

*Summary Narrative and the Diegetic Present***3.1 Introduction**

In this chapter, we move from scenic narrative (*mimesis*) to summary narrative (*diegesis*), where short stretches of discourse cover long stretches of story time. The following example illustrates the use of the present for preterite in such narrative passages:

- (1) Ποτειδεᾶται δὲ πέμψαντες μὲν καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρέσβεις, εἴ πως πείσειαν μὴ σφῶν περὶ νεωτερίζειν μηδέν, ἐλθόντες δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα μετὰ Κορινθίων, [ἔπρασσον] ὅπως ἐτοιμάσαιτο τιμωρίαν, ἦν δέη, ἐπειδὴ ἕκ τε Ἀθηνῶν ἕκ πολλοῦ πράσσοντες οὐδὲν ἠϋρόντο ἐπιτήδειον, ἀλλ' αἱ νῆες αἱ ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν καὶ ἐπὶ σφᾶς ὁμοίως ἔπλεον, καὶ τὰ τέλη τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ὑπέσχετο αὐτοῖς, ἦν ἐπὶ Ποτειδαίαν ἴωσιν Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐσβαλεῖν, τότε δὴ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον **ἀφίστανται** μετὰ Χαλκιδέων καὶ Βοττιαίων κοινῆ ξυνομόσαντες.

The Potideans, sending ambassadors to the Athenians, to see if they could persuade them not to take any novel actions against them, and going to Lacedaemon as well together with the Corinthians, in order to secure support should it prove necessary – when, after long negotiations, they got nothing useful from Athens, but the ships destined for Macedon sailed against themselves as well, and when the Lacedaemonian authorities promised them that they would invade Attica, if the Athenians should proceed against Potidaea, then at that moment [the Potideans] **revolt** [from the Athenians] together with the Chalcideans and the Bottiaeans, making common cause with them.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 1.58.1)

The events narrated in this short paragraph must have taken a long time to occur: the Potideans had to wait for the results of extensive negotiations in cities far from their own, and the conclusion of the agreement with the Chalcideans and the Bottiaeans will similarly have required substantial

preparations. Apart from temporal compression, characteristics of summary narrative are abstraction (e.g., ἀφίστανται [‘revolt’] designates an event that cannot be actually witnessed in its entirety at one moment in time) and discourse complexity (note the three participial clauses and two temporal subordinate clauses). In such a context, the present for preterite loses much of the ‘experiential’ quality that was associated with the mimetic use discussed in Chapter 2.¹

In the present chapter, I argue that the use of the present for preterite in summary narrative (henceforth ‘diegetic use’) evokes a conceptual scenario in which the past events are construed as presently accessible in the medium of the *discourse*. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, Section 1.7, the existence of such a conceptual construal is implied by the use of proximal demonstratives to designate discourse referents. When Thucydides, for example, refers to the Peloponnesian war as ‘*this* war’, this presupposes a construal in which the distal event space is mapped onto the mental space representing the discourse structure (compare Fauconnier [1984: 176–82]).² In other words, the war ‘is here’ because it is the *current object of joint attention* in the discourse. I argue that the present for preterite is similarly used to highlight the immediate accessibility of the designated event in the medium of the discourse. In this way, it signals to the addressees that they are to *update their mental model of the discourse* in the light of salient changes in its structure.³ In example (1), the revolt of the Potideans constitutes a significant change in the political ‘map’ we keep track of when reading the narrative: from this point on, the Potideans are in the camp of the Lacedaemonians. The impact of this event on the evolution of the narrative is emphasised by Thucydides in 1.118.1, where

¹ The phrase τότε δὴ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον (‘then at that moment’) is another sign that the viewpoint here is strongly retrospective; see also Section 3.3.4.

² E.g., 2.70.4 καὶ [τὸ] δεῦτερον ἔτος ἐτελεύτα τῷ πολέμῳ τῷδε ὃν Θουκυδίδης ξυγγράψεν (‘and the second year ended to this war which Thucydides chronicled’).

³ On the concept of a *mental discourse model* (with specific reference to the use of demonstratives), see Cornish, e.g., (2010), (2011); Kroon (2017). For the analogy between present tense usage and proximal demonstratives (as both signalling ‘focal referential concern’), see Janssen (1993), (2002). See also Diessel (2006) on the function of demonstratives in establishing joint attention. On the discourse-structural function of the present for preterite compare, e.g., Wolfson (1978) etc.; Schiffrin (1981); Porter (1989: 196); Fanning (1990: 231, with references in n. 67); Fleischman (1990); Fludernik (1991); Brinton (1992); Sicking and Stork (1997); Allan (2007) etc.; Runge (2010: 128–41); Lallot et al. (2011); Thoma (2011). Willi (2017: 240) compares the use of the present tense in chapter titles.

he mentions the 'Potidean affair' together with the 'Corcyrean affair' as a main motive for the states of Athens and Sparta to go to war.

In the remainder of this introductory section, I will explain how I view the relationship between scenic narrative and summary narrative and how this is relevant for the distinction between the mimetic and diegetic uses of the present for preterite (Section 3.1.1). Then I explain how I selected the material for the quantitative analyses presented in this chapter (Section 3.1.2).

In the main body of this chapter, I first present the theoretical outline of the central argument, that is, that the diegetic present for preterite signals to the addressees that the processing of the designated event involves a significant update to their mental discourse model (Section 3.2). In Section 3.3, I corroborate this argument by showing that the present for preterite has an affinity with certain narrative attention-management strategies. Then I discuss two specific discourse-structural functions of the present for preterite: marking changes in the narrative dynamic (Section 3.4) and marking changes in the status of referents (Section 3.5).⁴ Finally, I present two contrastive case studies as test cases for my account of the diegetic present for preterite (Section 3.6).

3.1.1 *Mimesis, Diegesis and Experientiality*

Scenic narrative and summary narrative are flexible categories. To begin with, there is no specific distance between discourse time and story time that defines the boundary between the two. Moreover, the category of summary narrative is extremely heterogeneous, because the distance between discourse time and story time may become infinitely large. For example, a paragraph of discourse may cover hours, days, weeks, months, years, millennia and so on. In reality, then, the distance between discourse time and story time is a continuous variable, and the distinction between two categories is mainly useful in so far as the category of scenic narrative is relatively circumscribed.

The point is that summary narrative may exhibit different degrees of experientiality. This depends mainly on the distance between discourse time and story time and the concreteness of the designated events. However, these factors can also be manipulated through linguistic construal: temporally extended and internally complex events can be described

⁴ Compare for these two functions Porter (1989: 196); Fanning (1990: 231).

in a way that makes them more easily processible in terms of direct experience.⁵ Consider the following passage:

- (2) Ὡς δὲ οἱ Ἀρκάδες περὶ τὸν Κρωῶνον ἦσαν, οἱ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἡλεῖοι πρῶτον μὲν ἰόντες ἐπὶ τὴν Πύλον **περιτυγχάνουσι** τοῖς Πυλίοις ἀποκεκρουμένοις ἐκ τῶν Θαλαμῶν. καὶ προσελαύνοντες οἱ ἵππεῖς τῶν Ἡλείων ὡς εἶδον αὐτούς, οὐκ ἐμέλλησαν, ἀλλ' εὐθύς **ἐμβάλλουσι**, καὶ τοὺς μὲν **ἀποκτινύουσιν**, οἱ δὲ τινες αὐτῶν **καταφεύγουσιν** ἐπὶ γήλοφον. ἐπεὶ μέντοι ἦλθον οἱ πεζοί, **ἐκκόπτουσι** καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ λόφῳ.

As the Arcadians were about Cromnus, the Elians from the city, going to Pylus first, **happen upon** the Pylians, who had been driven from Thalamae. When the cavalry of the Elians approached and caught sight of them, they did not delay, but **charge** immediately, and they **kill** some, but others **flee** to a hill. When the infantry came, however, they **knock away** those on the hill as well.

(Xenophon, *Hellenic affairs* 7.4.26)

While I would not consider this a typical example of summary narrative (the unity of time, place and action is strong), it would be problematic to classify it as scenic. We can be sure that the meeting between the two armies, the cavalry charge, the flight of the Pylians to the hill and the final defeat of the Pylians on the hill, took a substantial amount of time to occur. However, the events are construed in such a way as to minimise the relevance of the discrepancy between discourse time and story time. We get the impression that there is a quick succession of concrete and dynamic events, which is relatable in terms of ordinary experience.

For example, the part of (2) that tells of the encounter and the cavalry charge may be compared to the following passage:

- (3) καὶ ἡμῖν **συμβαίνει** ἀναστρέφουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Φερρεφαττίου καὶ περιπατοῦσιν πάλιν κατ' αὐτό πως τὸ Λεωκόριον εἶναι, καὶ τούτοις **περιτυγχάνομεν**. ὡς δ' ἀνemeίχθημεν, εἷς μὲν αὐτῶν, ἀγνώως τις, Φανοστράτῳ **προστίπτει** καὶ κατεῖχεν ἐκεῖνον.

And it so **happens** that we, as we {turn back} from the temple of Persephone and {walk around}, are right about at the Leocorion, and we **happen upon** them. As we mingled, one of them, unknown to us, **falls upon** Phanostratus and held him down.

(Demosthenes, *Against Conon* [54] 8)

⁵ On the cognitive parameters of experientiality, see Fludernik (1996), (2003). On the theoretical issues connected to the understanding of narrative experientiality adopted in this study, see Introduction, Section I.2.2 with note 4.

As in (2), there is a chance meeting (compare the present περιτυγχάνομεν ['happen upon'] in [3] to περιτυγχάνουσι ['happen upon'] in [2]) and an attack (προσπίπτει ['falls upon'] in [3], ἐμβάλλουσι ['charge'] in [2]). The only difference is that the events are 'downscaled' in (3): they take up less time, there are fewer participants and they occupy a smaller space. The effect of the presentation of the events in (2) is to convey the sense of immediacy associated with scenic narrative, which is what we observe in (3). Similarly, the present ἐκκόπτουσι ('knock away') in (2) construes an internally complex event in terms of simple manual action.⁶ All in all, the use of the present for preterite in (2) cannot be unambiguously assigned to either the mimetic or the diegetic category: it has aspects of both.

Further along the scale of diegesis are passages that seem more like summaries than actual narratives. Consider the following example:

- (4) ἐπει δὲ ἐτελεύτησε Δαρείου καὶ κατέστη εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν Ἄρταξέρξης, Τισσαφέρνης **διαβάλλει** τὸν Κύρον πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὡς ἐπιβουλεύει αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ **πείθεται** καὶ **συλλαμβάνει** Κύρον ὡς ἀποκτενῶν· ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ἐξαιτησαμένη αὐτὸν **ἀποπέμπει** πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν.

After Darius died and Artaxerxes was installed as king, Tissaphernes **falsely accuses** Cyrus to his brother of plotting against him. Artaxerxes **is persuaded** and **arrests** Cyrus, intending to kill him. But the mother, after [successfully] begging for his release, **sends** him back to his dominion.

(Xenophon, *Expedition of Cyrus* 1.1.3)

Here the richness of reality is reduced to a 'mere backbone' of a story (Fludernik [1996: 28]). As dry and uninvolved as this passage may seem, however, aspects of experientiality may be identified: human agency, intentional action and action-reaction patterns.⁷ Fludernik (1996: 29) argues that '[h]uman experience typically embraces goal-oriented behaviour and activity, with its reaction to obstacles along the way' and that a 'three-part schema of "situation-event(incidence)-reaction to event" . . . constitutes the core of all human action experience'. The narrative in (4) appeals to such experiential schemas: Tissaphernes' accusation initiates an action-reaction sequence where Artaxerxes arrests Cyrus, which prompts

⁶ For a 'downscaled' example with a comparable verb, see Lys. *fr.* 279 (Carey [2007]) ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔνδον ἐγενόμεθα, ἐμὲ μὲν **ἐκβάλλουσιν** ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ('when we got inside, they **throw** me out of the house'). Similarly, καταφεύγουσιν ('flee') in (2) can be compared to καταφεύγει ('flees') in Hdt. 3.78, where someone flees into a room during a fight.

⁷ This is not yet 'zero-degree narrativity' (Stanzel [1989: chapter 2]). I will discuss the use of the present for preterite in those contexts in Chapter 4.

the mother to rescue her son. A similar sequence in a scenic context can be found in Euripides, *Heracles* 994–7, which I discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.6.2: Heracles goes off to kill his third son, but the mother snatches him away to another room and closes the door. Through such an association, the narrative in (4) arguably still retains something of the character of embodied experience, although in highly attenuated form.

To conclude, the mimetic present in scenic narrative and the diegetic present in summary narrative should be considered prototype categories. The relation between these two categories may be understood in terms of a balance between the parameters of experientiality and communicative dynamism. In Chapter 2, I argued that the mimetic present should be explained mainly in terms of experientiality, with communicative dynamism acting as a moderating influence on its use. In summary narrative, on the other hand, the ‘dynamics of experientiality’ are, to a greater or lesser degree, ‘cancelled’ (Fludernik [1996: 28]), and the function of the present for preterite is to be understood mainly in terms of the impact of the designated event on the story structure. At the same time, experientiality may remain a factor that finds expression in such variables as animacy of the subject, voice, number, et cetera (Allan [2011a: 40–2], with reference to Wårvik [2004]). In this chapter, however, I will not focus on those aspects.

3.1.2 Selection of Material

In Sections 3.3–3.5 of this chapter, I will present quantitative analyses to support my claim that the diegetic present is structurally associated with certain discourse functions. In Chapter 2, I tried to isolate potentially mimetic uses of the present for preterite by selecting a corpus of eyewitness narratives in drama (Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1.1). The diegetic use of the present for preterite is associated with summary narrative, and this is what we typically find in historiography.

I have selected as my corpus Thucydides’ *Histories*,⁸ Xenophon’s *Hellenic affairs* (which continues Thucydides’ work) and Xenophon’s *Expedition of Cyrus* (perhaps better known by its Greek title *Anabasis*). Two main omissions deserve mention. First, I have excluded Herodotus’ *Histories*. The problem with this work is that it exhibits a great variety of narrative styles, which makes it harder to zoom in on a particular usage of

⁸ I have excluded the ‘archaeology’ (1.1–23) and the description of the colonisation of Sicily (6.1–5) because these are not straightforwardly narrative passages.

the present for preterite here. Also, I have excluded Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus* because it is often anecdotal and educational rather than historiographical.⁹

I have included all present for preterite forms in the selected texts, except those that fit the criteria for exclusion as specified in Section 2.1.1.2 of Chapter 2 and in the Appendix.¹⁰ These amount to a total of 1,190 (Thucydides' *Histories*: 546; Xenophon's *Hellenic affairs*: 265; *Expedition of Cyrus*: 379). For the contrastive corpus, I have selected the first 50 aorist forms in each book of these works that did not fit the criteria for exclusion. These amount to 400 for Thucydides and 350 for each of the works of Xenophon, to a total of 1,100 aorist forms.

I have discussed the issues associated with performing quantitative analysis on Classical Greek texts in Section 2.1.1.3 of Chapter 2. It should at all times be remembered that the *p*-values reported here have not been corrected in any way and that they only represent the intrinsic probability of the occurrence of a reported distribution. As I have explained, the point of this is to give an indication of the markedness of a distribution as a function of the effect size and the quantity of the data.

Another issue is the heterogeneity of the data: each of the three historiographical works constitutes its own group. While Thucydides' *Histories* and Xenophon's *Hellenic affairs* seem similar in character with respect to the mimesis-diegesis opposition, Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus* is generally more vivid. I therefore present the results for the individual works, except when there are very few cases in one of the categories of the predictor variable (as in Section 3.4.3).

3.2 *Deixis and the Discourse Space*

The main argument in this chapter is that the diegetic present for preterite is used to signal to the addressees that they are to update their mental model of the discourse in the light of salient changes in its structure. In this section, I will expound this argument in more theoretical detail.

What is the nature of our mental model of an evolving discourse? Two aspects are central to the argument in this chapter. First, the discourse is conceived as a *segmented* structure that is hierarchically organised.¹¹ For

⁹ There are only about 150 present for preterite forms in this large work.

¹⁰ Here I have also excluded atelic verbs (contrast Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1.2, note 24; in the present sample the procedure was relatively straightforward).

¹¹ Asher and Lascarides (2003) provide a formal semantic account of discourse segmentation. Functional Discourse Grammar defines a minimal unit of discourse organisation, the *discourse*

example, in episodic narrative (see Section 3.4.2, with references) a distinction can be made between individual narrative assertions, one or more assertions that make up a substructure within an episode ('orientation', 'complication', 'peak') and episodes as a whole.

Crucially, a narrative discourse segment can be conceived as an object that is presently available for consideration. I will illustrate this, first, with an example from the Classical Greek corpus. In the following passage, Helen tells Menelaus the story of Paris' judgement:

- (5) ἔκρινε τρισσὸν ζεῦγος ὄδε τριῶν θεῶν·
 καὶ Παλλάδος μὲν ἦν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δόσις
 Φρυγί στρατηγοῦνθ' Ἑλλάδ' ἐξανιστάναι·
 "Ἡρα δ' ὑπέσχετ' Ἀσιάδ' Εὐρώπης θ' ὄρους
 τυραννίδ' ἔξειν, εἴ σφε κρίνειεν Πάρις·
 Κύπρις δὲ τοῦμόν εἶδος ἐκπαγλουμένη
 δώσειν ὑπέσχετ', εἰ θεὰς ὑπερδράμοι
 κάλλει. τὸν ἔνθεν δ' ὡς ἔχει σκέψαι λόγον·
 νικᾷ Κύπρις θεάς.

This man [Alexander, aka Paris] judged the trio of goddesses.
 Pallas' gift to Alexander was to lead
 the Phrygians in a military expedition and upheave Greece;
 Hera promised that he would hold supreme rule over Asia
 and the bounds of Europe, if Paris chose her;
 and Cypris, praising my form exceedingly,
promised to give me to him, if she would outrun the goddesses
 in beauty. Consider the story (λόγον) from that point:
 Cypris **beats** the goddesses.

(Euripides, *Trojan Women* 924–32)

The culminating event in the narrative is Paris' decision in favour of Cypris (Aphrodite). Helen introduces this segment by explicitly asking Menelaus to 'consider' (σκέψαι) the next development in the discourse (note 933 λόγον, abstractly 'meaningful verbal structure', i.e., 'discourse' or 'story'). The impact of the narrated event on the discourse structure is then highlighted by the present for preterite νικᾷ ('beats').

There is also evidence from gesture studies for the conceptualisation of discourse segments as objects available for consideration in the present. Parrill (2012: 102–3) discusses an example where the speaker uses a *presenting gesture*, extending her lower arm, palm facing up, as she is

act, as distinct from the *move*, the 'largest unit of interaction relevant to grammatical analysis' (Hengeveld and MacKenzie [2008: 50–68, quotation from p. 50]; see also Hannay and Kroon [2005]).

narrating an event. Parrill (with reference to Parrill and Sweetser [2004]) argues that the metaphoric interpretation of this gesture is that ‘the speaker is presenting an object to the listener for inspection’, with the object being ‘interpreted as a segment of discourse’. The point is that the objectification of discourse segments facilitates the construal of past events as occurring in the present through the medium of this discourse.

The second constituent of the mental model of the discourse that is relevant to my analysis is the *referent*. Updating the mental discourse model involves keeping track of the referents evoked, in terms of both their activation status and their role or function.¹² Consider the following passage:

- (6) Μῆδεια ἀνδρῶν τυράννων κῆδος ἠράσθη λαβεῖν.
 Αἰγέυς δίδωσι δ’ αὐτῷ τίς; πέραινέ μοι λόγον.
 Μη. Κρέων, ὃς ἄρχει τῆσδε γῆς Κορινθίας.

MEDEA: He desired to acquire kinship with tyrants.

AEGEUS: And who **gives** [his daughter] to him? Continue the discourse (λόγον).

MEDEA: Creon, who rules this Corinthian land.

(Euripides, *Medea* 700–2)

Aegeus asks Medea to update the discourse (701 πέραινέ μοι λόγον [‘continue the discourse’]) by identifying a new referent. I argue that the use of the present for preterite δίδωσι (‘gives’) reflects the speaker’s increased engagement with the discourse at this point where a significant change in its structure occurs (compare Schuren [2014: 127–59] on the present for preterite in ‘narrative dialogue’).

The present forms in examples (5) and (6) illustrate what I will argue are the two main discourse-structural functions of the diegetic present for preterite: marking changes in the narrative dynamic (Section 3.4) and marking changes in the status of referents (Section 3.5). In these examples, the construal of the designated past events as immediately accessible in the discourse is hinted at by the explicit mention of the λόγος (‘discourse’). In the following sections, I will argue that this construal is generally implicit when the present for preterite is used. My argument will be based on an analogy between the present for preterite and the use of proximal demonstratives to refer to distal events and entities. In Section 3.2.1, I will briefly explain the demonstrative system in Classical Greek with specific reference to discourse deixis. In the following sections, I draw an analogy between the use of proximal demonstratives and the use of the present for preterite

¹² On activation status and accessibility, see, e.g., Fretheim and Gundel (1996); Ariel (2001); Cornish (2010), (2011); Allan (2014); Kroon (2017).

at salient narrative developments (Section 3.2.2) and at the introduction of referents (Section 3.2.3).

3.2.1 *Demonstratives and the Discourse in Classical Greek*

Unlike English and other Western-European languages, the Classical Greek system of demonstratives has a tripartite division along the proximal-distal axis (e.g., Ruijgh [2006]).¹³ These categories are typically characterised in terms of *I-deixis*, *you-deixis* and *him-deixis*. (This goes back to Brugmann [1904].) Demonstratives of the first category designate *immediate proximity* to the speaker and are translated with ‘this’. The morphological marker in Classical Greek is the suffix -δε, as in τό-δε (‘this [thing]’), ἐνθὲν-δε (‘from here’). For the second category, I use the term *relative proximity*, as it focuses on the accessibility of the designated entity to the addressee. In English, these demonstratives can be translated with ‘this’ or ‘that’ depending on the context (for clarity’s sake I have consistently translated with ‘that’). These forms can be recognised by the morpheme του-, τῶ-, or τευ-, as in τοῦ-το (‘that [thing]’) ἐν-τεῦ-θεν (‘from there’). Finally, demonstratives derived from the basic adverb ἐκεῖ (‘there’), e.g., ἐκεῖ-νο (‘that [thing]’), ἐκεῖ-θεν (‘from there’), designate *distance* from the speaker and addressee and are translated with ‘that’.¹⁴

Our main concern here is how this system relates to discourse deixis, which is concerned not with the actual spatio-temporal proximity of entities but with the accessibility of referents in the discourse. The distinction that is important to my argument is that between immediate and relative proximity. When referring to entities that are accessible from the previous discourse, the unmarked option is a demonstrative designating relative proximity.¹⁵ Consider the following example:

- (7) κάλυπτεν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου κατερράγη
 “Ἑλληνιστῶν ἐκ τριῶν λαϊκαστριῶν.

And from there_{RELPROX} the beginning of the war broke out
 for all the Greeks because of three cocksuckers.

(Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 527–8)

¹³ Kemmerer (1999: 47–51) presents an overview of different types of demonstrative systems across languages.

¹⁴ A suffix -ι (‘deictic iota’) can be added to pronouns and adverbs belonging to the first two categories to emphasise the accessibility of the designated entity, usually as physically present in the actual environment. For example, τοδ-ι (‘this [thing] here’), τουτ-ι (‘that [thing] over there’).

¹⁵ That is, ‘unmarked’ with respect to the other types of demonstratives; the use of a demonstrative is in itself marked with respect to the use of enclitic anaphoric pronouns or zero anaphora.

The use of the pronoun ἐντεῦθεν ('from there') signals that the designated time frame needs to be retrieved from the preceding discourse. It thus signals a measure of distance to this time frame. Contrast the reference to the beginning of the same war in Thucydides' *Histories*:

- (8) Ἄρχεται δὲ ὁ πόλεμος ἐνθένδε ἤδη Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων καὶ τῶν ἑκατέροις ξυμμάχων, ἐν ᾧ οὔτε ἐπεμείγνυντο ἔτι ἀκρυκτεῖ παρ' ἀλλήλους καταστάντες τε ξυνεχῶς ἐπολέμου.

From here_{IMMPROX} then **begins** the war between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians and the allies of both, in which they did not mingle with each other without the intervention of heralds and, once begun, waged war continuously.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 2.1.1)

As I argued in Chapter 1, Section 1.7, the use of the demonstrative ἐνθένδε ('from here'), designating immediate proximity, reflects the strong involvement of the narrator with the present development in the discourse.¹⁶ The use of this adverb to mark discourse progression is exceptional in Classical Greek prose.¹⁷ I suggest that its use here can be explained in terms of the exceptional discourse status of the designated event, that is, the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, which is the subject of the entire treatise. The present tense form ἀρχεται ('begins') further highlights the present accessibility of the war in the medium of the discourse.

As I argued in Chapter 1, this type of accessibility of distal entities through an intervening medium should be distinguished from the type of accessibility that is achieved through mental displacement. In this respect, I disagree with Ruijgh's (2006) account, which is otherwise illuminating, when he discusses a passage in Sophocles' *King Oedipus*. Jocasta has just mentioned that King Laius was killed at a fork in the road (716). This leads Oedipus to the realisation that he himself was the killer (726–48). He then tells how it happened. In this narrative, we find the following passage:

- (9) στείχων δ' ἰκνοῦμαι τούσδε τοὺς χώρους ἐν οἷς
σὺ τὸν τύραννον τοῦτον ὄλλυσθαι λέγεις.

On my journey I **arrive** at this place_{IMMPROX} in which you say that tyrant perished.

(Sophocles, *King Oedipus* 798–9)

¹⁶ Compare Ruijgh (2006: 151) who refers to Kühner and Gerth (1898: 644) and Lyons (1977: 677).

¹⁷ In drama, see E. *HF* 1001 κἀνθένδε πρὸς γέροντος ἱππεύει φόνον ('and from here he gallops to murder the old man'). Compare the expression ἐν τῷδε ('in this moment') in narrative in drama (e.g., E. *Hipp.* 1194; *Supp.* 707; *IT* 281).

Ruijgh (2006: 152) cites with approval earlier commentators who argued that the use of the demonstrative τοῦσδε ('these') suggests that the place is before Oedipus' mind's eye. As Ruijgh has it, 'Oedipus relives with anxiety the scene he describes'. This is supposedly corroborated by the 'vivid' use of the present for preterite ἰκνοῦμαι ('arrive'). I agree that the use of the expression τοῦσδε τοὺς χώρους ('this place') reflects the close involvement of Oedipus with the designated entity: the location of the murder has been a discourse topic for some time, and it is crucial to Oedipus' realisation that he is the killer. But this does not imply mental displacement to the designated location. Similarly, the function of the present for preterite ἰκνοῦμαι ('arrive') can be explained as discourse-structural, introducing a new phase in the narrative (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.4.1).¹⁸ In the absence of positive linguistic cues for a displacement scenario, such an interpretation is more economical.

