The effect of the echo. A text linguistic approach to Catullus Carmen 63', *Mnemosyne* 57.5 (2004) 629–650.

Kroon, C.H.M., 'Discourse modes and the use of tenses in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', in R.J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds.), *The language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (2007) 65–92.

Kroon, C.H.M., 'Anchoring as a communicative device in Roman historiography: a discourse-linguistic perspective', *Proceedings International Conference Anchoring in Antiquity* (Ravenstein 2015) [internet publication: http://www.ru.nl/oikos/ anchoring-innovation/anchoring-scholarship/anchoring-antiquity-international -conference/]

Kroon, C.H.M., 'Voce voco. Some text linguistic observations on Ovid *Heroides* 10', *Mnemosyne* 65.2 (2012) 238–250.

Labov, W., *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia 1972).

Levene, D.S., *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford 2010).

Matthew, C. & Trundle, M. (eds.), *Beyond the Gates of Fire* (Barnsley 2013).

McLoughlin, K. (ed.), 'War and words', in K. McLoughlin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing* (Cambridge 2009) 15–24.

Mineo, B. (ed.), *A Companion to Livy* (Malden 2015).

Pinkster, H., *Latijnse Syntaxis en Semantiek* (Amsterdam 1984).

Pinkster, H., *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (London 1990).

Priestley, J., *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture. Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories* (Oxford 2014).

Prince, G., *Narratology: the Form and Function of Narrative* (Berlin 1982)

Rijksbaron, A., *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae* (Amsterdam 1991).

Rijksbaron, A., *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (Amsterdam 1984).

Risselada, R., *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Leiden 1993).

Rose, P.J., *A Commentary on Augustine's De cura pro mortuis gerenda. Rhetoric in Practice* (Leiden 2013).

Schmitz, T.A., *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction* ([2002] Malden 2007).

Semino, E. & Culpeper, J., *Cognitive Stylistics. Language and Cognition in Text* (Amsterdam 2002).

Sherry, V. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of the First World War* (Cambridge 2005).

Smith, C.S., *Modes of Discourse. The Logical Structure of Texts* (Cambridge 2003).

Stanzel, F.K., *Theorie des Erzählens*, ([1979] Göttingen 1982).

Strasburger, H., *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg 1972).

Tolliver, J., 'Discourse Analysis and the Interpretation of Literary Narrative', *Style* 24.2 (1990) 266–281.

Toolan, M., *Making sense of Narrative Text: Situation, Repetition, and Picturing in the Reading of Short Stories* (New York 2016).

Walsh, R., 'Fictionality and Mimesis: Between Narrativity and Fictional Worlds', *Narrative* 11.1 (2003) 110–121.

Weinrich, H., *Tempus* (Stuttgart 1964).

White, H., *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in 19th-Century Europe* (Baltimore 1973).

White, H., *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore 1987).

Winkler, J.J., *Auctor and Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Berkeley 1985).

Woodman, A.J., *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London 1988).