

XENOPHON
AND
SPARTA

edited by

Anton Powell

and

Nicolas Richer



First published in 2020 by
The Classical Press of Wales
15 Rosehill Terrace, Swansea SA1 6JN
Tel: +44 (0)1792 458397
www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk

Distributor in North America
ISD,
70 Enterprise Drive, Suite 2,
Bristol, CT 06010, USA
Tel: +1 (860) 584-6546
Fax: +1 (860) 516-4873
www.isdistribution.com

© 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978-1-910589-74-8

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset by Louise Jones, and printed and bound in the UK by Gomer Press, Llandysul, Ceredigion, Wales

The Classical Press of Wales, an independent venture, was founded in 1993, initially to support the work of classicists and ancient historians in Wales and their collaborators from further afield. More recently it has published work initiated by scholars internationally. While retaining a special loyalty to Wales and the Celtic countries, the Press welcomes scholarly contributions from all parts of the world.

The symbol of the Press is the Red Kite. This bird, once widespread in Britain, was reduced by 1905 to some five individuals confined to a small area known as 'The Desert of Wales' – the upper Tywi valley. Geneticists report that the stock was saved from terminal inbreeding by the arrival of one stray female bird from Germany. After much careful protection, the Red Kite now thrives – in Wales and beyond.

CONTENTS

	Page
Publisher's note: the series 'Source + Sparta'	vii
Introductions and Acknowledgements <i>Anton Powell</i> and <i>Nicolas Richer</i>	ix
1 'One little <i>skytalē</i> ': Xenophon, truth-telling in his major works, and Spartan imperialism <i>Anton Powell</i>	1
2 The Lacedaemonian model in Xenophon's non-historical works (excluding the <i>Cyropaedia</i>) <i>Nicolas Richer</i> (trans. <i>William E. Higgins</i>)	65
3 Xenophon's portrayal of Sparta in the <i>Hellenica</i> , the <i>Lakedaimonion Politeia</i> and the <i>Agésilaios</i> <i>Giovanna Deverio Rocchi</i> (trans. <i>Anton Powell</i>)	109
4 Sparta and the <i>Cyropaedia</i> : the correct use of analogies <i>Vincent Azoulay</i> (trans. <i>Maxime Shellechy</i>)	129
5 The communication of history in Xenophon. The art of narration, the control of reception and happiness <i>Gianluca Cimiberti</i> (trans. <i>Robert T. Valgenti</i>)	161
6 Defining the difference: Xenophon and Spartan law <i>Vivienne Gray</i>	179
7 Xenophon and the myth of Lykourgos <i>Ephraim David</i> (trans. <i>Anton Powell</i>)	203
8 Foxes at home, lions abroad: Spartan commanders in Xenophon's <i>Anabasis</i> <i>Ellen Millender</i>	223

Contents

- 9 Xenophon and the Spartan economy
Thomas J. Figueira 261
- 10 True history: Xenophon's *Agésilao*s and the encomiastic genre
Noreen Humble 291
- 11 Xenophon presenting Agesilaos: the case of Phleious
Pierre Pontier (trans. *William E. Higgins*) 319
- 12 Xenophon and the selection of the *hippeis* (*Lak. Pol.* 4.1–6)
Jean Ducat 343
- Index 361

PUBLISHER'S NOTE:
THE SERIES 'SOURCE + SPARTA'

The present book, *Xenophon and Sparta*, is meant as the first of a short series, examining separately each of our main sources of information about the city which was classical Greece's greatest military power - and most potent source of moral influence.

A companion volume, *Thucydides and Sparta*, will follow imminently. *Herodotos and Sparta*, and *Plutarch and Sparta*, are in preparation. Planned also is a volume on *Archaeology and Sparta*.

Xenophon has been chosen to begin the series for several reasons. He was, of all our literary sources, probably the most knowledgeable about Sparta, but he remains challengingly enigmatic in his methods, and in his attitude to truth-telling. In addition his *œuvre* divides into numerous works varying widely in their literary forms and purposes. Xenophon's work thus engages the commitment of the present publisher to the principle of combining historical and literary analysis: to resist centrifugal and hermetic tendencies of modern research, and to promote a reintegration of Classics as a discipline.

THE COMMUNICATION OF HISTORY IN
XENOPHON.
THE ART OF NARRATION, THE CONTROL
OF RECEPTION AND HAPPINESS

Gianluca Cuniberti

(Translated from the Italian by Robert T. Valgenti)

I intend here to make observations on Xenophon's historical method and his innovations concerning the modes and ends of historical communication. In particular I intend to focus on the motivations and objectives that he reveals in the pages of his history, through the analysis of recurring rhetorical expressions that I have earlier treated separately in some of Xenophon's works.¹ In this way, I hope to confirm Xenophon's innovative attempts to control the reception of his own work by the reader or listener: through rhetorical art, diverse narrative strategies and the selection of narrated facts, Xenophon used his historical work to guide his audience in interpretation of particular narrated facts and indeed of an entire historical epoch. Xenophon may seem to open a dialogue with the reader or listener; but, in reality, he only simulates one and in fact uses it as an instrument of persuasion and education.²

Xenophon is aware that certain narrative and rhetorical strategies allow the author to take control of the contents' reception and re-elaboration by a reader or listener who is not adequately prepared to recognize these strategies for what they are.

Thus we can now begin a course of investigation through the historical works of Xenophon, in which the author attempts a political and ethical interpretation of his own era, whether in terms of the identification of models or through the analysis of the principal historical transformations.

