

Narrative suspense in Arrian's *Indikē* (29.9–31.9): the portraiture of Alexander and the exotic tradition intermingled*

Vasileios LIOTSAKIS

ARRIAN of Nicomedia, despite his contribution to our knowledge of the ancient world, constitutes one of the most neglected figures in narratological studies of ancient historiography. He managed to overcome the fact that he related events that took place four centuries before his own time, and bequeathed to future generations our most reliable historical accounts of Alexander the Great, the *Anabasis of Alexander* and the *Indikē*. However, although these works have been thoroughly examined as historical sources, little attention has been paid to their narrative features. The only specialized studies of this kind are a chapter in Hugo Montgomery's book, now fifty years old, Philip Stadter's seminal study of all the works of Arrian (1980), and a handful of more recent articles.¹ As a result, Arrian's shaping of his narrative remains a desideratum of modern scholarly inquiry into ancient historical writing. This paper aspires to shed light on his compositional strategies in the *Indikē*.

In particular, scarce attention has been paid to the narrative qualities of the *Indikē*,² with scholarly interest focusing traditionally on the reasons why Arrian decided to compose the work. The answers offered to date for this question approach the matter from two very different angles, starting either from (a) Arrian's compositional strategy or (b) the

* This study was written as part of the research project *Nearchus' 'Nostos': Narrative Suspense in Arrian's Indikē* during a CHS / Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Fellowship (2017–18). I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the CHS / AUTH for offering me this fellowship and to Prof. Lucia Athanassaki, Prof. Antonios Rengakos, and the anonymous readers of the journal *Ariadne* for their precious advices.

¹ MONTGOMERY 1965, 162–232; STADTER 1980; HIDBER 2004 and 2007.

² The most influential efforts to compare Arrian's and Strabo's use of Nearchus' account are those of PEARSON (1960, 119–25) and BOSWORTH (1988, 40–46). Cf. STADTER's (1980, 118–31, especially 128ff.) insightful remarks.

influence exercised on him by the earlier Greco-Roman literary tradition surrounding India. Concerning (a), it has aptly been observed that Arrian wrote the *Indikē* partly in order to avoid deviating from the main subject of the *Anabasis*, i.e. Alexander's military achievements.³ As for (b), the *Indikē* has also been seen as a reflection of Arrian's wish to be included in a canon of writers who have described in vivid colors the exoticism of Indian geography and its natural environment.⁴ Indeed, although repeatedly castigating those authors for offering untrustworthy accounts (*An.* 5.4.3–4; *Ind.* 3.4–6; 5.10–6.3; 9.4; 15.7),⁵ Arrian could not resist impressing his readers by mentioning in the first seventeen chapters of his work some of those remarkable features of this remote 'wonderland'.⁶

However, the question remains as to whether or not the exotic elements of the *Indikē* are aimed towards its main goal, namely to write an encomiastic account of Alexander. Arrian explicitly states in the *Anabasis of Alexander* that the *Indikē* should be seen by the reader as part of his oeuvre on Alexander (*An.* 6.28.6; *Ind.* 43.14). In this light, given the laudatory nature of the *Anabasis*, its satellite, the *Indikē*, should also be treated as a part of Arrian's romantic presentation of the imposing and groundbreaking nature of Alexander's expedition.⁷ This essay aspires to answer this question through a narratological approach of a specific—and, perhaps, the most distinctive—compositional feature of the *Indikē*,

³ STADTER 1980, 116–18; BRUNT 1983, 443–44; ZAMBRINI 1987, 139.

⁴ See, e.g., SCHWARZ 1975; STADTER 1980, 119–24; ZAMBRINI 1987; *HCA* II, 10. For ancient sources on the wonders of India, see MCCRINDLE 1901; REESE 1914 for accounts before Alexander; STADTER 1980, 114; ROMM 1992, 77–83, 85–91 on Ctesias (cf. VOFCHUK 2006, 105–8 on Pliny; 95–103 on Strabo). On Ctesias' *Indica* see *FGrH* 688; ROMM 1992, 86–92, 117, 120; VOFCHUK 2006; BECERRA ROMERO 2007; NICHOLS 2011, 18–36, 47–81. On Herodotus and India, see PUSKÁS 1983; ASHERI, LLOYD and CORCELLA 2007, 498–99. On Megasthenes' description of India, see ZAMBRINI 1985; FALCONI 2011. On Daemachus and his work on India, see SCHWARTZ, *RE* IV, 2 cols. 2008–09; SCHWARZ 1969 and 1975, 184–185. Iambulus' romance survives in summarized form in *D.S.* 2.55–60 and is also mentioned by Lucian (*VH* 1.3) and Tzetzes (*H.* 7.644). On Iambulus and his account, see, selectively, KROLL, *RE* IX, 1 cols. 681–683; TARN 1939; MOSSÉ 1969; SCHWARZ 1975, 181–85 and for further bibliography up to his time, 181 n. 2; WINSTON 1976; REARDON 1989; ROMM 1992, 48, 212; CIZEK 2006, 56–61; MONTANARI 2009; NISSAN 2009, 294–95; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2015.

⁵ On the passage from the *Anabasis*, see STADTER 1980, 114–15; *HCA* II, 225–27; *AAA* II, 465–67.

⁶ See, e.g., SCHWARZ 1975; STADTER 1980, 119–24; ZAMBRINI 1987; *HCA* II, 10.

⁷ SCHWARZ 1975; BRUNT 1983, 444.

namely its use of suspense. Drawing on modern findings in psychology, literary theory, and narratology, I argue that Arrian did not merely include the exotic descriptions found in his main source, Nearchus; rather, he incorporated these exotic elements into the main goal of his account, namely the creation of readerly suspense about the safety of the fleet and the embellishment of Nearchus' and Alexander's portraits.

In what follows, I offer a close reading of the two suspense-filled episodes of the digression in chs. 29.9–31.9, (i) that of the fleet's encounter with whales, and (ii) that of Nearchus' visit to Nosala, the mysterious sacred island of the Sun. Specifically, I will examine (a) the techniques through which Arrian stimulates readerly interest exclusively in those units (suspense on a local level), as well as (b) how these accounts also contribute to the creation of suspense with regard to the work's overall narrative goal, namely the survival of the Macedonian fleet (suspense on a global level).

