CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

XENOPHON

V. Gray

Xenophon's *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Apologia*, and *Symposium*, which all contain conversations of Socrates, share some important narratological features. The primary narrators are anonymous, but reveal themselves in introductory frames, which also state the topic of the conversation. The narrator claims to be remembering conversations he has heard himself (*Oeconomicus* and *Symposium*), or reports of them from others (*Apologia*), or a combination of these two types of memory (*Memorabilia*). This makes the works remembered narratives and authorizes them as the product of eye-witnessing, whether in the first or in the second degree. The narrator also displays through them the power of memory that was required of a Socratic pupil and the process that ensures that the lessons of the conversations remained with him (*Mem.* 1.2.19–21; 4.8.11; on this theme → Plato). They could provide private re-education, as *Memorabilia* 4.8.11 suggests, or be read aloud and thus shared with others (→ Plato).

Theoretically Xenophon might have chosen to call his narrator 'Xenophon'. Instead, as in *Anabasis*, he introduces the character Xenophon as a dramatized 'other', in order to secure an impression of objectivity and hence persuasive force. Indeed, he even allows Socrates to criticize this character for being 'foolish' (*Mem.* 1.3.8–13). Since Xenophon was probably too young to remember the party described in *Symposium* (for which the dramatic date is 422 BC), he cannot be identified as the narrator of this work either. The narrators of *Memorabilia* and *Oeconomicus* might be among those silent bystanders who are mentioned as witnesses to the conversations (*Mem.* 1.2.30; 1.6.1; 4.2.1; *Oec.* 3.1). In *Symposium*, he could be one of the named guests, referring to himself in the third person, or an anonymous guest. The memories are fictional if they are credited to the author,[1] but could still be the genuine memories of this 'other'.

[1] E.g. Kahn 1996: 29–35.

One common feature of the frames, which can be entirely narrative or involve dialogue, is their use of formulae. A very full range of these introduces the sequence of smaller conversations that form the bulk of *Memorabilia* 1.4–4.8. A typical instance is: 'I will first state what I once heard him say about the godhead in conversation with Aristodemus …' (1.4.2). The actual conversation is then started off by Socrates' perception of a problem that he tries to solve: 'Learning that he did not sacrifice to the gods … "Tell me", he said, "Aristodemus …"'.[2] There are also other forms of introductory remarks, such as exhortations to the narratees to join the narrator in his search for the truth ('Let us enquire …': 1.5.1, 7.1), and assertions of the narrator's discrimination ('it seems worthy of report': 1.6.1). The narrator does not intervene in the course of the conversations, but he often summarizes what Socrates achieved (1.4.19, 5.6; 4.2.40, 5.12), thereby rounding off one conversation before proceeding to the next one.

These formulae are found in later manuals of rhetorical instruction, which use them to introduce the sayings of the wise as proofs, and show how to elaborate them into short stories. The longest type of saying is the *apomnēmoneuma*, which is the Greek title of *Memorabilia*.[3] *Memorabilia* indeed elaborates the introductory formulae, as, for example, when we hear how Socrates came to view the famous courtesan Theodote (3.11.1), or how Socrates made Euthydemus receptive to his instruction over a period of time (4.2.1–8). The first makes a philosophic issue of the beauty of Theodote (it is beyond words, who benefits from it?), while the second characterizes the world of the reception for Socrates' teaching method, as in Plato (→). Euthydemus is introduced as an example of how Socrates adapted his approach to those who were unready to accept instruction (4.1). In a series of short scenes, Socrates breaks down his pride, speaking to his companions on topics meant to gain his silent attention, and using irony (4.2.1–8). The main conversations that follow these elaborations are then introduced in the formulaic ways: 'Tell me, Theodote …' (3.11.4); 'Tell me, Euthydemus …' (4.2.8). Sometimes the remark is developed to prove that Socrates practised what he preached, e.g. in 4.4.1–4, 5.1–2, 7.1, in accordance with the programme of the work, which sees imitation of his practice as an essential part of his education (1.3.1).

---

[2] Other examples: 1.2.29–30, 3.8; 2.1.1, 2.1, 3.1.

[3] Gray 1998: 107–122 has discussed these introductions to the so-called *chreiai*. See Hock and O'Neil 1986 for the relevant texts.