3.2.2 Narrative Structure: Beginnings and Culminations

In the previous section, I discussed Thucydides' use of the adverb ἐνθένδε ('from here') to introduce new developments in the narrative. Here I will discuss a similar use of a demonstrative designating immediate proximity in the context of a local episode. This will illustrate the importance of discourse structure to the dynamics of tense-switching. At some point in the second book, Thucydides narrates a military expedition undertaken by the Ampraciots against Amphilochia:

- (10) Κατὰ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους, τοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος, καὶ Ἀμπρακιῶται αὐτοὶ τε καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων πολλοὺς ἀναστήσαντες ἐστράτευσαν ἐπ' Ἄργος τὸ Ἀμφιλοχικὸν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἀμφιλοχίαν.

Around the same time, the summer ending, the Ampraciots – they themselves together with many of the barbaric tribes – made an expedition against Argos in Amphilochia, and against Amphilochia generally.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 2.68.1)

This is followed by a digression in which Thucydides explains whence the enmity between these peoples originated (2.68.2–8). After this, the narrative is resumed in the following manner:

¹⁸ Compare the frequent use of the present for preterite of ἀφικνεῖσθαι ('arrive') in historiography (for Thucydides see Lallot [2011]).

- (11) οἱ δὲ Ἀμπρακιῶται τὴν μὲν ἔχθραν ἐς τοὺς Ἀργεῖους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδραποδισμοῦ σφῶν αὐτῶν πρῶτον ἐποιήσαντο, ὕστερον δὲ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τήνδε τὴν στρατείαν **ποιοῦνται** αὐτῶν τε καὶ Χαόνων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν τῶν πλησιοχώρων βαρβάρων.

The Ampraciots first conceived their enmity against the Argives from their having been enslaved by them; and later in the war, they **make** this_{IMMPROX} expedition, manned by themselves and the Chaones and some other neighbouring barbarian tribes.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 2.68.9)

In the passage where the expedition is first mentioned, the reference is unambiguously to the past event space, as signalled by the adverbial phrase *κατὰ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους* ('around the same time') and the past tense form *ἐστράτευσαν* ('made an expedition'). After the digression, however, things become more interesting. We still have an adverbial phrase designating the past event space: *ὕστερον δὲ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ* ('later in the war'). At the same time, the demonstrative *τήνδε* ('this') highlights the immediate accessibility of the expedition in the discourse: it is *this expedition we are now talking about*. The present for preterite *ποιοῦνται* ('make') designates the present 'occurrence' of this expedition in the discourse. The variation between the present here and the aorist at 2.68.1 reflects the difference in discourse status of the designated expedition in the two instances. At 2.68.1, Thucydides mentions that there was an expedition but immediately breaks off the narrative to provide background information to the conflict. Only at 2.68.9 does the narrative of the expedition begin. I submit that this sharp discourse-structural relief motivates the use of the demonstrative *τήνδε* ('this') and the present tense form *ποιοῦνται* ('make') here.¹⁹

My claim is that the present for preterite by itself can carry the implication that the past event is presently accessible in the discourse. Consider the following example:

- (12) Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ χειμῶνος Μεγαρῆς τε τὰ μακρὰ τείχη, ἃ σφῶν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι εἶχον, κατέσκαψαν ἐλόντες ἐς ἔδαφος, καὶ Βρασίδας μετὰ τὴν Ἀμφιπόλεως ἄλωσιν ἔχων τοὺς συμμαχοὺς **στρατεύει** ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀκτὴν καλουμένην.

The same winter, the Megarians razed the long walls, which had been occupied by the Athenians, to the foundations; and Brasidas, after the

¹⁹ One may compare Dancygier's (2011: 191–2) observations concerning the 'resumptive' use of the adverb *now* in narrative. See also Kroon (2017) on the use of the Latin pronoun *hic* ('this') at discourse boundaries.

capture of Amphipolis, **makes an expedition** with the allied forces against the area called Acte.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 4.109.1)

As in 2.68.9, the present tense form στρατεύει ('makes an expedition') signals the start of a military expedition. By highlighting the 'present occurrence' of the expedition in the story, Thucydides signals to his addressees that they are to update their mental model of the discourse at this start of new developments.

The following pair of examples illustrates the discourse-as-representation construal at the *culmination* of narrative developments. First, consider the following passage:

- | | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| (13) Χορός | μη και λόγος τις Ζῆνα μειχθῆναι βροτῶι; | |
| βασιλεύς | κᾶκρυπτά γ' Ἡρας ταῦτα τᾶμπαλάγματ' ἦν. | 296 |
| Χο. | πῶς οὖν τελευτᾶ βασιλέων νείκη τάδε; | 298 |
| Βα. | βοῦν τῆν γυναικ' <u>ἔθηκεν</u> Ἀργεῖα θεός. | |

CHORUS: And isn't there some story that Zeus had intercourse with a mortal?

KING: Yes, and those_{RELPROX} entanglements were not hidden from Hera.

CHORUS: So how **does** this_{IMMPROX} dispute between the king and queen **end**?

KING: The goddess of Argos turned the woman into a cow.
(Aeschylus, *Suppliant women* 295–9)

The chorus of Egyptian suppliants introduce the story of how Zeus had intercourse with Io. The king of Athens affirms he knows the story. In his reaction to the chorus in line 296, he uses the past tense form ἦν ('were') to designate the past event space. The pronoun ταῦτα ('those'), designating relative proximity, similarly suggests a measure of distance to the events in the story ('those entanglements you just mentioned'). By contrast, the chorus, in the next line, highlight the immediate accessibility of the dispute between Zeus and Hera through the medium of the discourse, both by the pronoun τάδε ('this') and by the present tense τελευτᾶ ('ends').²⁰ This difference in referential strategy relates to two aspects. First, the chorus are talking about an important change in the structure of the story, that is, a culminating point, while the king refers to a situation. Second, the story is of crucial rhetorical importance to the chorus, as their descent from Io (the 'mortal' from the story) legitimises

²⁰ Compare A. *Ch.* 528 καὶ ποῖ τελευτᾶ καὶ καρανοῦται λόγος; ('and where does the story [λόγος] end and reach its fulfilment?')

their present claim for asylum.²¹ The king, on the other hand, still unsure whether to grant the chorus their wish, is more reserved.

Now compare the use of the present for preterite to highlight the climax of a dispute in the following passage:

- (14) ὥστ' εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον ὥστε καὶ χεροῖν
 κολεῶν ἐρυστὰ διεπεραιώθη ξίφη.
λήγει δ' ἔρις δραμοῦσα τοῦ προσωτάτω
 ἀνδρῶν γερόντων ἐν ξυναλλαγῇ λόγου.

So that they went so far as to even
draw with their hands the swords from their sheaths.
 But the dispute **ends**, after having ran to the furthest point,
 in an exchange of words between old men.

(Sophocles, *Ajax* 729–32)

The expression λήγει ἔρις ('the dispute ends') is, for all present purposes, synonymous to τελευτᾷ νείκη ('[this] dispute ends') in example (13). In that case, we saw how the immediate accessibility of this event in the discourse was highlighted by the demonstrative τᾶδε ('this'). In (14), the present for preterite λήγει ('ends') carries this implication by itself. Its function is to signal a significant update to our mental model of the discourse, that is, the culmination of the current discourse segment.

3.2.3 *Introducing Referents*

The introduction of new referents impacts our mental model of the discourse in analogous fashion to the introduction of new narrative developments. A salient example of the use of demonstratives at the introduction of new referents is the following:

- (15) Δημοσθένης ὁ χρησμός ἀντικρυς λέγει
 ὡς πρῶτα μὲν στυππειοπώλης **γίγνεται**,
 ὃς πρῶτος ἔξει τῆς πόλεως τὰ πράγματα.
 Νικίας εἷς οὔτοσι πώλης. τί τούντεῦθεν; λέγε.
 Δη. μετὰ τοῦτον αὐθις προβατοπώλης δεύτερος.
 Νι. δύο τῶδε πώλα. καὶ τί τόνδε χρή παθεῖν;
 Δη. κρατεῖν, ἕως ἕτερος ἀνὴρ βδελυρῶτερος
 αὐτοῦ γένοιτο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' **ἀπόλλυται**.

²¹ The chorus tell the story of Io in a choral song (524–99). The story is remarkably full of present forms (542 φεύγει ['flees'], 546 ὀρίζει ['divides'], 547 ἰάπτει ['rushes'], 549 περᾶ ['crosses'], 556 ἰκνεῖται ['reaches'], 578 παύεται ['is stopped'], 578–9 ἀποστάζει ['causes to drip']). This can be explained in terms of a mythography scenario (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2) and, again, the rhetorical importance of the story to the suppliants' cause.

- DEMOSTHENES: The oracle clearly says
that first an oakum-seller **arises**,
who will be the first to control the affairs of the city.
- NICIAS: That there_{RELPROX} is one seller. What
[happens] from there_{RELPROX}? Tell me.
- DEMOSTHENES: A sheep-seller [will be] the second after him.
- NICIAS: These_{IMMPROX} are two sellers. And what is
fated to happen to this one_{IMMPROX}?
- DEMOSTHENES: To hold power, until another, more
disgusting man than him arises; after that he
perishes.

(Aristophanes, *Knights* 128–35)

Demosthenes tells Nicias of the people who will rise to political prominence in the future. The first new referent introduced into the discourse is an oakum-seller. In his reaction, Nicias uses demonstratives designating relative proximity to designate the new referent (131 ούτοσί [‘that (man) there’]) and to mark discourse progression (τοῦντεῦθεν [‘from there’]). When the second participant is introduced, however, Nicias switches to demonstratives designating immediate proximity (133 τῶδε [‘these two (men)’], τόνδε [‘this (man)’]). The switch seems to reflect Nicias’ increased engagement with the discourse at this point, as it moves closer to the part that is actually relevant to his present situation. Moreover, at 131, Nicias immediately moves on, while here he asks for further information about the new referent. In any case, Nicias’ interruptions show how keeping track of referents is a processing task that occurs ‘here and now’ during the unfolding of the discourse. My argument is that such changes in the status of referents render the discourse structure cognitively salient, which facilitates the use of the present for preterite.²²

Two pairs of passages will serve to make the connection between the accessibility of referents in the discourse and the use of the present for preterite more evident. In the following example, Agamemnon, stranded at Aulis, tells the audience the events leading up to the expedition to Troy:

- (16) ἔλθῶν δ’ ἐκ Φρυγῶν ὁ τὰς θεὰς
κρίνας ὄδ’, ὡς ὁ μῦθος ἀνθρώπων ἔχει,

²² Note the ‘oracular’ use of the present tense to refer to future events (129 γίνεται [‘arises’], 135 ἀπόλλυται [‘perishes’]; compare Porter [1989: 230–3]; Fanning [1990: 221–6]; Mathewson [2010: 67–74] [all on the New Testament]). This construal of future events as presently accessible depends upon the assumption that the future is somehow ‘scheduled’ (compare, e.g., Langacker [2011]). In the present case, the ‘schedule’ is constituted by the text of the oracle: the future is ‘present’ in the text. See also Chapter 4 on the ‘registering’ present. (The future tense form ἐξεῖ [‘will control’] in 130 is probably chosen because of the stative actionality of the verb.)

Λακεδαίμον’, . . .

ἔρων ἔρωσαν ὥχ_{ετ}’ ἔξαναρπάσας

‘Ἐλένην πρὸς Ἴδης βούσταθμ’, ἔκδημον λαβῶν

Μενέλαον.

This man_{I_{MM}PROX}, the one who judged the goddesses
– as the story told by men goes – coming from the Phrygians
to Lacedaemon, . . .

went back carrying off Helen, the object of a
mutual desire, to the pastures of the Ida, as he had found
Menelaus away from home.

(Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Aulis* 71–3, 75–7)

The demonstrative ὄδε (‘this man’) in line 71 signals that the introduction of the referent is something that should be immediately attended to: Paris is ‘here’ as he enters the discourse at this point.²³ Now compare the following instance of the present for preterite introducing a new referent:

- (17) Ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους τούτους . . . **καταπλεῖ** δεῦρο ἐξ
Ἐλλησπόντου Ἡγήσανδρος, περὶ οὗ πάλαι εὔ οἶδ’ ὅτι θαυμάζετε
διότι οὐ μέμνημαι· οὕτως ἐναργές ἐστιν ὁ ἔρω.

During that same period . . . **arrives** here from the Hellespont
Hegesandrus – I’m sure you’ve been wondering for a long time why
I have not mentioned him; so vivid is [the memory of] what I am
about to say.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 55)

The present tense marks the arrival of Hegesandrus, both as a character on the scene in the story world, and as a referent in the discourse. Like Paris in example (16), Hegesandrus will be the cause of conflict in the narrative. The familiarity of the audience with this new discourse referent, which Aeschines emphasises, is another similarity.

For my second pair, I reproduce example (6) cited above:

- (18) Μήδεια ἀνδρῶν τυράννων κῆδος ἠράσθη λαβεῖν.
Αἰγεύς **δίδωσι** δ’ αὐτῷ τίς; πέρανέ μοι λόγον.
Μη. Κρέων, ὃς ἄρχει τῆσδε γῆς Κορινθίας.

²³ Such uses are common in English (*Then this man walks in*): compare, e.g., Ruijgh (2006: 152); Dancygier and Vandelanotte (2016). In Classical Greek, this is exceptional. Perhaps this use is here supported by the fact that Paris is generally known, as Agamemnon emphasises in the context: his role in the judgement of the goddesses is already an established μῦθος (‘story/myth’) among men. Interestingly, the demonstrative ὄδε (‘this [man]’) is used at E. *Hel.* 924 (example [5]) as well to refer to Paris in the context of the judgement of the goddesses.

- MEDEA: He desired to acquire kinship with tyrants.
 AEGEUS: And who **gives** [his daughter] to him? Continue the discourse (λόγος).
 MEDEA: Creon, who rules this Corinthian land.
 (Euripides, *Medea* 700–2)

Aegeus asks Medea to update the discourse by identifying a referent whose existence he infers from her preceding assertion. At this point, Aegeus explicitly evokes the λόγος ('discourse'). A comparable use of the present for preterite is found, again, in Aeschines' speech *Against Timarchus* (compare example [17]). Aeschines seeks to establish that Timarchus has prostituted himself to different men in Athens. At the beginning of the narrative, Aeschines announces he will focus on the men in whose house Timarchus has lived (section 40 of the speech). The second of these men is a certain Anticles, and he is introduced in the following manner:

- (19) Ἐπειδὴ τοῖνυν ὁ Μισγόλας τῇ τε δαπάνῃ ἀπέπειπε καὶ τοῦτον ἐξέπεμψε παρ' ἑαυτοῦ, μετὰ τοῦτον **ἀναλαμβάνει** αὐτὸν Ἀντικλῆς Καλλίου Εὐωνυμέως.

Now, when Misgolas could no longer support the expenses and sent the defendant away, after him Anticles, son of Callias, of Euonymon, **takes him up**.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 53)

As at *Medea* 701 (example [18]), the present for preterite serves to identify a referent whose existence is presupposed in the discourse (because Misgolas was only the first to take up Timarchus). It is instructive to contrast the use of the aorist of the same verb not much later in the same speech, when another person takes Timarchus into his house:

- (20) τῶν δὲ ἐκ τῆς διατριβῆς ταύτης ἐστὶ τις Πιττάλακος, ἄνθρωπος δημόσιος οἰκέτης τῆς πόλεως. οὗτος εὐπορῶν ἀργυρίου καὶ ἰδὼν τοῦτον ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ, ἀνέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔσχε παρ' ἑαυτοῦ.

One of the men who spends his time there is a certain Pittalacus, a public servant of the city. That man, being financially well-to-do, and seeing the defendant spending his time there, took him up and kept him by himself.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 54)

Here, the assertion containing the verb ἀνέλαβεν ('took up') is lower in information status than was the case with ἀναλαμβάνει ('takes up') in (19),

because the new referent has already been introduced in a separate, non-narrative clause.²⁴

3.2.4 Conclusion

In this section, I have presented a theoretical account of the diegetic present for preterite in terms of the discourse as a representation space: the designated events are construed as immediately accessible through the medium of the discourse. Through this construal, the present for preterite signals to the addressees that they are to update their mental model of the discourse in the light of salient developments. Such developments concern either the segmentation of the discourse in terms of narrative structure or the status of referents.

In the next sections, I will argue in more detail that the present for preterite is structurally associated with certain pragmatic functions relating to discourse organization. In Section 3.3, I will discuss the use of the present for preterite in combination with certain attention-management strategies. In Sections 3.4 and 3.5, I will focus on two specific discourse-structural functions of the present for preterite: marking changes in the narrative dynamic (compare Section 3.2.2) and marking changes in the status of referents (compare Section 3.2.3).

3.3 Attention-Management Strategies

A central aspect of the use of the present for preterite in summary narrative is the presence of the narrator as a mediating instance guiding the addressees through the discourse. If the present serves to draw attention to the impact of the designated events on the structure of the evolving discourse, then it will tend to be used precisely when the interaction between the narrator and addressees becomes foregrounded.

In this section, I will describe a number of context types where this tendency becomes apparent. What the strategies discussed here have in common is that they involve some kind of *anticipation* of what follows.²⁵

²⁴ The same pattern is found earlier, in 41. Aeschines first introduces a referent, Misgolas, in a non-narrative sentence (using the present tense form ἔστι [‘there is’]). Then he tells how this man took Timarchus into his house: ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔσχε παρ’ ἑαυτῶ (‘he made him change his lodgings and kept him by himself’).

²⁵ For this ‘cataphoric’ function of the present for preterite, compare Levinsohn (2016: 171–2).

I begin with announcements of the next event in the narrative, typically with cataphoric pronouns (i.e., pronouns that refer to what follows; Section 3.3.1). Then I discuss the use of imperatives and questions to draw the audience's attention (Section 3.3.2). Next, I move to more implicit, grammatical ways of drawing attention to an event: complex clause structure (Section 3.3.3) and the use of the particle *δή* ('then', 'so') to mark discourse progression (Section 3.3.4). In the first two sections, I will rely mainly on illustrative examples, citing parallel passages in footnotes, but in the latter two sections, I will provide statistics as well.

3.3.1 *Announcements and Cataphoric Reference*

One way to call attention to the next event in the narrative is to anticipate it with an abstract reference. Consider the following two examples:

- (21) ὡς δὲ τοῦτου διήμαρτον, καὶ ἐγὼ μάρτυρας μὲν ὦν ἔπασχον ἐπιούμην, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἐξημάρτανον εἰς αὐτούς, ἐνταῦθα ἤδη μοι **ἐπιβουλεύουσι** τὴν μεγίστην ἐπιβουλήν.

When they failed in that, and I made witnesses of the things I was subjected to, and I myself did not misbehave in any way towards them, at that point they **contrive** their greatest scheme against me.

(Demosthenes, *Against Nicostratus* [53] 16)

- (22) ὁ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα **διοικεῖται** Λεώστρατος οὐτοσί, τοῦτο πάντων δεινότατόν ἐστιν.

What Leochares here **manages** after that is the most terrible thing of all.

(Demosthenes, *Against Leochares* [44] 40)

In both cases, we are not told immediately what actually happened, but the narrator heightens our anticipation by announcing the next event and emphasizing its remarkable character ([21] τὴν μεγίστην ἐπιβουλήν ['their greatest scheme']; [22] πάντων δεινότατον ['the most terrible thing of all']). These are moments of high narratorial mediation, and the present tense forms ἐπιβουλεύουσι ('contrive') and διοικεῖται ('manages') serve to focus the joint attention of the narrator and addressees on the next event in the discourse.²⁶

²⁶ Similar cases: Lys. 13.17 ἐπιβουλήν οὖν τοιαύτην **ἐπιβουλεύουσι** ('so they **contrive** a scheme of the following character'; the cataphoric use of the demonstrative τοιαύτην ['of that character'], designating relative proximity, is unusual); D. 34.6 πρᾶγμα **ποιεῖ** πάντων δεινότατον ('he

In similar introductions, we often find demonstratives designating immediate proximity used as cataphoric pronouns. Consider the following passage from Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus*, which marks a transition from one book to another:

- (23) Ὅσα μὲν δὴ ἐν τῇ ἀναβάσει ἐγένετο μέχρι τῆς μάχης, καὶ ὅσα μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς ἃς βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ σὺν Κύρῳ ἀναβάντες Ἕλληνες ἐποιήσαντο, καὶ ὅσα παραβάντος τὰς σπονδὰς βασιλέως καὶ Τισσαφέρους ἐπολεμήθη πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπακολουθοῦντος τοῦ Περσικοῦ στρατεύματος, ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ δεδήλωται.

... τὴν δ' εἰς τοὺς Καρδούχους ἐμβολὴν ὧδε ποιοῦνται, ἅμα μὲν λαθεῖν πειρώμενοι, ἅμα δὲ φθάσαι πρὶν τοὺς πολεμίους καταλαβεῖν τὰ ἄκρα.

What happened during the expedition inland until the battle, and [what happened] after the battle during the truce which the king and the Greeks who had gone on the expedition with Cyrus had made, and how, when the king and Tissaphernes had broken the truce, war was waged against the Greeks as the Persian army was following their rear, [all that] has been made clear in the previous discourse.

... The invasion into the territory of the Carduchians they **make** in this way_{IMMPROX} in part because they were trying to remain hidden, in part because they were trying to reach their goal before the enemy could take possession of the heights.

(Xenophon, *Expedition of Cyrus* 4.1.1 and 4)

This and other summary-like passages in this work are considered spurious, but that does not matter much to my argument. The point here is the variation between the past tense forms ἐγένετο ('happened') and ἐπολεμήθη ('war was waged'), on the one hand, and the present ποιοῦνται ('make'), on the other. All these verb forms designate events that actually took place in the past. With respect to the discourse space, however, a distinction is made between what has already been narrated (and is thus *past in the discourse* – note ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ ['in the previous discourse']) and that which will be narrated presently. The present tense form ποιοῦνται ('make'), together with the demonstrative ὧδε ('in this [i.e., the following] way'), signals that the following developments are the new focus of attention.

In example (23), the context makes clear that the reference of the present tense is to the discourse space, but in other cases, this is implicit.

commits a most outrageous act'), 38.39 πρᾶγμα ποιεῖ πάνδεινον ('he **commits** a totally outrageous act'); Hdt. 2.119 ἐπιτεχνᾶται πρῆγμα οὐκ ὄσιον ('he **contrives** an unholy scheme').

In the following passage, we have just been told that Xenophon had a portentous dream. Then the narrator comments:

- (24) ὁποῖόν τι μὲν δὴ ἔστι τὸ τοιοῦτον ὄναρ ἰδεῖν ἕξεισι σκοπεῖν ἐκ τῶν συμβάντων μετὰ τὸ ὄναρ. **γίγνεται** γὰρ τάδε.

What it means to see a dream like that – it is possible to consider based on what happened after the dream. For this_{IMMPROX} **happens**.

(Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.1.13)

The narrator invites the audience to ‘consider’ (σκοπεῖν) what happens next. The phrase γίγνεται γὰρ τάδε (‘for this [i.e., the following] happens’) reinforces this strategy of directing the audience’s attention to the next event in the narrative.²⁷

3.3.2 *Interacting with the Audience*

A second class of attention-management strategies involves explicitly addressing the audience. In oratory, we find the present for preterite a number of times in rhetorical questions of the type *Then what does X do?* An example:

- (25) περὶ δὲ τῶν ὑπολοίπων εὐθύς ἐπεβούλευον καὶ πάντων δεινότατον πρᾶγμα κατεσκευάσαν, ᾧ ἄξιόν ἐστι προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν. Ὀρώντες γὰρ τὸν Εὐκτῆμονα κομιδῇ ἀπειρηκότα ὑπὸ γήρωσ καὶ οὐδ’ <ἐκ> τῆς κλίνης ἀνίστασθαι δυνάμενον, ἐσκόπουν ὅπως καὶ τελευτήσαντος ἐκείνου δι’ αὐτῶν ἔσοιτο ἡ οὐσία. Καὶ τί **ποιοῦσιν**; **Ἀπογράφουσι** τῷ παῖδι τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα ὡς εἰσποιήτω τοῖς τοῦ Εὐκτῆμονος ἕσι τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν, ἐπιγράψαντες σφᾶς αὐτοῦς ἐπιτρόπους.

They immediately began scheming to get the rest [of the property], and they contrived a most outrageous plot, which it is worth paying attention to. Seeing that Euctemon was entirely worn out by old age and could not even raise from his bed, they considered how his property would be in their control after his death as well. And what

²⁷ The combination of cataphoric pronouns with the present for preterite is especially common with verbs meaning ‘contrive’, as in the phrase μηχανᾶται τοιάδε (‘X contrives a scheme of this character’). See Hdt. 1.21, 1.59, 1.60, 3.11, 4.201, 6.62, 7.239; Th. 4.46.4, 5.45.2, 6.64.2, 7.73.3. With τεχνάομαι (‘contrive’, in composites): Hdt. 1.123, 2.2, 5.70. With σοφίζομαι (‘contrive’): Hdt. 8.27 (at 2.66 the present is generic). Compare X. *HG* 5.4.20 τοιόνδε εὐρίσκουσι μηχανήματα (‘they come up with a contrivance of this character’); Th. 2.75.6 τοιόνδε τι ἐπινοοῦσιν (‘they come up with something of this character’), 8.50.1 τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε τι (‘he turns to something of this kind’), 8.56.2 τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε εἶδος (‘he turns to something of this kind’).

do they **do**? They **register** these two boys with the archon as being adopted by the sons of Euctemon who had died, inscribing themselves as guardians.

