Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.09.2019

Перевірено на плагіат 30.09.2019 р.

унікальність – 98,2 %

<https://doi.org/10.17721/StudLing2019.15.40-52>

УДК 821.14'02

“ВИХОВАННЯ КІРА” КСЕНОФОНТА Й “ІСТОРІЯ РИМСЬКОЇ ДЕРЖАВИ ПІСЛЯ МАРКА АВРЕЛІЯ” ГЕРОДІАНА: СТРУКТУРНА ПОДІБНІСТЬ ЧЕРЕЗ СТОЛІТТЯ ДАВНЬОГРЕЦЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ (ОГЛЯД РЕЦЕПЦІЙ У СУЧАСНІЙ КЛАСИЧНІЙ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ)

Федір Володимирович Довбищенко (м. Київ, Україна)

fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

аспірант

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка,

Інститут філології

Стаття є спробою проаналізувати наративні стратегії та мету написання творів Ксенофонта “Виховання Кіра” й Геродіана “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” під кутом зору їх реценції у сучасній класичній філології. Висувається припущення, що наративні техніки написання історіографічних біографій в античності могли бути незмінними впродовж усього періоду, який розділяє згадані праці. Відстань у часі не спричинилася до радикальних змін у наративній структурі історіографії, що демонструє приклад “Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історії Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана. Аналіз античних історіографічних праць, як стверджується у статті, може здійснюватися не лише з метою з'ясування рівня їх фактуальної достовірності, а й щоб скласти уявлення про їх можливий вплив на сучасних їм слухачів і читачів. У статті також показано, що наративна структура обох творів значним чином відрізняється від наративної структури нефікціональної прози, і сучасна класична філологія схильна розглядати їх як фікціональні тексти. Крім того, вся антична історіографія, на відміну від сучасної, має сприйматись як

Actual Problems of Linguistics [Aktual'ni problemy movoznavstva]

© Dovbyshchenko F. V. [Dovbyshchenko F. V.], fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

The “Cyropaedia” of Xenophon and the “History of the Roman Empire” of Herodian: Structural Similarities through Centuries of Ancient Greek Historiography (a review of the receptions in modern classical philology) [“Vykhovannia Kira” Ksenofonta u “Istoriia Rymської derzhavy pislia Marka Avreliia” Herodiana: strukturna podobnist cherez stolittia davnohretskei istoriografii (ohliad retseptsiu u suchasni klasychnii filologii)] (in English)

фікціональна, адже стратегії її творення були подібними до наративних стратегій в інших жанрах.

Ключові слова: антична історіографія, наративні стратегії, наративна структура, сучасна рецепція, класична філологія.

THE “CYROPAEDIA” OF XENOPHON AND THE “HISTORY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE” OF HERODIAN: STRUCTURAL SIMILARITIES THROUGH CENTURIES OF ANCIENT GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY (A REVIEW OF THE RECEPTIONS IN MODERN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY)

Fedir V. Dovbyshchenko (Kyiv, Ukraine)

fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

PhD student

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Institute of Philology

The present article is an attempt to analyze the narrative strategies and scope of Xenophon's "Cyropaedia" and Herodian's "History of the Roman Empire" as viewed within the modern reception in classical philology. This paper presumes that the narrative techniques of writing historiographical biographies in antiquity might be the same across the whole period which separates the two works in question. The distance in time did not result in radical changes of the narrative structure in historiography, as the example of Xenophon's "Cyropaedia" and Herodian's "History" shows. The analysis of the ancient histories, as this article argues, can be conducted not only to understand the level of their factual reliability, but also to describe their possible impact on contemporary readers or listeners. It is also shown in the present article that the narrative structure of the two histories is far from being that of the non-fictional prose, and that modern classicists tend to consider them as fictional texts. Moreover, the whole ancient historiography, unlike the modern one, has to be treated as fiction, for the strategies of creating it were similar to the narrative strategies of other genres.