First, however, some attention should be given to the place and criteria for successful suspense in historical accounts. Suspense as to how a story will end (the so-called "*Spannung auf das Was*") is undoubtedly hard to create, as the audience is often familiar from the outset with the outcome of the events related by the historian. However, it is also unanimously agreed that historical accounts can generate suspense as to how the story will unfold ("*Spannung auf das Wie*"), simply because the audience of a historical work cannot always know the sequence of events and certain incidents and facts of a historical episode in full detail.⁸ In Arrian's case, in the greater part of the *Indikē* (twenty six chapters), the historian narrates the voyage of the Macedonian fleet under Nearchus' command along the coast from the Indus delta to the Persian Gulf, a journey which, as he has already informed us in the *Anabasis*, ended happily (*An.* 6.28.5–6; 7.5.6; 7.19.3). Even for those who begin reading the *Indikē* without having read the *Anabasis* it can still be discerned that Arrian based his account on that of Nearchus (*Ind.* 20.1), and so that the latter ultimately succeeded in leading the fleet from the Indus to Babylon. However, we can still feel suspense about certain details of the voyage and, above all, about how many casualties the fleet will suffer

⁸ This is what GERRIG (1989) defines as "anomalous suspense" and what RENGAKOS (2005, 81–82) describes as suspense not concerning *what* will eventually happen but concerning *how* it will happen. On this kind of suspense in classical historiography, see on Herodotus and Thucydides, RENGAKOS 2006a and b; RENGAKOS 2011 and GRETHLEIN 2009, 159; MILTSIOS 2009, 484–85 on Polybius.

before the end of the mission. This is a detail we never discover, either in the *Anabasis* or in the *Indikē*.

The first episode is as follows:

Οικία δὲ πεποιήνται οἱ μὲν εὐδαιμονέστατοι αὐτῶν ὅσα κήτεια ἐκβάλλει ἢ θάλασσα τούτων τὰ ὅσα ἐπιλεγόμενοι <καὶ> τούτοισιν ἀντὶ ξύλων χρεόμενοι, καὶ θύρας τὰ ὅστέα ὅσα πλατέα αὐτῶν ἀλίσκεται ἀπὸ τούτων ποιέονται· τοῖσι δὲ πολλοῖς καὶ πενεστέροισιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκανθῶν τῶν ἰχθύων τὰ οικία ποιέεται.

Κήτεια δὲ μεγάλα ἐν τῇ ἔξω θαλάσῃ βόσκεται, καὶ ἰχθύες πολὺ μέζονες ἢ ἐν τῇδε τῇ εἴσω. καὶ λέγει Νέαρχος, ὅποτε ἀπὸ Κυΐζων παρέπλεον, ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω ὀφθῆναι ὕδωρ ἄνω ἀναφυσώμενον τῆς θαλάσσης οἷά περ ἐκ πρηστήρων βίβρα ἀναφερόμενον, ἐκπλαγέντας δὲ σφᾶς πυνθάνεσθαι τῶν κατηγεομένων τοῦ πλόου ὅτι εἶη καὶ ἀπ' ὅτου τὸ πάθημα· τοὺς δὲ ὑποκρίνασθαι ὅτι κήτεια ταῦτα φερόμενα κατὰ τὸν πόντον ἀναφυσᾷ ἐς τὸ ἄνω τὸ ὕδωρ. καὶ τοῖσι ναύτησιν ἐκπλαγεῖσιν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν τὰ ἐρετμὰ ἐκπεσεῖν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπιὼν παρακαλεῖν τε καὶ θαρσύνειν, καὶ κατ' οὔστινας παραπλέων ἐγένετο, ἐς μέτωπόν τε κελεῦσαι καταστῆσαι ὡς ἐπὶ ναυμαχίῃ τὰς νέας, καὶ ἐπαλαλάζοντας ὁμοῦ τῷ ῥοθίῳ πυκνήν τε καὶ ξὺν κτύπῳ πολλῶ τὴν εἰρεσίην ποιέεσθαι. οὕτως ἀναθαρσήσαντας ὁμοῦ δὴ πλείει ἀπὸ ξυνηθήματος. ὡς δὲ ἐπέλαζον ἤδη τοῖσι θηρίοισιν, ἐνταῦθα αὐτοὺς μὲν ὅσον αἱ κεφαλαὶ αὐτοῖσιν ἐχώρειν ἐπαλαλάξαι, τὰς δὲ σάλπιγγας σημεῖναι, καὶ τὸν κτύπον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρεσίης ὡς ἐπὶ μήκιστον κατασχεῖν. οὕτω δὴ ὀρώμενα ἤδη κατὰ τὰς πρῶρας τῶν νεῶν τὰ κήτεια ἐς βυθὸν δῦναι ἐκπλαγέντα, καὶ οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον κατὰ τὰς πρύμνας ἀναδύντα ἀνασχεῖν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης αὔθις ἀναφυσῆσαι ἐπὶ μέγα. ἔνθεν κρότον τε ἐπὶ τῇ παραλόγῳ σωτηρίᾳ γενέσθαι τῶν ναυτέων, καὶ αἶνον ἐς τὸν Νέαρχον τῆς τε τόλμης καὶ τῆς σοφίης.

The richest among them have built huts by collecting the bones of any large sea animal the sea casts up, and using them in place of beams, with doors made from any flat bones which they get hold of. But the majority, and the poor, have huts made from the backbones of ordinary fishes.

Monstrously large sea animals feed in the outer ocean, much larger than those in our inland sea. Nearchus says that, when

they were sailing along the coast from Cyiza, about daybreak they saw water being blown upwards from the sea as it might be shot upwards by the force of a waterspout. They were astonished, and asked the pilots what it might be and how it was caused; they replied that it was these great animals spouting up the water as they moved about in the sea. The sailors were so startled that the oars fell from their hands. Nearchus went along the line encouraging and cheering them, and whenever he sailed past them he signaled them to turn the ships in line towards the animals as if to give them battle, to raise the battle cry in time with the splash of oars and to row with rapid strokes and with a great deal of noise. So they all took heart and sailed together according to the signal. But when they were actually nearing the beasts, then they shouted with all the power of their throats, the trumpets gave the signal, and the rowers made the utmost splashing with their oars. So the animals, now visible at the bows of the ships, were scared and dived into the depths; then not long afterwards they came up to the surface astern and again spouted water over a great expanse of sea. The sailors clapped at their unexpected escape from destruction and praised Nearchus for his courage and cleverness.⁹

To begin with, Arrian elicits suspense by preparing the reader for the imposing size and extraordinary strength of the sea monsters. First, he stresses their size by saying that the wealthiest natives built the doors of their houses using their bones as timbers. Equally revealing of those creatures' size is the ensuing comparison between the sea monsters and fishes of the Outer Ocean with those of the Inner Ocean (viz. the Mediterranean Sea). Arrian's intention to draw the reader's attention to this element is also reflected on a verbal level, through the repetition of the epithet μέγας (κῆττα δὲ μεγάλα, ἰχθύες πολὺ μέζονες). Although not foreshadowing it, this detail about the unusual nature of the whales serves as a prelude to the fleet's subsequent encounter with them, in that it anticipates their imposing nature and thereby prepares the reader emotionally for a possible meeting of the fleet with them. Having already been informed about the gigantic bodies of the sea monsters, the reader is invited to read the ensuing encounter not as a routine incident but as a potential *peripeteia* that carries sinister connotations for the

⁹ For the texts of the *Anabasis* and the *Indikē* I follow Roos' 1967–68 edition. I also use BRUNT's 1976–83 translation for both works.