(Isaeus, *On the Estate of Philoctemon* [6] 35–6)

The speaker characterises what happens in the next episode as ‘a most outrageous plot’ (πάντων δεινότατον πρᾶγμα) and notes that it is ‘worth paying attention to’ (ἄξιόν ἐστι προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν). In the narrative proper, he reinforces this strategy by focusing attention with a rhetorical question: καὶ τί ποιοῦσιν; (‘and what do they do?’) This question conveys the pretence that the construction of the narrative is a *joint activity* between the narrator and his audience. The use of the present tense underscores this joint engagement with the story.²⁸

It is instructive here to compare an instance of the present for preterite where the narratee actually participates in the construction of the narrative (‘narrative dialogue’, see Schuren [2014]):

(26) Δᾶος	ὁ τρόφιμος συναγαγὼν χρυσοῦς τινὰς ἑξακοσί]ους, ποτήρι' ἐπιεικῶς συχνά, τῶν τ' αἰχ]μαλῶτων τοῦτον ὄν ὄρᾳς πλησίον ὄχλον, ἄπο] πέμπει μ' εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ τῷ ξένῳ φράζει κ]αταλιπεῖν ταῦτα πρὸς θ' αὐτὸν πάλι [... ἄ]ναστρέφειν.
Σμικρίνης	τί οὔν δὴ γίνεται ;
ΔΑΟΣ:	My master {collected} some six hundred gold staters, a reasonably large amount of cups, and a crowd of captives, which you see here near. He sends me to Rhodes and tells me to leave these things with some friend of his, and then come back myself.
SMICRINES:	So what happens ?

(Menander, *The shield* 34–9)

²⁸ The other relevant examples are Lycurg. 85 τί ποιοῦσιν; (‘what do they do?’); D. 21.86 τί ποιεῖ; (‘what does he do?’), 23.171 τί ποιεῖ; (‘what does he do?’), 29.11 τί ποιῶ; (‘what do I do?’), 29.19 τί ποιῶ; (‘what do I do?’), 31.2 τί ποιεῖ; (‘what does he do?’). The only case of the aorist in such a question in a narrative context is D. 35.21–2 ταῦτα διαρρήδην γέγραπται, ὧ ἄνδρες δικάσασθαι. οὗτοι δὲ τί ἔποίησαν; (‘That is explicitly written [in the agreement], men of the jury. And what did those men do?’) Here the situation is different, because the narrative sequence is interrupted by a narratorial comment. Compare also D. 23.157 τί δὴ **συμβαίνει** παρ᾽αὐτῶν (‘so what **happens** immediately?’) An interesting parallel in English is found in P. G. Wodehouse, *Psmith in the city* (chapter 27): *What happens? Why, Willis, who fancies himself as a chauffeur, undertakes to do the driving; etc.*

The use of the present for preterite in the question τί οὖν δὴ γίνεται; ('so what happens?') reflects the close engagement of the narratee with the evolving discourse.

Another way to call for the audience's attention is to use an imperative (compare example [5]). In the following example, we find the combined use of an imperative and a rhetorical question (see also Nijk [2013a]):

- (27) εἰ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἰδίας ἔνεκ' ἔχθρας ἢ τοὺς Θετταλοὺς ἢ τοὺς Θηβαίους συμπεῖθοι βαδίζειν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, οὐδὲν' ἤγγεῖτο προσέξειν αὐτῶ τὸν νοῦν· ἔαν δὲ τὰς ἐκείνων κοινὰς προφάσεις λαβῶν ἡγεμῶν αἰρεθῆ, ῥᾶον ἤλπιξε τὰ μὲν παρακρούσεσθαι, τὰ δὲ πείσειν. τί οὖν; ἐπιχειρεῖ, θεάσασθ' ὡς εὖ, πόλεμον ποιῆσαι τοῖς Ἀμφικτύοσι καὶ περὶ τὴν Πυλαίαν ταραχήν.

Now, he [Philip] thought that, if he would try to persuade the Thessalians or the Thebans to march against you on account of his personal enmity, then no one would pay him heed; but if he would adopt their common grievances and be elected leader, then he expected he would be able to deceive them here, and persuade them there. What then? He **tries** – watch how cleverly! – to involve the Amphictyons in war and cause unrest for the Pylaeon meeting.

(Demosthenes, *On the crown* [18] 147)

First, Demosthenes uses imperfect forms to describe Philip's considerations. Then the rhetorical question τί οὖν; ('what then?') anticipates his next move. The phrase θεάσασθ' ὡς εὖ ('watch how cleverly!') serves to focus the audience's attention on the significance of this event; the present tense ἐπιχειρεῖ ('tries') correspondingly highlights the impact of this event on the structure of the story.²⁹ The use of the verb θεάομαι ('watch') is interesting here. The verb does not invite the audience to literally 'visualise' the designated event. Indeed, it would be hard to see how Philip's scheming here might be visualised at all. Rather, the concept of 'vision' is used metaphorically to express the *immediate accessibility* of the designated event through the medium of the discourse.³⁰ That is, the cleverness of Philip's act is available for close consideration in the story that Demosthenes is now telling.³¹

²⁹ Compare D. 18.148 πῶς οὖν ταῦτ' ἐποίησεν; **μισθοῦται** τούτωνι ('So how did he do this? He **hires** that man over there'), 19.124 πῶς οὖν; ἄρρωστέιν **προφασίζεται** ('How then? He **claims** to be ill').

³⁰ Compare the metaphorical extension of 'seeing' to 'knowing'; see Finglass (2007) ad S. *El.* 659.

³¹ For the use of the imperative of this verb in rhetorical narrative, compare D. 18.31 (followed by the present for preterite ὠνεῖται ['buys'] in 32), 23.152 (present πέμπει ['sends'] in 153) and especially 21.86 ὡς δ' ἐδυσχέρανον οὔτοι τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ οὐδετέρους ἐπειθεν, ἀπειλήσας καὶ διαλοιορηθεῖς

3.3.3 Sentence Complexity

A more implicit way to manage attention is to use subordination ('hypotaxis') to achieve a 'hierarchical ordering of event-presentation' (Toolan [1988: 126]). The effect of subordinate clauses in a periodic sentence is to foreground the main clause assertion, and this effect is stronger as the sentence becomes more complex. This is illustrated by the following example:

(28) Ποτειδεᾶται δὲ

- a. πέμπαντες μὲν καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρέσβεις, εἴ πως πείσειαν μὴ σφῶν πέρι νεωτερίζειν μηδέν,
- b. ἔλθόντες δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα μετὰ Κορινθίων, [ἔπρασσον] ὅπως ἐτοιμάσαιντο τιμωρίαν, ἣν δέη,
- c. ἐπειδὴ ἔκ τε Ἀθηνῶν ἕκ πολλοῦ πράσσοντες οὐδὲν ἠύροντο ἐπιτήδειον,
- d. ἀλλ' αἱ νῆες αἱ ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν καὶ ἐπὶ σφᾶς ὁμοίως ἔπλεον,
- e. καὶ τὰ τέλη τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ὑπέσχετο αὐτοῖς, ἣν ἐπὶ Ποτειδαίαν ἴωσιν Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐσβαλεῖν, τότε δὴ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον **ἀφίστανται** μετὰ Χαλκιδέων καὶ Βοττιαίων κοινῇ ξυνομόσαντες.

The Potideans,

- a. sending ambassadors to the Athenians, to see if they could persuade them not to take any novel actions against them,
- b. and going to Lacedaemon as well together with the Corinthians, in order to secure support should it prove necessary,
- c. when, after long negotiations, they got nothing useful from Athens,
- d. but the ships destined for Macedon sailed against themselves as well,
- e. and when the authorities of the Lacedaemonians promised them that they would invade Attica, if the Athenians should proceed against Potidaea, then at that moment they **revolt** [from the Athenians] together with the Chalcideans and the Bottiaeans, making common cause with them.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 1.58.1)

By delaying the main clause for so long, Thucydides heightens the audience's expectations: what will the Potideans finally do? This puts the main clause assertion into strong focus, and the effect is further enhanced by

ἀπελθὼν τί **πρῶτε**; καὶ θεάσασθε τὴν κακοῆθειαν ('When these men had misgivings about the matter, and he was not able to persuade either of them, he {went away} after making threats and calling them names, and what **does** he **do**? And watch his wicked character.')

means of the phrase τότε δὴ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ('then at that moment') (for the particle δὴ ['then', 'so'], see Section 3.3.4).³²

I hypothesise, then, that clause complexity increases the odds of the present for preterite being used in the main clause. In counting subordinate clauses, I have disregarded those that followed the main clause verb (in example [28], the participial clause ξυνομόσαντες κοινῇ ['making common cause with them']). This is because I am concerned with the *anticipation* of the main clause assertion. I have counted three types of subordinate clauses:

- (a) Conjunct participial clauses. These are participial clauses where the subject is coreferential with the subject of the main clause. For example, in example (28): ἐλθόντες δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα μετὰ Κορινθίων ('and going to Lacedaemon as well together with the Corinthians').
- (b) Absolute participial clauses. These are participial clauses where the subject is not coreferential with the subject of the main clause. These are in the genitive case or, rarely (with impersonal constructions), in the accusative. For example, βουλομένων δὲ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀποτειχίζειν ('the Thirty wishing to wall off the place'; Xenophon, *Hellenic affairs* 2.4.3).³³
- (c) Temporal subordinate clauses introduced by ἐπεὶ/ἐπειδὴ ('when'), ὡς ('as'), ἤνικα ('when'), ὅτε ('when').

I give the results for the total number of combined subordinate clauses per work. This number ranged from 0 to 6. In the uppermost regions, I have found only the present for preterite: four instances with six subordinate clauses, seven instances with five subordinate clauses.³⁴ This finding is highly suggestive of a positive influence of clause complexity on present for preterite usage. I have excluded these cases from further analysis, however,

³² Thucydides uses the exact same phrase at 2.84.3, where we also find the present for preterite (σημαίνει ['gives the signal']). Compare Lambert (2011: 208–9) for the concept of καιρὸς ('opportune/critical moment') in connection with the present for preterite.

³³ I have not included participial clauses that are 'obligatory constituents', that is, that form an integral part of the verb phrase: e.g., ὄρω ('see') with accusative and participle means 'see that X is doing Y'. See Rijksbaron (2002: 117–22). I have also excluded participial clauses modified by ὡς (indicating that the content of the participial clause is viewpointed through the subject of the sentence) or ὅτε (indicating a causal relation from the point of view of the narrator). See Rijksbaron (2002: 123–4).

³⁴ Th. 1.58.1 (ἀφίστανται ['revolt']), 2.70.1 (λόγους προσφέρουσι ['make overtures']), 2.84.3 (σημαίνει ['gives the signal']), 3.3.5 (ἀγγέλλει ['announces']), 4.25.5 (ἀπολλύουσιν ['destroy']) 4.75.1 (ἀναλαμβάνουσι ['take back']), 4.89.1 (ἄπρακτος γίγνεται ['fails to accomplish']), 8.25.4 (τίθενται ['place']), 8.80.3 (ἀφιστάσιν ['cause to revolt']); X. *HG* 3.4.2 (πείθει ['persuades']), 6.4.31 (ἀποσφάττεται ['is slaughtered']).

Table 3.1 *Tense and combined subordinate clauses*

Work	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Thucydides, <i>Histories</i>	1.44	< 0.001 ^a
Xenophon, <i>Hellenic affairs</i>	1.449	< 0.001 ^b
Xenophon, <i>Expedition of Cyrus</i>	1.333	0.022 ^c

^aB = .365 (constant = .009), standard error = .089, *N* = 937. I have checked the assumption of the linearity of the logit by looking at the interaction effect between the variable and a log-transformed copy of itself (Hosmer and Lemeshow [1989]). The *p*-value for this effect is .468, which does not approach statistical significance; therefore, I conclude that the assumption has been met.

^bB = .371 (constant = -.583), standard error = .097, *N* = 613. The *p*-value for the interaction effect between the variable and its log-transformed copy (see note ^a) is .357.

^cB = .287 (constant = -.037), standard error = .126, *N* = 722. The *p*-value for the interaction effect between the variable and its log-transformed copy (see note ^a) is .710.

to avoid zero counts for the preterite in the data (because the resulting infinite odds value is problematic in logistic regression). Moreover, in the case of Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus*, there were only six cases with more than two subordinate clauses (five with three, and one with four). This is problematic because it results in low expected counts for both categories. Therefore, I have only included cases in which up to two subordinate clauses are used.

The results for each work are listed in Table 3.1.

It should be understood that the odds ratio here expresses the average increase in odds of the present being used rather than the aorist for *each additional* subordinate clause. Thucydides' *Histories* and Xenophon's *Hellenic affairs* exhibit a highly similar trend (odds ratios of 1.44 and 1.449, respectively, with low *p*-values), which supports the hypothesis. In the *Expedition of Cyrus*, the observed effect is smaller (odds ratio 1.333) and statistically less certain (*p* = 0.022). As I explained in Section 3.1.1, such a difference may be expected because of the different character of the works. The *Expedition of Cyrus* is generally more vivid in character, and proliferation of subordinate clauses, as in example (28), is hardly ever observed in this work. It thus makes sense that other factors will be more central to tense-switching here.

3.3.4 Particle δή ('Then', 'So') Marking Discourse Progression

Greek narrators sometimes use the particle δή ('then', 'so') in order to 'move forward narration by marking major steps in an account' (Bonifazi

et al. [2016: IV.4, §89]).³⁵ Typically, the particle puts in focus an anaphoric pronoun or adverb, as in τότε δὴ ('at that moment then'), οὕτω δὴ ('under those circumstances then'), et cetera. According to Bonifazi et al. (2016: IV.4, §89), the particle serves to mark the author's voice as narrator. What this means exactly is hard to pin down. Bonifazi et al. (2016: IV.4, §90), with reference to Herodotus, speak of 'moderate involvement, a sort of investment . . . in the process of unfolding his historiographical discourse'. In other words, the particle puts the narrator's mediating presence in the foreground. If my claim that the present for preterite is used at points where the discourse structure becomes cognitively salient is correct, then we should expect the odds of the present being used to increase when this particle is used.

Let me give some examples. The first illustrates the use of the particle in the collocations mentioned above:

- (29) ἐπέστειλαν δὲ τῷ Κλεομβρότῳ μὴ διαλύειν τὸ στράτευμα, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἄγειν ἐπὶ τοὺς Θηβαίους, εἰ μὴ αὐτονόμους ἀφίειν τὰς πόλεις . . .³⁶ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἦσθετο οὐχ ὅπως τὰς πόλεις ἀφίεντας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ στράτευμα διαλύοντας, [ὡς ἀντετάττοντο πρὸς αὐτούς], οὕτω δὴ ἄγει τὴν στρατιάν εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν.

And they sent orders to Cleombrotus not to disband his army, but to lead it at once against the Thebans should they not leave the cities independent. When, therefore, he learned that, so far from leaving the cities independent, the Thebans were not even disbanding their army, in order that they might marshal themselves against him, under those circumstances then he **leads** his troops into Boeotia.

(Xenophon, *Hellenic affairs* 6.4.3; trans. after Brownson [1921])

The phrase οὕτω δὴ ('under those circumstances then') signals that at the designated point in the story, the local build-up of tension (will the Thebans listen, or will Cleombrotus have to invade their country?) reaches a critical point.³⁷

A second example illustrates the less common use of the particle to mark narrative progression by itself. Here, Alcibiades tells how he tried to win over Socrates as his lover. When his first attempts fail, he tries another route:

³⁵ The particle is notoriously polyfunctional. See Denniston (1954: 203–40); Sicking and van Ophuijsen (1993: 140–51).

³⁶ The intervening text is deleted by Marchant (1900).

³⁷ Bonifazi et al. (2016) mention the function of the particle to mark narrative peaks (IV.4, §89) and, more generally, turning points (§110).

- (30) ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐδαμῇ ταύτη ἦνυτον, ἔδοξέ μοι ἐπιθετέον εἶναι τῷ ἀνδρὶ κατὰ τὸ καρτερόν καὶ οὐκ ἀνετέον, ἐπειδὴ περ ἐνεκεχειρήκη, ἀλλὰ ἰστέον ἤδη τί ἐστί τὸ πρᾶγμα. προκαλοῦμαι δὴ αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ συνδειπνεῖν, ἀτεχνῶς ὥσπερ ἔραστής παιδικοῖς ἐπιβουλεύων.

When I made no progress whatsoever in that way, it seemed to me I had to attack the man forcefully, and not relent, seeing as I had already started – I had to know what the deal was already. So I **invite** him to dinner, wholly like a lover forming designs upon his darling.

(Plato, *Symposium* 217c)

Alcibiades tells how he wanted to make another attempt at Socrates, which raises the question what he tried to do next. Again, the particle δὴ ('so') puts into focus a new development after a build-up of anticipation.

Finally, the particle δὴ ('then', 'so') can be recognised in the grammaticalised conjunction ἐπειδὴ ('so when'), which is a combination of the conjunction ἐπεὶ ('when') and the particle. According to Bonifazi et al. (2016: IV.4, §110), 'the -δὴ component within the whole word (which functions as a temporal conjunction) corresponds to the pragmatic δὴ used for narrative progression'. The following passage is suggestive of the difference in value between the marked and the unmarked conjunction. Xenophon rides out to meet the Thracian ruler Seuthes. When he arrives, the following happens:

- (31) Ἐπεὶ δ' ἐγγύς ἦσαν, ἐκέλευσεν εἰσελθεῖν Ξενοφῶντα ἔχοντα δύο οὓς βούλοιο. ἐπειδὴ δ' ἔνδον ἦσαν, ἠσπάζοντο μὲν πρῶτον ἀλλήλους καὶ κατὰ τὸν Θράκιον νόμον κέρατα οἴνου προύπινον.

When (ἐπεὶ) they were close, he [Seuthes] told Xenophon to come inside with two men of his choice. So when (ἐπειδὴ) they were inside, they first greeted each other and drank to each other's health from horns, according to the Thracian custom.

(Xenophon, *Expedition of Cyrus* 7.2.23)

After the subordinate clause introduced by the neutral conjunction ἐπεὶ ('when'), the narrator tells of some formal interaction preceding the actual meeting between Xenophon and Seuthes. The marked conjunction ἐπειδὴ ('so when') then signals that the narrator comes to the point: Xenophon actually went in and met Seuthes, as we were anticipating.

Now let me present the relevant statistics. First, I have looked at the use of the particle at the second position in the sentence (example [30]) or in the main clause (example [29]); on the position of particles, see, e.g., Denniston [1954: lviii–lxi]). As I explain in the Appendix, Section A.1.3, I also include non-restrictive relative clauses and subordinate clauses

Table 3.2 *Tense and connective δή*

Work	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Thucydides, <i>Histories</i>	4.472	0.051 ^a
Xenophon, <i>Hellenic affairs</i>	2.028	0.128 ^b
Xenophon, <i>Expedition of Cyrus</i>	6.105	0.004 ^c

^aB = 1.498 (constant = .294), standard error = .767, *N* = 946 (20 cases of δή).

^bB = .707 (constant = -.301), standard error = .464, *N* = 615 (14 cases of δή).

^cB = 1.809 (constant = .037), standard error = .626, *N* = 729 (22 cases of δή).

Table 3.3 *Tense and the particle δή in conjunctions*

Category	<i>Present</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
ἐπειδή	10 (6)	4 (8)	3.529	0.042 ^a
ἐπεὶ	51 (55)	72 (68)		

^aB = 1.261 (constant = -.345), standard error = .619.

marking an endpoint or result in my data sample. In such cases, the particle can modify the relative pronoun or the conjunction, as in πρὶν (γέ) δή ('until then/finally'). I regard this use as analogous to that modifying anaphoric expressions in the main clause (τότε δή ['at that moment then']), and have therefore included these cases as well.³⁸ The results are listed in Table 3.2.

The odds ratios and *p*-values are rather divergent. This must be due at least in part to the low number of cases where we find the particle (see the numbers in the notes to Table 3.2). Overall, however, the effect is clearly positive, so that the results support the hypothesis.

Things are more difficult with respect to the difference between ἐπειδή ('so when') against simple ἐπεὶ ('when'). Thucydides almost always uses the marked conjunction.³⁹ In Xenophon's works, the marked conjunction is rare, but it does seem to have a predilection for the present for preterite. Grouping Xenophon's two works together, the results are listed in Table 3.3.

The results suggest that, for Xenophon, the use of the marked conjunction with the particle δή ('then', 'so') has a positive influence on the odds

³⁸ Th. 1.132.5, 7.71.5, 7.39.2. I have not counted the case of X. *HG* 5.4.39, where the particle is used in the fully idiomatic expression οἷα δή ('as tends to happen when'), and its position at the second place in the sentence is incidental.

³⁹ There are only 3 instances of simple ἐπεὶ in my data sample, against 32 instances of marked ἐπειδή.

of the present for preterite being used (odds ratio 3.529), but the effect is not very certain ($p = 0.042$).⁴⁰

3.3.5 Conclusion

In this section, I have aimed to support the claim that the diegetic present for preterite functions to mark salient changes in the discourse structure by showing that it has an affinity for certain attention-management strategies. In Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, I discussed examples of the present for preterite in combination with announcements (in particular with cataphoric reference) and in questions and exhortations to the audience. In Sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.4, I discussed evidence suggesting that clause complexity and the use of the particle $\delta\eta$ ('then', 'so') to mark discourse progression positively correlate with present for preterite usage. In sum, I hope this has convincingly shown that the diegetic present is associated with a strongly mediating stance of the narrator.

3.4 Changes in the Narrative Dynamic

The first main function of the diegetic present for preterite is to mark changes in the narrative dynamic (or narrative *turns*, Fludernik [1991]). The narrative dynamic concerns the momentum of the story, that is, the way it progresses from one narrated event to the next. Dynamicity can be measured along a continuum of stability or turbulence in the story. On one end of the spectrum is a completely stable situation, such as we may find at the beginning of a narrative (or a local episode) when only the time, place and the relevant participants have been specified. The other extreme is a full-blown crisis, which is typical of narrative peaks; the story of Heracles' madness in Euripides' eponymous play, which I discussed in Section 2.6.2 of Chapter 2, would be a case in point. Individual events vary in the degree to which they affect change in the story world and influence the causal chain of events. My argument in this section is that the present for preterite tends to be used when the narrative impact of the designated event is large.

I will first give a schematic typology of different types of changes in the narrative dynamic (Section 3.4.1). Then I discuss my relationship to

⁴⁰ As for the individual works, in the *Hellenic affairs* we find, with $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, 4 present forms (2 expected) and 1 aorist (3 expected); in the *Expedition of Cyrus*, we find 6 present forms (4 expected) and 3 aorist forms (5 expected).

previous approaches that have focused mainly on episodic structure as the unit of narrative analysis (Section 3.4.2). Finally, I present quantitative evidence to the effect that the present for preterite has a structural predilection for certain narrative schemas that involve changes in the narrative dynamic (Section 3.4.3).

3.4.1 *Typology*

In the abstract, there are three types of changes in the narrative dynamic:

- (a) the start of new developments against the background of a stable situation;
- (b) a change in the direction of the story's progression;
- (c) the culmination of narrative complications.

The boundaries between these categories are fluid. The distinction between (a) and (b) depends on the degree of turbulence already present in the story at a certain point, and this is of course a continuous variable. Similarly, a change in the story's direction (b) may be such that it puts a complete end to the narrative complications leading up to that point (c). Nevertheless, it is useful to make these distinctions for heuristic purposes.

For the first category (a), I use the term *initiative* when the event is brought about by intentional human agency. In the following example, a character in the story actively seeks a confrontation with another:

- (32) οὗτος γὰρ ἐπειδὴ ἀφίκετο εἰς Θάσον ἥδη μου τέταρτον μῆνα ἐπιτριραρχοῦντος, παραλαβὼν ἐγὼ μάρτυρας τῶν τε πολιτῶν ὡς ἔδυνάμην πλείστους καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας καὶ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν **προσέρχομαι** αὐτῷ ἐν Θάσῳ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ.

For when the defendant arrived at Thasus, as I was already serving as trierarch for the fourth month after the expiration of my term, I, taking as witnesses as many of the citizens as I could, as well as the marines and rowers, **approach** him in the market of Thasus.

(Demosthenes, *Against Polycles* [50] 29)

In this example, the initiative marks the beginning of a new episode ('incipit', see Section 3.4.2), which is neatly introduced by the embedding particle γὰρ ('for', after a narratorial abstract which I have not cited) and a temporal subordinate clause setting the scene.⁴¹

⁴¹ Similar uses of the same verb in the same speech: 24 προσέρχεται ('approaches'), 27 προσέρχονται ('approach'), 47 προσέρχεται ('approaches'), 49 προσέρχομαι ('approach'), 55 προσέρχομαι ('approach'). Note also 32 πορεύομαι ('walk').

Another example illustrates the start of unexpected developments against the background of routine procedures (here we move towards [b]). The speaker and a certain Olympiodorus were making necessary arrangements after the death of a certain Comon, a relative of the two men. Then Olympiodorus raises an issue:

- (33) ὄντων δ' ἡμῶν περὶ ταύτην τὴν πραγματείαν, ἐξαίφνης λόγον μοι **προσφέρει** Ὀλυμπιόδωρος οὕτως, ὅτι καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ προσήκουσα εἶη τῷ Κόμωνι τῷ τετελευτηκότῳ, καὶ ὅτι δίκαιον εἶη καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ μέρος λαβεῖν ἀπάντων ὧν ὁ Κόμων κατέλειπεν.

As we were engaged with this business, Olympiodorus over there suddenly **presents** me with a proposal, saying that his mother was also related to Comon, the deceased, and that it was just that he should also be apportioned a share of all that Comon had left.

(Demosthenes, *Against Olympiodorus* [48] 6)

According to Fludernik (1991: 374, referring to Pollak [1960] and Quasthoff [1980]), '[t]he major occurrences of the historical present can be analysed as marking the incident which cuts into a setting – in the well-known “schema of incidence”’. Example (33) fits this description. The setting is provided by the participial clause ὄντων δ' ἡμῶν περὶ ταύτην τὴν πραγματείαν ('as we were engaged with this business'), and the unexpectedness of the event cutting into this setting is marked with the adverb ἐξαίφνης ('suddenly'; compare the examples in Fludernik [1991: 375]).

However, I prefer to reserve the term *incident* for changes in the narrative dynamic where intentional agency is absent or de-emphasised. Consider the following passage:

- (34) χρόνου δὲ προβαίνοντος καὶ πάνυ οἰκείως διεκείμεθα, καὶ ἐγὼ τε οὕτως οἰκείως διεκείμεν πρὸς τοῦτον, ὥστ' οὐδενὸς πώποτε ὧν ἐδεήθη οὗτος ἐμοῦ ἀπέτυχεν, οὗτός τε αὖ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἄχρηστος ἦν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιμεληθῆναι καὶ διοικῆσαι, καὶ ὁπότε ἐγὼ ἀποδημοίην ἢ δημοσίᾳ τριηραρχῶν ἢ ἰδίᾳ κατ' ἄλλο τι, κύριον τῶν ἐν ἀγρῶ τοῦτον ἀπάντων κατέλειπον.