Актуальні проблеми мовознавства [Актуальные проблемы языкознания]

© Довбищенко Ф. В. [Довбищенко Ф. В.], fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

“Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана: структурна подібність через століття давньогрецької історіографії (огляд реценцій у сучасній класичній філології) [“Воспитание кира” Ксенофонта и “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана: структурное сходство сквозь столетия античной историографии (обзор реценций в современной классической филологии)] (Англійською / На англ. яз)

Keywords: *ancient historiography, narrative strategies, narrative structure, modern reception, classical philology.*

“ВОСПИТАНИЕ КИРА” КСЕНОФОНТА И “ИСТОРИЯ РИМА ПОСЛЕ МАРКА АВРЕЛИЯ” ГЕРОДИАНА: СТРУКТУРНОЕ СХОДСТВО СКВОЗЬ СТОЛЕТИЯ АНТИЧНОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ (ОБЗОР РЕЦЕПЦИЙ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ КЛАССИЧЕСКОЙ ФИЛОЛОГИИ)

Фёдор Владимирович Довбищенко (г. Киев, Украина)

fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

аспирант

*Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко,
Институт филологии*

В статье осуществлена попытка проанализировать нарративные стратегии и цель написания произведений Ксенофонта “Воспитание Кира” и Геродиана “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” с точки зрения их рецепции в современной классической филологии. Предполагается, что нарративные техники написания историографических биографий в античности могли оставаться неизменными в течение всего периода, который разделяет упомянутые произведения. Расстояние во времени не привело к радикальным изменениям в нарративной структуре историографии, что и демонстрирует пример “Воспитания Кира” Ксенофонта и “Истории Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана. Анализ античных историографических произведений, как утверждается в статье, может осуществляться не только с целью выяснения их фактуальной достоверности, но и для того, чтобы сложить представление об их возможном влиянии на современных им читателей и слушателей. В статье также показано, что нарративная структура обоих произведений существенно отличается от нарративной структуры нефикциональной прозы, и современная классическая филология склонна рассматривать их как фикциональные тексты. Кроме того, вся античная историография, в отличие от современной, должна восприниматься как фикциональная, поскольку стратегии её создания сравнимы с нарративными стратегиями в других жанрах.

Ключевые слова: *античная историография, нарративные стратегии, нарративная структура, современная рецепция, классическая филология.*

Actual Problems of Linguistics [Aktual'ni problemy movoznavstva]

© Dovbyshchenko F. V. [Dovbyshchenko F. V.], fedir.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

The “Cyropaedia” of Xenophon and the “History of the Roman Empire” of Herodian: Structural Similarities through Centuries of Ancient Greek Historiography (a review of the receptions in modern classical philology) [“Vykhovannia Kira” Ksenofonta y “Istoriia Rymsskoi derzhavy pislia Marka Avreliia” Herodiana: strukturna podobnist cherez stolittia davnohretskei istoriografii (ohliad retseptsii u suchasnyi klasychnyi filolohii)] (in English)

Introduction. The object of the present research is the ancient historiographical narrative. The study of the ancient historiographical narrative is tempting in the context of the perspectives opened by narratology and reader-response criticism. These branches of philology make it possible to analyze historical writings not only in order to understand whether they are reliable or not, but also as a kind of speech act, within the methods which best fit such an approach. Choosing to study the two histories is intentional. *Cyropaedia* and Herodian's *History* are interrelated by the Attic dialect and historiographical genre, though written under different conditions and distanced from one another by six centuries. Six hundred years after *Cyropaedia*, *paideia* continued to be the common thread of any biography. It is interesting that this did not change through wars and the Roman domination of Greece. **The research's scope** are the tactics of writing ancient historical biography which remained the same, for classical Greek patterns were still so for later historians. **The goal of this article** is to summarize modern approaches to the study of the narrative techniques used by Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*) and Herodian (*Regnum post Marcum*).

In Herodian, Marcus Aurelius is a pattern of *paideia* and a litmus test for his successors who are evaluated depending on how far they depart from his mode of life, and this criterion is crucial for both the emperor's and the state's destiny [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2805]. *Cyropaedia* is a history about one ruler, and this article aims to observe, within the reception in modern classical philology, how Cyrus departed from the Persian *paideia*. Herodian's *History* describes the rules of a series of emperors from Commodus to Gordian III, but the account of each rule (perhaps except for that of Pertinax) is a history about the emperor's decay (moral and, consequently, physical) because all of them did not follow the pattern of *paideia*. [Sidebottom 1998] has already noticed that Xenophon's and Herodian's works are parallel, in particular, in the accounts of Cyrus' and Marcus' deathbed speeches [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2806]¹ which, as the author thinks, are, let one say, litmus tests of their successors' deeds. There is no doubt about Marcus' role, but Cyrus' life would be better considered as "education vice versa", for, in fact, he rejected Persian education while formally demonstrating an attachment to it. On the other hand, Cambyses in *Cyrop.* I.6 is indeed