Constitution of the Lacedaemonians and Agesilaus

Even given their differences, the two works by Xenophon with explicitly Spartan content are profoundly characterized by the use of certain narrative strategies. In the *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* the absolute originality and priority of the Spartan constitution, and above all the primacy of the

model of Lycurgus as a way to *eudaimonia*, are asserted and supported by rhetorical gestures. From the very beginning, with ingenuity, Xenophon reveals why he began to write about Sparta: 'It occurred to me one day that Sparta, though among the most thinly populated of states, was evidently the most powerful and most celebrated city in Greece; and I fell to wondering how this could have happened. But when I considered the institutions of the Spartans, I wondered no longer' (1.1).³ The affirmation is taken up again symmetrically at the end of the first chapter when Xenophon challenges his audience with what is virtually a rhetorical question: 'Whether he succeeded in populating Sparta with a race of men remarkable for their size and strength anyone who chooses may judge for himself' (1.10).

In this way the author begins to call into question the interlocutor himself and continues to do so for the entire work.⁴ With these phrases Xenophon opens a dialogue with the audience, but most importantly prevents objections and lays a basis which is beyond controversy.

In some cases this dialogue with the reader or listener takes the form of rhetorical questions that affirm as absolute truths the appropriateness of Lycurgus' system to the achievement of *eudaimonia*.⁵ Ultimately, this way of relating with the audience characterizes the discussion in the opening and the closing of Chapter XIV:⁶ in this manner the author gestures to the obvious objection regarding how far they are from the original form of Spartan society and from the model of Lycurgus.

We can read *Agessilaus* similarly: here Xenophon rethinks the *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* and elegizes the life of Agessilaus in perfect correspondence to the system of Lycurgus. To this end, the author opens a dialogue with the reader or listener, beginning with the reasons for writing this elegy for Agessilaus.⁷

The description of the qualities of Agessilaus involves a sustained attempt to grip the audience through sequences of interrogative sentences. In particular, at the start of chapter IV, Xenophon recognizes in Agessilaus the values that Lycurgus imposed on his own city: the profound respect for the divine, the knowledgeable management of riches, pleasures and comforts, wisdom in battle and obedience to the homeland and its laws, foresight, the 'virile' minimalism in household furnishings, as well as in the raising of hunting dogs and horses for war and for carts, the constant service to one's homeland and to friends, full vigour in old age, and the priority of the common good of Greece even in cases of victory over other Greeks.⁸

At the end, the reference to the opportunity lost by Sparta⁹ corresponds to Chapter XIV of the *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* and to some

important chapters in the *Hellenica*, to which we shall return: the incapacity for respect and obedience as compared with the *politeia* of Lycurgus, the now lost source of *eudaimonia*. This limitation of Spartan society harms all of Greece in which, however, Xenophon finds a widespread lack of wisdom.

The *Cyropaedia*

In the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon explores the potentialities offered by this tool of rhetorical art: interrogative sentences are thus used not only to formulate a question that implicitly contains the answer, and not only to argue and embellish the discourse by heightening its style, but also for asking for an approval that one cannot deny because it is the only obvious and correct response, or else to request an action that one cannot avoid, because it is the only right and possible one.¹⁰ In this way, the rhetorical question is also an act of coercion, or at least of subordination: it tends to create an asymmetrical relation between the one who poses the question and the one who must give a response.

With an important parallel in *Hiero*,¹¹ as only there do we observe a similar distribution of statements, the *Cyropaedia* allows us to propose a classification of Xenophon's rhetorical interrogatives. We can identify questions related to the following aims in Xenophon's writing:

a) *to describe the system of values which supports the training to govern and to be king*
Here the dialogue between Cyrus and Mandane is especially important. Confronted by a worried mother,¹² the son maintains that his grandfather would never teach him to exploit one's fellow man, as he has always taught the Medes to have less and not more.¹³ The reasoning has elements of notable weakness but convinces the mother, due to the affirmations carried through rhetorical questions.¹⁴ Along with this episode, other passages describe the values grounding the formative journey of Cyrus: to defend and help one's friends,¹⁵ to respect and have faith in the gods,¹⁶ to identify that which brings wellbeing to one's family or that which determines success and sustains the military, or, finally, that which is iniquity and abuse of power¹⁷ – all teachings that Cyrus immediately demonstrated he learned well and that Cyrus himself repeated in the same interrogative mode in the discourse.

b) *to motivate military action*

An important sequence of passages shows how rhetorical questions function in a military context in order to incite military action and to reassure the listener as to its success,¹⁸ but above all, to point out its role in the pursuit of *eudaimonia*.¹⁹

c) to analyze and redefine military strategies
 Xenophon uses the interrogative sentence to provide Cyrus with the analysis of military action and military victory.²⁰ In the same way, always through questions, Cyrus convinces the army, or friends and allies, to take military action based on proper strategies and the principles of opportunity and justice.²¹ In addition, we see that, always in the speeches of Cyrus, Xenophon uses this rhetorical tool to emphasize developments of military strategy in a direction that is appreciated and, in other cases, demanded precisely by Xenophon himself, for example, regarding the necessity of having one's own cavalry.²²

d) to describe the construction of the king's public image
 A fourth series of questions aims to indicate the need for the king to present an image of himself as simple and reliable, for example, through the choice of plain garments and contextually through significant generosity by distributing the more beautiful garments to his friends (who are then invited to do the same for their friends).²³

e) to carry beyond himself the kingship and the values connected to it
 In the *Cyropaedia* one of Cyrus' last speeches, final in many ways, is profoundly marked by rhetorical questions: through a truly spiritual testament Cyrus exalts the value of unity and the strength of the ties among brothers and among friends, as well as the search for happiness as the ultimate and essential need in human life.²⁴