συμβαίνει δὴ μοι τριηραρχία περὶ Πελοπόννησον, ἐκέθην δὲ εἰς Σικελίαν ἔδει τοὺς πρέσβεις ἀγειν, οὓς ὁ δῆμος ἐχειροτόνησεν.

As time went on we came to be on very familiar terms: I was on such familiar terms with him that he never failed to obtain anything he asked of me, and he from his part was of use to me in taking care of my affairs and managing them. And whenever I was away either on state business as trierarch, or on some private business, I would leave him in charge of everything on my farm.

So, a trierarchy **falls to** my **lot** for a journey around the Peloponnese, and from there I was to bring the ambassadors whom the people had elected to Sicily.

(Demosthenes, *Against Nicostratus* [53] 4–5)

The speaker first paints a picture of his circumstances. He tells us that on different occasions he was sent out as trierarch. Then he focuses on a specific occurrence where he was appointed as trierarch. This marks the end of the introductory section ('orientation', see Section 3.4.2) and the start of narrative complications. The present tense συμβαίνει ('falls to [my] lot') highlights this change in the discourse structure; note also how the narrative progression is marked by the particle δὴ ('so', Section 3.3.4).

Now we move to the second category: changes in the direction of the story's progression. Again, I make a distinction between two subtypes in terms of the presence or absence of intentional human agency. The *intervention* is a purposeful action performed by a main character in the narrative seeking to change an unwanted course of events. We find two instructive examples in a narrative passage in Plato's *Symposium*. In 189c–93d, Aristophanes gives his speech in praise of Eros, in which he tells a myth to explain man's relationship to the god. According to him, the original race of man consisted of spheric creatures, with four arms, two heads, et cetera. Being high-minded, these creatures tried to ascend to heaven to attack the gods. So Zeus had to come up with a solution:

(35) ὁ οὖν Ζεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι θεοὶ ἐβουλευόντο ὅτι χρὴ αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι, καὶ ἠπόρουσαν. . . μόγις δὴ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐννοήσας λέγει ὅτι 'Δοκῶ μοι,' ἔφη, 'ἔχειν μηχανήν, ὡς ἂν εἶεν τε ἄνθρωποι καὶ παύσαιντο τῆς ἀκολασίας ἀσθενέστεροι γενόμενοι.'

So Zeus and the other gods deliberated what they should do to them, and they were at a loss. . . So finally, Zeus {thought of something} and **says**: 'I seem,' he said, 'to have a contrivance, so that people will still exist, but will be weaker and cease their intemperance.'

(Plato, *Symposium* 190c)

This is a typical 'difficult situation-solution' schema (note in the Greek ἠπόρουσαν ['were at a loss'] and μηχανήν ['contrivance']; compare Section 3.4.3). If nothing were to be done, conflict between man and the gods would arise; so Zeus acts to change this course of events. His speech marks a change in the narrative dynamic, and this is why the present tense is used to introduce it.

Zeus proceeds to carry out his idea: he cuts man in half, so that each individual now has only two arms, one face, etc.; in this way, they are less powerful. However, this results in a new problem: each half-person is torn

with desire for his or her other half, and they seek each other out, embrace each other and yearn to be stitched back together. In this way, they die, because they refuse to do anything else. This course of events is also deemed undesirable by Zeus, who does not wish the race of man to perish. So he comes up with a new solution:

- (36) καὶ οὕτως ἀπώλλυντο. ἐλεήσας δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς ἄλλην μηχανὴν **πορίζεται**, καὶ **μετατίθησιν** αὐτῶν τὰ αἰδοῖα εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν.

And in that way they perished. Pitying them, Zeus **finds** another contrivance: he **displaces** their private parts to the front.

(Plato, *Symposium* 191b)

Zeus' solution allows people to have intercourse again (after having been cut in half, their private parts were in their backs), so that they will not perish. Note again the word μηχανήν ('contrivance') as a semantic indicator of a change in the narrative dynamic.

In other cases, the change in the progression of the story is the result of unintentional action or brought about by some external agent (e.g., a god or a character who is outside the 'main cast'). Here I will use the term *incident* as well (the difference between [a] and [b] in this respect is not essential from a descriptive standpoint). Two passages in the narrative of the chariot race in Sophocles' *Electra* illustrate the progression-incident pattern very neatly:

- (37) καὶ πρὶν μὲν ὀρθοὶ πάντες ἔστασαν δίφροις·
ἔπειτα δ' Αἰνιάνος ἀνδρὸς ἄστομοι
πῶλοι βίᾳ **φέρουσιν**, ἐκ δ' ὑποστροφῆς
τελοῦντες ἕκτον ἔβδομόν τ' ἤδη δρόμον
μέτωπα **σμπάιουσι** Βαρκαίοις ὄχοις.

...

καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους πάντας ἀσφαλῆς δρόμους
ὠρθοῦθ' ὁ τλήμων ὀρθὸς ἐξ ὀρθῶν δίφρων·
ἔπειτα λύων ἠνίαν ἀριστερὰν
κάμπτοντος ἵππου **λανθάνει** στήλην ἄκραν
παίσας.

And at first they all stood upright in their chariots; but next, the hard-mouthed colts of the Aenian man forcefully **carry** him **away**, and after turning around, fulfilling their sixth and seventh lap already, **hit** their heads **against** the car of the Barcaeian.

...

As for all the other laps, the miserable man [Orestes] safely steered through them, standing upright in his upright chariot; but next, as he loosened his left rein

as his horse was making the turn, he **inadvertently hits** the edge of the pillar.

(Sophocles, *Electra* 723–7; 741–5)

Up to a certain point, the race is progressing safely and steadily, each charioteer remaining upright in their chariot (723 ἔστασαν [‘stood’]). Then one of the competitors loses control of his horses, and a crisis ensues: the horses carry the man away and crash into another chariot (present tense forms 725 φέρουσιν [‘carry away’] and 727 συμπαίουσι [‘hit against’]). The change from stable progression to incident is marked by the contrast between the adverbs πρῖν (‘first’, 723) and ἔπειτα (‘next’, 724) and by the switch in tense. A similar pattern occurs later on: Orestes safely finished all laps, except the last one, when he inadvertently hits the pillar. Again, the contrast is marked by the opposition between τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους πάντας . . . δρόμους (‘all the other laps’, 741) and ἔπειτα (‘next’, 743), and the present tense highlights the moment of change (744–5 λανθάνει . . . παίσας [‘inadvertently hits’]).

Finally, there is the *culmination* of narrative complications (category [c]). What is peculiar about this type of change in the narrative dynamic with respect to the other two is that the element of surprise is less prominent: the culmination is essentially the fulfilment of the expectation that the narrative complications need to reach a certain critical moment in order to be resolved (compare, e.g., Allan’s [2009: 187] definition of the ‘peak’; see Section 3.4.2). This often happens according to typical schemas, such as a battle ending in a loss or victory, a trial ending in a verdict, etc. For example:

- (38) Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ’ εἰσήει ἡ γραφή εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, ἀρρώστως δ’ ἔχων ὁ Φιλοκράτης ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶ συνήγορον Δημοσθένην, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμέ. Παρελθὼν δ’ ὁ μισοφίλιππος Δημοσθένης, κατέτριψε τὴν ἡμέραν ἀπολογούμενος· καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἀποφεύγει Φιλοκράτης, ὁ δὲ γραφάμενος τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων οὐ μεταλαμβάνει. Καὶ ταῦθ’ ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες ἴστε.

After that, the case came to trial. Being ill, Philocrates called as his advocate Demosthenes, not me. Demosthenes {came forward} and spent the whole day on his defence speech. And in the end, Philocrates **is acquitted**, and the prosecutor **does** not **get** one fifth of the votes. That you all know.

(Aeschines, *On the false embassy* [2] 14)

Philocrates was indicted for proposing an illegal decree. This is the start of new complications in the story (the indictment is marked with the present γράφονται [‘indict’] in [14]). The episode proper is introduced with the

clause μετὰ ταῦτ' εἰσῆει ἡ γραφή εἰς τὸ δικάστηριον ('after that, the case came to trial'). This episode reaches its culmination with the outcome of the trial, introduced with the phrase τὸ τελευταῖον ('in the end'). The present forms ἀποφεύγει ('is acquitted') and '[οὐ] μεταλαμβάνει ('does [not] get') highlight this peak.

Similarly, in the final part of the messenger narrative in Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, the messenger tells how Iolaus went in pursuit of his foe Eurystheus:

- (39) κἀνταῦθ' ὁ πρέσβυς ὕλλον ἐξορμώμενον
 ἰδὼν, ὀρέξας ἰκέτευσε δεξιὰν
 ἰόλαος ἐμβῆσαι νιν ἵππειον δίφρον.
 λαβῶν δὲ χερσὶν ἡνίας Εὐρυσθέως
 πῶλοις ἐπέιχε.

And at that point, the old man Iolaus, seeing Hyllus riding out, {stretched out his arms} and begged him to let him board the chariot of horses. Taking the reins with his hands, he followed hard upon the colts of Eurystheus.

(Euripides, *Children of Heracles* 843–7)

This naturally creates anticipation: will Iolaus fail or succeed? The present marks the culminating point, which constitutes the answer to this question (859–60): **αἰρεῖ** δ' ὁ κλεινὸς ἰόλεως Εὐρυσθέως | τέτρωρον ἄρμα πρὸς πέτραις Σκιρωνίσιον ('famed Iolaus **captures** the four-horsed chariot of Eurystheus by the Scironian rocks').

To conclude, I use the following descriptive terms for identifying changes in the narrative dynamic:

- Initiative*. The start of narrative complications, intentionally initiated by a human agent.
- Intervention*. A change in the direction of the narrative progression, intentionally initiated by a human agent.
- Incident*. Either the start of new complications or a change in the narrative progression, with agency being absent or de-emphasised.
- Culmination*. The climax of narrative complications.

3.4.2 Episodic Structure

Changes in the narrative dynamic of the types I have just described are normally discussed with reference to a specific framework: that of episodic structure (Fleischman [1990]; Fludernik [1991]; Allan [2007], [2009],

[2011a]). In this section, I present a critical evaluation of the explanatory value of this model for the Classical Greek material.

The theory of the episodic structure of narrative was introduced by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and further elaborated by Labov (1972) and Fleischman (1990). The idea is that narratives, in particular conversational ones, consist of certain fixed structural elements. There is an *abstract*, explaining what the narrative will be about; followed by an *orientation*, specifying the time, place and participants; then follows the *complication*, which is the actual action; the complication culminates in the *peak*; after that follows the *resolution*, which is what finally happened; and then an *evaluation*, the narrator's reflection on the events.⁴²

In the existing narrative-structural models of the present for preterite, the function of the present is tied to specific points in the structure of the episode. In Allan's model, applied to Euripidean messenger speeches and Thucydides' historical narrative (Allan [2007], [2009], [2011a]), the present for preterite is used to mark the *peak* and (less frequently) the *incipit*, that is, the beginning of the complication.⁴³ An effective illustration is the following narrative episode from Andocides' speech *On the mysteries*:

- (40) [Abstract] Δευτέρα τοίνυν μήνυσις ἐγένετο.
 [Orientation] Τεῦκρος ἦν ἐνθάδε μέτοικος, ὃς ὤχετο Μέγαράδε ὑπεξελθών.
 [Complication: Incipit] ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐπαγγέλλεται τῇ βουλῇ, εἴ οἱ ἄδειαν δοῖεν, μνηύσειν καὶ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων, συνεργὸς ὧν, τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ποιοῦντας μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἑρμῶν τῆς περικοπῆς ἃ ἦδει.
 [Complication continued] Ψηφισαμένης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς (ἦν γὰρ αὐτοκράτωρ) ὤχοντο ἐπ' αὐτὸν Μέγαράδε·
 [Peak] καὶ κομισθεῖς, ἄδειαν εὐρόμενος, ἀπογράφει τοὺς μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ.
 [Resolution] Καὶ οὗτοι κατὰ τὴν Τεύκρου μήνυσιν ὤχοντο φεύγοντες.
 [Evaluation] Καὶ μοι λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν.
 [Abstract] Now, there was a second laying of information.
 [Orientation] Teucer was a resident alien here [at Athens], who went quietly to Megara.
 [Complication: Incipit] From there he **informs** the council that, if they gave him immunity, he would lay information: regarding the

⁴² There is also a *coda*, which is of little interest here.

⁴³ There is also the function of highlighting 'dramatic shots', which is less relevant to summary narrative (as Allan [2011a: 44] notes).

mysteries, where he had been a participant, he would give the names of the others who had participated with him; and regarding the affair of the Hermae, he would tell what he knew.

[Complication continued] The council having voted the resolution (for it had full authority), they *went* to Megara to fetch him.

[Peak] And having been brought over and having been granted immunity, he **writes down** the names of his companions.

[Resolution] And these men fled on account of Teucer's information.

[Evaluation]⁴⁴ (*to the clerk*) Take the document and read me their names.

(Andocides, *On the mysteries* [1] 15)

In this episode, all structural slots I mentioned above are filled and the present is found exactly in the designated positions. In the abstract, we are told what the story is about: a μήνυσις ('laying of information'). The orientation gives us the main protagonist – a certain Teucer – and tells us of his circumstances. The complication starts when Teucer makes a proposal to the Athenian Council: he will lay information against the profanators of the mysteries and the mutilators of the Hermae if given immunity. The present ἐπαγγέλλεται ('informs') here thus marks an incipit – in my terms, this is an 'initiative'. At the peak (culmination), Teucer fulfils his promise and writes down the names: note how ἄδειαν εὐρόμενος ('having been granted immunity') harks back at ἄδειαν ('immunity') in the incipit. As a result of this information, the denounced persons fled (resolution). Finally, the orator asks for the relevant document to be read, a typical part of a rhetorical evaluation.

The great merit of this approach is that it ties the use of the present for preterite to a criterion that is, in principle, objective and independent. That is, the structure of narrative episodes can be determined by factors other than tense usage. In practice, however, things are rarely as clear-cut as in the passage just cited. To begin with, we sometimes find the present in the 'wrong spot', and in such cases it is hard to resist the temptation to conform the structural analysis to the tense usage.⁴⁵ More problematic than the existence of incidental counterexamples is the fact that narrative passages do not always submit to an analysis in terms of episodic structure. Many narrative assertions containing the present for preterite in the corpus are

⁴⁴ I use the term 'evaluation' somewhat liberally here. The reading of documents pertaining to the narrated events usually serves as the basis for a more explicit evaluation of these events.

⁴⁵ For example, Allan (2009: 194) discusses some problematic examples and argues that a distinction should be made between 'the crucial event in the plot structure' and 'the linguistic peak (signalled by the historical present)'.

part of macro-structural gestures that extend beyond episodic units (which are circumscribed in terms of time, place, participants and action).⁴⁶ This tends to be more the case as we move further to the diegesis end of the mimesis-diegesis continuum.

To begin, let me discuss an example where the present for preterite marks the beginning of new developments. The context is as follows. A man named Pittalacus had a boy with whom he was in love, by the name Timarchus, stolen from him by a certain Hegesandrus. One night, Hegesandrus, together with Timarchus and others, raided Pittalacus' house and gave the man a flogging. The next day, Pittalacus went to an altar in the marketplace for refuge. He was ultimately persuaded by Hegesandrus and Timarchus to leave the altar based on the understanding that he would receive some sort of compensation. Then the following happened:

- (41) Ὡς δ' ἀπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, οὐκέτι προσεῖχον αὐτῷ τὸν νοῦν. Βαρέως δὲ φέρων τὴν ὕβριν αὐτῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δίκην ἐκατέρω αὐτῶν λαγχάνει. Ὅτε δ' ἐδικάζετο, σκέψασθε μεγάλην βώμην Ἥγησάνδρου· ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἡδικηκότα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐναντίον ἡδικημένον, οὐδὲν προσήκοντα αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ δημόσιον οἰκίτην τῆς πόλεως, ἦγεν εἰς δουλείαν φάσκων ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι.

But after he left the agora, they no longer paid attention to him. Taking their outrageous behaviour against him badly, the man **files** a suit against both of them. When the case was coming to trial, consider a powerful feat of Hegesandrus. He tried to drag the man into slavery, saying he belonged to him – a man who had done him no wrong whatsoever, but on the contrary, had been wronged by him, who did not belong to him in any way, but was a public servant of the city.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 61–2)

After Pittalacus was persuaded to leave the altar, Hegesandrus and his henchmen paid no further attention to Pittalacus. This is the resolution of the previous episode. Now Pittalacus files a suit against the two men (present λαγχάνει ['files']). This constitutes a new initiative; the participial clause βαρέως δὲ φέρων τὴν ὕβριν αὐτῶν ('taking their outrageous behaviour against him badly') signals an imminent change in the narrative dynamic (see Section 3.4.3). However, it is difficult to speak of an incipit here in terms of episodic structure. The problem is that the narrative assertion falls squarely in between the previous episode, which was closed

⁴⁶ On the definition of the 'episode' in terms of such parameters, see van Dijk (1981); also Brinton (1996: 41–4).

off neatly with a resolution, and the next one, which is introduced by a subordinate clause that serves as an orientation (ὅτε δ' ἐδικάζετο ['when the case came to trial']) and an announcement that refocuses the audience's attention (σκέψασθε μεγάλην ῥώμην Ἡγησάνδρου ['consider a powerful feat of Hegesandrus']). The complications in this episode begin when Hegesandrus tries to take Pittalacus away as a slave. The point is that the present for preterite here can be accounted for in terms of a change in the narrative dynamic but on a higher level than that of the episode.

Let me discuss an example from historiography that is particularly illustrative of the use of the present for preterite in summary narrative to mark changes in the narrative dynamic. It is a long passage and it is hard to find a suitable starting point without quoting much material irrelevant to my analysis. The point is that some party at Athens is scheming to bring Alcibiades back from exile. Phrynichus, an Athenian general, does not wish this to happen, and the following events unfold:

- (42) γνούς δὲ ὁ Φρύνιχος ὅτι ἔσοιτο περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου καθόδου λόγος καὶ ὅτι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐνδέξονται αὐτήν, δεῖσας πρὸς τὴν ἐναντίωσιν τῶν ὑφ' αὐτοῦ λεχθέντων μῆ, ἣν κατέλθη, ὡς κωλυτὴν ὄντα κακῶς δρᾶ, **τρέπεται** ἐπὶ τοιόνδε τι. **πέμπει** ὡς τὸν Ἀστύοχον τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων νάυαρχον ἔτι ὄντα τότε περὶ τὴν Μίλητον κρύφα ἐπιστείλας ὅτι Ἀλκιβιάδης αὐτῶν τὰ πράγματα φθείρει Τισσαφέρην Ἀθηναίους φίλον ποιῶν, καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα σαφῶς ἐγγράμας· συγγνώμην δὲ εἶναι ἑαυτῷ περὶ ἀνδρὸς πολεμίου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἀξυμφόρου κακὸν τι βουλεύειν.

ὁ δὲ Ἀστύοχος τὸν μὲν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἄλλως τε καὶ οὐκέτι ὁμοίως ἐς χεῖρας ἰόντα οὐδὲ διανοεῖτο τιμωρεῖσθαι, ἀνελθὼν δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἐς Μαγνησίαν καὶ παρὰ Τισσαφέρην ἅμα **λέγει** τε αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐπισταλέντα ἐκ τῆς Σάμου καὶ **γίγνεται** αὐτὸς μηνυτής, προσέθηκέ τε, ὡς ἐλέγετο, ἐπὶ ἰδίῳις κέρδεσι Τισσαφέρνει ἑαυτὸν καὶ περὶ τούτων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων κοινοῦσθαι· διόπερ καὶ [περὶ] τῆς μισθοφορᾶς οὐκ ἐντελοῦς οὔσης μαλακωτέρως ἀνήπτετο.

ὁ δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης εὐθύς **πέμπει** κατὰ Φρυνίχου γράμματα ἐς τὴν Σάμον πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τέλει ὄντας οἷα δέδρακε, καὶ ἀξίων αὐτὸν ἀποθνήσκειν.

θορυβοῦμενος δὲ ὁ Φρύνιχος καὶ πάνυ ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ κινδύνῳ ὦν διὰ τὸ μήνυμα **ἀποστέλλει** αὐτὸς πρὸς τὸν Ἀστύοχον, τὰ τε πρότερα μεμφόμενος ὅτι οὐ καλῶς ἐκρύφθη καὶ νῦν ὅτι ὄλον τὸ στράτευμα τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐτοιμὸς εἶη τὸ ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ παρασχεῖν αὐτοῖς διαφθεῖραι, γράμας καθ' ἕκαστα, ἀτειχίστου οὔσης Σάμου, ᾧ ἂν τρόπῳ αὐτὰ πράξειε, καὶ ὅτι ἀνεπίφθονόν οἱ ἦδη εἶη περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δι' ἐκείνους κινδυνεύοντι καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἄλλο πᾶν δρᾶσαι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθίστων αὐτὸν διαφθαρήναι.

ὁ δὲ Ἀστύοχος **μηνύει** καὶ ταῦτα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ.

καὶ ὡς προήσθετο αὐτὸν ὁ Φρύνιχος ἀδικοῦντα καὶ ὅσον οὐ παροῦσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου περὶ τούτων ἐπιστολήν, αὐτὸς προφθάσας τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξάγγελος **γίγνεται** ὡς οἱ πολέμιοι μέλλουσιν ἀτειχίστου οὔσης τῆς Σάμου καὶ ἅμα τῶν νεῶν οὐ πασῶν ἔνδον ὀρμουσῶν ἐπιθήσασθαι τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, καὶ ταῦτα σαφῶς πεπυσμένους εἶη, καὶ χρῆναι τειχίζειν τε Σάμον ὡς τάχιστα καὶ τᾶλλα ἐν φυλακῇ ἔχειν.

Phrynichus, realising that there would be a proposal to restore Alcibiades, and that the Athenians would consent to it, and fearing after what he had said against it that Alcibiades, if restored, would avenge himself upon him for his opposition, **turns** to the following recourse. He **sends** a secret letter to the Lacedaemonian admiral, Astyochus, who was still in the neighbourhood of Miletus, to tell him that Alcibiades was ruining their cause by making Tissaphernes the friend of the Athenians, and containing an express revelation of the rest of the intrigue, desiring to be excused if he sought to harm his enemy even at the expense of the interests of his country.

However, Astyochus, instead of thinking of punishing Alcibiades, who, besides, no longer ventured within his reach as formerly, {went up} to him and Tissaphernes at Magnesia, **tells** them the contents of the letter from Samos, and **turns informer**, and if report may be trusted, **made** himself the paid creature of Tissaphernes, undertaking to inform him as to this and all other matters; which was also the reason why he did not remonstrate more strongly against the pay not being given in full.

Upon this Alcibiades instantly **sends** to the authorities at Samos a letter against Phrynichus, stating what he had done, and requiring that he should be put to death.

Phrynichus, being distraught, and placed in the utmost peril by the denunciation, **sends** again to Astyochus, reproaching him with having so ill kept the secret of his previous letter, and saying that he was now prepared to give them an opportunity of destroying the whole Athenian armament at Samos; giving a detailed account of the means which he should employ, Samos being unfortified, and pleading that being in danger of his life on their account, he could not now be blamed for doing this or anything else to escape being destroyed by his mortal enemies.

This also Astyochus **reveals** to Alcibiades.

When Phrynichus timely perceived that he was playing him false, and that a letter on the subject was on the point of arriving from Alcibiades, he himself {anticipated} the news, and **informs** the army that the enemy, seeing that Samos was unfortified and the fleet not all stationed within the harbour, meant to attack the camp; that he could

be certain of this intelligence, and that they must fortify Samos as quickly as possible, and generally look to their defences.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 8.50–1.1; trans. after Dent [1910])

The framework of episodic structure offers little help in accounting for the present forms here. If the entire passage is considered to constitute a single episode (which makes some sense given the unity of participants and action), then there are too many present forms. The alternative is to distinguish between different episodes within this passage, with the episode boundaries being constituted by the topic shifts and the (mostly implicit) changes of scene. In this analysis, the first episode consists of Phrynichus sending a letter to Astyocho; the next episode narrates how Astyocho betrays Phrynichus to Alcibiades; and so on. In this analysis, each episode is stripped down to its very core, to one central event, which becomes the peak by default.⁴⁷ The problem, in my view, is that this allows so much flexibility to the application of the model as to be detrimental to its explanatory power.

In my analysis, we can simply explain these clustered instances of the present in terms of the impact of each individual event on the narrative dynamic. Phrynichus fears that Alcibiades will return; he therefore acts to prevent this from happening by sending a letter to Astyocho (intervention: *τρέπεται* [‘turns’], *πέμπει* [‘sends’]). Astyocho betrays him, thwarting Phrynichus’ plan and prompting Alcibiades to act (intervention: *λέγει* [‘tells’], *γίνεται* *μηνυτής* [‘turns informer’]). Thereupon, Alcibiades plots to have Phrynichus killed (initiative: *πέμπει* [‘sends’]). Phrynichus is distressed and tries to persuade Astyocho once more (intervention: *ἀποστέλλει* [‘sends’]). Again, Astyocho betrays him (intervention: *μηνύει* [‘reveals’]). Thereupon, Phrynichus acts to prevent Alcibiades from accomplishing his goal of having him put to death by informing the Athenian army at Samos that the enemy is preparing an attack on the city (intervention: *ἑξάγγελος* *γίνεται* [‘becomes messenger’, i.e., ‘informs’]).⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Allan (2011b) suggests an analysis similar to this to explain the high concentration of present forms in the narrative of Themistocles’ exile at 1.135.2–138.

⁴⁸ The use of the present for preterite to refer to the communication of new, and especially sensitive, information, is typical. In Thucydides, see 1.132.5 *μηνυτής* *γίνεται* (‘turns informant’), 1.136.4 *δηλοῖ* (‘reveals’), 1.137.2 *φράζει* (‘tells’), 3.2.3 *μηνυταὶ* *γίνονται* (‘turn informant’), 3.3.5 *ἀγγέλλει* (‘announces’), 3.110.1 *ἀγγέλλεται* (‘it is announced’), 4.68.6 *καταγορεύει* (‘reveals’), 5.10.2 *ἀγγέλλεται* (‘it is announced’), 6.28.1 *μηνύεται* (‘information is laid’), 6.54.3 *καταγορεύει* (‘reveals’), 6.60.4 *μηνύει* (‘reveals’), 6.65.3 *ἀγγέλλουσι* (‘announce’), 6.74. *μηνύει* (‘reveals’), 7.31.3 *ἀγγέλλει* (‘announces’), 7.43.4 *ἀγγέλλουσι* (‘announce’), 8.26.1 *ἀγγέλλεται* (‘it is announced’), 8.73.4 *σημαίνουνσι* (‘reveal’), 8.74.3 *ἀγγέλλει* (‘announces’), 8.79.5 *ἀγγέλλεται* (‘it is announced’), 8.94.1 *ἀγγέλλονται* (‘are announced’).