¹ On the same page see on Herodian's book one as the description of Commodus' path from education to decaying: he became the enemy of *paideia*.

a mirror showing us Cyrus' real essence. That is why Sidebottom's parallel might sound as "Cambyses – Marcus". Moreover, Herodian's *History* belongs to the second sophistic² for which *paideia* was a central concept, and *Cyropaedia*, though having the word "education" in its title, is still about the rejection of education, as Herodian's work does. It is even more appropriate to say that in Herodian one can observe a mere departure from education, while in Xenophon it is rather a simulacrum to cover the ambition for absolute power.

As has been stressed, not only the ruler's person, but the state's destiny in both works depends on the king's or emperor's education. In Herodian, the possession of Greek virtues guarantees a successful rule [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2812].³ Herodian's "History" overemphasizes *paideia*. It is true for *Cyropaedia* too and makes Herodian's work different from that of Cassius Dio [Asirvatham 2017, p. 541], for it abounds in rhetorical devices. The rhetoric makes both histories, that of Xenophon and Herodian, fictional, but does not deprive them of the treats of historiography.

S. Asirvatham argues that the idea of a ruler's direct influence on his subjects is Herodian's novation [Asirvatham 2017, p. 541]. However, if one considers the epilogue of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as an integral part of this history, which is in line with the narrative strategy aiming to unmask Cyrus, one can conclude that Persian society did indeed change for the worse under the king's influence, and the beginning of its decay is due both to Cyrus' rule and death, for the absence of the universal controller resulted in the state's collapse. The ruler's exclusive role is a common idea for both histories, and it provides a deplorable impact on the whole state (*paideia* does not win *tyche*). Such a resemblance makes the two writings in question even more interesting to compare.

If Xenophon's and Herodian's main characters cannot be considered as followers of the Greek *paideia*, this is the contrary for readers or listeners who got acquainted with both works which aimed not to tell something new (the truth), but to educate the audience. It is thus evident that the "truthfulness" criterion is hardly applicable to the two writings, for their character was caused by the narrative scope

² Even despite the fact that only Philostratus uses this term openly, the sophistic nature of Herodian's work is grounded by the centrality of *paideia* in it. See [Asirvatham 2017, p. 536].

³ The author sums up that *paideia* is a watershed which separates *basileia* or *aristocratia* from *tyrannia* and helps an emperor avoid the fate (*tyche*).

rather than by the need to truthfully relate events [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2821–2822].⁴ The “sufficient truthfulness”, let one say, might be understood not as the lack of attention to truth or of the focus on details, but as the realization of a profound narrative strategy aiming at education. For Herodian (as for Xenophon), the historical truth does not consist of events. It is rather the relationship between the ruler and *paideia* [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2822], and in this case, one can forgive the authors for some degree of fiction: the “reality” of histories is sacrificed to achieve an educative goal. Such a conception is also grounded by the fact that the listeners of Xenophon or Herodian being their contemporaries, surely knew the histories’ contents, that is why they paid attention rather to material handling, manner, style, interpretation and conclusions [Kemezis 2014, p. 4]. It is suitable here to follow A. Kemezis who put it clearly that the ancient historiographical work could hardly be considered from the modern point of view; it is better to analyze its impact on the contemporary society, whose representatives have already known the context the history had been written in. The above results in the difference between classical (*Quellenforschung*) and narratological approaches to historiographical works. The *Quellenforschung* appears when the events become history without immediate eyewitnesses, that is why the sources must undergo a critical analysis: one must reply to the question “What did really happen?” The main question for the narratological approach, which is primary for the events’ contemporaries, is “Why has it been written?” From such a viewpoint, the object of the study is not the work’s truthfulness; it is rather its structure. This structure embodies the narrative strategy of bringing some message to contemporary and future readers. That message is not only an account of events, but also, for Xenophon and Herodian, an educative intent.

The *Cyropaedia*, like Herodian’s *History*, pursues a clearly educative objective, it does not aim for a simple narration of events which were hardly unknown to the audience. In Xenophon, regional history is ever present, but at the same time the *Cyropaedia* contains something very different from, for example, Herodotean *History*, where regional natural studies play a crucial role and are the work’s overt objective. In *Cyropaedia*, they are not of crucial importance, giving way to the educative goal [Tamiolaki 2017, p. 177].