safety of the troops.¹⁰

One further technique that generates suspense in this introductory installment is the identification of the reader's horizon of knowledge with that of the characters. As readers, we may identify with the characters of a story on a cognitive level, especially when the author forces us to experience what is happening through the eyes, ears, and thoughts of these characters. In such cases, we experience the same anxiety, curiosity, and uncertainty about the final resolution of the story as they do, as we receive no further instructions from the author through, say, an authorial comment, a foreshadowing, etc.¹¹

Accordingly, in this short episode, the omniscient narrator withdraws in order to confine our knowledge to the narrow limits of the sight of the protagonists. We never learn what the whales actually do but instead only what the troops see them doing. These animals appear twice in the episode: first when they are seen by Nearchus' men, and second in the final scene, when they dive in front of the ships and come out of the water behind them. In both cases, their activity is introduced by the verb ὀρῶ, while their movements and behavior is offered in participles and infinitives (ὀφθῆναι ὕδωρ ἄνω ἀναφυσώμενον τῆς θαλάσσης οἷά περ ἐκ πρηστήρων βία ἀναφερόμενον; οὕτω δὲ ὀρώμενα ἤδη κατὰ τὰς πύρας τῶν νεῶν τὰ κήτεια ἐς βυθὸν δύναι ἐκπλαγέντα, καὶ οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον κατὰ τὰς πρύμνας ἀναδύντα ἀνασχεῖν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης αὐθις ἀναφυσῆσαι ἐπὶ μέγα).

The first of the two scenes is particularly telling in the degree to which the identification of the reader's horizon of knowledge with that

¹⁰ On this prerequisite for the creation of suspense, see BREWER and OHTSUKA 1988; DE WIED 1994, 109; DIJKSTRA et al. 1994, 141; LUELSBORFF 1995, 2–3; MIALI 1995, 277–79. For the importance of uncertainty in suspense accounts, see DE WIED 1994, 109, 111; DIJKSTRA et al. 1994, 146; GERRIG and BERNARDO 1994; LUELSBORFF 1995, 1; LEONARD 1996; HOEKEN and VAN VLIET 2000, 285; WULFF 1996, 4–6; BARONI 2007, 269–71. On the so-called phenomenon of 'harm anticipation', see ZILLMANN 1980; 1991; 1994, 33; DE WIED 1994, 109–11; VORDERER, WULFF and FRIEDRICHSEN 1996, viii; WULFF 1996, 7–12.

¹¹ Compare further ZILLMANN 1994, 36–49 on the degree to which the reader may identify with the character(s) of a story on a cognitive level. On the other hand, aspects that foreground the author's presence in the text sometimes reveal his or her hindsight (LUELSBORFF 1995, 4) and "pragmatic intent" (for this term, see HUNT and VIPOND 1986; DIJKSTRA et al. 1994, 142–43), i.e. his or her goals as to how (s)he expects the readers to apprehend the narrated story. In this respect, the reader is deprived of the opportunity to experience the events narrated in an immediate fashion.

of the protagonists contributes to the creation of suspense. As we saw, the story begins as follows: while sailing near the city Cyiza, Nearchus and his men saw water being blown upwards from the sea in the shape of a waterspout, and, being surprised by this odd phenomenon, asked their pilots what on earth was going on. As readers, we thus do not learn from the outset that the men are faced with whales. Needless to say, our knowledge does not align exactly with the characters', since the preceding introduction to the sea monsters of the Outer Sea and the way in which the Fish-Eaters used them in the construction of their houses has already readied us for the fact that this phenomenon must be related somehow to those creatures. Even so, these few lines constitute a short delay that adds a moment's uncertainty before the ensuing plot development justifies our suspicions. What is more, the very vocabulary in which Arrian delineates the false impression of the troops about the whales highlights their great strength and makes us worry about what harm they can do to the protagonists. We are instantly invited to wonder about the identity of these creatures that are so immensely strong (βίᾱ) that they can make the sea look like a waterspout (οἶα περ ἐκ πρηστήρων), and their behavior can be described as a natural phenomenon (πάθημα).¹² Arrian compels us in this way to fear that the ensuing encounter between these monsters of nature and the unlucky sailors will probably cost the lives of some of the latter.

This incident is followed by the episode of the sacred island of the Sun. Here is the text:

εὔτε δὲ παρέπλεον τὴν χώρην τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων, λόγον ἀκούουσι περὶ νήσου τινός, ἣ κεῖται μὲν ἀπέχουσα τῆς ταύτης ἡπείρου σταδίου ἐς ἑκατόν, ἐρήμη δὲ ἐστὶν οἰκητόρων. ταύτην ἱρὴν Ἡλίου ἔλεγον εἶναι οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καὶ Νόσαλα καλέεσθαι, οὐδέ τινα ἀνθρώπων καταίρειν ἐθέλειν ἐς αὐτήν· ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀπειρήνῃ προσχῆ, γίνεσθαι ἀφανέα. ἀλλὰ λέγει Νέαρχος κέρκουρόν σφι ἓνα πλήρωμα ἔχοντα Αἰγυπτίων οὐ πόρρω τῆς νήσου ταύτης γενέσθαι ἀφανέα, καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τοῦ πλοοῦ ἰσχυρίζεσθαι ὅτι ἄρα κατάραντες ὑπ' ἀγνοίης εἰς τὴν νῆσον γένοιτο ἀφανέες. Νέαρχος δὲ πέμπει κύκλω περὶ τὴν νῆσον τριηκόντορον, κελύσας μὴ κατασχεῖν μὲν ἐς τὴν νῆσον, ἐμβοᾶν δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡς μάλιστα ἐν χρωῶ

¹² For this use of the term πάθημα in Arrian, cf. *An.* 3.7.6: τῆς σελήνης τὸ πάθημα; *An.* 6.19.1: τὸ πάθημα ἐπιγίγνεται τῆς μεγάλης θαλάσσης ἢ ἄμπωτις.

παραπλέοντας, καὶ τὸν κυβερνήτην ὀνομάζοντας καὶ ὅτου ἄλλου οὐκ ἀφανὲς τὸ οὖνομα. ὥς δὲ οὐδένα ὑπακούειν, τότε δὲ αὐτὸς λέγει πλεῦσαι ἐς τὴν νῆσον καὶ κατασχεῖν δὴ προσαναγκάσαι τοὺς ναύτας οὐκ ἐθέλοντας, καὶ ἐκβῆναι αὐτὸς καὶ ἐλέγξει κενὸν μῦθον ἔοντα τὸν περὶ τῆς νήσου λόγον. ἀκοῦσαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλον λόγον ὑπὲρ τῆς νήσου ταύτης λεγόμενον, οἰκῆσαι τὴν νῆσον ταύτην μίαν τῶν Νηρηίδων· τὸ δὲ οὖνομα οὐ λέγεσθαι τῆς Νηρηίδος. ταύτη δὲ ὅστις πελάσειε τῇ νήσῳ, τούτῳ συγγίνεσθαι μὲν, ἰχθὺν δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ποιέουσιν ἐμβάλλειν ἐς τὸν πόντον. Ἥλιον δὲ ἀχθεσθέντα τῇ Νηρηίδι κελεύειν μετοικίξεσθαι αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς νήσου· τὴν δὲ ὁμολογεῖν μὲν ὅτι ἐξοικισθήσεται, δεῖσθαι δὲ οἱ τὸ πάθημα <παυθῆναι>. καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον ὑποδέξασθαι, τοὺς δὲ δὴ ἀνθρώπους οὔστινας [ἄν] ἰχθύας ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πεποιήκει κατελεήσαντα ἀνθρώπους αὐθις ἐξ ἰχθύων ποιῆσαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ἰχθυοφάγων τὸ γένος καὶ εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον κατελθεῖν. καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι ψευδέα ἐξελέγχει Νέαρχος, οὐκ ἐπαινῶ αὐτὸν ἔγωγε τῆς σχολῆς τε καὶ σοφίης, οὔτε κάρτα χαλεπὰ ἐξελεγχθῆναι ἔοντα, ταλαίπωρόν τε ὃν γινώσκων τοὺς παλαιοὺς λόγους ἐπιλεγόμενον ἐξελέγχειν ὄντας ψευδέας.