Finally, the present for preterite can be used to mark changes in the discourse structure on a much higher level. In Thucydidean historiography, this often concerns changes in the military/political map in Greece. Such usages are often more easily understood in terms of changes in the status of referents, which I discuss in Section 3.5. Let me just give one example here. The following passage narrates actions taken by the Lacedaemonians after having successfully completed a military expedition against a place called Iasus:

- (43) τό τε πόλισμα Τισσαφέρνει παραδόντες καί τὰ ἀνδράποδα πάντα καί δοῦλα καί ἐλεύθερα, ὧν καθ' ἕκαστον στατήρα Δαρεικόν παρ' αὐτοῦ ξυνέβησαν λαβεῖν, ἔπειτα ἀνεχώρησαν ἐς τήν Μίλητον. καί Πεδάριτόν τε τὸν Λέοντος ἐς τήν Χίον ἄρχοντα Λακεδαιμονίων πεμψάντων **ἀποστέλλουσι** πεζῇ μέχρι Ἐρυθρῶν ἔχοντα τὸ παρὰ Ἀμόργου ἐπικουρικόν, καί ἐς τήν Μίλητον αὐτοῦ Φίλιππον **καθιστᾶσιν**. καί τὸ θέρος ἔτελεύτα.

After handing over the town to Tissaphernes, together with all the captives, slaves and [formerly] free men, agreeing to a price of one Dareic stater per head, they retreated to Miletus. And Pedaritus, the son of Leon, who was sent by the Lacedaemonians to Chios as commander, they **send** by land as far as Erythrae with the mercenary force from Amorges; and they **install** Philip in Miletus. And the summer ended.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 8.28.4–5)

The aorist ἀνεχώρησαν ('retreated') marks the resolution of the military expedition. Before the summer ended (imperfect ἔτελεύτα ['ended']), the Lacedaemonians make some preparations, sending a commander to Erythrae (ἀποστέλλουσι ['send']) and installing a certain Philip as governor of Miletus (καθιστᾶσιν ['install']). To my mind, the concept of the 'episode' has no explanatory value here with respect to the use of the present for preterite. Rather, the present signals changes in the macro-level discourse structure. Our mental model of the discourse involves keeping track of what force or which commander is where at what moment. Philip is *now* the commander at Miletus, and Pedaritus is *now* on his way to Erythrae.⁴⁹

In conclusion, the model of episodic structure may be a useful heuristic tool for identifying particular locations of changes in the narrative dynamic (the incipit and the peak), but only in those cases where the narrative

⁴⁹ The narrative strand of Pedaritus is picked up in 8.32.2: καί μετὰ τοῦτο Πεδάριτος, τότε παριῶν πεζῇ ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου, γενόμενος ἐν Ἐρυθραῖς **διαπεραιοῦται** αὐτός τε καί ἡ στρατιά ἐς Χίον ('and after that Pedaritus, who at that time came by land from Miletus, {arrived} at Erythrae and **crosses over** with his army to Chios').

submits to such an analysis in the first place. In summary narrative, it is often good economy to explain the use of the present for preterite in terms of changes in the structure of the narrative without reference to episodic structure.

3.4.3 *Narrative Schemas: Corpus Analysis*

Having discussed a number of suggestive examples, I now aim to show in a more systematic fashion that the present for preterite is structurally associated with the pragmatic function of marking changes in the narrative dynamic.

The evidence presented in Sections 3.3.3 (sentence complexity) and 3.3.4 (discourse progression marked by *δή* ['then', 'so']) already points in this direction. Another factor is verbal semantics. It has been noted many times that the present for preterite has a predilection for certain verbs or event types. For example, in the volume on the 'historical present' in Thucydides (Lallot et al. [2011]), there are individual contributions on the verbs *αἰρέω/λαμβάνω* ('capture') (Allan [2011a]), *τρέπω* ('turn to flight') (Mortier-Waldschmidt [2011]), *πείθω* ('persuade') (Jacquinod [2011]) and *πέμπω* ('send') (Lambert [2011:211–21]). These verbs all have a high present-to-aorist ratio and typically mark changes in the structure of the narrative.⁵⁰ Other salient examples are verbs such as *μηχανάομαι* ('contrive'; 5 present forms, 0 aorists in my selected corpus; compare Section 3.3.1, note 27), *ἐπιβουλεύω* ('form a plot'; 3 present forms, 0 aorists) and the auxiliary verb *φθάνω* ('do something before someone else can prevent it'; 9 present forms, 1 aorist; see also Chapter 2, Section 2.6.2).

However, as there are many different verb types and it is difficult to come up with objective criteria for determining their inherent 'change-marking' quality, I will not attempt a systematic review of tense marking and verb type. Instead, I will focus on how changes in the narrative dynamic are cued in the context surrounding the main clause assertion. I have identified seven narrative schemas involving a change in the narrative dynamic. Six of these are characterised by certain keywords, and one by a negation in a subordinate clause. I describe these schemas as follows:⁵¹

⁵⁰ On the predilection of the present for certain verbs, see also, e.g., Koller (1951); Lallot (2011); Nijk (2013a). On *ἄφικνέομαι* ('arrive') and *πέμπω* ('send'), see also Section 3.5.2.

⁵¹ Such narrative schemas have also been identified by Lambert (2011), who discusses examples from Polybius and Thucydides. According to Lambert, the tendency for the present for preterite to be used after subordinate clauses referring to the state of mind of a character in the story (which,

- (1) A character is in a DIFFICULT SITUATION and tries to get rid of it:

Ἀπορῶν δὲ καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἄλλην εὐρίσκων ἀπαλλαγὴν, πείσας τοῦ ξένου τοὺς παῖδας **διαφθείρει** τὸ γραμματεῖον, ὃ ἔδει Σάτυρον λαβεῖν εἰ μὴ μ' ἀπαλλάξαιεν οὗτος.

Being at a loss and finding no other way out, he {bribes} the slaves of the stranger and **counterfeits** the document which Satyrus was to receive in case he did not come to an agreement with me.

(Isocrates, *Speech against the banker* [17] 23)

Keywords: ἀπορέω ('be at a loss'), πιέζομαι ('be pressed').

- (2) A character FEARS that something will happen and acts to prevent it:

γενομένης δὲ τῆς τροπῆς περὶ δειλὴν ὄψιαν, δέισαντες οἱ ὀλίγοι μὴ αὐτοβοεῖ ὁ δῆμος τοῦ τε νεωρίου κρατήσκειν ἐπελθῶν καὶ σφᾶς διαφθείρειεν, **ἐμπιπρᾶσι** τὰς οἰκίας τὰς ἐν κύκλῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τὰς ξυνοικίας, ὅπως μὴ ἦ ἔφοδος.⁵²

As they were routed towards dusk, fearing that the people would attack and take control of the arsenal at first shout, and destroy them, the oligarchs **set fire to** the houses and the lodging-houses around the marketplace, so that there would be no way to advance against them.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 3.74.2)

Keywords: ἔδεισα, φοβέομαι.

- (3) A character IS ANGRY about something and seeks redress:

Βαρῆως δὲ φέρων τὴν ὕβριν αὐτῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δίκην ἐκατέρῳ αὐτῶν **λαγχάνει**.

Taking their outrageous behaviour against him badly, the man **files** a suit against both of them.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 62)

Keywords: ὀργίζομαι ('be angry'), χαλεπῶς/βαρέως φέρω ('find difficult to bear'), ἀγανακτέω ('be grieved'), ἀλγέω ('be pained'), λυπέω ('be pained').

however, Lambert does not support with statistics) suggests that the present for preterite conveys a certain empathy with the character. Lambert (2011: abstract) points out that '[i]n other cases, it happens that the narrator insists on the fact that the event he is telling about has upset the situation'. To my mind, this is the central point. Lambert's insistence on the aspect of empathy seems forced in certain cases (see especially pages 205–7).

⁵² There follows a long subordinate clause which I leave out for the sake of convenient translation.

- (4) A character WISHES to accomplish something and sets out to do this:

οἱ δ' αὖ Θηβαῖοι ἀντιτιμωρεῖσθαι βουλόμενοι **στρατεύουσι** πανδημεὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Θεσπιῶν χώραν.

The Thebans, wishing to take vengeance in turn, **make an expedition** with the entire citizen body against the land of the Thespians.

(Xenophon, *Hellenic affairs* 5.4.42)

Keywords: βούλομαι ('want').

- (5) A character SEES (or realises, perceives, learns, knows) a certain problematic situation or, conversely, an opportunity, and acts accordingly:

ὁ δὲ Ἐτεόνικος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ὡς εἶδον προσθέοντας τοὺς ὀπλίτας, **συγκλείουσι** τὰς πύλας καὶ τὸν μοχλὸν **ἐμβάλλουσιν**.

When Eteonicus and those with him saw the hoplites running towards the city, they **close** the gate and **thrust in** the bar.

(Xenophon, *Expedition of Cyrus* 7.1.15)

Keywords: ὁράω ('see'), γινώσκω ('realise'), αἰσθάνομαι ('perceive'), μαθάνω ('learn'), πυνθάνομαι ('hear/learn').

- (6) A character THINKS that something is the case and acts accordingly:

οἱ δ' ἐμποδῶν νομιζοντες αὐτὸν εἶναι τῷ ποιεῖν ὃ τι βούλοιντο, **ἐπιβουλεύουσιν** αὐτῷ.

But they [the Thirty], thinking that he [Theramenes] was in their way, preventing them to do as they pleased, **form a plot against** him.

(Xenophon, *Hellenic affairs* 2.3.23)

Keywords: νομίζω ('think'), ἠγέομαι ('think'), δοκέω ('think', with the cogniser in the nominative case, or 'seem', with the cogniser in the dative case).

- (7) Things GO DIFFERENTLY than a character anticipated, so that a different approach is called for:

Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τῷ Πιπταλάκῳ διελέχθη δεόμενος παραδοῦναι τοῦτον· ὡς δ' οὐκ ἔπειθεν, αὐτῷ τούτῳ **προσβάλλει**.

So at first, he talked to Pittalacus, asking him to hand over the defendant; but when he failed to persuade him, he **makes an attempt on** the defendant himself.

(Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* [1] 57)

This schema is not characterised by a specific keyword but by a negation in a temporal subordinate clause.

The criteria for inclusion in the data and coding were the following:

- (a) As sentence complexity in itself increases the odds of the present for preterite being used (Section 3.3.3), I included only complex sentences in my data sample. For schemas 1 to 6, I included cases with a minimum of one temporal subordinate clause or conjunct participial clause (either preposed or postposed). For schema 7, I included only cases with a preposed temporal subordinate clause (because all relevant instances containing a negation were preposed). Absolute participial clauses were ignored.
- (b) For schemas 1 through 6, instances were coded as belonging to a certain schema when the main verb of one of the subordinate clauses belonged to one of the defined keywords (composites were included).⁵³ Moreover, the subject of the subordinate clause had to be coreferential with that of the main clause (except in the case of *δοκέω* ['seem'], schema 6).
- (c) Instances were coded as belonging to schema 7 when the temporal subordinate clause contained a negation, without further conditions.

Two further thoughts. First, I have tried to keep my selection of keywords as simple as possible. There are many other cases I might have included in a more generous selection, but this would have made the selection more arbitrary. I have aimed at simplicity and consistency, not at maximizing positive results: the reader may judge whether I have left out keywords that should have obviously been included, or vice versa. Second, by looking only at subordinate clauses, I have excluded cases where the schema extends beyond a single sentence. To give an example:

- (44) ἐν τοιοῦτῳ δ' ὄντι μοι κινδυνεύειν ἐδόκει, ὡς τοῦ γε ἀποθανεῖν
ὑπάρχοντος ἤδη. καλέσας δὲ Δάμνιππον λέγω πρὸς αὐτὸν τάδε.

As I was in such a situation, it seemed to me that I should make a venture, seeing that I was already as good as dead. I {called} Damnippos and say to him the following.

(Lysias, *Against Eratosthenes* [12] 13–14)

In the first main clause, the character arrives at the idea that he should try to escape his dire situation (*ἐδόκει* ['it seemed'] is a keyword for schema 6). The second main clause narrates the action taken by the character. The reason for not including such examples is that it is hard to decide where to draw the line: how great should we allow the distance between the two

⁵³ With the exception of *ἀναγιγνώσκω* in the sense 'read' (schema 5).

Table 3.4 Tense and narrative schemas

Schema	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value	Cases
<i>Difficult situation</i>	4.656	0.047 ^a	14
<i>Fear</i>	2.482	0.019 ^b	38
<i>Wish</i>	2.155	0.109 ^c	23
<i>See</i>	1.478	0.045 ^d	130
<i>Go differently</i>	1.366	0.423 ^e	32
<i>Think</i>	1.296	0.447 ^f	38

^aB = 1.518 (constant = .273), standard error = .766. *N* = 1155.

^bB = .909 (constant = .261), standard error = .386. *N* = 1155.

^cB = .768 (constant = .274), standard error = .479. *N* = 1155.

^dB = .391 (constant = .245), standard error = .195. *N* = 1155.

^eB = .312 (constant = .199), standard error = .389. *N* = 254.

^fB = .260 (constant = .279), standard error = .342. *N* = 1155.

elements of the schema to be? Sticking to subordinate clauses makes the selection of the data more objective.

The results are listed in Table 3.4. Because the total number of instances of the schema in question (listed under ‘cases’) is generally low, I have grouped the three historiographical works together. The loss of individual differences is less important, in my view, than the overall picture. I have ranked the schemas according to odds ratio, from high to low. Schema 3 (‘angry’) was excluded because the data yielded only a handful of cases.

The generally positive effect associated with these schemas supports the claim that one of the main functions of the present for preterite is to mark changes in the narrative dynamic. Note that the increase in odds reported here is above the increase in odds due to the mere presence of at least one conjunct participial clause or temporal subordinate clause (odds ratio 1.511).⁵⁴ The observed hierarchy makes sense in light of the hypothesis presented here. It stands to reason that the ‘difficult situation’ schema should be the surest sign of an imminent change in the narrative dynamic. Next, a character’s ‘fear’ is the strongest semantic cue. Of the other four, ‘wish’ (which has a reasonably strong odds ratio at 2.155 but a rather high *p*-value at 0.109) is the strongest indicator of a protagonist’s intention to effect a change in the narrative dynamic. ‘See’ and ‘think’ (a statistically negligible effect at *p* = 0.447) are more neutral terms.

⁵⁴ B = .413 (constant = .129), standard error = .084, *p* < .001. *N* = 2290.

As for the ‘go differently’ schema, many cases where the aorist is used are easily explained away in terms of narrative dynamics. The aorist is normally used when an attempt is abandoned altogether. For example:

- (45) ὡς δ’ οὐδὲν ἀπέβαινεν αὐτοῖς ὧν προσεδέχοντο καὶ ἐπελελοίπει ὁ σῆτος, ἀνεχώρησαν καὶ διελύθησαν κατὰ πόλεις.

When nothing turned out as they expected and their provisions had run short, they retreated and disbanded, each [returning] to their own city.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 3.26.4)

The aorist is almost always used in such contexts, where the resolution of narrative tension is marked by characters ‘going away’ (ἀπέρχομαι), ‘retreating’ (ἀναχωρέω), ‘sailing away’ (ἀποπλέω) and the like. This is very different from when an initial setback inspires a new attempt to accomplish the original goal. At least 7 out of the 12 cases of the aorist counted for this schema fall into this category.⁵⁵ Ignoring such cases would certainly make the effect (which is now statistically negligible at $p = 0.423$) stronger. Similar instances are found with the other schemas as well.

3.4.4 Conclusion

In this section, I have argued that one of the main discourse-structural functions of the present for preterite is to mark changes in the narrative dynamic. I identified four types: initiatives, interventions, incidents and culminations (Section 3.4.1). Next, I argued that the explanatory value of these concepts for tense-switching supersedes that of the model of episodic structure (Section 3.4.2). Finally, I presented evidence from the corpus to the effect that subordinate clauses that cue an imminent change in the narrative dynamic increase the odds of the present for preterite being used (Section 3.4.3).

3.5 Changes in the Status of Referents

The second main function of the diegetic present for preterite is to mark changes in the status of referents. I distinguish two types. First, changes in the *activation status* of referents. This concerns either the (re-)introduction

⁵⁵ Th. 3.16.2 ἀνεχώρησαν (‘retreated’), 3.18.1 ἀπῆλθον (‘went away’), 3.26.4 ἀνεχώρησαν (‘retreated’), 8.10.2 ἐπανεχώρησαν (‘retreated’), 8.20.2 ἀπέπλευσεν (‘sailed away’); X. *HG* 2.1.23 ἀπέπλευσαν (‘sailed away’); *An.* 4.3.6 ἀνεχώρησαν (‘retreated’).

of referents or their *exit*.⁵⁶ Second, changes in the *position* or *role* of referents: objects changing possession, persons changing their relationship status, cities changing allegiance, et cetera.⁵⁷ These functions often overlap (a character may be re-introduced into the discourse with a new role), but this is not always the case, and it makes sense to make this distinction from a descriptive point of view.

In Section 3.5.1, I sketch a typology of different types of changes in the status of referents. In Section 3.5.2, I argue that the referent-managing function of the present for preterite may be supported by an additional conceptual scenario, in which the designated entities are traced on a 'mental map'. Then, in Section 3.5.3, I explore the hypothesis that greater unpredictability of the subject referent increases the odds of the present for preterite being used.

3.5.1 Typology

I begin with changes in activation status. The *activation* of a referent entails either the introduction of an entirely new referent or the re-introduction of an already established referent in a particular episode or scene ('cast change markers'; see van Dijk [1981: 181]). The following example illustrates the former principle:

- (46) Καὶ ἐδοξέ σφι ἕκαστον ἄνδρα Περσέων προσεταιρίσασθαι τοῦτον ὅτεω πιστεύει μάλιστα. Ὅτανης μὲν νυν **ἰσάγεται** Ἰνταφρένεα, Γωβρύης δὲ Μεγάβυζον, Ἀσπαθίνης δὲ Ὑδάρνεα. Γεγονότων δὲ τούτων ἕξ **παρὰγίνεται** ἐς τὰ Σοῦσα Δαρεῖος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος ἐκ Περσέων ἠκων.

And they decided that each of them should take as companion the Persian he most trusted. Now, Otanes **brings** in Intaphrenes; Gobryas: Megabyzus; and Aspathines: Hydarnes. These being six, Darius, the son of Hystaspes, **arrives** at Sousa, coming from the Persians.

(Herodotus, *Histories* 3.70)

Intaphrenes, Megabyzus and Hydarnes are mentioned here for the first time. Darius has been mentioned before by Herodotus but not as a character in the main narrative. These men, together with the already

⁵⁶ For the function of the present for preterite in introducing new referents, compare Thoma (2011).

⁵⁷ Compare Fanning (1990: 232), who describes the use of the present for preterite 'to introduce new participants in an existing paragraph' and 'to show participants moving to new locations within a paragraph'.

mentioned Otanes, Gobryas and Aspathines, will play the leading role in the following narrative, as they rise against the reign of Smerdis the mage.

An example of a local re-introduction of a character who has already been established in the macro-narrative is the following:

- (47) ἤδη δὲ ἡμῶν κεχειροτονημένων ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄρκους, οὐπω δὲ ἀπηρκότων ἐπὶ τὴν ὑστέραν πρεσβείαν, ἐκκλησία **γίγνεται**, ἐν ἣ Δημοσθένης ὁ νυνὶ κατηγορῶν ἐμοῦ **λαγχάνει** προεδρεύειν.

When we had already been elected to administer the oaths, but had not yet left on our second embassy, an assembly **is held**, in which Demosthenes, who is now my accuser, **is chosen by lot** to act as president.

(Aeschines, *On the false embassy* [2] 82)

The present in ἐκκλησία γίγνεται ('an assembly is held') marks a new development in the macro-narrative structure, prompting the beginning of a new episode (the beginning of the actual episode is marked in the next sentence with the phrase ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ['in that assembly']). The present λαγχάνει ('is chosen by lot') serves to highlight the introduction of Demosthenes, who is a main character in the macro-narrative, as an actor in this new episode.

Finally, the following instance illustrates the re-introduction of a referent on the scene on two levels of narrative organisation. The speech is Lysias' *Against Simon*, and the context is as follows: After a confrontation between the speaker and the defendant over a boy, Theodotus, the speaker left Athens. After a while, he comes back:

- (48) ἐπειδὴ δὲ ᾧμην ἰκανὸν εἶναι τὸν χρόνον Σίμωνι ἐπιλαθέσθαι μὲν τοῦ νεανίσκου, μεταμελήσει δὲ τῶν πρότερον ἡμαρτημένων, **ἀφικνοῦμαι** πάλιν. κἀγὼ μὲν ὠχόμην εἰς Πειραιᾶ, οὗτος δ' αἰσθόμενος εὐθέως ἤκοντα τὸν Θεόδοτον καὶ διατρίβοντα παρὰ Λυσιμάχῳ, ὃς ᾧκει πλησίον τῆς οἰκίας ἧς οὗτος ἐμεμίσθωτο, παρεκάλεσέ τινας τῶν τούτου ἐπιτηδείων. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν ἤριστων καὶ ἔπινον, φύλακας δὲ κατέστησαν ἐπὶ τοῦ τέγους, ἵν', ὁπότε ἐξέλθοι τὸ μειράκιον, εἰσαρπάσειαν αὐτόν. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ **ἀφικνοῦμαι** ἐγὼ ἐκ Πειραιέως, καὶ **τρέπομαι** παριῶν ὡς τὸν Λυσιμάχον.

When I believed enough time had elapsed for Simon to have forgotten about the boy and regret his acts of wrongdoing, I **arrive** again. I went to Piraeus, but the defendant, perceiving immediately that Theodotus had come back and was staying with Lysimachus, who lived close to the house which the defendant had rented, called some of his friends over. So they ate and drank, and they placed guards on the roof, so that, when the boy came out, they might seize him and

take him inside. In that moment I **arrive** from Piraeus, and in passing I **turn** to Lysimachus' house.

(Lysias, *Against Simon* [3] 10–12)

The two instances of ἀφικνοῦμαι ('arrive') have been found problematic by those who explain the use of the present for preterite purely in terms of rhetorical impact (Sicking and Stork [1997]). In my account, these present forms mark the re-introduction of the speaker on the scene on different levels of the narrative. First, the speaker arrives back at Athens: this marks the start of a new phase in the narrative on a macro-structural level. The second instance marks the arrival of the speaker on the scene in the context of episodic developments. Note how the phrase ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ ('in that moment') indicates that the event designated by the main clause verb constitutes an incision in the structure of the story.⁵⁸

De-activation of referents occurs when referents are taken 'off the stage' (*exit*), usually by death. This is illustrated by the following example:

- (49) Μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ξυνθήκας Θηριμένης μὲν παραδοὺς Ἀστυόχῳ τὰς ναῦς ἀποπλέων ἐν κέλῃτι **ἀφανίζεται**.

After [the establishment of] that agreement Therimenes, after handing over the ships to Astyochus, {sailed away} in a small boat and **disappears**.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 8.38.1)

With his disappearance in the story, Therimenes disappears as a discourse referent that the addressees need to take into account in the processing of the narrative.

Changes in the *role* of characters often coincide with changes in their activation status in the discourse. One instance, however, where the referent is already highly active when his role changes, is the following:

- (50) ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ταῦτα πολιτευομένου τούτου τότε καὶ τοῦτο τὸ δεῖγμ' ἐξενηροχότος περὶ αὐτοῦ, τοὺς περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης πρέσβεις πέμπειν ὡς Φίλιππον ἐπέισθητε ὑπ' Ἀριστοδήμου καὶ Νεοπτολέμου καὶ Κτησιφώντος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐκεῖθεν ἀπαγγελλόντων οὐδ' ὀτιοῦν ὑγιές, **γίγνεται** τῶν πρέσβων τούτων εἷς καὶ οὗτος, οὐχ ὡς τῶν ἀποδωσομένων τὰ ὑμέτερα, οὐδ' ὡς τῶν πεπιστευκότων τῷ Φιλίππῳ, ἀλλ' ὡς τῶν φυλαξόντων τοὺς ἄλλους.

Now, when you were induced by Aristodemus, Neoptolemus, Ctesiphon and others, who had brought entirely misleading reports

⁵⁸ Compare my earlier comments on the term καιρός ('opportune/critical moment') at example (28) in Section 3.3.3, with note 32.

from Macedonia, to send an embassy to negotiate peace with Philip, the defendant, having conducted those policies and having exhibited that example of his conduct, **becomes** one of the ambassadors – being chosen not as one who would make traffic of your interests, not as one who had any confidence in Philip, but as one of the party that was to keep an eye on the rest, for in view of his early speeches, and of his known hostility to Philip, it was natural that you should all have such an opinion of the man.

(Demosthenes, *On the false embassy* [19] 12;
trans. after Vince and Vince [1926])

Aeschines here acquires the role of ambassador. This is a key moment in Demosthenes' narrative, as it concerns Aeschines' alleged misbehaviour while acting in this function.

Finally, typical changes in the position of referents involve events such as marriage, adoption, financial transactions, transfer of property and the like.⁵⁹ I discuss two cases that also illustrate the cumulative effect of the use of present forms in close succession to mark different changes in the status of referents. First, consider the following passage:

(51) ὑπὸ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦτον καὶ Τιμοσθένης ὁ Αἰγιλιεύς **ἀφικνεῖται** κατ' ἐμπορίαν ἰδίαν ἀποδημῶν. ἐπιτήδεις δὲ ὦν Φορμίῳ καὶ κοινωνὸς ὁ Τιμοσθένης, ὅτ' ἐξέπλει, **δίδωσιν** ἀποθεῖναι τῷ Φορμίῳ μετ' ἄλλων χρημάτων καὶ φιάλας λυκιουργεῖς δύο. ἀπὸ τύχης δὲ ὁ παῖς ταύτας τὰς φιάλας, οὐκ εἰδὼς ὅτι ἀλλότρια ἦσαν, **δίδωσι** τῷ Αἰσχυρίῳ τῷ ἀκολουθῶ τῷ τούτου, ὅτ' ἐπέμψθη ὡς τὸν πατέρα τὸν ἐμὸν ὑπὸ τούτου, καὶ ἠτεῖτο τὰ στρώματα καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ τὰς φιάλας, καὶ τὴν μνᾶν τοῦ ἀργυρίου ἐδανείσατο, ἀφικομένων ὡς τοῦτον Ἀλκέτου καὶ Ἰάσονος.