⁴ H. Sidebottom notices that Herodian, in particular, did not aim to retell an absolute historical truth, it was rather a “sufficient truthfulness” which put forth the narrative strategy: a rule depends on education.

Актуальні проблеми мовознавства [Актуальные проблемы языкознания]

© Довбищенко Ф. В. [Довбищенко Ф. В.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

“Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана: структурна подібність через століття давньогрецької історіографії (огляд реценцій у сучасній класичній філології) [“Воспитание Кира” Ксенофонта и “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана: структурное сходство сквозь столетия античной историографии (обзор реценций в современной классической филологии)] (Англійською / На англ. яз)

As one can observe, both works are not purely historiographical in the modern sense. They abound in rhetorical and narrative devices serving to educate the audience. Thus, there appears a need of a narratological approach to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and Herodian's *History*, for one could pay attention to a contemporary reception of the works in question rather than to a modern interpretation shaped by *Quellenforschung* and a modern understanding of historiography, where the communicative goal of a history risks escaping the scope of studies. An important feature of ancient historiographical narratives is their tight connection with rhetoric, which served not only to embellish the narration, but also to structure historical facts (or fiction) within a certain conceptual paradigm.⁵ Generally, ancient historiography was influenced significantly by rhetoric [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2828]. In this respect, it is hardly appropriate to condemn the two writings in question for a lack of or mistakes in factual data, for this has not been the major objective of the historical narrative in Xenophon and Herodian. Modern approaches to studying ancient historiographical texts can turn to be insufficient to demonstrate their communicative goals. Narratology, instead, could be seen as an appropriate instrument to study messages laid down in ancient histories, for the concrete author is there separated from the narrator (the author's presence in the text), and the concrete reader is separated from the narratee (the sum of all markers in the text which indicate the reader) [Kemezis 2014, p. 11].⁶ This opens the possibility to look beyond historicism and to consider the text as a communicative act containing a message addressed by somebody to somebody. While studying ancient historiography, one must remember about the blurring of the distinction between fiction and non-fiction, for the constructive devices to write both types of texts were the same in antiquity [Kemezis 2014, p. 13].⁷ [Kemezis 2014] argues that the fictional narrative strategy is present in Herodian, and it consists in the author's self-withdrawal and in his non-participation in the events described by him.⁸ The above

⁵ [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2828] argues that rhetorical narrative in historiography was not unusual for the histories' contemporaries.

⁶ The author claims that a narrative and, in particular, that of the ancient historiography, can exist outside the scheme of concrete author and reader as a narrative world.

⁷ Both ancient novels and histories are linear narrative [ibid.].

⁸ Kemezis 2014, p. 260-261: an author's identification with the world he described would be a poor narrative strategy.

means that it is not necessary for the author to intervene into the text by digressions or personal opinion. A simple self-withdrawal can also be a narrative strategy which only enhances the fiction of a work.

In fact, Quintilian has already noticed the fiction of historiography, and, as [De Jong 2004] puts it, it was the influence of Homeric embedded speeches and focalization [De Jong 2004, p. 9]. The treats of fiction are numerous in any ancient historiographical writing. One cannot reduce his attention exclusively to authors as historical personalities; to better understand the message laid down in the text, one has rather to distance oneself from any kind of author's *persona* in order to analyze the text itself [Kemezis 2014, p. 10].

The *Cyropaedia* and Herodian's *History* have thus to be considered as fictive historiography, for both of them do contain the treats of fiction and history, as scholars have already remarked. But the fiction does not serve in this case to promote the narrator's communication which praises or justifies a ruler; it is rather provided to demonstrate authorial communication which aims to denounce him. The fiction helps the author not only distance himself from praise or flattery, but also completely deny them.

Scholars have already noticed a deliberate abundance of rhetoric in Herodian [Gray 2004, p. 391–392].⁹ This author uses plenty of devices to activate the reader's perception; his seemingly accidental omissions, mistakes or fiction turn to be purposeful [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2814]. [Sidebottom 1998] splits these devices into linear narrative and rhetoric; among the latter he includes anticipation, which has to be more broadly studied within the reader-response criticism.¹⁰ All these devices enhance the reader's participation in the text and his mastery of the story [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2827]. The same concerns Herodian's *History*, which, while not aiming to emphasize the importance of the world outside the text, is itself a potent act of narration; its value consists in the very narrative rather than in the events it describes [Kemezis 2014, p. 271]. For the *History* of Herodian (as for the *Cyropaedia*), no matter the reliability of the sources used by the authors, these works combine historiography and fiction. The authors take care of the presentation rather than of the

⁹ Though, the author considers the narrative tools in *Cyropaedia* as the means to praise Cyrus. See also [Gruen 2011, pp. 54, 65].