As whole, the questions listed here describe a system of values in which it is easy to recognize the priorities of Xenophon himself:²⁵ life and military action, the exercise of power according to the law, the respect for the gods,²⁶ friendship and good relations²⁷ as the absolute point of reference for every decision.²⁸ In addition, in all the cases here analyzed, with the sole exception (quite understandable in the context of kingship) of the questions posed to Cyrus by his father, all of the interrogative sentences are posed by Cyrus.²⁹ It is clear that these are the expression of Cyrus' power: only one who is the father, who teaches, or who commands an army can pose rhetorical questions, which are intended to explicate a hierarchical difference and become a way of exercising power. At the same time these questions contain all of the foundational values that Xenophon, through Cyrus, wants to point out, matters which, according to Xenophon, need to be transmitted through rhetorical tools of persuasion and instruction.

From *Anabasis* to the *Hellenica*

In the *Anabasis* the communication of late-fifth-century history is constructed from an expedient narrative that consists in the writing of an

autobiography, one that conceals a deliberate ambiguity between the role of the protagonist and the role of the author. Even here, we find the use of interrogative rhetorical sentences: it is minimised, even in the dialogues, but such sentences can be identified at important turns in the narrative, often to help explain the role of the military commander, first Cyrus, and then Xenophon himself.

As in the *Cyropaedia*, we find questions that are exhortations to military action.³⁰ The presence of interrogative rhetorical sentences in diplomatic relations is also important, for example in the passage where Clearchus addresses Tissaphernes,³¹ or in cases that follow a typical pattern of judicial dialogues, as when Cyrus the Younger presses Orontas so that, overwhelmed by a long sequence of questions, he has to admit to his own faults.³²

As in the *Cyropaedia*, the words of the principal figure (from the narrative point of view, but also according to the military hierarchy) contain the majority of the rhetorical questions, not only in order to motivate an action, but also to justify and defend his own command. More precisely, from the beginning of Book III, where Xenophon enters the scene as the protagonist,³³ all of the cases occur within dialogue where Xenophon is speaking.³⁴ Taken together, these sentences describe Xenophon's persuasive and convincing reasons which, accusations notwithstanding, defend and in the end motivate his choice to unite his troops with the Lacedaemonians.³⁵ All of these passages from the *Anabasis*, largely consisting of words attributed to the soldier Xenophon,³⁶ were constructed to convey the opinion of Xenophon the historian: he, above all by Book III, clearly has no need to intervene directly in the narrative as author, but does so as the protagonist in the narrated action. In this way Xenophon avoids the explicit autobiographical superimposition between author and protagonist and, through an apparently objective account, obtains the audience's acceptance of the story's truthfulness and the related values that the protagonist, above all, represents and illustrates.

Precisely this element – the role of the author in the events – allows the *Hellenica* (the true *Hellenica*, as it begins with Book III, after the continuation of Thucydides) to be read as the realization of a historiographical strategy: Xenophon distances himself from the *Anabasis* and from its narrative form of historical account.

I hold that all of the choices related to content, style and rhetoric ought to be understood as made by the author in the *Hellenica*: they are not due solely to the instinctive partiality of the writer, but are instead fundamental tools for guiding the reader or listener along a path intended to legitimate Spartan hegemony, to exalt its leader, and in the end to explain its failure

by placing primary responsibility within Sparta itself.³⁷ An indispensable basis for this literary operation is the attribution of the *Anabasis* itself to one ‘Themistogenes of Syracuse’: ‘So ended the civil strife at Athens. Shortly after this Cyrus sent messengers to Lacedaemon... As to how Cyrus collected an army and with this army made the march up country against his brother, how the battle was fought, how Cyrus was slain, and how after that the Greeks effected their return in safety to the sea – all this has been written by Themistogenes the Syracusan.’³⁸

According to Plutarch,³⁹ the historian distributed the *Anabasis* with the pseudonym ‘Themistogenes of Syracuse’ because aware that being revealed as the author of the work would have compromised his own credibility as narrator of facts in which he was the protagonist. In reality, we recall that the proof of the work’s authorship is not in the *Anabasis*, but in the *Hellenica* and, more importantly, at the very start of Book III. Precisely at this point the caesura is clear: Xenophon omits almost two years; thus, he summarizes very quickly Cyrus’ expedition, his death, and the return from the expedition and refers instead to the account of ‘Themistogenes of Syracuse’.

Now, why does Xenophon attribute the *Anabasis* to Themistogenes at this particular point in the *Hellenica*? I suggest that he does it not only to give objectivity to the narration of the *Anabasis*: Xenophon might also have wanted to prevent the *Hellenica* in large part (above all in III–IV 1) from being considered not objective because it was written by the same author who, in *Anabasis*, wrote autobiography. In order to avoid this interpretation, the attribution to Themistogenes notwithstanding, Xenophon makes a radically different choice in the *Hellenica*: while the *Anabasis* exalts the presence of Xenophon, the *Hellenica* does not register it, not even when the presence of Xenophon is clear in the narrated episodes.⁴⁰ The *Hellenica*, on the one hand, confirms the link between Cyrus’ expedition and facts subsequent to 401, and on the other, implicitly recognizes Xenophon’s role; at the same time, however, the author of the *Hellenica* exalts the indispensable contribution of the men of Cyrus’ expedition – and thus, among them and above all, Xenophon – and moreover, thanks to their contribution, the positive hegemonic function of Sparta in favour of the allies.⁴¹ Dercylidas enacts this hegemonic role, unlike his predecessor Thibron, but earlier the soldiers of Cyrus and their commander had supported it; subsequently it would be developed by Agesilaus, to protect the autonomy of the Greek *poleis*.⁴²