About the same time, Timosthenes of Aegilia also **arrives** home from a journey abroad which he had made on private business. Timosthenes {was} a friend and partner of Phormio, and when he set sail he **gives** to Phormio to put away for him along with other articles two bowls of Lycian workmanship. By chance the boy, not knowing that these bowls were the property of someone else, **gives** them to Aeschion, the body-servant of the defendant, when he was sent to my father by the defendant and requested the bedding and the cloaks and the bowls, and borrowed the mina of silver, at the time when Alcetas and Jason came to the defendant's house.

(Demosthenes, *Against Timotheus* [49] 31;
trans. after Murray [1939])

⁵⁹ On marriage, adoption and financial transactions, see also Chapter 4, especially Section 4.4.

The present ἀφικνεῖται ('arrives') highlights the activation of a new referent: Timosthenes of Aegilia. Then, the narrative moves back to a previous occasion. The first instance of the present δίδωσιν ('gives') introduces a new referent (the bowls), re-activates a familiar referent (Phormio) in this new part of the story and marks a possession change (the bowls move from Timosthenes to Phormio). The second instance again marks a possession change and re-activates a referent who is familiar from the preceding discourse (Aeschrión).

My second example concerns the narrative in Isaeus' speech *On the estate of Hagnias* (11). The facts as presented by the speaker are as follows: Hagnias did not leave his estate to his next-of-kin, but adopted a niece as his daughter. Should he die, his estate would go to whomever she married. However, he had written in his will that, in case his adopted daughter should die, the property was to go to Glaucon, his half-brother. Beside Glaucon, Hagnias' next-of-kin were Eubulides, Stratocles, Stratius and the speaker. This was the situation, but then things changed:

- (52) Χρόνων δὲ διαγενομένων μετὰ ταῦτα **τελευτᾷ** μὲν Εὐβουλίδης, **τελευτᾷ** δ' ἡ θυγάτηρ ἦν ἐποιήσατο Ἄγνιας, **λαμβάνει** δὲ τὸν κληρὸν Γλαύκων κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην.

Some time having elapsed after that, Eubulides **dies**, the daughter whom Hagnias had adopted **dies**, and Glaucon **takes possession of** the estate in accordance with the will.

(Isaeus, *On the Estate of Hagnias* [11] 9)

The first two present forms (τελευτᾷ ['dies']) mark the *exit* of referents in the narrative who were important in that they were potential claimants to the disputed inheritance. The form λαμβάνει ('takes possession of') marks the transfer of the inheritance to the possession of Glaucon. Isaeus continues to use the present for preterite in the rest of this short narrative to mark changes of possession and *exits* of referents.⁶⁰ This serves to facilitate our processing of the discourse, as we keep track of who is in possession of the estate, and which potential claimants are still alive, at each point in the narrative.

3.5.2 Mental Maps

The present for preterite is often used to mark stages in a journey. This use may be understood in terms of marking a change in the position of

⁶⁰ 9 λαμβάνει ('takes possession of'), 10 τελευτᾷ ('dies', *bis*).

referents as well. However, I argue that the conceptual scenario in which the position of referents is traced in the discourse space may be supported by another conceptual scenario in which the position of referents is traced on a fictive *map*. This mental map is a ‘visual aid’ which helps to concretise the more abstract concept of referents changing position in the discourse space.

The most well-known cases of what we may call the ‘itinerary present’ are found in the first book of Xenophon’s *Expedition of Cyrus*. Here the stages of Cyrus’ expedition into upper Persia are consistently marked with present forms, in formulas of the following type: *From there he marches X stages, Y parasangs, to location Z*. The most remarkable cluster of such present forms is found in the following passage:⁶¹

- (53) Ἐντεῦθεν **ἐξελαύνει** σταθμούς δύο παρασάγγας δέκα ἐπὶ τὸν Ψάρον ποταμόν, οὗ ἦν τὸ εὖρος τρία πλέθρα. ἔντεῦθεν **ἐξελαύνει** σταθμὸν ἓνα παρασάγγας πέντε ἐπὶ τὸν Πύραμον ποταμόν, οὗ ἦν τὸ εὖρος στάδιον. ἔντεῦθεν **ἐξελαύνει** σταθμούς δύο παρασάγγας πεντεκαίδεκα εἰς Ἴσσοῦς, τῆς Κιλικίας ἐσχάτην πόλιν ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάττῃ οἰκουμένην, μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα.

From there he **marches out**, two stages, ten parasangs, to the river Psarus, which was three plethra in width. From there he **marches out**, one stage, five parasangs, to the river Pyramus, which was a stadium in width. From there he **marches out**, two stages, fifteen parasangs, to Issus, the last city of Cilicia, situated on the sea, large and wealthy.

(Xenophon, *Expedition of Cyrus* 1.4.1)

Rijksbaron (2002: 24) devotes a separate heading to this use of the present for preterite. He argues that ‘decisiveness’, which he considers the typical function of the present for preterite elsewhere (22–4), is ‘a less prominent feature’ here. Rijksbaron assigns a narrative-structural function to this use of the present: ‘[T]hey “punctuate”, as it were, the narrative, dividing it into narrative units.’ I think discourse segmentation is certainly an important consideration here. The narrative ‘moves along’ with the main character: as Cyrus marches to a next stage, we are led from one spatio-temporally defined narrative unit to the next (compare Willi [2017: 240]; Huitink [2019: 196–8]).

⁶¹ The other instances (to a total of 23) are: (1.)2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11 (*bis*), 2.14, 2.19 (*bis*), 2.20, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.19, 5.1, 5.5, 7.1, 7.14. We find the aorist only at 1.2.23 (ἤλασε [‘marched’]). Here the verb does not mark an uninterrupted march from one resting place to the next, but rather the completion of a stage that was already begun.

On the other hand, I do not think this interpretation is entirely satisfactory. When the present is used in close succession, as in the example just cited, the idea that each present form marks the beginning of a new ‘narrative unit’ loses much of its explanatory value. The first two present forms do not introduce a new episode; nothing further happens after Cyrus arrives at his destination. In my view, this explanation should be supported by one that is more specifically geared towards the kind of conceptualisation that is evoked by these verbs – verbs such as ἐξελαύνω (‘march out’) in example (53), as well as (very frequently) ἀφικνέομαι (‘arrive’) and πέμπω (‘send’) and others such as ὀρμίζομαι (‘anchor’).⁶²

I argue that the present for preterite of such verbs may activate a conceptual scenario in which the designated change in location is traced on a virtual map. The existence of maps in Classical Athens is well-attested, although the texts we have suggest that maps were something of a novelty.⁶³ The best-known passage is probably the story in Herodotus’ *Histories* (5.49), where Aristagoras, the ruler of Miletus, comes to Sparta in order to convince King Cleomenes to undertake a military expedition into Persia. Aristagoras carries with him ‘a bronze tablet in which a map of the entire earth and the entire sea and all the rivers was engraved’ (5.49.1 χάλκεον πίνακα ἐν τῷ γῆς ἀπάσης περιόδου ἐνετέμνητο καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες).⁶⁴ On this map, Aristagoras shows Cleomenes the peoples that he will conquer on the way to Susa, pointing out their riches to entice the king to take on the enterprise:

- (54) ‘Κατοίκηνται δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενοι ὡς ἐγὼ φράσω. Ἴωνων μὲν τῶνδε οἶδε Λυδοί, οἰκούντες τε χώρην ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολυαργυρώτατοι ἐόντες’ (δεικνύς δὲ ἔλεγε ταῦτα ἐς τῆς γῆς τὴν περίοδον τὴν ἐφέρετο ἐν τῷ πίνακι ἐντετεμμένην). ‘Λυδῶν δέ’, ἔφη λέγων ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης, ‘οἶδε ἔχονται Φρύγες οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἡῶ, πολυπροβατώτατοί τε ἐόντες πάντων τῶν ἐγὼ οἶδα καὶ πολυκαρπώτατοι.’

‘They inhabit neighbouring territories, as I will explain. Neighbouring the Ionians here_{IMMPROX} are the Lydians over here_{IMMPROX}, inhabiting

⁶² For the frequent use of the present for preterite of ἀφικνέομαι (‘arrive’) and πέμπω (‘send’) in Thucydides, see Lallot (2011). Present for preterite forms of the verb πέμπω (‘send’) often designate changes in the narrative dynamic of the initiative and intervention type: see Lambert (2011: 211–21). For ὀρμίζομαι (‘anchor’) in Thucydides, see 1.46.3, repeated in 1.46.5 (example [55]), 7.34.1, 8.10.3, 8.11.1, 8.95.1, 8.103.3.

⁶³ Compare Dover (1968) and Aristophanes, *Clouds* 206; see note 68. See also Purves (2010: ch. 3, with p. 99, n. 7 for references).

⁶⁴ The phrase περίοδος γῆς, which we can here translate as a ‘map of the world’ (as at Aristophanes, *Clouds* 206, see below), literally means ‘perimeter of the world’ or ‘round journey of the world’. See Romm (1992: ch. 1) for a discussion of the broader applications of the term.

a good land and being exceptionally rich in silver.' And as he said that he pointed to the map of the world which was engraved in the tablet he carried. 'And neighbouring the Lydians,' continued Aristagoras, 'are the Phrygians of the east over here_{IMMPROX}, who are the richest in sheep of all the peoples I know, and richest in fruit.'

(Herodotus, *Histories* 5.49.5)

Note how Aristagoras uses demonstratives designating immediate proximity to refer to the representations of the Ionian, Lydian and Phrygian peoples on the map (ἰώνων τῶνδε ['neighbouring the Ionians here'], οἷδε Λυδοί ['the Lydians over here'], οἷδε Φρύγες ['the Phrygians over here']). In reality, these peoples live far away, but their representations on the map are within arm's reach of Aristagoras.⁶⁵

I argue that the use of the 'itinerary' present conveys the pretence that the narrated journey can be traced on a map that is currently accessible to the speech partners. Of course, there is no actual map and no actual tracing: we are dealing with a covert scenario, a conceptual substrate we supply in order to make sense of the utterance (Langacker [2008: 531–5]). In Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus* (example [53]), we mentally trace Cyrus' journey inland on a map, moving our focus from one location to another.⁶⁶ The way Xenophon describes the stages is iconic of this act of tracing. Xenophon starts with the reference location (ἐντεῦθεν ['from there']), then gives the verb (ἐξελαύνει ['marches out']), the distance travelled (σταθμούς δύο παρασάγγας δέκα ['two stages, ten parasangs']) and the destination (ἐπὶ τὸν Ψάρον ποταμὸν ['to the river Psarus']).⁶⁷

⁶⁵ The rhetorical effect of the compression of space achieved by the map is discussed by Purves (2010: ch. 4).

⁶⁶ In this connection it is highly interesting that Purves (2010: 98) suggests that the origins of prose narrative may have been 'inherently bound up with the art of pictorial representation'. She points to the doxographical tradition that Anaximander presented an account of the world together with a map in one book; the same is believed of Hecataeus. Purves (2010: 107) also refers to West (1971: 19, 49–50; 1997: 146 and n. 193), who has suggested that the mythographer Pherecydes may have had a map of the world before him while writing his *Theogony*.

⁶⁷ Purves (2010: 128–9, 147) points to similar iconic effects in Herodotus' description of Asia. Further on, however, with reference to Herodotus' description of the King's road, Purves (2010: 144–50) distinguishes Herodotus' *hodological* understanding of space from a *cartographical* understanding (with reference to Janni [1984]). While a map gives a synoptic representation of a spatial expanse, Herodotus' discourse 'follows a trajectory from A to B, following the traveler's experience and perspective rather than that of an abstract, overseeing eye' (Purves [2010: 145]). In my view, it is possible to have a hodological description of traversing space while at the same time establishing links with a mental space representing a map. Moreover, I point out that Aristagoras' 'reading' of the map to king Cleomenes is also hodological to a certain extent, as there is a chronological progression when he moves further east ('here are the Ionians, here are the Lydians, here are the Phrygians').

This explanation is not mutually exclusive with an explanation in terms of discourse structure. Rather, it reinforces it. Let me give another example to argue this point:

(55) αἱ μὲν δὴ νῆες [sc. τῶν Ἀθηναίων] ἀφικνοῦνται ἐς τὴν Κέρκυραν, οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι, ἐπειδὴ αὐτοῖς παρεσκευάστο, ἔπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν Κέρκυραν ναυσὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν... ἐπειδὴ δὲ προσέμειξαν τῇ κατὰ Κέρκυραν ἠπείρῳ ἀπὸ Λευκάδος πλέοντες, ὁρμίζονται ἐς Χειμέριον τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος γῆς.

ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν, καὶ πόλις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κεῖται ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐν τῇ Ἐλαιάτιδι τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἐφύρη. ἐξίησι δὲ παρ' αὐτὴν Ἀχερουσία λίμνη ἐς θάλασσαν· διὰ δὲ τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἀχέρων ποταμὸς ῥέων ἐσβάλλει ἐς αὐτὴν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχει. ρεῖ δὲ καὶ Θύαμις ποταμὸς, ὀρίζων τὴν Θεσπρωτίδα καὶ Κεστρίνην, ὧν ἐντὸς ἡ ἄκρα ἀνέχει τὸ Χειμέριον.

οἱ μὲν οὖν Κορίνθιοι τῆς ἠπείρου ἐναυῦθα ὁρμίζονται τε καὶ στρατόπεδον ἐποίησαντο.

The ships [of the Athenians] **arrive** at Corcyra, and the Corinthians, when their preparations had been made, sailed against Corcyra with one hundred and fifty ships... They {sailed} from Leucas, and when they drew near the mainland over against Corcyra, **cast anchor** at Chimerium in the territory of Thesprotia.

It is a harbour, and above it lies a city away from the sea in the Eleatic district of Thesprotia, Ephyra by name. Near it is the outlet into the sea of the Acherusian lake; and the river Acheron runs through Thesprotia and empties into the lake, to which it gives its name. There is also the river Thyamis, which separates Thesprotia and Cestrine, and between these rivers rises the promontory of Chimerium.

At that point of the mainland, then, the Corinthians **cast anchor** and made a camp.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 1.46; trans. after Smith [1919])

The present forms ἀφικνοῦνται ('arrive') and ὁρμίζονται ('cast anchor') signal a salient change in the position of referents in the discourse: the Athenian ships 'are now' at Corcyra, and the Corinthians 'now anchor' at Chimerium.⁶⁸ The conceptual construct of a map serves as an aid to

⁶⁸ The use of a world map to point out locations within Greece is illustrated by a passage in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (200–17). A student of Socrates' school shows Strepsiades the location of Athens (207 αἶθε μὲν Ἀθῆναι ['this is Athens']), Euboeia (211–12 ἡ δὲ γ' Εὐβοί, ὡς ὄρας, | ἡδὲ παρατέταται μικρὰ πόρρω πάνυ ['and Euboeia, as you can see, is stretched out over here over a very long distance']) and Lacedaemon (214 ὅπου στίβ; αὐτῆι ['Where is it? Over there.']). The nature of the map as representation is comically misunderstood by Strepsiades; see Purves (2010: 114).

visualise this change in the discourse structure. In other words, a link is established between the referents in the discourse space and entities as represented in a mental map. When referents ‘move’ in the discourse, this moving is visualised by a repositioning of the entities on the map. This interpretative move is facilitated by the geographical description of the harbour inserted into the narrative by Thucydides.

3.5.3 Referent Designation: Corpus Analysis

In order to support the claim that the present for preterite is structurally associated with the function of highlighting changes in the status of referents, I will discuss evidence from the corpus pertaining to tense usage and the way referents are coded linguistically. The general hypothesis explored here is that the odds of the present for preterite being used increase as the subject of the main clause becomes less predictable. Concretely, this means that the odds of the present for preterite will increase, first, when the subject is given more coding material (according to Givón’s [1991] *quantity principle*), and second, when the referent is marked as indefinite.

Let me give an example to illustrate these points:

- (56) Τοῦ δ’ ἐπιγιγνομένου χειμῶνος Ἀριστείδης ὁ Ἀρχίππου, εἷς τῶν ἀργυρολόγων νεῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, αἱ ἐξεπέμφθησαν πρὸς τοὺς συμμαχούς, Ἀρταφέρην ἄνδρα Πέρσην παρὰ βασιλέως πορευόμενον ἐς Λακεδαίμονα **ξυλλαμβάνει** ἐν Ἡϊόνι τῇ ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι.

The next winter Aristides the son of Archippus, one of the admirals of the Athenian ships that had been sent to the allies to collect money, **arrests** Artaphernes, a Persian, as he was marching from the [Persian] king to Lacedaemon, at Eion on the Strymon.

(Thucydides, *Histories* 4.50.1)

The subject (Aristides) is designated by proper noun rather than by a pronoun or by zero anaphora (i.e., no designation). This signals that the subject is not retrievable from the immediately preceding discourse context. Moreover, the subject is designated not only by proper noun but by patronym as well (‘Aristides the son of Archippus’), which suggests that the man is entirely new to the discourse.⁶⁹ This becomes further apparent from the apposition with an indefinite description: εἷς . . . στρατηγός (‘one

⁶⁹ On the position of proper nouns in the *givenness hierarchy* (Gundel et al. [1993]), see Mulkern (1996).

of the admirals'). Apparently, we are not supposed to be familiar with the referent or his role in the discourse. The object of the sentence is also designated by proper noun ('Artaphernes'), and here too an indefinite description signals the referent's all-new status in the discourse (ἄνδρα Πέρσην ['a Persian']). The introduction of two all-new referents constitutes a significant incision in the discourse structure, and we find the present for preterite in the main clause (ξυλλαμβάνει ['arrests']). In the next two sections, I will try to establish to what extent the association of the present for preterite with the unpredictability of referents is a structural property of the Classical Greek language.

3.5.3.1 *Coding Material*

When a referent is new to the discourse or newly activated, more linguistic material will be used to designate this referent. Givón (1991) proposes the following hierarchy: zero anaphora > unstressed pronoun > independent pronoun > full noun phrase. My hypothesis is that the odds of the present for preterite being used increase when we move higher in this hierarchy.⁷⁰ I will confine myself to the analysis of subject designations. A subsidiary hypothesis I will discuss below is concerned with variation within the category of proper nouns: here I look at the difference between simple names and full names (see Mulkern [1996]).

My focus here is solely on *how* referents are designated, with other aspects (e.g., animacy, number) being kept constant as much as possible. In order to address this, I have limited my data sample to cases where the main verb is singular and the subject is *a person who can be identified by name* (because the name is given somewhere in the text). Within this set, I have made a distinction between three kinds of reference:

- (a) Noun phrase. This is almost always a proper noun (e.g., Δημοσθένης ['Demosthenes']). Cases where we find a type noun to refer to a character who is known by name (e.g., ὁ ἀνὴρ ['the man']) are exceedingly rare. I have therefore excluded these from the data.⁷¹
- (b) Pronoun: ὁ ('he'), αὐτός ('he himself'), οὗτος ('that [man]'), ἐκεῖνος ('that [man]'). This is relatively uncommon, and I have therefore not

⁷⁰ Technically, what matters is not so much quantity as informativity (compare Grice's [1975] *maxim of quantity*). A pronoun may be formally more complex than a proper noun: ἐκεῖνος ('that [man]') is less specific than Ἄγις ('Agis') (a king of Sparta), but the former designation contains more syllables than the latter. Generally speaking, however, informativity corresponds to formal complexity.

⁷¹ I have also excluded references to the King of Persia, who is normally not designated by name but simply as βασιλεὺς ('king'), without the article.

Table 3.5 *Tense and subject designation*

Work	Category	<i>Present</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Thuc. <i>Hist.</i>	Proper noun	87 (78)	15 (24)	2.939	0.002 ^a
	Pronoun	22 (20)	4 (6)	2.787	0.077 ^b
	Zero	75 (86)	38 (27)		
Xen. <i>Hell.</i>	Proper noun	48 (39)	71 (80)	1.718	0.045 ^c
	Pronoun	8 (11)	27 (24)	0.753	0.525 ^d
	Zero	37 (43)	94 (88)		
Xen. <i>Exp.</i>	Proper noun	94 (98)	89 (85)	0.734	0.156 ^e
	Pronoun	18 (22)	23 (19)	0.544	0.084 ^f
	Zero	95 (87)	66 (74)		

^aB = 1.078 (constant = .68), standard error = .343.

^bB = 1.025 (constant = .68), standard error = .579.

^cB = .541 (constant = -.932), standard error = .269.

^dB = -.284 (constant = -.932), standard error = .447.

^eB = -.31 (constant = .364), standard error = .218.

^fB = -.609 (constant = .364), standard error = .353.

found it useful to make more fine-grained distinctions within this group.

(c) Zero anaphora.

I have coded subject designations found in the main clause (*Demosthenes did X*), in a subordinate clause (*As Demosthenes saw this, [he] did X*), or as an extra-clausal *theme*-constituent (*Demosthenes, seeing this, did X*; see Matić [2003]; Allan [2014]). In the latter two cases, I have coded only the immediately following main clause verb for the relevant designation.⁷²

The results are listed in Table 3.5. In Thucydides' *Histories*, there is a substantial increase in odds of the present being used when the referent is designated by proper noun in comparison with zero anaphora (odds ratio 2.939, $p = 0.002$). The observed effect for pronouns is almost as strong (2.787), but this is statistically much less certain ($p = 0.077$). In

⁷² I have also counted the exceptional cases where the subject of the main clause is marked with a different case than the nominative, as in Th. 4.93.2 τῷ δὲ Ἱπποκράτει ὄντι περὶ τὸ Δῆλιον ὡς αὐτῷ ἠγγέλθη ὅτι Βοιωτοὶ ἐπέρχονται, πέμπει ἐς τὸ στράτευμα ('and to Hippocrates, as he was in the neighborhood of Delium, when it was reported to him that the Boeotians were coming, [he, i.e., Hippocrates] sends a message to the army'). When the subject is designated first with a proper noun and then with a pronoun (which sometimes happens in long sentences), I have coded for the highest-order designation.

Xenophon's *Hellenic affairs*, we similarly see a positive effect of subject designation with a proper noun over the baseline condition, but it is less strong and less certain (odds ratio 1.718, $p = 0.045$). The results for the pronoun category are statistically negligible at $p = 0.525$. Overall, the results from these two works support the hypothesis.

This is not the case for Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus*: here the results are negative both for the pronoun category (odds ratio 0.544) and for the proper noun category (odds ratio 0.734). However, the effects are uncertain (p -values of 0.084 and 0.156, respectively). The 23 cases of the 'itinerary' present ἐξελαύνει ('marches out') in book 1 (see Section 3.5.2) probably have an inordinate influence: there are only three cases with the proper noun against 20 with zero anaphora. More generally, the difference in results may reflect the difference in narrative character between the works (Section 3.1.2): the narrative in the *Expedition of Cyrus* is more vivid than in the other two works, so that the discourse-structural quality of the present for preterite may be less pronounced here (compare the results for sentence complexity, Section 3.3.3).

Now let us zoom in on the 'proper noun' category. As Mulkern (1996) notes, the use of a simple name ('John') implies greater accessibility of the referent than the use of a full name ('John Smith'). In Classical Greek, there are no surnames. I regard as the equivalent of a full name a noun phrase including the name of the referent and either an adjective specifying the referent's citizenship (Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ['Thucydides, an Athenian' or 'Thucydides of Athens']) or an attributive genitive specifying the identity of the referent's father (Θουκυδίδης ὁ Ὀλῶρου ['Thucydides the son of Olorus']).⁷³ As I explained at example (56), such a phrase typically implies that the designated referent is new to the discourse (or at least has been out of sight for a long time).⁷⁴

⁷³ The examples are taken from Th. 1.1.1 and 4.104.4. I might also have considered names with apposite noun phrases as 'full names', e.g., Λακράτης ὁ Ὀλυμπιονίκης ('Lacrates the Olympian victor', X. *HG* 2.4.33), Παισανίας ὁ βασιλεύς ('Pausanias the king', X. *HG* 2.4.29), Σιμωνίδης Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός ('Simonides, an Athenian general', Th. 4.7.1). To keep matters as simple as possible, I have stuck to the criteria defined in the main text.

⁷⁴ The use of a more informative designation than strictly necessary may also be dictated by certain cultural conventions (e.g., considerations of politeness, Mulkern [1996: 246]). In other cases, such 'overdesignation' may be used for rhetorical effect. For example, at the end of the story of Croesus and Adrastus in Herodotus' *Histories*, Adrastus commits suicide. At this point, he is referred to with an elaborate description: Ἄδρηστος δὲ ὁ Γορδῖεω τοῦ Μίδεω, οὗτος δὴ ὁ φονεὺς μὲν τοῦ ἑωυτοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ γενόμενος, φονεὺς δὲ τοῦ καθήραντος ('Adrastus, the son of Gordias son of Midas, that man who had become the murderer of his own brother and the murderer of the man who purified him', 1.45). This is undoubtedly done to add pathos to the dramatic end of Adrastus' life, which is marked with the present for preterite ἐπικατασφάζει ('slays').

Table 3.6 *Tense and simple name versus full name*

Category	<i>Present</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Full name	29 (29)	22 (22)	1	
Simple name	200 (200)	153 (153)		

For simplicity's sake, I present the results for all three works grouped together, as these are representative of the individual results as well. As can be seen from Table 3.6, I found no effect whatsoever.

Several considerations play a role here. First, in Thucydides' *Histories*, the category 'proper noun' yields 87 present forms against 15 aorists. These are very high odds to begin with, so it is perhaps not surprising that no further effect can be observed (in the 'full name' category, we find 11 present forms against 2 aorists, exactly the expected counts). Second, in the *Expedition of Cyrus*, Xenophon is more generous with 'full names' than expected on the premise that this use is mainly reserved for introducing new referents. For example, Hagasias is mentioned 15 times in the entire work, and 7 times he is called (ὁ) Στυμφάλιος ('a [the] Stymphalian'). Perhaps the reason for this is that the origin of the commanders is considered particularly relevant in a narrative about a mercenary army. This work accounts for 31 of the total 51 cases in the 'full name' category reported above.⁷⁵ In light of such considerations, I believe the hypothesis is worthy of further investigation in other (later) historiographical works, even if it is not supported by the results presented here.