While they were coasting along the territory of the Fish-eaters, they heard a story of an uninhabited island which lies some 100 stades from the mainland here. The local people said it was sacred to Helios and called Nosala, and that no human being put in there of his own will, but that anyone who touched there in ignorance disappeared. However, Nearchus says that when one of his *kerkouroi* with an Egyptian crew disappeared with all hands not far from this land, and the pilots explained this by asserting that it was because they had touched ignorantly on the island that they had disappeared, he sent a triacontor to sail round the island, with orders that they should not put in, but that the crew should shout loudly, while coasting round as near as they dared, and should call on the lost helmsman by name, or on any of the crew whose name they knew. He tells us that as no one answered he himself sailed up to the island, and compelled his crew to put in against their will; he went ashore and exploded this island fairy-tale. They heard another story current about this island, that one of the Nereids dwelt there, whose name was not told; she would have intercourse with an-

yone who approached the island, but then turn him into a fish and throw him into the sea. Helios became irritated with the Nereid and ordered her to leave the island, and she agreed to move, but begged that the misery she caused be ended; Helios consented and in compassion for the men she had turned into fishes turned them back again into human beings; they were the ancestors of the people of Fish-eaters down to Alexander's day. Nearchus shows that all this is false, but I do not commend him for his learned discussion, as in my judgement, the stories are easy enough to refute and it is tedious to relate the old tales and then prove them false.

In this episode, Arrian generates suspense through the creation of a sinister atmosphere in the introductory paragraphs. In stories of suspense, between the initiating event and the final resolution, the author arranges the intermediate material in such a way that (s)he forces the reader to feel uncertainty about what exactly the eventual outcome will be.¹³ When the information offered by a story succeeds in making us wonder whether its end will be favorable or disastrous for the protagonists, tension is created between our hopes for a happy ending and our fears and concerns about possible calamities. This emotional state is the core of the suspense we experience in the activity of reading a story. Furthermore, the greater the number of possible negative outcomes—without, however, excluding the possibility for a favorable ending—the greater our anxiety, as we fear that something bad will happen to the characters (which has been designated “harm anticipation”).¹⁴ Accordingly, Arrian opens this episode by mentioning rumors about the danger lurking on this island and in the surrounding waters. The author implies that the disappearances of unsuspected travelers were the result of the supernatural, as we read that this was the holy island of the Sun-god.

Arrian is obviously playing with the Greco-Roman readers' superstitions in order to stimulate their interest in the ensuing plot development. For the Greeks and the Romans were more than familiar with the dangerous nature of an island of the Sun. In the *Odyssey*, Thrinacia is the island where the god Sun has his cattle. Both Teiresias (*Od.* 11.106–

¹³ DE WIED 1994, 109, 111; DIJKSTRA et al. 1994, 146; GERRIG and BERNARDO 1994; LUELSORFF 1995, 1; LEONARD 1996; HOEKEN and VAN VLIET 2000, 285; WULFF 1996, 4–6; BARONI 2007, 269–71.

¹⁴ Cf. further ZILLMANN 1980; 1991; 1994, 33; DE WIED 1994, 109–11; VORDERER, WULFF, and FRIEDRICHSEN 1996, viii; WULFF 1996, 7–12.

117) and Circe (*Od.* 12.147–151) foretell to Odysseus that he and his comrades will land on this island. Both of them also warn the hero that he should not allow his men to harm the Sun's cattle. According to the blind seer and the goddess, if Odysseus and his companions let the cattle unharmed, they will continue their journey in safety. On the contrary, if they kill those animals, Odysseus' men will die and he will return to Ithaca only after a long period of time and immense toil. Eventually, despite Odysseus' advice, the men eat the cattle and are later on killed by Zeus (*Od.* 12.268–439), while Odysseus is doomed to wander for many years until he finally reaches his homeland.

The Homeric case and Arrian's story differ from each other in many respects. In the *Odyssey* it is not the landing itself on Thrinacia that is dangerous for Odysseus and his men but the harming of the cattle of the Sun. Differently, in Arrian's episode, even approaching the waters of Nosala can be fatal for travelers. Secondly, while Odysseus takes into serious consideration Teiresias' and Circe's warnings and tries to dissuade his men from staying at Thrinacia, Nearchus is not equally cautious and eventually forces his men to approach Nosala and then land there. However, the two stories also demonstrate some striking similarities. Both in the *Odyssey* and the *Indikē* we read of an island which serves as the territory of the god Sun. What is more, in both cases, the protagonists are wayfarers and are warned about the dangers lurking in the island. These similarities, along with the fact that some of Nearchus' troops were lost in Nosala, can generate in the reader's mind associations between the Homeric and the Indian island and thereby make them anticipate a sinister end for Nearchus and his men too.

One further technique through which suspense is brought about is through the net of verbal cross-references between the sinister rumors and the following stages of the episode. According to the natives, no one wanted to land on this island (οὐδέ τινα ἀνθρώπων καταίρειν ἐθέλειν ἐς αὐτήν), while those who approached it in ignorance of the rumors disappeared (ὅσους δ' ἂν ἀπειρήν προσχῆ, γίνεσθαι ἀφανέα). These words pre-figure the ensuing disappearance of the ship from Nearchus' fleet (κέρκουρόν σφι ἓνα πλήρωμα ἔχοντα Αἰγυπτίων οὐ πόρρω τῆς νήσου ταύτης γενέσθαι ἀφανέα) as well as the explanation offered by the guides κατάραντες ὑπ' ἀγνοίης εἰς τὴν νῆσον γένοιτο ἀφανέες. These verbal resemblances in describing the disappearance of Nearchus' ship to the phraseology of the initial rumors convey the impression that the natives' warnings were well-founded, and consequently that the island

was indeed dangerous for Nearchus and his men. This also applies to the final stage of the story, Nearchus' order to his men to approach Nosala (κατασχεῖν δὴ προσαναγκάσαι τοὺς ναύτας οὐκ ἐθέλοντας). The unwillingness of the troops is reminiscent of the general attitude of the local people towards the island and the doom that befalls those who visit it. In this respect the men's reluctance partly serves as an element of 'misdirection' for the reader, since it predisposes her for a possible negative outcome in the last scene of Nearchus' landing on the island, even though this never comes to fruition.