The other works also begin with variations of these formulae, and there is an impression that they form a continuous sequence. *Oeconomicus* begins: 'I once heard him [Socrates] speak about household management *as well* … "Tell me," he said …'. *Symposium* begins: 'But to me it seems that not only are the serious pursuits of gentlemen worth remembering (as is the common opinion) but the playful ones *as well*.' He next introduces his actual narrative with the well-known formulaic frame: 'On account of what experiences I came to this conviction I wish to reveal'. *Apologia*, like *Oeconomicus*, starts like another one of the conversations embedded in *Memorabili*a: 'It seems to me worth remembering *also* …'; cf. *Memorabilia* 1.6.1. The sense of continuity and the similarity to the frames of the sequence of conversations in *Memorabilia* suggest that these other works constitute further conversations in the sequence and come from the same narrator. Perhaps this expresses the continuity of the process of remembering and the collected force of the wisdom that they contain.

The authority of this anonymous internal narrator is expressed in his claims to have been present at Socrates' conversations and to have heard them himself, or at least to have heard about them. He appeals to his own memory (e.g. *Mem.* 1.3.1), or simply claims to 'know' (*Mem.* 2.7.1, 2.10.1; 3.3.1; 4.4.5, 4.5.2). Occasionally he introduces anonymous spokesmen ('others'), who were witnesses themselves and as such can confirm what the narrator says (e.g. *Mem.* 4.3.2). He turns to a named secondary internal narrator at the end of *Memorabilia*, where Hermogenes tells him about a conversation he had with Socrates, which revealed his remarkable attitude to death (4.8.4–11). The named witness gives special authentication to something that the narratees might find particularly unbelievable. We are in fact told that Socrates' critics fail to understand his attitude to death (4.8.1) and that this applied at first even to Hermogenes. Hermogenes therefore carries authority not only because of his personal experience of Socrates, but also because he initially shared the ignorance of the critics, but learned the truth from Socrates himself. Hermogenes appears in this same role in *Apologia*, where the narrator refers to the inadequacy of other accounts and introduces him to tell the true story. The concern for authority can be found in the frame of a conversation within *Memorabilia* too, where Socrates, as narrator of the story of Prodicus, refers to the possible failure of his memory (2.1.21) but then asserts authority in saying that he is not using the exact words of Prodicus—which he must know (2.1.34).

Introductory frames can model a world of reception for Socratic teaching for the primary narratees, as in Plato (→), characterizing not only Euthydemus in *Memorabilia* 4.2 but also Callias in *Symposium*, who is presented as one who is passionate to spend time with Socrates, who prefers the company of the wise to that of military men and office-seekers, and whose passion is confirmed in his distress at Socrates' initial refusal of his invitation to his party. He seems keener to display his wisdom to Socrates than receive it, but Socrates ironically reveals that his wisdom is inferior since it has been purchased from the sophists. In *Oeconomicus*, Critobulus as secondary narratee shows the same passion for Socrates' advice (2.14, 3.1).

Primary narrators often express as their motive for narration the correction of an erroneous view: that Socrates' condemnation was wrong (*Memorabilia*), that play is unworthy of memory (*Symposium*), or that Socrates' attitude to death was unworthy (*Apologia*). This makes the narrators educators in their own right.

The works also have their own distinct features, to which I turn next.

Memorabilia

Memorabilia's anonymous internal primary narrator embarks on his tale because he wonders what arguments persuaded the jurors to condemn a man like Socrates. The first part of the work (1.1–2) refutes the charges with arguments in defensive courtroom mode, confronting the opposition (from 1.2.9 onwards) and illustrating some points with dialogues (1.2.29–46); while the rest (1.3.1–4.8) offers a sequence of dialogues, framed and sometimes interspersed with narrative, as well as some plainer reports, such as the account of the limit of Socrates' instruction (4.7), which serve as more positive proofs of Socrates' virtuous instruction of others.[4] The conversations present a comprehensive account of Socrates' teaching to a very wide variety of people, mainly on their relationships—to the gods and to each other. This range of topics makes the work a compendium of wisdom, unlike any single dialogue of Plato. The conversations are often in order of the importance of their topics (beginning with religion: 1.4, and then self-control: 1.5), but they are also grouped according to topic (conversations about family rela-

[4] Gray 1998, especially 123–158, describes the structure of the contents and establishes that there is a programme in it, which previous scholars have questioned.

tions: 2.2–3, friendships: 2.4–10, relations between political officials and their constituencies: 3.1–7). The conversations with Euthydemus (4.2–3, 5–6) offer an almost complete process of education in the one interlocutor, raising the original teaching on religion and self-control to a higher level and culminating in the teaching of dialectic. The last conversation (4.8) takes place on the eve of Socrates' death, bringing us back to the beginning of the work and hence creating closure.