¹⁰ See the theoretical basics of such study in [Dovbyshchenko 2019].

Актуальні проблеми мовознавства [Актуальные проблемы языкознания]

© Довбищенко Ф. В. [Довбищенко Ф. В.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

“Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана: структурна подібність через століття давньогрецької історіографії (огляд реценцій у сучасній класичній філології) [“Воспитание Кира” Ксенофонта и “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана: структурное сходство сквозь столетия античной историографии (обзор рецензий в современной классической филологии)] (Англійською / На англ. яз)

credibility of events in the narrative. Their preoccupation is much more certainly the style and manner, but not a precise account of historical events [Potter 2005, pp. 86, 89].¹¹

It is common to consider that the *Cyropaedia* is not an ode to Cyrus.¹² [Gruen 2011] grounds this point by the fact that the work does not contain any overt criticism of the Persian king [Gruen 2011, p. 57]. Practical studies show, in the example of the book one, that criticism does have place, but it is rather implicit than explicit.¹³ It can be revealed if one analyzes the text of Xenophon within narratology (for it separates authorial and narrator's communication) and reader-response criticism (in particular, the doctrine about provocation of reader's activity). It emerges from the analysis mentioned above that it is worth paying attention to the idea of parallelism between Xenophon and Ctesias in the context of Cyrus' struggle for social respect [Gruen 2011, p. 55]. Book one of *Cyropaedia*, which depicts the Persian heir's growth, shows a series of manipulations Cyrus employed to achieve esteem and sympathy of the surrounding community. These manipulations were denounced by nobody except for Cyrus' father Cambyses, apparently because the latter was not together with his son. The will to achieve respect moved Cyrus in his deeds, and studies contain a reasonable affirmation that he extended his power through scheming and fear. The desire of the sole power via political manipulations drove Cyrus' state to decay after his death [Gruen 2011, pp. 57, 60, 64; Tamiolaki 2017, p. 178].

Although the epilogue of the *Cyropaedia* is not the immediate topic of the present article, one must note that its role is definitive: at the last moment of narration, it unveils authorial communication by showing the decay of the Persian empire after Cyrus' death. If one follows the narrator's communication ("the praise"), one can conclude that the epilogue is even not an original part of Xenophon's work, so strikingly it contrasts the preceding narrator's leitmotif.¹⁴ ¹⁵ The analysis of the

¹¹ Perhaps, documentary sources were used seldom in the third century, but it is not so important due to the fictional nature of the texts.

¹² As argues, for example, [Gruen 2011, p. 53].

¹³ See [Довбищенко 2018].

¹⁴ See the analysis of different views of the epilogue's role and authenticity in [Gray 2004, p. 393].

¹⁵ [Gruen 2011, p. 65] argues that *Cyropaedia* depicts, on the example of Persia, an ideal state for Greeks. This point of view is hardly acceptable, for there emerges then the question why such a state split into pieces once the ruler who had created it died.

Cyropaedia's book one (see the above references) demonstrates that already, in correlation with the fragment in question, the epilogue is a logical ending of the text. The accordance between the epilogue and the rest of the text may be explained by the fact that the *Cyropaedia* was written, as the present article argues, not so much as Cyrus' biography as an illustration of the decisive role of *paideia* in the life of a ruler and a state. This concept, as it has already been mentioned, unites the works of Xenophon and Herodian. The latter, while applying this concept to his characters, proclaims himself in disagreement with such a principle in the proem, but in fact attaches his writing to it: having rejected the demonstration of *paideia*, as Lucian recommended to do in his manual, he does demonstrate it across the whole text by widely using rhetorical devices [Asirvatham 2017, p. 534].