In Agesilaus the *Hellenica* finds the principal point of reference which, positively and negatively, defines the narrative; this centrality of the king is realized by a consistent use of rhetorical tools.⁴³ These, like the reference

to Themistogenes, promote Xenophon’s theme of the excellence of the Spartan model, its potential even outside Sparta, and finally, its failure. It is clear, however, that this interpretation of the facts is accompanied by a biographical positioning of the author himself regarding his greater or lesser proximity to Sparta. In reality, even in the *Hellenica*, as in the *Anabasis*, the author is the constant guide to historical interpretation; his own life, his own movements, his own point of view, his own arrangement, geographical and political, are the unique point of observation, of selection and of exposition of the narrated facts.⁴⁴

We can thus place, alongside the rhetorical questions, the overview of the tools that the historian uses and that differ in the various parts of the work – ones that are determined in correspondence with the diverse phases not only of the composition of the *Hellenica*, but also of the life of Xenophon.⁴⁵ Among them we see the direct interventions of the author within the historical account. They have three different functions, all oriented to furnish explanations for the reader or listener and to guide his capacity for judgment.⁴⁶ To these direct interventions we can juxtapose expressions, often peremptory, which, in indirect form, express the judgment of the author about individuals involved in the events,⁴⁷ about specific historical situations,⁴⁸ above all in reference to Sparta,⁴⁹ about the phases of development, highs and lows of the Spartan hegemony,⁵⁰ about the role of fate and of the gods in history,⁵¹ and about military strategies.⁵²

All of these interventions are superimposed on a narrative level that one could define as informative: on this level Xenophon wants to furnish a report of the incident, a simple sequence of events reconstructed in a manner that seems objective. Nevertheless, in the midst of this information, Xenophon creates a more hidden level, constructed with the use of rhetorical tools destined to control the reception of the information itself by his audience. The rhetorical questions are, yet again, the clearest example of this superimposition of various narrative levels.

One need only think, for example, of the words the author uses to intervene at 3.14.18. After having described the remarkable military workshop created by Agesilaus at Ephesus,⁵³ Xenophon writes: ‘For where men revere the gods, train themselves in deeds of war, and practise obedience to authority, may we not reasonably suppose that such a place abounds in high hopes?’⁵⁴ In this way Xenophon formulates a rhetorical question that strongly assumes the exclamatory tones of an affirmative sentence, rich with enthusiasm for the possibility that, even outside Sparta, an essential part of the tradition of Sparta and originally of Lycurgus (the gods, war, discipline) can form.

Alongside this passage we can place other uses of rhetorical questions:

the underlining of Spartan success because it was sustained and impelled by a divine force,⁵⁵ or the author's judgment regarding a strategic error by Iphicrates.⁵⁶ In the same way the opinion of the historian shines through in the praise given to the Phliasians, which is also formulated in the form of a rhetorical question,⁵⁷ as well as in Xenophon's admiration for the Athenian cavalry who fought at Mantinea in 362.⁵⁸

It is clear that these questions anticipate the reader's reflections and above all the reader's objections. Moreover, the five questions by the author refer to three things fundamental for Xenophon himself:

1. the potential excellence of Sparta (and the possibility, at least in part, of extending this excellence to the 'small *poleis*' that oppose Thebes);
2. the recognition of a 'historical' role of fate and of the gods that directly indicates the course of events;
3. the evaluation of the strategic choices made by various commanders of the army.⁵⁹

Overall, through these rhetorical devices, Xenophon describes a re-orientation of his own political thought: after starting from a faithfully pro-Spartan viewpoint, he comes to analyze historical contexts in which there is hope for a new twin-polar relation between Sparta and Athens that is capable of stabilizing Greece. This path confirms an exact coincidence between historical transformations and the author's biographical changes, above all regarding his greater or lesser proximity to Sparta. Moreover, this evolutionary concept of the contents of the *Hellenica* does not necessarily require us to give up the idea of a unitary composition of the work itself,⁶⁰ but leads to a reconsideration of its ideological structure. Xenophon constructs it in a form that is not fixed, but in continuous and coherent evolution in order to represent, parallel to the narrated facts, not only his personal trust and then disappointment in the Spartan model and its widespread utopian application, but also his subsequent acceptance of the political perspectives of the first half of the fourth century regarding the hegemonic roles of Sparta and Athens, the role of the different *poleis* and, not least, the different and new role of the federal states.⁶¹

On the evolution of this historical and political vision, the *Hellenica* provide a constant overlapping with the system of values synthesized through the other works of Xenophon that are analyzed here. A glance at this constant and coherent system of values makes it possible to clarify the historiographical approach of the author: thanks to Socrates,⁶² Xenophon received a philosophical, political, but also rhetorical education. On the one hand, he feels the permanent need to shape historiographical material as a constant search for *eudaimonia* with the hope, ultimately disappointed,

that this objective is historically realized in the *polis* and in the relations between *poleis*.⁶³ On the other hand, Xenophon wants not only to investigate, but also to teach the journey towards *eudaimonia*, thus making use of history as pragmatic example in which to see successes and failures, opportune methods and wicked deviations, positive protagonists and negative characters in reference to this same path. So Xenophon looks for an ideal situation of happiness, well-being and harmonious relations and proposes to identify it, often imperfect but tending to the ideal, in the success of military expeditions conducted with justice and legitimacy, in the excellence of a *politia*, in the extraordinary character of a king, in privileged relations with friends, and in religious devotion.