The narrator's organization of his work (refutation of the charges, followed by positive proof of Socrates' virtue in a sequence of conversations) rather interestingly shows him to be one who has learned the Socratic teaching technique that he portrays in the work.[5] The combination of refutation followed by more positive instruction is the shape of the character Socrates' instructional dialogue, e.g. his education of Euthydemus, which begins with negative refutation (4.2 *passim*) but proceeds to positive instruction, which begins at 4.2.40. This characterizes the narrator as a true disciple of the educational process of his venerated master in his instruction of his narratees and is a unique narratological feature of *Memorabilia*. In accordance with the clear rhetorical purpose of the work, the narrator, though anonymous, is overt; he is throughout present with his emotions and evaluations, e.g. 'I wonder then how the Athenians can have been persuaded that Socrates was a freethinker …' (1.1.20), and numerous first-person comments (I believe', 'I see', etc.).

The narratees are anonymous like the narrator. Their presence is implicitly felt, however, when the narrator inserts numerous rhetorical questions in the first part of his defence, e.g. 'So, in pronouncing on opinions of his that were unknown to them, it is not surprising that the jury erred: but is it not astonishing that they should have ignored matters of common knowledge?' (1.1.17).[6] They are also the focus of persuasion when the narrator constructs and refutes the various arguments of anonymous opponents, structuring his work as a virtual dialogue with these (from 1.2.9 onwards): 'The accuser says … but I say against this …' (1.2.19); 'A man might say against this … I do not oppose that, but …' (1.2.17); a sustained use of the 'anonymous interlocutor' device. Perhaps the opposition represents the views of some narratees, but for others, the victory of the narrator over his opposition persuades them that he has argued the stronger case. The narrator

[5] Gray 1998: 91.
[6] Cf. 1.5.1, 2.2, 2.8, 2.11, 2.15, etc.

indeed overwhelms his opposition in the course of the work, first refuting their view that Socrates was harmful (1.2.9–64), then beginning to prove him helpful (1.3), reintroducing the opposition to argue that he was only partly helpful (1.4.1), dismissing this with a series of conversations that prove Socrates' entire helpfulness, letting them put a final thesis regarding Socrates' death (4.8.1), and crushing this as well. His first-person conclusion finally dismisses them, when it invites 'a man' who is not pleased with his evaluation to compare Socrates against others (4.8.11). This conclusion also uses the 'continuance' motif to indicate to them how influential Socrates has been: 'All who knew what manner of man Socrates was and who seek after virtue continue to this day to miss him beyond all others.'

There are a few embedded stories credited to secondary narrators. The longest of these is Prodicus' 'story' of Heracles (2.1.21–33), which the secondary narrator Socrates introduces with a formula similar to those with which the primary narrator introduces his own conversations. The purpose of this embedding is to reinforce the teaching on toil by offering a range of instructional styles on the same topic: poetic didacticism (Hesiod and Epicharmus) and sophistic epideictic (Prodicus) are embedded within Socrates' own dialectical conversation. The question of translation arises when Socrates pretends not to have been able to capture Prodicus' own grand language, but this is more likely to illustrate his knowledge of the original (2.1.34).

Oeconomicus

Oeconomicus presents a multiplicity of narrators,[7] in a manner comparable to that found in Plato (→). The primary narrator, anonymous and internal, without motivation, but in his role of eyewitness, recounts in dramatized form a discussion between Socrates and Critobulus about successful estate management. After one sentence ('I once heard him discussing the subject of estate management in the following manner') he disappears never to surface again, except to provide speech-introductions. This topic (of estate management) is the realm of the *kaloskagathos*, who can 'use his household and his house-holders and relatives, and friends and polis and fellow-citizens for benefit', like the

[7] Pomeroy 1994: 17–18 briefly describes the structure of the work. The embedding once gave some the impression that the work is not a unity.