Herodian (as Xenophon did) wrote his history for the elite which shared the system of *paideia*. [Sidebottom 1998] provides a number of examples from the text to prove that that elite was essentially Greek and different from the Roman one [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2823]. The centrality of *paideia* as a cornerstone of a state's existence is a characteristic trait of the elitist rhetoric within the second sophistic [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2825]. Following Greek *paideia* guarantees the emperor's virtue, and this results in the whole state's prosperity [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2826]. That is why the attempt to find out in Herodian a comprehensive analysis of social and political crisis in the third century's Roman empire is baseless: Herodian was in line with the contemporary concept which attached the state's ups and downs to the emperor's personal traits [Sidebottom 1998, pp. 2798, 2803].

The purposeful fiction of Herodian's *History* and its exceptional concentration on the most important deeds of the emperors (like a cinematographic close-up) only enhance the narrator's refrain from the excessive explicitness as well as his internal status. The narrator and his narratees both seem to be present in the work and observe the events as if they were in the first row of an amphitheater. Such a strategy of the narrator's identification with his narratees makes it possible to completely realize the authorial plot, that is, to focus on the ruler and to show by several impressionistic light smears how *paideia* influences the whole state through its emperor. Taking into account the fiction of the work, such a strategy may be regarded as the most exact realization of the authorial plot rather than as a vice [Hidber 2004, p. 201].

Актуальні проблеми мовознавства [Актуальные проблемы языкознания]

© Довбищенко Ф. В. [Довбищенко Ф. В.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

“Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана: структурна подібність через століття давньогрецької історіографії (огляд реценцій у сучасній класичній філології) [“Воспитание кира” Ксенофонта и “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана: структурное сходство сквозь столетия античной историографии (обзор реценций в современной классической филологии)] (Англійською / На англ. яз)

Without breaking with the classical tradition of fiction in history, as one can observe here and further in this article, Herodian is, to a certain extent, an innovator in his field. By his sophistic focusing on the ruler's *persona* he created an almost new sub-genre in ancient historiography (that is what differentiates him from his nearest contemporary Cassius Dio) [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2778]. Herodian's novation is also that by distancing himself from universal histories he focused on the recent past, and this caused the application of the strategy mentioned above [Asirvatham 2017, p. 541]. Such a narrative did not become an episodic phenomenon; on the contrary, it developed, since the third century, into a separate narrative style of historiographical writings and occupied the whole late antiquity [Kemezis 2014, p. 3].

Conclusions. This article observes that ancient historiographical works written by different authors under different conditions and distanced one from another by more than a half-millennial timespan use the same constructive devices and the same narrative strategy. Despite the fact that the *Cyropaedia* is a monument of the classical period, and Herodian's *History* is that of Roman-hellenistic period, they are united not only by the Greek language of writing, but also by the narrative strategy of representing history in general. It becomes even more interesting if one takes into account that both narratives are that of decline [Sidebottom 1998, p. 2797].¹⁶ In Xenophon, it is the Persians' moral decay which accompanied the rise of their empire, and in Herodian, it is the beginning of destructive processes which later resulted in the decline of Rome.

The similarity of the way the narrative is constructed in Xenophon and Herodian draws attention to the development of narrative strategies in ancient historiography within the timespan which separates the two writings. Can one speak about the evolutionary development of structuring ancient historiographical texts? Is such a structure proper exclusively to historical biography, or is it used in ancient histories in general? These questions need profound studies at the limits of narratology, reader-response criticism, linguistics, and history. Perhaps, these kinds of studies will help in future to rethink ancient historiography treating it not only as a sum of historical sources, but also as a cluster of texts, where each text has its

¹⁶ This explains also a purely historiographical interest in the works of Xenophon and Herodian.

Actual Problems of Linguistics [Aktual'ni problemy movoznavstva]

© Dovbyshchenko F. V. [Dovbyshchenko F. V.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

The "Cyropaedia" of Xenophon and the "History of the Roman Empire" of Herodian: Structural Similarities through Centuries of Ancient Greek Historiography (a review of the receptions in modern classical philology) ["Vykhovannia Kira" Ksenofonta y "Istoriia Rymaskoi derzhavy pislia Marka Avreliia" Herodiana: strukturna podobnist cherez stolittia davnohretskei istoriografii (ohliad retseptii u suchasni klasychnii filolohii)] (in English)

complex structure called, first of all, to realize the author's plan and to send a certain message. That message is not so simply readable if one considers ancient histories from the perspective of the modern vision of historiography.