Suspense is also created through Arrian's attentive selection of mythical material and the careful placement of this material at suitable points of the episode. Specifically, Arrian seems to have purposely located the story of the Nereid and Helios at the end of the unit in order not to diminish, but to enhance, the suspenseful character of his narrative. The author's pejorative comment in his epilogue on Nearchus' attempt to refute the validity of old local myths is particularly telling of Arrian's intentions in composing the whole episode. As he himself admits, 'it is tedious to relate the old tales and then prove them false'. For Arrian, then, to include such stories in one's account and then to deny their truthfulness is tiresome for both the author and the reader. In view of this thought, it can be safely argued that Arrian did not deliberately refer from the outset to Nearchus' skepticism towards those local rumors about the island. Endeavoring to hold the reader's interest until the very end of the story, he avoided touching upon the myth of the relationship of the island and Helios and Nearchus' doubts about it. Had he done so, the reader would then have read through the episode expecting that nothing unusual or supernatural would follow.

These two accounts, focusing on India's exciting nature, contribute to the exotic flavor that predominates in the work's first half. As I stated at the beginning of this paper, in writing the *Indikē*, Arrian partly aspired to enter the circle of authors who wrote exotic accounts on India. This intention of Arrian is particularly discernible in the first seventeen chapters of the work. First, Arrian tries to impress the reader about India's natural environment: its rivers are countless, while the four biggest ones surpass in size even the Nile and Danube, the *oikoumenē's* most significant rivers (3.9–5.2). Equally impressive are the country's flora, which include trees under the shade of which more than 10,000 people can stand (11.7). In this extraordinary environment, we may also find rare species of animals, some of whom are further recounted for the way

that they were hunted and captured by the natives (6.8; 13–15). In India, the land of pearls (8.8–13), even the inhabitants fascinate us because of their unusual characteristics, such as those Indians who were taller and slimmer than most other peoples in the world (17.1), or the tribe that has a lower limit of life expectancy, with its women giving birth to children from just seven years old (9.1–8).

This material indicates, if anything, that, although avoiding the inclusion of stories and descriptions of *terata* typical of most accounts of India, Arrian could not resist the desire to entertain his readership by exploiting traditional lore on India, its natural environment, ethnography, and material culture. The stories on the extraordinary whales and the mysterious island of the Sun should certainly be included among those elements through which Arrian wished to render his work as attractive as possible to a readership already familiar with the exotic literature of the Indian marvels. Indeed, the interest in *paradoxa* or *admiranda* can be traced in an abundance of literary genres of classical literature up to Arrian's age. In its most specialized form, this enthusiasm for *paradoxa* takes shape in a distinguishable genre, the paradoxographical collections. In the Imperial Era, the Greek and Roman authors of these works, continuing a tradition originating in the Aristotelian school, gather in a paratactic fashion groups of short reports/descriptions of unusual phenomena, cites, and creatures.¹⁵ Accordingly, the Roman geographers, in accordance with their Greek predecessors, transfer us from place to place and in the course of their 'journey' they inform us of the peculiarities (phenomena, creatures, myths) of each area, either by including local myths or short descriptions as those found in the paradoxographical collections.¹⁶ *Paradoxa* similar to Arrian's whales and the Island of the Sun are also very frequently found in Roman encyclopaedic works

¹⁵ See the collections written in Greek of Isigonus of Nicaea (1st cent. BE or AD; GIANNINI 1966, 146–48) and Nicolaus of Damascus (1st cent. BC; GIANNINI 1966, 149–63). See also the excerpts of collections in the *Paradoxographus Florentinus* (1st cent. AD; GIANNINI 1966, 315–29), *Paradoxographus Vaticanus* (1st cent. AD; KELLER 1877, 106–15; GIANNINI 1966, 331–51) and *Paradoxographus Palatinus* (GIANNINI 1966, 353–61), as well as the collection *Περὶ θαυμασίων καὶ μακροβίων* of Phlegon of Tralles (WESTERMANN 1839, 117–42 and 197–213; KELLER 1877, 57–105; GIANNINI 1966, 169–219; HANSEN 1996; BRODERSEN 2002). With regard to Latin authors who wrote collections of *mirabilia*, see, e.g., the collection of M. Terentius Varro (116–27 BC) and M. Tullius Cicero's *Admiranda*. For all those works, see SCHEPENS and DELCROIX 1996, 425–33 with exhaustive bibliography.

¹⁶ SCHEPENS and DELCROIX 1996, 439–40.

of human knowledge, such as Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*.¹⁷ Last but not least, the marvellous elements obtain a more energetic role in the plot development itself of a narrative in ancient novel and journey letters, where the *paradoxa* contribute to the intensification of the element of adventure, as they do in Arrian's *Indikē*.¹⁸

The presence of *paradoxa* in such an abundance of literary genres of the Imperial Era betrays, if anything, an intense interest on the Greco-Roman audience's part in these themes. In this respect, the inclusion of the list mentioned above of the peculiarities of the Indian territory in the introductory chapters of his *Indikē* and the adventurous stories of the whales and the Island of the Sun in the main narration of the Macedonian journey must have been dictated by contemporary readerly demands.¹⁹ Besides, his friend and one of the most prominent figures among his readers, the Emperor Hadrian, is closely connected with the paradoxography of his age. Phlegon of Tralleis, a contemporary of Arrian and a freedman of Hadrian,²⁰ has composed one of the few surviving paradoxographical collections of that period written in Greek (Περὶ θαυμασίων καὶ μακροβίων). What is more, a certain Fermes wrote a marvel letter to Hadrian, in which he was narrating his travel to the East.²¹ In his own letter to Hadrian about his circumnavigation of the Black Sea, Arrian resembles Fermes in that he instantly tries to satisfy Hadrian's interest in marvellous themes by mentioning that Achilles and Patroclus often appear in the dreams of those who approach Achilles' sacred island (*Peripl. M. Eux.* 23.1–4). The inclusion of *paradoxa* and *admiranda* in the *Indikē* should be seen as a manifestation of similar goal-settings, possibly associated *inter alia* with Hadrian's interest in such themes.

Now, let us return to our subject, namely the ways in which these exotic elements participate in the portraiture of Alexander. The main ways

¹⁷ SCHEPENS and DELCROIX 1996, 433–39.

¹⁸ For the function of *paradoxa* in the narratives of Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, see ROMMEL 1913. On this feature in travel letters, see SCHEPENS and DELCROIX 1996, 440–42.

¹⁹ In LIOTSAKIS 2019 (forthcoming) I offer a detailed analysis of how Arrian shaped his narrative in the *Anabasis of Alexander* and the *Indikē* in compliance with his readers' tastes.

²⁰ FEIN 1994, 193–99; HANSEN 1996, 1–2; SCHEPENS and DELCROIX 1996, 430 n. 190; BRODERSEN 2002, 11.