kaloikagathoi who associate with Socrates at *Memorabilia* 1.2.48 and 64. Socrates teaches in his customary way, defining 'estate' in terms of its function, which is to benefit the possessor (1.1–15). For further instruction, he introduces reported narrators, recounting what 'people say' about the practices of the Persian king (4.4), what Cyrus 'is said' to have told those who received his gifts (4.15–16), what Lysander 'is said' to have told a Megarian stranger about Cyrus (4.20–25), and, becoming a secondary narrator himself, reports a long conversation he had with the supreme estate manager Ischomachus, in which he learned management (6.12 to the end). This Ischomachus, becoming a tertiary narrator, embeds his own 'memories' (7.43; 8.23) of the conversations in which he instructed his wife (7.5–10.13) and spoke with the mate of a ship he once inspected (8.11–16). The secondary narrator Socrates intervenes only occasionally into the conversations he reports ('I said': 10.1, 11.1), while, as was noted earlier, the primary narrator has disappeared altogether. Thus, the work ends with Ischomachus addressing Socrates.

Introductions to the embedded conversations mention the leisure that is the setting for philosophical discourse, but show that men with property shun such idleness. (Socrates:) 'Seeing Ischomachus once … since he seemed at leisure, I approached him and sat down and said. "You're not accustomed to sitting down doing nothing …"' (7.1); (Ischomachus:) 'I saw this man in his leisure making a full inspection … I asked him what he was doing and he said …' (8.15). These introductions, then, are part of the 'economic' lessons imparted.

There is considerable characterization of the secondary and tertiary narrators and narratees. Socrates as secondary narrator seeks his customary definitions, employs irony, describes models for his narratee Critobulus to imitate and sends him to higher authorities for experience he does not possess (a habit of his noted in *Memorabilia* 4.7). In estate management he is a success himself, since he succeeds in making a small profit from his small estate (2.10). The secondary narratee Critobulus is a young man of much greater property, under the greater obligations that this carries (2.1–9; also 7.3), married, but spending money on idleness such as boyfriends and dramatic performances (2.3–8; 3.12), and becoming aware that he is exhausting his means and eager for instruction in how to become a *kaloskagathos* (6.12). The tertiary narrator Ischomachus is the ultimate model for Critobulus, and therefore a fully characterized narrator. He has a great property and is married like Critobulus, but unlike Critobulus, is not given to idleness,

but to farming. He has a reputation as a *kaloskagathos* (6.17) and he supplies the instruction that Socrates has foreshadowed—training his wife to rule the servants and increase his estate (7–10; cf. 3.11–16), developing his physique and training for war while himself increasing his estate (11; cf. 4), teaching his workers to increase his estate (12–14), teaching Socrates how to farm (15–19) and telling him what ruins estates (20–21; cf. 1.16–23). He is an excellent teacher, instructing his workers in the art of ruling (13.3–5)—which he considers the peak of achievement (21–22)—and bringing knowledge to birth in Socrates (19.14–15). Socrates as his tertiary narratee is eager to learn, which he says is characteristic of a philosopher (16.9), thus providing a model for his own secondary narratee, Critobulus.

The possibility that Socrates is ironic arises when he says that he sought Ischomachus out because he had a reputation as a *kaloskagathos* (6.12–17, since reputations can be misleading). Yet there is no irony in his own praise of farming as secondary narrator (5.1–13; 6.4–10). Successful farming indeed requires and develops philosophic virtues, such as self-control (1.16–23), and permits the cultivation of friends and polis (6.4–11). Ischomachus is ironic about his own reputation (7.3) and he knows when Socrates is being ironic (11.3–7; 20.22–29), but he is also serious about his own instruction, and Socrates elicits even from his remark about profiteering (20.22–29) the serious principle that 'all men naturally love whatever they think will bring them a profit'. *Oeconomicus* can therefore be read as a straightforward lesson in how Socrates taught his associates to manage their households and other organizations by extension, such as the polis. Ischomachus says the principles are applicable to any organization (21.2), and Socrates does not oppose this; elsewhere, he even endorses it (*Mem.* 3.4.12).

Other narratees are characterized to a lesser extent. Ischomachus characterizes his wife through her reactions to his training (7.8, 14, 37 etc.), just as he is seen as beautiful through her eyes (10.6). She has been identified as the Chrysilla whom Andocides criticized for subsequent immorality, but to import this into the work and make her portrayal ironic is narratologically indefensible.[8]

Secondary and tertiary narratees such as Critobulus and Socrates steer the reception of the primary narratees in their eagerness to learn. The truth of the embedded stories is not seriously challenged. Crito-

[8] Pomeroy 1994: 261–264 believes that an ironic reading would destroy the point of the work, but ironists could read it as a parody of the impossibility of such perfection.

bulus asks whether Socrates really believes what 'they say' about the Persian king (4.4), but accepts it as true (4.12) after Socrates proves it through an 'enquiry' into it (4.5–11). He gives the same acceptance (4.17) to further reported narratives about the king.