A large part of Xenophon's literary output feeds on this hope, but another part denounces its disappointment (as the despairing end of the *Hellenica* demonstrates). However, the author always points out to the reader or listener the indispensable points of his system of values, perpetuating them through an evaluation of historical events that is exegetically personal, but becomes absolute in the definition proposed to the audience. The aim is clearly to assert the historicity of the narrative, a reading that intends not to raise doubts, but to transmit certainties, ones incompatible with the correct application of the historical method, but attuned to a specific objective of rhetorical strategies and the ethical need to provide help and caution in the search for *eudaimonia*.

Notes

¹ Cumiberti 2007, 2012, 2014: these contributions are the basis for the data reviewed in this study.

² The moment of reception assumes even more importance in relation to the mainly didactic purpose that the work of Xenophon often has: cf. Mossay 1974; Grayson 1975; Tuplin 1977.

³ [Translator's note] Most quotations from the original works of Xenophon are taken from the following: Xenophon. *Hierm. Agesilaus. Constitution of the Lacadaemonians. Ways and Means. Cavalry Commander. Art of Horsemanship. On Hunting. Constitution of the Athenians. Cavalry Commander. Art of Horsemanship*. On Hunting. *Constitution of the Athenians*. Translated by E. C. Marchant, G. W. Bowersock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925; *Cyropaedia*, vols I–II. Translated by Walter Miller. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914; *Anabasis*. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Revised by John Dillery. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998, and *Hellenica*, Volumes I–II. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

⁴ With expressions such as these: 'I wish next to explain' (2.1), 'No one, I suppose, can fail to see that' (2.7), 'Someone may ask' (2.8), 'I am not surprised, however, that people refuse to believe this' (2.14), 'anyone who chooses may once more judge for himself' (2.14), 'I will now try to describe' (5.1), 'we all know that' (8.1), 'And so it has

proved' (8.2), 'here is the information he seeks' (11.1), 'the prevalent opinion that' (11.5), 'Let not the length to which I run occasion surprise' (12.7).

⁵ Why, then, should making money be a preoccupation in a state where the pain of possessing it is greater than the pleasure of enjoying it? (7.6: cf. Lipka 2002, 166–168); 'Again, the following surely entitles the work of Lycurgus to high admiration.' (10.4: cf. Luppino Manes 1988, 88–89).

⁶ 'Should anyone ask me whether I think that the laws of Lycurgus still remain unchanged at this day, I certainly could not say that with any confidence whatever... Yet we need not wonder if these reproaches are levelled at them, since it is manifest that they obey neither their god nor the laws of Lycurgus.'

⁷ 1.1; 10.3; 11.1. Cf. Luppino Manes 1991a, 89–107; Redondo 1990–1992, 83–114; Stenger 2004, 421–424.

⁸ 2.25; 5.4 (on the ideal of friendship without sexual implications, cf. Luppino 1991b, 157; on the emphasis on the Socratic footprint, cf. Hindley 1999, 74–99); 5.6; 6.8 (on the common and widespread testimony to the virtue of Agesilaus, see also 7.1; 11.5 and above all 4.5: all of the city of the Lacedaemonians is witness); 8.6–7.

⁹ 7.4.

¹⁰ Cf. Ghiazza – Napoli 2007, 295–297. See also Marchese 1978, 148–149.

¹¹ Cf. Plácido 1989, 135–153; Woronoff 1993, 41–48; Gelenczey-Mihálicz 2000, 113–121; Mercalli 2002, 207–209; Sevieri 2004, 277–288; Gray 2007, 30–38.

¹² According to the mother, Astyages would teach him kingliness based not on justice and legality, but tyrannical despotism. For an analogous characterization of power in relation to the law, see *Ages.* 2.16 and *Anab.* 1.9.3–5; of the opposition kingliness-tyranny, see *Mem.* 4.6.12.

¹³ *Cyropaedia* 1.3.18.

¹⁴ Cf. Nadon 2001, 29–54, 120–139; on the double *paideia* of Cyrus with the end of elaborating an ideal form of government, cf. Azoulay 2004a, 147–173.

¹⁵ *Cyr.* 1.5.13.

¹⁶ *Cyr.* 1.6.4; 1.6.5.

¹⁷ *Cyr.* 1.6.7; 1.6.10; 1.6.27–28.

¹⁸ *Cyr.* 2.1.17; 3.3.62; 6.4.18.

¹⁹ *Cyr.* 7.1.10–12: 'I trust you remember, men, that in the present battle not only is today's victory at stake, but also the first victory you won and all our future success.' [...] 'To what fairer common feast (*eranos*: a banquet formed by reciprocity) could we ever invite each other, my men, than to this one?' Cf. Lefèvre 1971, 283–296.

²⁰ *Cyr.* 4.1.10–11; 4.2.5.

²¹ *Cyr.* 5.3.33; 6.1.15.

²² This persistent employment of rhetorical questions regarding the use of horses clearly responds to a strategic priority not so much of Cyrus but rather of Xenophon himself, who thus asks for the approval of the reader or listener in a strained attempt to construct opinion: *Cyr.* 4.3.5–7, 10.13 (a sequence of ten questions intended to signal how useful, and indeed indispensable, it is to have horses that are pleasant, fast, effective). Cf. Nadon 2001, 100–10.