Література:

1. Довбищенко, Ф. В. “Комунікативна структура І книги трактату Геродіана “Історія після Марка Аврелія””, *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*, I (52) (2015): 242–253.
2. Довбищенко, Ф. В. “Авторська наративна стратегія в І книзі твору Ксенофонта “Виховання Кіра””, *Studia Linguistica*, 13 (2018): 71–91.
3. Asirvatham, S. R. “Historiography,” in *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, ed. D. Richter and W. Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 530–546.
4. De Jong, I. J. F. “Introduction. Narratological theory on narrators, narratees, and narratives,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives In Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 1–12.
5. Dovbyshchenko, F. “The Theoretical Basics of Studying Ancient Historiographical Biography,” *Science and Education a New Dimension VII* (6), issue 210 (2019): 14–20.
6. Gray, V. “Xenophon,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 391–402.
7. Gruen, E. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011.
8. Hidber, T. “Herodian,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives In Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 201–212.
9. Kemezis, Adam M. *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian. Greek culture in the Roman world*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
10. Potter, D. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian (Approaching the Ancient World)*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
11. Sidebottom, H. “Herodian's Historical Methods and Understanding of History,” *ANRW*, II. 34.4 (1998): 2775–2836.
12. Tamiolaki, M. “Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Tentative Answers to an Enigma”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, ed. Michael A. Flower (Cambridge:

Актуальні проблеми мовознавства [Актуальные проблемы языкознания]

© Довбищенко Ф. В. [Довбищенко Ф. В.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

“Виховання Кіра” Ксенофонта й “Історія Римської держави після Марка Аврелія” Геродіана: структурна подібність через століття давньогрецької історіографії (огляд реценцій у сучасній класичній філології) [“Воспитание кира” Ксенофонта и “История Рима после Марка Аврелия” Геродиана: структурное сходство сквозь столетия античной историографии (обзор реценций в современной классической филологии)] (Англійською / На англ. яз)

Cambridge University Press, 2017), 174–194.

References:

1. Asirvatham, S. R. “Historiography,” in *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, ed. D. Richter and W. Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 530–546. (in Eng.).
2. De Jong, I. J. F. “Introduction. Narratological theory on narrators, narratees, and narratives,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives In Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 1–12. (in Eng.).
3. Dovbyshhenko, F. V. “Komunikatyvna struktura I knygy traktatu Gerodiana ‘Istoriia pislja Marka Avrelija’” [= The Communicative structure of Herodian’s “Regnum post Marcum” Book one], *Movni i konceptual’ni kartyny svitu*, I (52) (2015): 242–253. (in Ukr.).
4. Dovbyshhenko, F. V. “Avtors’ka naratyvna strategija v I knyzi tvoriv Ksenofonta ‘Vyhovannja Kira’” [= The Authorial Narrative Strategy in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* Book one], *Studia Linguistica*, 13 (2018): 71–91. (in Ukr.).
5. Dovbyshchenko, F. “The Theoretical Basics of Studying Ancient Historiographical Biography,” *Science and Education a New Dimension VII* (6), issue 210 (2019): 14–20. (in Eng.).
6. Gray, V. “Xenophon,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 391–402. (in Eng.).
7. Gruen, E. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011. (in Eng.).
8. Hidber, T., “Herodian,” in *Narrators, Narratees, And Narratives In Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene De Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 201–212. (in Eng.).
9. Kemezis, Adam M. *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian. Greek culture in the Roman world*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. (in Eng.).
10. Potter, D. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian (Approaching the Ancient World)*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. (in Eng.).
11. Sidebottom, H. “Herodian’s Historical Methods and Understanding of History,” *ANRW*, II. 34.4 (1998): 2775–2836. (in Eng.).
12. Tamiolaki, M. “Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*: Tentative Answers to an Enigma,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, ed. Michael A. Flower (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 174–194. (in Eng.).

Actual Problems of Linguistics [Aktual’ni problemy movoznavstva]

© Dovbyshchenko F. V. [Dovbyshchenko F. V.], fedor.dovbyshchenko@gmail.com

The “*Cyropaedia*” of Xenophon and the “History of the Roman Empire” of Herodian: Structural Similarities through Centuries of Ancient Greek Historiography (a review of the receptions in modern classical philology) [“Vykhovannja Kira” Ksenofonta y “Istoriia Rymsskoi derzhavy pislja Marka Avrelia” Herodiana: strukturna podobnist cherez stolittia davnohrets’koi istoriohrafii (ohliad retseptsiï u suchasniï klasychniï filolohii)] (in English)