The function of the embedded narratives in *Oeconomicus* is educational: they are paradigms, which bring the narratees into the presence of successful managers of great estates (the Persian king, Ischomachus) and reinforce Socrates' teaching about the excellence of farming, or the excellence of his paradigms. They use a range of educational methods: Socrates teaches through questions, definitions, paradigms and protreptic; Ischomachus' instructional styles include protreptic (15.10–16.7), and the Socratic method of questioning and bringing knowledge to birth (16.10 to 19.14–15). Ischomachus also offers instructional models for all narratees to adopt in managing their own households: the lectures he delivers to his wife (7–10), and the praise and blame, rewards and punishments that he uses on his workers (12–14). His instruction of Socrates also illustrates Socrates' customary search for wisdom and his expressed concern to find expertise he does not have: he has theoretical knowledge, but lacks the experience of running a large estate (this disqualification is mentioned at 2.3.11–13). This is why Socrates promises to send Critobulus to other teachers for various areas of instruction (2.13–18; 3.14–16; 4.4), but in fact he supplies Ischomachus as a person who combines all these.[9] This embedded narrative also allows Socrates to cast himself as pupil and reveal the delight of the philosopher in learning, which models the reception that is appropriate for Critobulus.

Apologia

The anonymous external primary narrator in *Apologia* motivates his own narrative by saying that other writers agree about the 'high-mindedness' of Socrates over the period of his trial, thus authorizing this feature, but make it look 'witless' by failing to explain his conviction that death was preferable to life. He wants to correct this situation by intro-

[9] For example, Socrates does not fulfil his promise to have Aspasia give advice on wives (3.14), but this advice is incorporated into Ischomachus' account. In his own instruction he remembers more than what has been agreed at 6.6–7 but his expansion is a natural extrapolation from 4.3, where craftsmen are said to be bad defenders of their country.

ducing a named internal secondary narrator, Hermogenes, who alone made Socrates' high-mindedness appear 'appropriate' by explaining its rationale. This secondary narrator is authoritative, because he was an eyewitness of the trial, indeed a companion and interlocutor of Socrates (cf., e.g. 2–3).

The primary narrator offers minimal framing. In 2 he introduces a report of a conversation that Hermogenes had with Socrates before the trial ('He stated that, on seeing Socrates discussing any and every subject rather than the trial, he had said …'); this conversation runs from 3 to 9 (cf. the similar report in *Memorabilia* 4.8.4–10). In 10 ('Hermogenes stated that with this resolve Socrates came before his jurors …') he introduces a report of the trial itself (11–21), including the embedded responses of Socrates' accusers (20–21). In 22 he curtails Hermogenes' account of the trial, stating that he knows that much more was said by Socrates and his counsellors, but that he limits himself to the proof of his conviction about death. This intervention from the primary narrator into the account of his secondary narrator demonstrates his wider knowledge, anticipates any hypothetical objection from the primary narratees that his account is incomplete, and at the same time characterizes his desire to discriminate and focus on his theme. From this point the voices of the primary and secondary narrator merge, endorsing the same image of Socrates in persuasive harmony. In 23–31 the primary narrator recounts mainly in his own voice, occasionally recalling his source Hermogenes (e.g. 27: 'Hermogenes reports him as asking …'), how subsequent events proved Socrates' disregard of death, recording conversations with his pupils (27–28) and comments on his prosecutor Anytus (29–30). The narrator even seems to step into the shoes of Hermogenes when he describes how Socrates' physical appearance was 'in agreement with' his resolve (27), something only Hermogenes, who alone was present, could have seen.

There is some direct engagement with the narratees, but not very much: two instances of the 'presentation through negation' device represent the ignorant narratees' expectation (31: 'he was not cheated of this expectation, but …'; 33: 'he did not shrink in the face of death, but he met and saw it through in high spirits') and an extended instance of the 'anonymous interlocutor' motif at the very end of the work, which challenges those narratees who do not accept his final conclusion ('I am unable not to remember him and, in remembering, not to praise him. If any of those who desire virtue have been with a man more helpful than Socrates, I think him a real man worthy of the name most blessed': 34).