²¹ OMONT 1913; FARAL 1914; WITTKOWER 1942, 172.

in which *paradoxa* are integrated in a corpus of text in Arrian's age can be roughly described as three: (a) in short reports/descriptions accumulated in the form of a list (a distinctive feature of the paradoxographical collections); (b) as autonomous stories with a beginning, middle, and end, either cut off from their immediate context or loosely connected with it (e.g. in geography and in Phlegon of Tralles); and (c) as organic parts of the wider plot development of a narrative (e.g. in novels and journey letters). Arrian integrates exotic *paradoxa* in the *Indikē* in all these three ways. In the introductory list of the Indian phenomena and creatures, he exploits (a), while we have so far analyzed how the stories of the whales and the Island of the Sun develop in the way (b), namely as autonomous exotic stories. So far we have seen how Arrian keeps the reader's suspense alive about the details of these two episodes. In what follows, I explain how these stories intensify the element of adventure of the wider plot, similarly to what happens in ancient novel and marvel letters. I demonstrate the way in which these exotic units contribute to intensifying the reader's interest in the overall narrative goal of the work, namely the fleet's survival and the respective characterization of Nearchus and Alexander.

Hence, some general remarks on the *Indikē*'s structure would be useful. The work is thematically divided into two parts: while the first seventeen chapters are dedicated to India's geography, nature, and peoples of India, the greater part of the work (twenty six chapters) constitutes a narration of the voyage of the Macedonian fleet under Nearchus' command along the coast from the Indus delta to the Persian Gulf. Its second part, the account of the fleet's adventure, is built upon a deliberately suspense-laden structure that invites the reader to worry about the lives of the protagonists and thereby to sympathize with Alexander's concerns about the fate of his troops.

This narrative whole is, in its turn, organized in two stages. First are placed the chapters that cover the story from its very beginning (Alexander's decision at the Indus' mouth to send the expedition) until the end of the coasting along the Fish-eaters' territory (20–31.9). At this stage, the narrator invites the readers to worry about the lack of supplies facing the protagonists. Second comes the account of the events that lead to Nearchus' meeting with Alexander. In these chapters, the problem of the lack of supplies has already been solved, and Arrian now draws our attention to questions such as when and where Nearchus and his men will rejoin the main body of Alexander's forces, when Alexan-

der will at last be relieved from his anxiety about the condition of his fleet, and what his reaction will be to the news that the troops are safe.

The episodes of the encounter with whales and the island of Nosala contribute to the generation of readerly suspense about these questions through the technique of temporal displacement. Given that the fleet met the whales while sailing alongside the coast from Cyiza, Arrian could have related the incident in a chronologically linear way, namely in ch. 27.2, which refers to the fleet's voyage in those waters. However, Arrian chose instead to narrate it analeptically within a digression, as we have seen, a choice which should be explained in light of his aims in ch. 27.2–28.8. In that part of his account, Arrian shapes his narrative in such a way that he elicits suspense concerning the lack of supplies. In ch. 26.9, he has already given us cause for alarm that there is a lack of corn, and thereby caused readerly unease about the troops' safety. From this point onwards the narrator will describe the places visited by the fleet on the basis of whether they can provide the protagonists with the desired provisions. The inhabitants of the village Cyiza have no corn to offer, but instead the army finds animals, a temporary solution to its problem. The next village too is surrounded by rich vegetation, but it does nothing to offer a resolution to the men's deprivations (27.2). Arrian constructs his narrative in such a way that he underlines the troops' suffering from a serious lack of supplies and the difficulties they face in reaching a decisive solution to their problems. Our interest in this matter will reach its peak in the ensuing episode of the battle between Nearchus' men and the Fish-eaters. Had Arrian included the episode of the troops' encounter with the sea monsters here, he would have interrupted the escalation of tension concerning Nearchus' struggle to provide his men with supplies. In this case, the reader would have been distracted from the main subject of that stage of the narrative. As for the Nosala episode, we are not in a position to know exactly when Nearchus visited the island, since its location remains unknown to us.²² Nonetheless, Arrian must have avoided narrating it rectilinearly for the same reason.

Furthermore, the two episodes intensify the readers' suspense through narrative retardation. In ch. 28.8, we read that, after their defeat in the battle against Nearchus' men, the Fish-eaters provided the Macedonians with a small quantity of corn, thus offering no permanent solution to the

²² For modern views on the identity of the island, see SCHIWEK 1962, 58.

fleet's problems. This foreshadows the ensuing complication of ch. 29.2. However, the reader will be informed only three chapters later that the fleet is relieved of the lack of supplies. In the meantime, Arrian deviates from his linear narration to offer some information on the Fish-eaters and to relate analeptically the two suspenseful episodes, first about the fleet's encounter with whales in their waters (30) and second about Nearchus' visit to a mysterious island where many ships had been lost (31). Though narrated analeptically, these two episodes heighten the account's suspense on both a local and a global level. First, they make us interested to know whether there will be any casualties in Nearchus' fleet (local/episodic suspense). Second, these episodes belong to an analeptic digression (29.9–31.9) that interrupts the fleet's progress from the coastline of the Fish-eaters to Carmania, where the supply problems will cease. The episodes thus also generate suspense about the overall goal of this part of the account, the anticipated resolution to the supply problem (global suspense), which has remained in the air since ch. 29.2 and will eventually be resolved only in ch. 32.4.

This structuring of the plot in Arrian's *Indikē* is aimed to foreground Nearchus' intellectual skills and the merits of his character (bravery, loyalty to his king, perspicacity, rationalism, concern for his men, and skilful leadership), elements which had most probably been stressed by Nearchus too in his effort to highlight his leading role in this exploratory achievement.²³ On the other hand, as stated above, Arrian repeatedly explains that he did not aspire to present the Indian voyage as Nearchus' feat but as Alexander's. Alexander too is presented as being particularly concerned with Nearchus' and his men's lives. Nearchus was very carefully chosen among a plethora of candidates, according to the degree to which he was able to ensure the safety of the fleet (20.1–2). Alexander's decision to trust Nearchus is justified by Nearchus' excellent capacity and concern in protecting his troops. In this respect, the two exotic suspenseful episodes, foregrounding Nearchus' skill, contribute to the favorable delineation of his own and Alexander's image.

To conclude, the exotic flavor of the *Indikē* is not divorced from Arrian's portraiture of Alexander, but rather contributes in interesting ways

²³ STADTER 1980, 115–32. On Nearchus as a source of Arrian, see SCHWARTZ, *RE* II, 1, col. 1239; *FGrH*, IIB, *Komm.*, 467–68; KORNEMANN 1935, 20; STRASBURGER 1952, 458, 465; PEARSON 1960, 112; cf. BRUNT's (1976, xxx) thoughts: "whom he regarded as no less reliable than Ptolemy and Aristobulus"; *HCA* I, 32; BOSWORTH 1988, 13–14; *HCA* II, 361–65; AAA I, XXVI, XXXII; LANE FOX 2005, 520ff.; MÜLLER 2014, 65–70.

to it. The main technique for this mixture of exotic elements and the characterization of Alexander in this part of the *Indikē* is the creation of suspense. It can thus be concluded that Arrian was following the literary tradition of the exotic descriptions of India without deviating from his main goal, the favorable delineation of Alexander's image. On the contrary, he managed to make the exotic elements of his account one of the most integral parts of his portraiture of the Alexander and Nearchus.