²³ *Cyr.* 2.4.4–6. *Cyr.* 8.3.4. The overlapping of the portrait of Cyrus with that of Agesilaus is evident in its sobriety and care for friends (cf. for example, *Ages.* 1.19.35.38; 2.21; 4.3; 8.2; 8.6–7; 9.7 and above all *Hell.* 4.1.30).

²⁴ *Cyr.* 8.7.14–18 e 25.

²⁵ On this matter, the end of Book VIII is very important for identifying these observations with a precise interpretative will of the author. Xenophon celebrates Cyrus as the benefactor and model of generosity with his friends through interrogative rhetoric that forestalls and diverts every question and doubt raised by the reader or listener: 'For who has richer friends to show than the Persian king? Who is there that is known to adorn his friends with more beautiful robes than does the king? Whose gifts are so readily recognized as some of those which the king gives [...]? And of whom else is it said that by the munificence of his gifts he makes himself preferred above even brothers and parents and children? Who else was ever in a position like the Persian king to punish enemies who were distant a journey of many months? And who, besides Cyrus, ever gained an empire by conquest and even to his death was called "father" by the people he had subdued? For that name obviously belongs to a benefactor rather than to a despoiler' (*Cyr.* 8.2.8–9).

²⁶ On Xenophon's conception of the relation to the gods and the divine in general, cf. Dillery 1995, 179–194.

²⁷ On the value of friendship in Xenophon, even in unequal relations and regarding the evolution of *philia* in *philanthropia*, cf. Azoulay 2004b, 281–326.

²⁸ On the educative and theoretical-political intentions that motivated Xenophon to write the *Cyropaedia*, cf. Carlier 1978, 133–163; Due 1989, 147–184, 207–229; Hirsch 1989, 61–100; Tuplin 1990, 17–29; Stadter 1991, 461–491; Tuplin 1994, 127–181; 1996, 65–162; Nadon 2001, 161–180.

²⁹ In the *Cyropaedia*, in passages different from those now cited there are only three individuals who pose to Cyrus question in the rhetorical form: Cyaxares (4.1.14; 5.5.14–23; On the definitive role of this individual in relation to the views of action taken by Cyrus, cf. Nadon 2001, 87–100) and Chrysantas (3.3.51–52; 4.3.16–21; 7.5.56–57; 8.1.2–3) in the name of the proper relation of *philia* with Cyrus; Tigranes, the son of the king of Armenia: he can speak to Cyrus and point out to him the proper reasoning (and he does so with rhetorical questions) because Cyrus respects him as someone educated by a wise man, whom Xenophon calls a sophist and describes in terms clearly reminiscent of Socrates, above all because of his unwarranted death sentence for alleged corruption (*Cyr.* 3.1.14–31, 37. Cf. Due 1989, 76–79).

³⁰ *Anabasis* 2.4.3. Cf. Lendle 1995, 109.

³¹ *Anab.* 2.5.10–12. Cf. Lendle 1995, 124–125. Even more, as regards Clearchus and the direct interventions of the author in *Anabasis*, the funeral elegy contained in 2.6.6 is very important.

³² *Anab.* 1.6.6–8. Cf. Lendle 1995, 51–53.

³³ On *Anabasis* as an autobiography in defence of the author/protagonist, cf. Erbse 1966, 485–505; Cawkwell 2004, 47–67; Reichel 2005, 45–73.

³⁴ *Anab.* 3.1.13–14; 3.1.17–18; 5.7.6–10.32–33; 6.5.18–20; 7.6.14–15, 20–21, 24, 27, 31–32; 7.7.10, 18, 26, 30, 33–34, 45–46, 54.

³⁵ On Chapters 6–7 of Book VII, cf. Lendle 1995, 457–476. On the culture of suspicion that runs through the narrative events in the *Anabasis* and that involves Xenophon himself, cf. Wencis 1977, 44–49.

³⁶ While these words convey the thinking of the author, it is at the same time clear that the contents of these questions are functional to the organizational and psychological stability of the army: in order to estimate how decisive this is in the problematic context and in the complex organization of the army of veterans of Cyrus'

expedition, a *polis* in movement and delicate balance, cf. Nussbaum 1959, 16–29; 1967, 162–193; Hornblower 2004, 243–263; Lee 2004, 289–317.

³⁷ The quotation, only incidentally, of the battle of Cnidus, the silence about the creation of the second Attic League, as well as about the foundation of Megalopolis, and the mention, only fleeting, of the Theban Epaminondas are only the most striking cases of a systematic selection of facts that he had to present to an ideologically oriented public. On the omissions and their functionality within the *Hellenica* of Xenophon, cf. Lévy 1990, 125–157; Riedinger 1991, 41–60.

³⁸ *Hellenica* 3.1.2.

³⁹ Plutarch, *De Glor. Ath.* 1 e = 345e. On the choice of a Sicilian author, cf. Sordi 2004.

⁴⁰ For example, as regards the integration of the men from Cyrus' expedition into the army of Thibron, cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 7.8.23–24 and Diod. 14.36.1 with *Hellenica* 3.1.4–6.

⁴¹ Cf. 3.2.1 and above all 3.2.6–7 (explicit reference to the commander of the veterans of Cyrus' expedition), 3.2.17 (Tissaphernes' refusal to fight because he remembered the quality of Cyrus' troops), 3.4.2 (the presence of Cyrus' men is the fundamental argument used by Lysander to convince Agesilaus to undertake an expedition in Asia), 3.4.20 (after the arrival of Agesilaus, Xenophon continues to underscore the presence of Cyrus' soldiers).