Symposium

Symposium tells the story of a party, from the invitations to the break-up, and takes as its theme the seriousness that can be found in the playful activities of *kaloikagathoi*. *Memorabilia* 4.1.1 finds the same seriousness in Socrates' playful claim to be in love with his young men. The narrator is anonymous and undramatized and though internal (cf. 1: *hois … paragenomenos:* 'an experience of mine') after the first framing chapter invisible in his own story. His initial scene models the world of philosophy, when it recounts how the company gathered to celebrate the victory of Autolycus (1.2–6), characterizing Callias, his host and lover, as an enthusiastic fan of philosophy, and Socrates and his friends as men who are indeed, as Callias describes them, purified in soul. Thus they 'as was natural' (i.e. for educated men), praised Callias for the invitation, but at first declined to attend (1.7). The narrator also frames the speeches that form the bulk of the work with narratives that contrast different types of play, some worthy of philosophers, some not. At the beginning Autolycus' beauty produces the civilizing effects of love on the company, but this is disturbed by the entry of the clown Philip with his buffoonish play. Socrates will eventually reject passive entertainment like this in favour of the more engaged play of philosophers (3.2). Love is indeed the subject of Socrates' long speech, and the kind of play that Socrates will eventually harness to most serious educational purpose, in order to make Callias a political leader and lover of the polis (8.36–43). At the end of the work, young actors 'play' a dramatic mime of the love of Dionysus and Ariadne, balancing the homosexual love in the introduction with heterosexual love (9.2–6). Yet the actors playing the lovers are seriously in love once more, and under that god's civilizing influence. The performance ends the work with the company inspired by thoughts of wedded bliss, while Socrates, Callias, and others join Autolycus and his father on their walk (9.1, 9.7).

Though invisible as a character, the narrator is overt, in that he comments on the events of his story. He introduces the various speeches of the guests that form the inner core of the work with simple tags ('he said, they said'), occasionally turning to indirect speech (e.g. 3.14; 4.50). He marks stages of the conversation (e.g., 4.5, 9, 28, 45, 64; 9.1, 7), guiding the narratees to an interpretation (6.10), involving them as virtual eyewitnesses through the use of the 'anonymous witness' device ('A person who took note of the course of events would have come at once to the conclusion that beauty is in essence something

regal …': 1.8), or reminding them of the theme of the work (4.28). He introduces *hōs eikos*-comments (1.7, 8), which recall the narrator of Xenophon *Anabasis* and *Hellenica* (→). He also intervenes to give brief descriptions of the entertainment, sometimes in order to have Socrates evaluate it (e.g. 2.8, 11–12, 22; 5.9–10; the final entertainment is the mime). In particular he marks the relation between outer appearance and inner realities, to make the inner reality clearer. He thus indicates, as the Socratic narrator in Plato (→), Socrates' outer seriousness and inner irony (e.g. 2.17; 3.10; 8.4; cf. 4.19), the outer blush that betrays Autolycus' inner modesty, (3.12), and the inner malice that provokes the Syracusan's jokes (6.6–10). This has been a theme also of the introduction, where Autolycus has an inner and outer beauty and produces the same harmony in the company (their silence, their poses, their tender looks reflect their inner feelings); the clown uses mock mournful poses and gestures and voice to convey his inner pain at not causing laughter in the company; and in the mime too, the 'players' resolve their inner and outer appearance, because they truly feel the serious emotions that they express as stage lovers.[10]

There is only one secondary narrator, Charmides, when he contrasts his previous life as a rich man with his current life as a poor one, adopting a view of democracy in the process that is patently ironic (4.29–32). Otherwise there are only analytic discussions, but here the reactions of the rest of the company to the speakers guide the reactions of the primary narratees, just as the internal audience's reaction to the visual spectacles guides their reaction to those spectacles in narrated form. This is illustrated by the general disapproval of the malice of the Syracusan entrepreneur, and his polite but firm treatment by Socrates (6.6–10).

[10] Description of physical appearance is relatively rare in classical literature, but *Anabasis* 2.6.9 also characterizes the looks and voice of Clearchus as an outer reflection of his inner character; *Apologia* 27 marks the conformity of Socrates' appearance with his words.