Vasileios Liotsakis
University of the Peloponnese
vliotsakis@yahoo.gr



BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- AAA = SISTI, F. 2001–4. *Anabasi di Alessandro*. Vols I–II. Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori.
- FGrH = JACOBY, F. 1926–30. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* Nr. 106–261 *Text*, vol. II B: *Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien und Memoiren*, and vol. II D: *Kommentar zu Nr. 106–261*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- HCA = BOSWORTH, A. B. 1980–95. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- BARONI, R. 2007. *La tension narrative: Suspense, curiosité et surprise*. Paris: Seuil.
- BECERRA ROMERO, D. 2007. El «díkaion» en la obra «Indika» de Ctesias de Cnido: propuesta de identificación. *Emerita* 75: 255–72.
- BOSWORTH, A. B. 1988a. *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 1988b. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____, 1996a. *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 1996b. Alexander, Euripides, and Dionysos. The Motivation for Apotheosis. In: R. W. WALLACE and A. M. HARRIS (eds), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C. in honor of E. Badian*. Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 140–66.

- BREWER, W. F. and OHTSUKA, K. 1988. Story Structure, Characterization, Just World Organization, and Reader Affect in American and Hungarian Short Stories. *Poetics* 17: 395–415.
- BRODERSEN, K. 2002. *Phlegon von Tralleis. Das Buch der Wunder und Zeugnisse seiner Wirkungsgeschichte*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- BRUNT, P. A. 1974. Notes on Aristobulus of Cassandria. *CQ* 24: 65–69.
- _____, 1976–83. *Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander*. Vols I–II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- BURLIGA, B. 2013. *Arrian's Anabasis: An Intellectual and Cultural Story*. Gdańsk: Foundation for the Development of University of Gdańsk for the Department of Mediterranean Archaeology.
- CARROLL, N. 1996. The Paradox of Suspense. In: VORDERER et al. (eds) 1996, 71–91.
- CHATMAN, S. 1978. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- CIZEK, E. 2006. L'esprit militant des stoïciens et le premier état communiste de l'histoire. *Latomus* 65: 49–61.
- DELFINO, A. 2000. Per I frammenti degli storici greci. Una formuletta algebrica? *QUCC* 65.2: 99–106.
- DE WIED, M. 1994. The Role of Temporal Expectancies in the Production of Film Suspense. *Poetics* 23: 107–23.
- DIJKSTRA, K., ZWAAN, R. A., GRAESSER, A. C., and MAGLIANO, J. P. 1994. Character and Reader Emotions in Literary Texts. *Poetics* 23.1–2: 139–57.
- DREYER, B. 2009. Heroes, Cults, and Divinity. In: W. HECKEL and L. A. TRITILE (eds), *Alexander the Great: A New History*. Chichester: Wiley–Blackwell, 218–34.
- DUCKWORTH, G. E. 1931. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- FALCONI, S. 2011. Aspetti della descrizione dell' India di Megastene. *Sileno* 37: 31–43.
- FARAL, E. 1914. Une source latine de l'histoire d'Alexandre : la *Lettre sur les merveilles de l'Inde*. *Romania* 43.170: 199–215; 43.171: 353–70.
- GERRIG, R. 1989a. Reexperiencing Fiction and Non-Fiction. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47: 277–80.
- _____, 1989b. Suspense in the Absence of Uncertainty. *Journal of Memory and Language* 28: 633–48.
- _____, 1996. The Resiliency of Suspense. In: VORDERER et al. (eds) 1996, 93–105.
- _____, 1997. Is There a Paradox of Suspense? A Reply to Yanal. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 37: 168–74.
- GERRIG, R. and BERNARDO, A. 1994. Readers as Problem-Solvers in the Experience of Suspense. *Poetics* 22: 459–72.
- GIANNINI, A. 1966. *Paradoxographorum Graecorum reliquiae*. Milan: Istituto editoriale italiano.

- GRETHLEIN, J. 2009. Philosophical and Structuralist Narratologies – World Apart? In: GRETHLEIN and RENGAKOS (eds) 2009, 153–74.
- GRETHLEIN, J. and RENGAKOS, A. (eds) 2009. *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- HANSEN, W. F. 1996. *Phlegon of Tralles' Book of Marvels*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- HIDBER, T. 2004. Arrian. In: I. J. F. DE JONG, R. NÜNLIST and A. BOWIE (eds), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in ancient Greek narrative, vol. 1*; Mnemosyne, Supplementa. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 165–74.
- _____, 2007. Arrian. In: I. J. F. DE JONG and R. NÜNLIST (eds), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in ancient Greek narrative, vol. 2*; Mnemosyne, Suppl. 291. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 183–95.
- HOEKEN, H. and VAN VLIET, M. 2000. Suspense, Curiosity, and Surprise: How Discourse Structure Influences the Affective and Cognitive Processing of a Story. *Poetics* 27: 277–86.
- HUNT, R. A. and VIPOND, D. 1986. Evaluations in literary Reading. *Text* 6: 53–71.
- JOSE, P. E. and BREWER, W. F. 1984. Development of Story Liking: Character Identification, Suspense, and Outcome Resolution. *Developmental Psychology* 20: 911–24.
- KELLER, O. 1877. *Rerum naturalium scriptores Graeci minores*, vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner.
- KORNEMANN, E. 1935. *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I. von Ägypten*. Leipzig & Berlin: Teubner.
- KROLL, W. 1914. Iambulos. In: *RE IX*, 1: cols. 681–83.
- LANE FOX, R. 2005. *Alexander der Grosse. Eroberer der Welt*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- LEONARD, G. 1996. Keeping Our Selves in Suspense: The Imagined Gaze and Fictional Constructions of the Self in Alfred Hitchcock and Edgar Allan Poe. In: VORDERER et al. (eds) 1996, 19–35.
- LIOTSAKIS, V. 2016. Narrative Defects in Thucydides and the Development of Ancient Greek Historiography. In: V. LIOTSAKIS and S. FARRINGTON (eds), *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 73–98.
- LUELSDORF, P.-A. 1995. A Grammar of Suspense. *Journal of Literary Semantics* 24: 1–20.
- MCCRINDLE, J. W. 1901. *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*. Westminster: Today and Tomorrow's Printers and Publications.
- MIALL, D. S. 1995. Anticipation and Feeling in Literary Response: A Neuropsychological Perspective. *Poetics* 23: 275–98.
- MILTSIOS, N. 2009. The Perils of Expectations: Perceptions, Suspense and Surprise in Polybius' *Histories*. In: GRETHLEIN and RENGAKOS (eds) 2009, 481–506.