⁴² 3.4.5 The failure of this political position will become, for Xenophon, the explanation for the entire failure of Spartan hegemony described in the *Hellenica* beginning with 5.4: the impiety of the Spartans is the cause of their ruin because they (for greed, cf. *Lak. Pol.* 14) had violated the oaths of autonomy for the Greek cities (the speeches of Autocles and Callistratus, and above all of the Spartan Prothoos, are central).

⁴³ In Asia Xenophon recognizes in Agesilaus the embodiment of the ideal of Sparta and its exportability outside of Sparta. The portrait of Agesilaus is completed in the first chapter of Book IV: the episode of Spithridates and Otys is retold in order to emphasize how Agesilaus is worried about his friends (4.1.3–15), the meeting between Pharnabazus and Agesilaus attests to the simplicity of the Spartan king (4.1.30). These arguments are the same ones as in the elegy for Agesilaus, but in the *Hellenica* they are reported in the exact moment of their detection by Xenophon: the historian, or better the soldier, has found in Agesilaus the man who can realize Spartans' hegemony in a just and fair form towards their allies, bearer of freedom and autonomy, and in the end, the source of happiness (4.1.36).

⁴⁴ Not surprisingly, Xenophon begins to denounce the errors of Sparta beginning from Book IV, namely, from the fact that from the military point of view Xenophon no longer lives as a protagonist alongside the king or the Spartan commanders.

⁴⁵ On the use of oratorical writing in Xenophon, cf. Pontier 2001, 395–408; see also Gray 2003, 111–123; Rood 2004, 305–329. In general, on the relation between Xenophon and rhetoric, cf. Pontier 2014 and, on contacts with Isocrates concerning the use of history, Richer 2016.

⁴⁶ Interventions to explain the digressions and other narrative choices: 4.8.1; 6.1.19; 5.1; 7.2.1; 4.3; 4.1; 5.27; justification facing a probable objection by the reader or listener: 2.3.56; 5.1.4; evaluations of an episode or a person in the historical account: 5.3.7; 4.1, 2.39; 6.5.51; 7.5.8 (this category of direct intervention is present only in the

final books, in a manner clearly not casual, as they represent a more complex and differentiated interpretative line of the historian following the disappointment over the positive role of Sparta).

⁴⁷ In addition to the widespread attention given to Agesilaus, see also 4.8.22 (Diphridas); 4.8.31 (Thrasybulus); 5.2.28 (Phoebidas); 5.2.37 (Teleutias); 5.3.20 (Agesipolis); 6.1.2 (Polydamas); 6.3.3 (Callias); 6.4.32 (Jason); 7.1.23 (Lycomedes); 7.3.12 (Euphron).

⁴⁸ 4.4.2 (Corinth).

⁴⁹ 3.1.9; 3.3.1; 4.4.17; 4.5.6; 5.2.6; 5.4.24; 7.1.32.

⁵⁰ 3.1.5; 5.1.36; 5.3.27; 7.5.26.

⁵¹ 2.4.14; 6.4.8; 7.4.32; 5.12–13; 5.26.

⁵² 2.4.27; 3.4.12; 3.4.27; 4.3.19; 5.3.5; 6.4.21; 7.5.19.

⁵³ *Hellenica* 3.4.16–18. As is known, Xenophon is present at Ephesus and there personally experiences a truly exciting moment which transforms his life as well as the elaboration of his system of values in relation to the ideal of Sparta. Even in this case Xenophon leaves a clue: even in this case the historian describes the composition of the army and underlines the presence of the soldiers of Cyrus' expedition (and therefore of himself), as always decisive within the troops guided by Sparta (3.4.20). Cf. Dillery 2004, 264–267.

⁵⁴ *Hell.* 3.4.18.

⁵⁵ *Hell.* 4.4.12.

⁵⁶ *Hell.* 6.5.52.

⁵⁷ *Hell.* 7.2.16; cf. *Hell.* 7.3.1. On the role of the Phliasiens in *Hellenica*, cf. Daverio Rocchi 1991, 2004 and Pontier (this volume).

⁵⁸ *Hell.* 7.5.16. The author's judgment here is certainly also guided by his own emotion as he describes a battle in which his son died.

⁵⁹ On the strict relation between gods and war in Xenophon, cf. Sordi 2001.

⁶⁰ Sordi 1950–1951; 2005.

⁶¹ Bearzot 2004.

⁶² On the Socrates-Xenophon relation and on the Socrates of Xenophon, cf. Luccioni 1953, 128–138; Higgins 1977, 21–43; Morrison 1994, 181–208; Huss 1999, 381–410; Waterfield 2004, 79–113; Dorton 2013, as well as the extensive bibliographic review in Bevilacqua 2010, 216–234. Even the use of questions is clearly Socratic, as Xenophon himself points out in *Oec.* 19.15 in the words of Ischomachus: 'Is it not true that asking means teaching?' (See Pomeroy 1994, 336–337) and widely in the *Memorabilia* (Bevilacqua 2010, 63–92). This original feature of Socrates' teaching is confirmed, despite its comic distortion, by Aristophanes' *Clouds* (222–517; 627–812). Thus Socrates controlled and conducted the reasoning of his interlocutor where he wanted. On the non-science of Socrates and the *elenchos*, cf. Bevilacqua 2010, 63–92, 113–136, with particular reference to the Socrates of Xenophon in the *Memorabilia*; cf. also Patzer 1999, 50–76. In this Socratic use we can recognize all the variables indicated by the ancient treatises of rhetoric: the *interrogatio* (in Greek *erōtēma* or *erōtēsis*) is a question posed to confirm or reinforce the arguments put forward first and foremost in the judicial hearings of the courts; for this reason the rhetorical interrogative form preserves the purposes of judicial dialectic in every literary instance: to convince, but also to defend and to accuse, to save or to condemn; it is also a means of exasperating the person to whom the question has been put (see, in particular,

Aristot., *Rhet.* 1418, 40, 1420, 4, *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22, Quint. 9.2.6–13; Aquila 11; Martianus Capella 38.524) with positive and constructive objectives or negative and destructive ones with respect to the opinion that one intends to generate in the recipient (see Lausberg 1969, 245–246, §444–445).