3.5.3.2 *Definiteness*

If the present for preterite is associated with the function of introducing new referents into the discourse, then we should expect the odds of the present for preterite to increase when the subject is indefinite. Consider the following example:

- (57) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ὧ ἄνδρες, χρόνου μεταξύ διαγενομένου καὶ ἐμοῦ πολὺ ἀπολελειμένου τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ κακῶν, **προσέρχεται** μοί τις πρεσβύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ὑποπεμφθεῖσα ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἐμοίχευεν, ὡς ἐγὼ ὕστερον ἤκουον.

⁷⁵ The ratio is 15 present forms (16 expected) against 16 aorists (15 expected). The *Hellenic affairs* accounts for the remaining 7 instances (3 present forms, 4 aorists – exactly the expected counts).

After that, men of the jury, after some time had elapsed, with me being completely clueless about my misfortunes, some old woman **approaches** me. She {was sent} by a woman with whom that man [Eratosthenes] was having an affair, as I later heard.

(Lysias, *On the murder of Eratosthenes* [1] 15)

The introduction of this character is important to the development of the narrative, because she reveals to the speaker that Eratosthenes has seduced his wife.

In coding for definiteness, I have adhered to the following principles:

- (a) As it seems that the type of coding material influences tense usage (see Section 3.5.3.1), I have limited my investigation to a select group, including only *subject phrases where the head is either a noun (but not a proper noun), an adjective, or a participle*.⁷⁶ Cases where the subject or one of the subjects was designated with a proper noun (whether a person, city, or – exceptionally – a ship) were altogether excluded. Subject phrases with a pronoun as head were ignored,⁷⁷ but any other subjects in the same sentence that fit the criterion were coded.
- (b) For the position of the subject phrase I have adhered to the same rule as specified in Section 3.5.3.1, coding for the subject phrase as found in the main clause, in a subordinate clause or as an extra-clausal theme constituent.⁷⁸
- (c) I have determined (in)definiteness mainly based on the presence or absence of the definite article. There are two important exceptions. First, the word βασιλεύς ('king') is used without the article to specifically designate the King of Persia. This was coded as definite. Second, in expressions designating a group of men belonging to a certain city or country, the article is optional (e.g., Ἀθηναῖοι ['the Athenians']). These cases were coded as definite by default.

⁷⁶ Adjectives used in this way are typically derived from toponyms, as in οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ('the Athenians'). An example where the head of the subject phrase is a participle is X. *HG* 2.2.1 οἱ δὲ προδόντες Ἀλκιβιάδῃ τὸ Βυζάντιον ('those who betrayed Byzantium to Alcibiades').

⁷⁷ This includes, e.g., anaphoric pronouns (see Section 3.5.3.1 under [b]), numerals and forms of πολὺς ('many') and ὀλίγος ('few', except in the idiomatic expression οἱ ὀλιγοὶ ['the oligarchs'], Th. 3.74.2).

⁷⁸ I have included an exceptional instance where the subject of the main clause is marked in a subordinate clause with a different case than the nominative: X. *An.* 5.7.23 ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰδότε τινὶ ἐπέτυχον, λέγει μοι ὅτι . . . ('when I ran into someone who knew about it, he tells me that . . .'). Here I coded εἰδότε τινὶ, lit. 'someone knowing', for indefiniteness.

Table 3.7 *Tense and definiteness*

Number	Category	<i>Present</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Singular	Indefinite	33 (28)	21 (26)	1.763	0.107 ^a
	Definite	41 (45)	46 (42)		
Plural	Indefinite	15 (18)	20 (16)	0.653	0.232 ^b
	Definite	209 (206)	182 (185)		

^aB = .567 (constant = -.115), standard error = .352.

^bB = -.426 (constant = .138), standard error = .356.

- (d) Cases with multiple subjects were coded as ‘indefinite’ if at least one of the subjects was indefinite.⁷⁹
- (e) I have distinguished between two groups: one with singular verbs and one with plural verbs. In Classical Greek, a singular verb can be used with a plural subject if its gender is neuter. I have excluded these cases.⁸⁰

The results are presented in Table 3.7. Let me begin with the plural. The results do not support the hypothesis; in fact, a negative effect is observed (odds ratio 0.653), but we need not take this very seriously in light of the high *p*-value (0.232). The results for the individual works do not add much nuance to the picture.⁸¹

For the singular, a positive effect is observed (odds ratio 1.763), but again this is highly uncertain (*p* = 0.107). Breaking down the results per work, we see that the effect is due mainly to Thucydides’ *Histories*.⁸² An

⁷⁹ Some incidental issues are the following: In two cases, a noun without a definite article was followed by a cataphoric pronoun: γίγνεται οὖν ἐκεχειρία αὐτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς ξυμμαχοῖς ἥδε (‘so an armistice is established by them and their allies – the following’, Th. 4.117.3, compare 5.22.3). I have coded this as definite. I have coded expressions of the type ‘night/day came’ as indefinite, even though it is evident that specifically *the following* night or day is intended (Th. 4.25.3 νύξ [‘night’]; X. *An.* 4.2.4 σκότος [‘darkness’], 5.7.16 ἡμέρα [‘day’]). When a single subject is designated with two descriptions, one definite, and one indefinite, I have coded it as definite: Th. 8.102.2 τέσσαρες δὲ τῶν νεῶν αἱ ὕσταται πλέουσai (‘four of the ships, the ones that sailed last’).

⁸⁰ E.g., X. *HG* 5.1.35 διελύθη δὲ καὶ τὰ ναυτικὰ στρατεύματα (‘and the naval armaments were disbanded as well’).

⁸¹ The counts for the indefinite category are as follows: Thucydides’ *Histories*: 8 present forms, 6 aorists (identical to the expected counts). Xenophon’s *Hellenic affairs*: 4 present forms (6 expected), 8 aorists (6 expected). Xenophon’s *Expedition of Cyrus*: 3 present forms (4 expected), 6 aorists (5 expected). The negative effect is thus due to Xenophon, but the counts are too low to attach any weight to this.

⁸² The counts for the indefinite category are as follows: Thucydides’ *Histories*: 17 present forms (13 expected), 12 aorists (16 expected). Xenophon’s *Hellenic affairs*: 8 present forms (6 expected),

individual analysis of this work yields an odds ratio of 2.942, with a *p*-value of 0.033.⁸³

As to the interpretation of these results, I offer the following thoughts. In example (57), we saw how an indefinite description was used at the introduction of a new character who played an important role in the narrative. However, the cases included in the dataset are rarely this straightforward. In the case of the singular, indefinite subjects are rarely persons or concrete objects. In most cases, the noun denotes either an action (ναυμαχία ['naval battle']), a natural phenomenon (χειμών ['storm']), or sometimes an emotion (φόβος ['fear']). Out of the 29 cases in Thucydides, for example, only 4 subject phrases designate a person or a concrete object (the present is used in all four cases but that may of course be accidental).⁸⁴ With the plural, there are only 36 cases in the indefinite category, and there is some 'noise' here as well – that is, few cases straightforwardly conform to the type where new entities are introduced that will play an important role in the narrative.⁸⁵

Definiteness, then, does not seem to be a predictor of tense usage, but it is uncertain to what extent this affects the claim that the present for preterite is used to introduce new referents due to the heterogeneity of the 'indefinite' category.

3.5.4 Conclusion

In this section, I have argued that the second main discourse-structural function of the present for preterite is to mark changes in the status of

1 aorist (3 expected). Xenophon's *Expedition of Cyrus*: 8 present forms (9 expected), 8 aorists (7 expected).

⁸³ $B = 1.079$ (constant = -0.731), standard error = $.506$.

⁸⁴ Th. 3.3.5 ἀνὴρ ('a man'), 4.68.6 τις ξυνειδώς ('someone who knew about it'), 4.97.2 κήρυξ ('a herald'); 7.3.5 τριήρης ('a trireme').

⁸⁵ For example, X. *An.* 7.3.21 ἔπειτα δὲ τρίποδες εἰσηνέχθησαν πᾶσιν ('next, tripods were brought in for all'). This is merely one of the preparations for a dinner. See also X. *An.* 3.3.20 καὶ ταύτης τῆς νυκτὸς σφενδονῆται μὲν εἰς διακοσίους ἐγένοντο, ἵπποι δὲ καὶ ἵππεῖς ἐδοκιμάσθησαν τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ εἰς πεντήκοντα, καὶ σπολάδες καὶ θώρακες αὐτοῖς ἐπορίσθησαν, καὶ ἵππαρχος ἐπεστάθη Λύκιος ὁ Πολυστράτου Ἀθηναῖος ('and that night slingers were found to a number of two hundred, and the next day horses and horsemen were approved to a number of fifty, and jerkins and cuirasses were provided to them, and Lycius the son of Polystratus, an Athenian, was appointed as commander'). This happens after a speech by Xenophon, in which he argues that the army needs slingers and horsemen for general use (3.3.16). After this speech is approved, men and material are found. The aorist is typical for such military preparations. By contrast, in 4.1.26–8, volunteers are required for a dangerous mission that will be narrated in the subsequent chapters. Here, the present is used to mark the volunteers' coming forward (ὕφιστάται ['undertakes'] in 27 and 28; the subjects are designated with proper nouns).

referents. I divided this into changes in activation status and changes in role or position (Section 3.5.1). For verbs of ‘travelling’ and the like, I argued that the conceptual scenario of the discourse as representation is supplemented by a scenario in which we trace the designated journey on a mental map (Section 3.5.2).

In Section 3.5.3, I translated these theoretical considerations into the hypothesis that the odds of the present for preterite being used increase as the subject becomes less predictable. This was partly corroborated by the observation that designation of the subject by proper noun increases the odds of the present being used over zero designation (but only for Thucydides’ *Histories* and Xenophon’s *Hellenic affairs*; Section 3.5.3.1). A comparison between designation by simple name and by full name yielded no effect. Definiteness (Section 3.5.3.2) did not turn out to be a significant predictor either, except perhaps with respect to the singular in Thucydides’ *Histories*; but the heterogeneity of the data constituted a major problem. All in all, the degree to which the present for preterite can be structurally associated with the function of marking changes in the status of referents is a matter to be investigated further.

3.6 Case Studies

I round off this chapter, as I did the previous one, with two contrastive case studies to show how the concepts laid out in the previous sections can be brought to bear on the analysis of tense-switching in actual discourse.

The challenge was to find examples that were maximally illustrative of the explanatory value of the principles I have discussed in this chapter, while avoiding the charge of having cherry-picked examples that fitted my theory. I found that the best way to address this issue was to discuss parallel passages where the same events were narrated in different versions. Because such cases are rare in the corpus, their selection as case studies seemed non-arbitrary. The stories I will discuss are the following: the adoption of Boeotus, narrated in the Demosthenic speeches *Against Boeotus* 1 and 2 (Section 3.6.1), and the beginning of the peace process between Athens and Philip of Macedon, narrated in Aeschines’ *On the false embassy* and *Against Ctisiphon* (Section 3.6.2).⁸⁶ These examples are extremely instructive

⁸⁶ Buijs (2007) compares passages from Xenophon’s *Hellenic affairs* and *Agesilaus*. He focuses on aspect but includes an observation on the present for preterite at 150–2. Rijksbaron (2011b) discusses the affair of the mutilation of the hermae and the profanation of the mysteries as narrated by Andocides in his *On the mysteries* and by Thucydides in the *Histories*. Nijk (2013a: 384–91) compares the use of the present for preterite in Demosthenes’ *On the crown* with that in

because in both cases, the parallel passages are almost the exact inverse of each other with respect to tense usage. This allows us to zoom in on the strategies of narrative presentation that influence the choice for either the present or the preterite.

3.6.1 *The Adoption of Boeotus in Demosthenes' Against Boeotus 1 and 2*

The Demosthenic corpus contains two speeches written for a certain Mantitheus against his half-brother Boeotus.⁸⁷ Mantitheus' father, Mantias, had extramarital relations with a woman named Plangon. She gave birth to two sons and claimed they were by Mantias. When the man wouldn't recognise them as his own, one of the boys threatened to take legal action. Mantias, unwilling to go to court, saw himself forced to make an arrangement with Plangon. In return for a sum of money, to be given to a third party for her sake, Plangon agreed to the following: Mantias would challenge her to declare under oath that he was in fact the father of the two boys, and she would refuse, so that Mantias would not be forced to recognise them as his own. Plangon, however, violated the agreement, accepted the oath and swore that both her sons had been fathered by Mantias. Thereupon, Mantias was forced to acknowledge them as his own and entered them into the clan register, naming the one Boeotus, the other Pamphilus.

Subsequently, the boys had to be entered in the official deme register when they reached the age of eighteen. In the meantime, however, Mantias died, and when the time came, Boeotus had himself entered under the name Mantitheus. But this was the name of Mantias' legitimate son, who proceeded to take legal action against Boeotus to force him to drop his claim to the name Mantitheus.

I will discuss the narrative section of the first speech in its entirety and the overlapping portion of the second speech. The narrative in the second speech is longer because it deals with more issues; I will come back to this below. I divide the narrative into two portions: first, the events leading up to, and including, the trial where Plangon deceived Mantias; second, the registration of the sons of Plangon into the clan register.

On the false embassy by the same author. Another interesting case is the narrative of the siege of Plataea in the speech *Against Neaera* (traditionally attributed to Demosthenes but written by Apollodorus) 59.98–103 and in Thucydides, *Histories* 2.2–6, 2.71–8, 3.20–4, 3.52–68.

⁸⁷ The second speech is believed to be by a different author than Demosthenes. (See the introduction to this speech in Murray [1936].)

The relevant passages in the first part are presented as parallel texts below. Both passages lead up to the arbitration, where Mantias administered the oath and Plangon, against the agreement, accepted it. The central point here is the difference between the aorist *κατωμώσατο* ('swore') in 39.4 and the present *ᾄμνυσιν* ('swears') in 40.11. As I will argue, this reflects a difference in the way the events are presented in the two narratives.

Against Boeotus 1 (39)

2. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐτέρου τινὸς οὗτος ἔφη
πατὴρ εἶναι καὶ μὴ τοῦ ἑμοῦ,
περίεργος ἂν εἰκότως ἐδόκουν εἶναι
φροντίζων ὃ τι βούλεται καλεῖν
οὗτος ἑαυτόν.
νῦν δὲ λαχῶν δίκην τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἑμῷ
καὶ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ κατασκευάσας
ἐργαστήριον συκοφαντῶν,
Μνησικλέα τε, ὃν ἴσως γινώσκετε
πάντες, καὶ Μενεκλέα τὸν τὴν Νῖνον
ἐλόντ' ἐκείνον, καὶ τοιούτους τινάς,
ἐδικάζεθ' υἱὸς εἶναι φάσκων ἐκ τῆς
Παμφίλου θυγατρὸς καὶ δεινὰ
πάσχειν καὶ τῆς πατρίδος
ἀποστερεῖσθαι.
3. ὁ πατὴρ δέ (πᾶσα γὰρ εἰρήσεται ἢ
ἀλήθει', ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί) ἅμα μὲν
φοβούμενος εἰς δικαστήριον εἰσιέναι,
μὴ τις, οἷ' ὑπὸ πολιτευομένου,
ἐτέρωθί που λελυπημένος ἐνταυθοῖ
ἀπαντήσῃεν αὐτῷ, ἅμα δ'
ἐξαπατηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς τουτοῦ
μητρὸς, ὁμοσάσης αὐτῆς ἢ μήν, ἐὰν
ᾄρκον αὐτῇ διδῶ περι τούτων, μὴ
ὀμείσθαι, τούτων δὲ πραχθέντων
οὐδὲν ἔτ' ἔσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ
μεσεγγυησαμένης ἀργύριον,

Against Boeotus 2 (40)

9. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὗτος αὐξηθεὶς καὶ μεθ'
αὐτοῦ παρασκευασάμενος
ἐργαστήριον συκοφαντῶν, ὧν
ἡγεμῶν ἦν Μνησικλῆς καὶ Μενεκλῆς
ἐκεῖνος ὁ τὴν Νῖνον ἐλών, μεθ' ὧν
οὗτος ἐδικάζετό μου τῷ πατρὶ
φάσκων υἱὸς εἶναι ἐκείνου—
10. συνόδων δὲ γιγνομένων πολλῶν
ὑπὲρ τούτων, καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ
ἂν φάσκοντος πεισθῆναι, ὡς οὗτοι
γεγόνασιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, τελευτώσα ἡ
Πλαγγών, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί
(πάντα γὰρ εἰρήσεται τάληθῆ πρὸς
ὑμᾶς), μετὰ τοῦ Μενεκλέους
ἐνεδρεύσασα τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ
ἐξαπατήσασα ᾄρκω, ὃς μέγιστος
δοκεῖ καὶ δεινότατος παρὰ πᾶσιν
ἀνθρώποις εἶναι, ὠμολόγησεν
τριάκοντα μναῖς λαβοῦσα τούτους
μὲν τοῖς αὐτῆς ἀδελφοῖς εἰσποιήσῃεν
υἱεῖς, αὐτῇ δέ, ἂν πρὸς τῷ δαιτητῇ
προκαληθῆται αὐτὴν ὁ πατὴρ μου
ὁμόσαι ἢ μήν τοὺς παῖδας ἐξ αὐτοῦ
γεγονέναι, οὐ δέξεσθαι τὴν
πρόκλησιν. . . .

ἐπὶ τούτοις **δίδωσι** τὸν ὄρκον.

4. ἡ δὲ δεξαμένη, οὐ μόνον τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἕτερον πρὸς τούτῳ κατωμόσατ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τοῦ ἐμοῦ.

If the defendant declared himself the son of another father and not of my own, I should naturally have seemed meddlesome in caring by what name he chose to call himself;

but, as it is, he {brought suit} against my father, and having got up a gang of blackmailers to support him – Mnesicles, whom you all probably know, and that Meneclēs who secured the conviction of Ninus, and others of the same sort – he went into court, alleging that he was my father's son by the daughter of Pamphilus, and that he was being outrageously treated, and robbed of his civic rights.

My father (for the whole truth shall be told to you, men of the jury) {feared} to come into court lest someone, on the ground of having elsewhere received some injury from him in his public life, should confront him here;

and at the same time he {was deceived} by this man's mother. For {she had} sworn that if he should tender her an oath in this matter, she would refuse it, and that, when this had been done, all relations between them would be at an end; and she had also had money deposited in the hands of a third party on her behalf;—

11. συγχωρηθέντων δὲ τούτων—τί ἂν ὑμῖν μακρολογοίην; ὡς γὰρ πρὸς τὸν δαιτητὴν ἀπήνησεν,

παραβάσα πάντα τὰ ὠμολογημένα ἡ Πλαγγὼν **δέχεταιί** τε τὴν πρόκλησιν καὶ **ὄμνυσιν** ἐν τῷ Δελφινίῳ ἄλλον ὄρκον ἐναντίον τῷ προτέρῳ, ὡς καὶ ὑμῶν οἱ πολλοὶ ἴσασιν· περιβόητος γὰρ ἡ πράξις ἐγένετο.

But after the defendant had grown up and had associated himself with a gang of blackmailers, whose leaders were Mnesicles and that Meneclēs who secured the conviction of Ninus, in connection with these men he brought suit against my father, claiming that he was his son.

Many meetings {took place} about these matters, and my father {declared} that he would never be convinced that these men were his children, and finally Plangon, men of the jury (for the whole truth shall be told you), having in conjunction with Meneclēs laid a snare for my father, and deceived him by an oath that among all mankind is held to be

the greatest and most awful, agreed that, if she were paid thirty minae, she would get her brothers to adopt these men, and that, on her own part, if my father should challenge her before the arbitrator to swear that the children were in very truth his sons, she would decline the challenge. . . .

When these terms had been accepted – for why should I make my story a long one? – and he went to meet her before the arbitrator,

on those conditions, then, my father **administers** the oath.

But she, accepting it, swore that not only the defendant, but his brother too, her other son, was my father's child.

Plangon, violating the entire agreement, **accepts** the challenge, and **swears** in the Delphinium an oath which was the opposite of her previous one, as most of you know well; for the transaction became a notorious one.

(trans. after Murray [1936])

(trans. after Murray [1936])

Both passages start with the situation where Boeotus, the son of Plangon, sued Mantias (39.2 ἐδικάζετο ['went into court'], in a main clause, 40.9 ἐδικάζετο ['brought suit'] in a subordinate clause), aiming to be acknowledged as his legitimate son. To prevent being forced to acknowledge the boy as his son, Mantias came to an agreement with Plangon. This agreement is discussed in a little more detail in the second speech, where it gets a main clause verb (40.10 ὡμολόγησεν ['agreed']). In the first speech, the conclusion of the agreement is more implicit: we are told in a participial clause that Mantias was 'deceived' (39.3 ἐξαπατηθεῖς) by Plangon and that he administered the oath 'on those conditions' (ἐπὶ τούτοις). In both cases, the conclusion of the agreement only serves as the background for what happens during the arbitration.

So let us consider how this event is construed in the two narratives. In the second speech, only the acceptance of the oath is narrated, and this constitutes the peak (culmination) of this section. The speaker uses certain attention-management strategies here that draw attention to the impact of the designated event on the narrative (compare Section 3.3). First, the event is introduced with a 'cut-to-the-chase' formula (τί ἄν ὑμῖν

μακρολογίην; [‘why should I make my story a long one?’]), which signals the speaker moves on to the main point. Second, the outrageousness of Plangon’s act is emphasised by the participial clause παραβάσα πάντα τὰ ὠμολογημένα (‘violating the entire agreement’) and by the note that the oath was ‘the opposite of her previous one’ (ἐναντίον τῷ προτέρῳ).⁸⁸ Also, the speaker appeals to the audience’s own knowledge of the matter, claiming that it was ‘notorious’ (περιβόητος) at the time.⁸⁹ The present forms δέχεται (‘accepts’) and ὀμνυσιν (‘swears’), then, highlight Plangon’s act of deceit as the peak of this portion of the narrative.

In the first speech, both the administration of the oath by Mantias and the acceptance of the challenge by Plangon are narrated. Here the administration of the oath is construed as a change in the narrative dynamic of the intervention type. Mantias sees himself confronted with a problematic situation: Boeotus is going to court. The administration of the oath is Mantias’ attempt to prevent this from happening. Note how the typical ‘fear’ pattern is indicative of the intervention (39.3 φοβούμενος [‘feared’]; see Section 3.4.3). After Mantias falls into the trap, Plangon’s acceptance of the oath is here presented with a high degree of presupposition. What is a main clause verb in 40.11 (δέχεται [‘accepts’]) is here only a participle (δεξαμένη [‘accepting’]). And where in 40.11, the verb ὀμνυσιν (‘swears’) is part of the focus of the clause, in 39.4 the verb κατωμόσατο (‘swore’) is presupposed material: the focus of the assertion is on the heavy preverbal constituent οὐ μόνον τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἕτερον πρὸς τούτῳ (‘not only the defendant, but his brother too, her other son’).

⁸⁸ Compare D. 23.154 ὀλιγωρήσας τῶν ὀρκῶν καὶ παραβᾶς αὐτούς (‘disregarding the oaths and violating them’), followed by the present καταλαμβάνει (‘captures’); 35.22 ἀμελήσαντες τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ (‘disregarding what was written in the contract’), followed by the present δανείζονται (‘loan’); 56.10 καταφρονήσαντες μὲν τῆς συγγραφῆς . . . καὶ τῶν ἐπιτιμιῶν . . . καταφρονήσαντες δὲ τῶν νόμων τῶν ὑμετέρων (‘in contempt of the contract and the penalties, and in contempt of your laws’), preceded by the present forms ἐξαιρείται (‘takes out’) and ἀποδίδοται (‘sells’).

⁸⁹ Compare D. 19.196–8, the story of the mistreatment of an Olynthian woman. The story culminates in a peak with three present forms: the woman is flogged (197 ξαίνει [‘threshes’]), throws herself at Hiattrocles (198 προσπίπτει [‘throws herself at’]) and overturns the table (198 ἀνατρέπει [‘overturns’]). Demosthenes comments: καὶ περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐν Ἄρκαδιᾷ λόγος ἦν ἐν τοῖς μυρίοις, καὶ Διοφάντος ἐν ὑμῖν ἀπήγγελλεν ἃ νῦν μαρτυρεῖν αὐτὸν ἀναγκάσω, καὶ κατὰ Θετταλίαν πολὺς λόγος καὶ πανταχοῦ (‘and there was talk about that woman in Arcadia at the meeting of the Ten Thousand, and Diophantus reported to you that which I will now force him to testify, and in Thessaly there was much talk about the matter, as there was everywhere else’). Also, Aeschin. 1.56 (see Section 3.2.3) οὗτος ὁ Ἡγησανδρος ἀφικνεῖται, ὃν ὑμεῖς ἴστε κάλλιον ἢ ἐγώ (‘that Hegesandrus arrives, whom you know better than I’); 2.14 (see Section 3.4.1) καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἀποφεύγει Φιλοκράτης, ὃ δὲ γραψάμενος τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων οὐ μεταλαμβάνει. καὶ ταῦθ’ ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες ἴστε. (‘And in the end, Philocrates is acquitted, and the prosecutor does not get one fifth of the votes. That you all know.’)

The second part of the story is presented below. In both cases, the speaker notes that Mantias was forced to register the boys as his sons (39.4 ἦν ἀνάγκη [‘it was necessary’]; 40.11 ἀναγκασθεῖς [‘was compelled’]). The registration of Boeotus and Pamphilus gets a present form in 39.4 (ἐγγράφει [‘registers’]), but in 40.11 we find the aorist ἐνέγραψε (‘registered’). In the first speech, the registration of the boys is presented as a peak. After the aorists εἰσήγαγεν (‘entered’) and ἐποιήσατο (‘adopted’), referring to protocollary actions, the speaker uses a ‘cut-to-the-chase’ formula (ἵνα τὰν μέσῳ συντέμω [‘to cut short the intervening matters’]) to highlight the registration of the boys. In the second speech, the registration is simply presented as a specification of what was narrated in the previous sentence (note how the verb ἐνέγραψε [‘registered’] constitutes presupposed information).

Against Boeotus 1 (39)

4. ὡς δὲ τοῦτ’ ἐποίησεν, εἰσάγειν εἰς
τοὺς φράτερας ἦν ἀνάγκη τούτους
καὶ λόγος οὐδεὶς ὑπελείπετο.

εἰσήγαγεν, ἐποιήσατο,

ἵνα τὰν μέσῳ συντέμω, ἐγγράφει τοῖς
Ἄπατουρίοις τουτονὶ μὲν Βοιωτὸν
εἰς τοὺς φράτερας, τὸν δ’ ἕτερον
Πάμφιλον·

Μαντίθεος δ’ ἐνεγεγράμμην ἐγώ.