- MONTANARI, S. 2009. Morale et société idéale dans l'utopie d'Iamboulos. In: B. POUDERON and C. BOST-POUDERON (eds), *Passions, vertus et vices dans l'ancien roman : Actes du colloque de Tours. 19-21 octobre 2006*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux, 51–67.
- MONTGOMERY, H. 1965. *Gedanke und Tat. Zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.
- MOSSÉ, C. 1969. Les utopies égalitaires à l'époque hellénistique. *Revue Historique* 241: 297–308.
- MÜLLER, S. 2014. *Alexander, Makedonien und Persien*. Berlin: Trafo.
- NICHOLS, A. 2011. *Ctesias: On India and Fragments of his Minor Works*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- NISSAN, E. 2009. Deadly Flowers and Lethal Plants. *Fabula* 50: 293–311.
- OMONT, H. 1913. Lettre à l'empereur Adrien sur les merveilles de l'Asie. *BEC* 74: 507–15.
- PEARSON, L. 1960. *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*. New York: American Philological Association.
- PUSKÁS, I. 1983. Herodotus and India. *Oikumene* 4: 201–7.
- REARDON, B. P. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- REESE, W. 1914. *Die griechischen Nachrichten über Indien bis zum Feldzuge Alexanders des Grossen*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- RENGAKOS, A. 2006a. Thucydides' Narrative: The Epic and Herodotean Heritage. In: A. RENGAKOS and A. TSAKMAKIS (eds), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden: Brill, 279–300.
- , 2006b. Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Techniques on Herodotus and Thucydides. In: F. MONTANARI and A. RENGAKOS (eds), *La poésie épique grecque. Métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire*. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 52. Vandoeuvres, Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 183–209.
- ROMM, J. S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ROMMEL, H. 1913. *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- ROOS, A. G. 1967–68. *Flavii Arriani quae extant omnia*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- SCHEPENS, G. and DELCROIX, K. 1996. Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception. In: O. PECERE and A. STRAMAGLIA (eds), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino : Atti del Convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14-17 settembre 1994*. Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 375–460.
- SCHIWEK, H. 1962. Der Persische Golf als Schiffahrts- und Seehandelsroute in Achämenidischer Zeit und in der Zeit Alexanders des Grossen. *Booner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn und des Rheinischen Amtes*

- für Bodendenkmalpflege im Landschaftsverband Rheinland und des Veriens von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande 162: 4–97.
- SCHWARTZ, E. 1895. Arrianus. In: *RE* II, 1: cols. 1229–47.
- _____, 1901. Daimachos. In: *RE* IV, 2: cols. 2008–09.
- SCHWARZ, F. F. 1969. Daimachos von Plataiai. Zum geistesgeschichtlichen Hintergrund seiner Schriften. In: R. ALTHEIM-STIEHL (ed.), *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben. Festschrift für Franz Altheim zum 6.10.1968*, I. Berlin: de Gruyter, 293–304.
- _____, 1975. Arrian's *Indike* on India: Intention and Reality. *East and West* 25: 181–200.
- STADTER, P. A. 1980. *Arrian of Nicomedia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- _____, 1952. Alexanders Zug durch die Gedrosische Wüste. *Hermes* 80: 456–93.
- TARN, W. W. 1939. The Date of Iambulus: A Note. *CQ* 33: 193.
- VOFCHUK, R. C. 2006. Ctesias de Cnido y «lo monstruoso» en el imaginario Greco-latino de la India. In: E. CABALLERO DE DEL SASTRE, B. RABAZA and C. VALENTINI (eds), *Monstruos y maravillas en las literaturas latina y medieval y sus lecturas*. Rosario: Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Facultad de Humanidades y Artes, 279–88.
- VON MÖLLENDORFF, P. 2015. Stoics in the Ocean: Iambulus' Novel as Philosophical Fiction. In: M. P. F. PINHEIRO and S. MONTIGLIO (eds), *Philosophy and the Ancient Novel*. Groningen: Groningen University Library, 19–33.
- VORDERER, P., WULFF, H., and FRIEDRICHSEN, M. (eds) 1996. *Suspense: Conceptualizations, Theoretical Analyses, and Empirical Explorations*. New York: Routledge.
- WESTERMANN, A. 1839. *Παραδοξογράφοι. Scriptores rerum mirabilium Graeci*. London: Black and Armstrong.
- WINSTON, D. 1976. Iambulus's *Islands of the Sun* and Hellenistic Literary Utopias. *Science Fiction Studies* 3: 219–27.
- WITKOWER, R. 1942. Marvels of the East. A Study in the History of Monsters. *JWI* 5: 159–97.
- WULFF, H. J. 1996. Suspense and the Influence of Cataphora on Viewer's Expectations. In: VORDERER et al. (eds) 1996, 1–17.
- ZAMBRINI, A. 1985. Gli *Indika* di Megastene II. *ASNP* 15: 781–853.
- _____, 1987. A Proposito degli *Indika* di Arriano. *ASNP* 17: 139–54.
- ZILLMANN, D. 1980. Anatomy of Suspense. In: P. H. TANNEBAUM (ed.), *The Entertainment Functions of Television*. New York: Psychology Press, 133–63.
- _____, 1991. The Logic of Suspense and Mystery. In: J. BRYANT and D. ZILLMANN, D. (eds), *Responding to the Screen: Reception and Reaction Processes*. Hillsdale, New York: Erlbaum, 281–304.
- _____, 1994. Mechanisms of Emotional Involvement with Drama. *Poetics* 23: 33–51.

Narrative suspense in Arrian's *Indikē* (29.9–31.9): the portraiture of Alexander and the exotic tradition intermingled

Vasileios LIOTSAKIS

Abstract

BY UNDERTAKING to narrate the navigation of the Indian coastline by the Macedonian fleet, Arrian aspired to compose a work which, along with the *Anabasis of Alexander*, would serve as an integral part of his prosopography of Alexander. On the other hand, Arrian was also fully aware of the fact that, in writing the Indian account, he was also invited to follow a long tradition of exotic literature on the *mirabilia* of India. As a result, in the *Indikē* the reader is offered the opportunity to meet with passages that serve both the author's need to amuse and his intention to focus on the characters of Alexander and Nearchus.

Although modern scholarship has repeatedly noted the twofold nature of the work, little attention has been paid to if and how these two goals intermingle on a narrative level. The present study constitutes the first narratological analysis of Arrian's *Indikē* and elaborates exactly on this question: How did Arrian manage to reach a compromise in his narrative between these two goals of the work, the amusement of the reader and the delineation of Alexander's and Nearchus' literary portraits? By drawing from recent outcomes of psychology, theory of literature, and narratology, I examine the narrative techniques through which Arrian exploits exotic stories about the Macedonian navy's voyage in the Indian Sea in his effort not only to entertain his readers but also to shape a favorable image for the protagonists. The main point of argument of this essay is that the exotic and amusing elements of the *Indikē* should not be seen cut off from the literary representation of Alexander's and Nearchus' intellectual and moral qualities but as a part of this representation. The basic narrative technique, through which Arrian combines elements of exotic content and characterization, is the creation of suspense.