5. συμβάσης δὲ τῷ πατρὶ τῆς τελευτῆς
πρὶν τὰς εἰς τοὺς δημότας ἐγγραφὰς
γενέσθαι, ἐλθὼν εἰς τοὺς δημότας
οὕτοσι ἀντὶ Βοιωτοῦ Μαντίθεον
ἐνέγραψεν ἑαυτόν.

Against Boeotus 2 (40)

11. καὶ οὕτως ὁ πατήρ μου διὰ τὴν
ἑαυτοῦ πρόκλησιν ἀναγκασθεῖς
ἔμμεῖναι τῇ διαίτη, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς
γεγενημένοις ἠγανάκτει καὶ βαρέως
ἔφερον, καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὐδ’ ὡς
εἰσδέξασθαι τούτους ἠξίωσεν,
εἰς δὲ τοὺς φράτερας ἠναγκάστη
εἰσαγαγεῖν.

καὶ τοῦτον μὲν ἐνέγραψε Βοιωτὸν, τὸν
δ’ ἕτερον Πάμφιλον.

Thus, my father {was compelled} on account of his own challenge to abide by the arbitrator’s award, but he was indignant at what had been done, and took the matter heavily to heart, and did not even so consent to admit these men into his house;

When she had done this it was necessary to enter them among the clansmen, and there was no excuse left.

He entered them, adopted them, and (to cut short the intervening matters) he **registers** the defendant at the Apaturia as Boeotus on the list of the clansmen, and the other as Pamphilus. But I had already been registered as Mantitheus.

When my father died before the entries were made on the register of the demesmen, the defendant {went} to the demesmen and registered himself as Mantitheus, instead of Boeotus.

(trans. after Murray [1936])

but he was compelled to introduce them to the clansmen.

The defendant he registered as Boeotus, and the other as Pamphilus.

(trans. after Murray [1936])

This difference in presentation ties in with the difference in the rhetorical importance of the designated event in the context of the two speeches.⁹⁰ In the first speech, the main concern of the speaker is to show that Mantias did in fact register Boeotus *under that name* and that the man should not be allowed to call himself Mantitheus. When the speaker calls witnesses to establish the truth of his narrative, this is the point he focuses on (6 ὄν μὲν τοίνυν τρόπον ἡμᾶς ἐνέγραψεν ὁ πατήρ, ἀκηκόατε τῶν μαρτύρων [‘now, you have heard from the witnesses in what manner my father registered us’]).

In this connection, it is noteworthy that we find the present marking the same fact later on in a predominantly argumentative passage, which is rare:

νή Δί', ἀλλ' ὕβρει καὶ ἐπηρεΐα τινὶ τοῦτ' ἐτέθη σοι. ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μὲν, ὅτ' οὐκ ἐποιεῖθ' ὁ πατήρ τούτους, ἔλεγον οὗτοι ὡς οὐδὲν χεῖρους εἰσὶν οἱ τῆς μητρὸς τῆς τούτου συγγενεῖς τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐμοῦ. ἔστι δ' ὁ Βοιωτὸς ἀδελφοῦ τῆς τούτου μητρὸς ὄνομα. ἐπειδὴ δ' εἰσάγειν ὁ πατήρ τούτους ἠναγκάζετο, ἐμοῦ προεισηγμένου Μαντιθέου, οὕτω τοῦτον **εἰσάγει** Βοιωτόν, τὸν ἀδελφὸν δ' αὐτοῦ Πάμφιλον.

Ah, you may say, but that name was given you by way of derision or insult. No; very often, during the time when my father refused to

⁹⁰ On the importance of the speaker's ‘main concern’ in relation to tense usage, especially in rhetoric, see Sicking and Stork (1997); Lamers and Rademaker (2007); Nijk (2013a).

acknowledge them, these men used to say that the kinsfolk of the defendant's mother were quite as good as those of my father. Boeotus is the name of his mother's brother; and when my father was compelled to bring them into the clan, when I had already been introduced as Mantitheus, he **enters** the defendant as Boeotus, and his brother as Pamphilus.

(Demosthenes, *Against Boeotus* I [39] 32; trans. after Murray [1936])

The use of the present tense to mark this fact both here in the argument section and in the narrative seems to underscore its rhetorical importance to the speaker. Incidentally, I think this is also the reason why the next event in the narrative in this speech is designated only with an aorist: 39.5 ἐνέγραψεν ('registered'). That Boeotus laid claim to the name Mantitheus is not disputed; the point is that that is not the name his father gave him.⁹¹

In the second speech, by contrast, the speaker's goal is to regain his mother's dowry. It seems that the speaker had lost the previous case and was now forced to sue his step-brother under the name Mantitheus (40.18). When the speaker talks about his 'original misfortune' (ἀτύχημα ἐξ ἀρχῆς) in the abstract (40.2) – that is, the Plangon episode which corresponds to the entire narrative in the first speech – he limits himself to Plangon's deceit and the fact that he was forced to acknowledge two brothers and share his inheritance with them. After this, the speaker goes on to the main issue, which is the dispute surrounding the dowry (40.14–18). All in all, the main point of the Plangon story in the second speech is that her deceitful act forced Mantias to acknowledge her sons as his own; the naming issue has faded to the background.

Let me conclude. In the two speeches *Against Boeotus*, we see two instances where the tense of verbs referring to the same event is reversed: κατωμόσατο ('swore') in 39.4 becomes ὀμνυσι ('swears') in 40.11, and ἐγγράφει ('registers') in 39.4 becomes ἐνέγραψε ('registered') in 40.11. These differences can be explained in terms of narrative presentation and the rhetorical concerns of the speaker. In 39.4, the aorist κατωμόσατο ('swore') follows upon a change in the narrative dynamic (3 δίδωσι ['administers']), while in 40.11, the present ὀμνυσι ('swears') constitutes the peak, introduced by a 'cut-to-the-chase' formula and with emphasis on

⁹¹ Note again the heavy preverbal focal constituent: ἀντὶ Βοιωτοῦ Μαντίθεον ('Mantitheus instead of Boeotus').

the outrageousness of the act. In 39.4, ἐγγράφει ('registers') designates the crucial point to the speaker's case and is presented as a peak with a 'cut-to-the-chase' formula. In 40.11, the same fact has little bearing on the speaker's case, and it is presented simply as a matter of protocol.

3.6.2 *The Beginning of the Peace Process with Philip in Aeschines'*
On the false embassy *and* Against Ctesiphon

In 348, Athens was at war with Philip of Macedon. Encouraged by reports that Philip wanted peace, Philocrates wrote a decree that allowed Philip to send ambassadors to Athens. Philocrates was indicted on the charge of having written an illegal decree, but he was acquitted. After further positive reports from Macedon, Philocrates wrote another decree that proposed to elect ten ambassadors to Macedon to have peace talks with Philip. Among those chosen to serve were Demosthenes and Aeschines. The ambassadors went to Macedon and came back with optimistic reports.

These and subsequent events are discussed in the two pairs of opposing speeches by Aeschines and Demosthenes: Demosthenes' *On the false embassy* (19) versus Aeschines' *On the false embassy* (2) and Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon* (3) versus Demosthenes' *In defence of Ctesiphon* or *On the crown* (18). I will discuss here the two passages that lend themselves best to a side-by-side comparison: Aeschines 2.12–19 and 3.62–3.⁹²

The starting point for my comparison is the passing of Philocrates' first decree. Aeschines' narrative in speech 3 begins with this event, but in speech 2, he provides some background, which I will briefly discuss here.⁹³ Some messengers from Euboea came to Athens to talk about peace. They mentioned that Philip was also interested in making peace with Athens. Some time later, Ctesiphon was sent as envoy to Macedon in order to recover some ransom money that was paid to Macedonian privateers who had captured a certain Phryno. When Ctesiphon came back, he made a report to the assembly about the business on which he was sent, but he also added that Philip had said that he wished to end the war with Athens. This is where my discussion begins. The parallel passages from Aeschines' two speeches are printed below:

⁹² See Nijk (2013a: 384–91) for a comparison of the uses of the present for preterite in the two speeches by Demosthenes.

⁹³ The rhetoric behind the chronology in Aeschines' presentation of the facts in the second speech is discussed by Badian and Heskell (1987).

On the false embassy (2)

13. Εἰπόντος δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ
Κτησιφώντος, καὶ πολλήν τινα
ἐξαγγείλαντος πρὸς τούτοις
φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ τοῦ δήμου
σφόδρα ἀποδεξαμένου καὶ τὸν
Κτησιφώντα ἐπαιέσαντος,
ἀντειπόντος δ' οὐδενός,
ἐνταῦθα ἤδη **διδῶσι** ψήφισμα
Φιλοκράτης ὁ Ἄγνουσιος, καὶ ὁ
δῆμος ἅπας ὁμογνωμονῶν
ἐχειροτόνησεν, ἐξεῖναι Φιλίππῳ
δεῦρο κήρυκα καὶ πρέσβεις πέμπειν
ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης. Πρότερον μὲν γὰρ καὶ
αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐκωλύετο ὑπὸ τινων, οἷς
ἦν τοῦτ' ἐπιμελές, ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ
πρᾶγμα ἔδειξεν.

14. **Γράφονται** γὰρ οὗτοι παρανόμων
τὸ ψήφισμα, Λυκῖνον ἐπὶ τὴν
γραφὴν ἐπιγραψάμενοι, καὶ τίμημα
ἑκατὸν τάλαντα.

Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ' **εἰσήει** ἡ γραφὴ εἰς τὸ
δικαστήριον,

ἀρρώστως δ' ἔχων ὁ Φιλοκράτης
ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῷ συνήγορον
Δημοσθένην, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐμέ. Παρελθὼν
δ' ὁ μισοφιλιππος Δημοσθένης,
κατέτριψε τὴν ἡμέραν
ἀπολογούμενος·

καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον **ἀποφεύγει**
Φιλοκράτης, ὁ δὲ γραψάμενος τὸ
πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων οὐ
μεταλαμβάνει. Καὶ ταῦθ' ὑμεῖς
ἅπαντες ἴστε.

13. When Ctesiphon had said this and
had also told of the marked kindness
of his reception, and the people
eagerly accepted his report and
passed a vote of praise for Ctesiphon,
and not a voice was raised in
opposition –
then finally, Philocrates of Hagnus
offers a motion, which was passed by

Against Ctesiphon (3)

62. **Ἔγραψε** Φιλοκράτης ἐξεῖναι
Φιλίππῳ δεῦρο κήρυκα καὶ
πρέσβεις πέμπειν περὶ εἰρήνης.

Τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα **ἐγράφη**
παρανόμων.

Ἦκον οἱ τῆς κρίσεως χρόνοι·

κατηγόρει μὲν Λυκῖνος ὁ γραψάμενος,
ἀπελογεῖτο δὲ Φιλοκράτης,
συναπελογεῖτο δὲ Δημοσθένης·

ἀπέφυγε Φιλοκράτης.

62. Philocrates made a motion that we
permit Philip to send to us a herald

<p>unanimous vote of the people, that Philip be allowed to send to us a herald and ambassadors to treat for peace.</p>	<p>and ambassadors to treat concerning peace.</p>
<p>For up to this time even that had been prevented by certain men who made it their business to do so, as the event itself proved.</p>	
<p>14. For they attack the motion as unconstitutional, subscribing the name of Lycinus to the indictment, in which they proposed a penalty of one hundred talents.</p>	<p>This motion <u>was attacked</u> in the courts as illegal.</p>
<p>When the case came to trial,</p>	<p>The time of the trial <u>came</u>. Lycinus, who had indicted him, <u>spoke for the prosecution</u>;</p>
<p>Philocrates {was ill}, and <u>called</u> as his advocate Demosthenes, not me. And Demosthenes the Philip-hater {came to the platform} and <u>used up</u> the day in his plea for the defence.</p>	<p>Philocrates <u>spoke in his own defence</u>, and Demosthenes <u>spoke in his behalf</u>;</p>
<p>Finally Philocrates is acquitted, and the prosecutor does not get the fifth part of the votes. That you all know. (trans. after Adams [1919])</p>	<p>Philocrates <u>was acquitted</u>. (trans. after Adams [1919])</p>

It should immediately strike the reader that the passage on the left is full of present for preterite forms, but the passage on the right is devoid of them. This can be explained in terms of narrative presentation. First, the decree of Philocrates is marked with the present $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota$ ('offers') in 2.13 but with the aorist $\xi\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\epsilon$ ('made a motion') in 3.62. In speech 2, the event is presented as a peak (culmination). All events narrated so far lead up to this point. Multiple reports have come to Athens that Philip wants to make peace, so now Philocrates proposes a decree that allows Philip to send ambassadors. The phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\alpha$ ἤδη ('then finally') is a typical marker of changes in the narrative dynamic, suggesting that 'now (in the story) finally' things start to happen. The five absolute participial clauses leading up to the main clause serve to heighten the audience's anticipation (compare Section 3.3.3). Also, Philocrates' introduction as a character in the narrative is highlighted by the fact that he is mentioned by a fuller designation than necessary: $\Phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ὁ Ἄγνουσιος ('Philocrates of

Hagnus⁹⁴; he was widely known and was already mentioned in the proem at 6 and 8; compare Section 3.5.3.1, note 74). In speech 3, by contrast, the event constitutes the very beginning of the story. The aorist is normally used in such contexts.⁹⁴

Similar considerations apply to the indictment of Philocrates, marked with the present γράφονται ('attack [by legal means]') in 2.14 but with the aorist ἐγράφη ('was attacked') in 3.62. In principle, the event constitutes a change in the narrative dynamic in both cases. However, in speech 2 this is more strongly highlighted. Aeschines introduces the event with a narratorial comment: πρότερον μὲν γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐκωλύετο ὑπὸ τινων, οἷς ἦν τοῦτ' ἐπιμελές, ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ πρῶγμα ἔδειξεν ('for up to this time even that [allowing Philip to send ambassadors] had been prevented by certain men who made it their business to do so, as the event itself proved'). The indictment is presented as an intervention by men who sought to prevent peace from being made. In speech 3, on the other hand, the agency behind the indictment is backgrounded, as Aeschines uses a passive construction to describe the event.

This backgrounding of agency is part of a larger strategy of narrative presentation. In the passage from the third speech, the events are treated in a strikingly summary fashion. Several linguistic features bear this out:

- (a) Absence of connective particles where clauses move forward narrative time.
- (b) Absence of subordinate clauses.
- (c) Main clauses contain only syntactically essential material: verb, subject and, in a few cases, complement.

The aim of this narrative strategy seems to be to deal quickly with facts that the speaker presents as background information.⁹⁵ In speech 2, Aeschines pretends to give a clear and honest account of the peace of Philocrates: 11 ὅθεν δ' ἠγοῦμαι σαφειστάτους μοι τοὺς λόγους ἔσεσθαι καὶ γνωρίμους ὑμῖν καὶ δικαίους, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρξομαι, ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης

⁹⁴ Compare my comments on E. *El* 509 ἦλθον ('came') in Chapter 2, Section 2.6.1.

⁹⁵ This narrative style is rarely employed, but another example is D. 24.11–14. Compare especially 11 ψήφισμ' εἶπεν ἐν ὑμῖν Ἀριστοφῶν ἐλέσθαι ζητητᾶς ('Aristophon proposed a decree in the assembly to elect investigators') to Aeschin. 3.62 ἔγραψε Φιλοκράτης ἐξεῖναι Φιλίππῳ δεῦρο κήρυκα καὶ πρέσβεις πέμπειν περὶ εἰρήνης ('Philocrates made a motion that we permit Philip to send to us a herald and ambassadors to treat concerning peace').

λόγων καὶ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῆς πρεσβείας ('but I will begin with those events which I think will enable me to make my presentation most clear and intelligible to you, and fair; these events are the discussion that took place concerning the peace, and the choice of the ambassadors'; trans. Adams [1919]). The narrative in speech 3 has a stronger focus. Considerations of space play a role here, as many other things had happened since the 'false embassy' trial that Aeschines wishes to discuss as well. With regard to the Peace of Philocrates, Aeschines explicitly states that his main concern is to discuss 'the decrees that Demosthenes wrote together with Philocrates' (60 τὰ ψηφίσματα ... ἃ μετὰ Φιλοκράτους ἔγραψε Δημοσθένης). Philocrates' initial proposal, which was defended by Demosthenes but not written by him or passed under his auspices, is preliminary material; as we will see shortly, we start finding present forms when Demosthenes and Philocrates start working in concert.

To conclude this section, I argue that the narrative style of the entire passage in 3.62 explains the absence of the present for preterite here. Aeschines wants to do away with these facts as quickly as he can to move on to the part that is immediately relevant to his main concern. This extends to the form ἀπέφυγε ('was acquitted') as well, which I have not discussed individually. For the corresponding present forms ἀποφεύγει ('is acquitted') and [οὐ] μεταλαμβάνει ('does [not] get') in 2.14, which mark a peak (culmination), see Section 3.4.1.

The second pair of parallel passages concerns Philocrates' second decree, which proposed to elect ten ambassadors to go to Philip to talk about peace. Again, Aeschines provides background material in speech 2 (15–17) which has no parallel in speech 3. Olynthus was taken, and many Athenian citizens were captured; the Athenians sent an envoy to Philip on behalf of those captured; when the envoy came back, he reported that Philip wished to become an ally of Athens. This is where the narratives start to run parallel again:

On the false embassy (2)

(17. εἷς δὲ τῶν βουλευτῶν ἦν
Δημοσθένης ὁ ἐμὸς κατήγορος.)

Against Ctesiphon (3)

62. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπήει χρόνος
Θεμιστοκλῆς ἄρχων·
ἐνταῦθ' εἰσέρχεται βουλευτῆς εἰς τὸ
βουλευτήριον Δημοσθένης, οὔτε
λαχῶν οὔτ' ἐπιλαχῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ
παρασκευῆς πριάμενος, ἵν' εἰς
ὑποδοχὴν ἅπαντα καὶ λέγοι καὶ
πράττοι Φιλοκράτει, ὡς αὐτὸ ἔδειξε
τὸ ἔργον.

18. Ῥηθέντων δὲ τούτων, ψήφισμα ἔγραψεν ὁ Φιλοκράτης ἐλέσθαι πρέσβεις πρὸς Φίλιππον ἄνδρας δέκα, οἵτινες διαλέξονται Φιλίππῳ περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ τῶν κοινῆ συμφερόντων Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Φιλίππῳ.

Χειροτονουμένων δὲ τῶν δέκα πρέσβειων, ἐγὼ μὲν προεβλήθην ὑπὸ Ναυσικλέους, Δημοσθένης δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Φιλοκράτους, ὁ νυνὶ Φιλοκράτους κατηγορῶν.

(17. One of the Council members was Demosthenes, my accuser.)

18. When those things had been said, Philocrates wrote a decree proposing that ten ambassadors be chosen to go to Philip and discuss with him both the question of peace and the common interests of the Athenians and Philip.

At the election of the ten ambassadors I was nominated by Nausicles, but Demosthenes by Philocrates himself – Demosthenes, the man who now accuses Philocrates.

(trans. after Adams [1919])

63. **Νικᾶ** γὰρ ἕτερον ψήφισμα Φιλοκράτης ἐν ᾧ κελεύει ἐλέσθαι δέκα πρέσβεις, οἵτινες ἀφικόμενοι ὡς Φίλιππον ἀξιώσουσιν αὐτὸν δεῦρο πρέσβεις αὐτοκράτορας πέμπειν ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης.

Τούτων εἷς ἦν Δημοσθένης.

62. After that came the archonship of Themistocles.

At that point Demosthenes **enters** the Council as a member, not drawn by the lot either as a member or as a substitute, but through intrigue and bribery; the purpose of it was to enable him to support Philocrates in every way, by word and deed, as the event itself made evident.

63. For Philocrates **carries** a second resolution, providing for the election of ten ambassadors, who shall go to Philip and ask him to send plenipotentiaries here to negotiate peace.

Of these ambassadors one was Demosthenes.

(trans. after Adams [1919])

Now the situation is exactly opposite from above: we find present forms in speech 3 where we find preterites in speech 2. In the period of Themistocles' archonship, Demosthenes 'enters' (εἰσέρχεται) the Council as a member (3.62). The present marks the introduction of a main character into a new part of the narrative (see Section 3.5.1 with example [47]). Moreover, Aeschines presents this event as the start of the machinations between Demosthenes and Philocrates, which is the main concern

of his narrative: Demosthenes bought his position so that he could help Philocrates in any way possible. In speech 2, there is no dramatic introduction of Demosthenes. Aeschines simply mentions at a certain point that Demosthenes was Council member (2.17 ἦν ['was']).

Philocrates' proposal is marked with the present νικᾷ ('carries') in 3.63 but with the aorist ἔγραψεν ('wrote a decree') in 2.18. As I have just explained, in speech 3, the passing of the decree is presented as part of the joint machinations of Demosthenes and Philocrates, which form the main rhetorical concern of this part of Aeschines' narrative. Note how it is introduced with the phrase ὡς αὐτὸ ἔδειξε τὸ ἔργον ('as the event itself made evident'), which is strongly reminiscent of ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἔδειξεν ('as the event itself proved') in 2.13. In both cases, the comment serves to direct attention to the next event in the narrative as something significant.

In 2.18, on the other hand, the decree is not presented as in any way remarkable. It seems that this was simply the natural thing to do, after the first decree had been approved by the Athenian assembly, and now news had come that Philip definitely wanted to make peace. The differences in the way this second decree and the first decree are presented in the same speech are telling. In 2.13, the present in δίδωσι ψήφισμα ('offers a motion') is accompanied by several cues indicating a change in the narrative dynamic: the accumulation of absolute participial clauses, the phrase ἐνταῦθα ἤδη ('then finally'), and the introduction of Philocrates by a fuller designation than necessary (Φιλοκράτης ὁ Ἄγνουσιος ['Philocrates of Hagnus']). Such cues are absent here.

The nomination of Demosthenes and Aeschines is presented with an aorist in 2.18 (προεβλήθην ['was nominated']). This corresponds to the imperfect ἦν ('was') in 3.63, referring to Demosthenes' role as ambassador. In 2.18, the fact that Demosthenes and Aeschines were nominated is presented as presupposed information, as witnessed by the ellipsis of the verb in the second part ('I was nominated by Nausicles, but Demosthenes by Philocrates himself').⁹⁶

To conclude, we have seen how tense usage is exactly reversed in the two parallel passages I discussed here. In the speech *On the false embassy*, Philocrates' initial proposal constitutes a peak in the narrative, and the indictment of Philocrates and the outcome of the trial are also significant

⁹⁶ Contrast how in D. 19.12, the election of Aeschines as ambassador is marked with the present γίγνεται ('becomes'); see Section 3.5.1, example (50).

changes in the narrative dynamic. In *Against Ctesiphon*, by contrast, the whole affair is backgrounded with respect to the following narrative, where Demosthenes and Philocrates 'write decrees together'. Consequently, we find present for preterite forms in the former version but not in the latter. Conversely, Philocrates' second decree is presented as unremarkable in *On the false embassy*, while it is presented as a deceitful act in *Against Ctesiphon*. Here the situation with respect to tense usage is reversed, with the present being used in the second case but the preterite in the first.

3.6.3 Conclusion

In this final section, I have presented two case studies that aimed to demonstrate the relevance of the analytical tools I have laid out in previous sections for explaining tense-switching in discourse. I would not claim that these case studies are entirely representative of the corpus as a whole (large as it is), but I do think these parallel discussions have revealed some important aspects of narrative presentation that influence tense-switching. The running thread throughout my discussions was that the present for preterite is used when the narrator highlights the impact of the designated event on the structure of the story. We saw how this was reinforced in a number of ways:

- (a) Subordinate clauses evoking narrative schemas ('fearing', 'seeing'), as explained in Section 3.4.3.
- (b) Generally, proliferation of subordinate clauses (Section 3.3.3).
- (c) Narratorial comments: 'cut-to-the-chase' formulae as indicative of peaks (Section 3.6.1), 'as-the-event-proved' formulae as indicative of significant acts (Section 3.6.2).
- (d) Emphasis on the outrageousness of the designated events: for example, παραβᾶσα πάντα τὰ ὠμολογημένα ('violating the entire agreement') in Demosthenes 40.11 (Section 3.6.1).
- (e) Use of the marker ἤδη ('finally' or 'now').

On the other hand, the preterite is associated with backgrounded material:

- (a) Routine or predictable events. Low information status of the verb is indicative of the predictability of the designated event.
- (b) Resolution material (events that follow upon a change in the narrative dynamic).

- (c) Passages characterised by a marked brevity: simple sentences with only the necessary constituents, without connective particles (Section 3.6.2).

Finally, I have argued that what narrators choose to construe as changes in the narrative dynamic is ultimately determined by their main rhetorical concerns. While tense usage is certainly not the sole diagnostic for rhetorical importance, the present tense can be used – as part of a complex of strategies – to signal to the audience that the designated event is something they should pay particular attention to.

3.7 Conclusion

Let me review the main arguments made in this chapter:

- (a) *Discourse as representation*. I have argued that the use of the present for preterite in summary narrative ('diegetic' use) depends on a conceptual scenario in which the designated past events are mapped onto the discourse space. The pragmatic function of the present for preterite here is to signal to the addressees that they are to update their mental model of the discourse in the light of salient changes in its structure.
- (b) *Attention-management strategies*. The present for preterite has an affinity with certain aspects of narrative presentation that put an event in the story into stronger focus. This is suggestive of the discourse-structural implications of the present for preterite. I have identified the following attention-management strategies: announcements of the next event, typically with cataphoric reference; questions and exhortations to the audience; clause complexity; and the use of the particle $\delta\acute{\eta}$ ('then', 'so') to mark discourse progression.
- (c) *Functions, 1*. The first main discourse-structural function of the diegetic present for preterite is marking changes in the narrative dynamic. I have argued that the explanatory value of this concept is not predicated on an analysis in terms of episodic structure. Quantitative analysis suggests that there is indeed a connection between the present for preterite and certain narrative schemas that involve a change in the narrative dynamic.
- (d) *Functions, 2*. The second function of the diegetic present for preterite is marking changes in the status of referents. In this case, the discourse-as-representation scenario may be supplemented by another

conceptual scenario in which we trace the position of discourse referents on a virtual map. To corroborate the argument concerning this second pragmatic function of the present for preterite, I have explored the hypothesis that unpredictability of subject referents has a positive effect on the probability of the present being chosen over the preterite. The quantity of coding material does seem to have a positive effect (at least in two out of the three historiographical works), but no clear effect was found for proper noun complexity (full name compared to simple name) or indefiniteness.