⁶³ First of all, the failure of the hope of seeing *eudaimonia* realized within Sparta and above all outside it, first of all by the Lacedaemonians themselves, weighs heavily on Xenophon. On Sparta as the ideal site for this possible realization, cf. Richer 2001, 13–38.

Bibliography

- Azoulay, V.
 2004a 'The Medo-Persian ceremonial: Xenophon, Cyrus and the king's body' in C. J. Tuplin (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*, Stuttgart, 147–173.
 2004b *Xenophon et les grâces du pouvoir: de la charis au charisme*, Paris.
 Bianco, E.
 1996 'Il capitolo 14 della *Lakedaimonion Politeia* attribuita a Senofonte', *MH* 53, 12–24.
 1997 'Ifrate, rhetor kai strategos', *MGR* 21, 179–207.
 Birgalias, N.
 1999 *L'Odyssée de l'éducation spartiate*, Athens.
 Boring, T. A.
 1979 *Literary in Ancient Sparta, Mnemosyne* suppl. 54, Leiden.
 Cartledge, P.
 2001 'Literacy in the Spartan oligarchy', in id. *Spartan Reflections*, London, 39–54. Orig. pub. in *JHS* 98, 1978, 25–37.
 Cuniberti, G.
 2000 'Ἀκερδαμωνίων Πολιτεία: priorità e originalità nel dibattito sulle politeiai-modello di Sparta e Creta', *SIFC* 18, 99–111.
 2007 'Per chi scrive Senofonte? Il ruolo dei Lacedemoni nella produzione e ricezione delle opere di Senofonte', *Ktema* 32, 379–390.
 2012 'The direct participation of Xenophon in the narrated events and his historiographic evaluation. *Hellenica* III–IV, 1: the continued and overturned *Anabasis*', *Historika* 1, 61–80.
 2014 'L'utilisation des questions rhétoriques dans la stratégie historiographique de Xénophon' in P. Pontier (ed.) *Xénophon et la rhétorique*, Paris, 139–157.
 Daverio Rocchi, G.
 1991 'Le poleis megalai e mikrai come tema letterario, motivo politico e rapporto giuridico', *Acme* 44, 53–71.
 2004 'La città di Fluente nelle *Elleniche*: caso politico e modello letterario', in G. Daverio Rocchi and M. Cavalli (eds) *Il Peloponneso di Senofonte*, Milan, 41–56.
 Dorion, L.-A.
 2013 *L'autre Socrate. Études sur les écrits socratiques de Xénophon*, Paris.
 Ducat, J.
 1999 'Perspectives on Spartan education in the classical period', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds) *Sparta: New perspectives*, Swansea, 43–66.
 2006 *Spartan Education: Youth and society in the classical period*, Swansea.

- Erbse, H.
 1966 'Xenophons Anabasis', *Gymnasium* 73, 485–505.
 Gelenczey-Mihácz, A.
 2000 'Thoughts on tyranny: Xenophon's Hiero', *AntHung* 40, 113–121.
 Giraud, J.-M.
 2000 'Xénophon et l'explication de la défaite spartiate', *DHA* 26, 85–107.
 Gray, V. J.
 2003 'Interventions and citations in Xenophon, *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*', *CQ* 53, 111–123.
 Grayson, C. H.
 1975 'Did Xenophon intend to write history?', in B. Levick (ed.) *The Ancient Historian and his Materials: Essays in honour of C. E. Stevens*, Farnborough, 31–43.
 Hamilton, C. D.
 1982 'Agesilaos and the failure of Spartan hegemony', *AncW* 5, 67–78.
 Humble, N.
 2004 'The author, date and purpose of Chapter 14 of the *Lakedaimonion Politeia*', in C. J. Tuplin (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*, Stuttgart, 215–228.
 Kelly, T.
 1985 'The Spartan σκντάλη', in J. W. Eadie and J. L. Ober (eds) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in honor of Chester G. Starr*, Lanham, 141–169.
 Lefèvre, E.
 1971 'Die Frage nach dem βίος ἐνδοίων: Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos bei Xenophon', *Hermes* 99, 283–296.
 Lévy, E.
 1990 'L'art de la déformation historique dans les *Helléniques* de Xénophon', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (eds) *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BC*, Leuven, 125–157.
 2003 *Sparta: histoire politique et sociale jusqu'à la conquête romaine*, Paris.
 Lipka, M.
 2002 *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution: Introduction, text, commentary*, Berlin. Luppino Manes, E.
 1988 *Un Progetto di riforma per Sparta: La « Politeia » di Senofonte*, Milan.
 1991a 'Agesilaos re di Sparta: immagine e realtà', in M. Sordi (ed.) *L'immagine dell' homo politico: vita pubblica e morale nell'antichità*, CISA 17, Milan, 89–107.
 1991b *L'Agesilaos di Senofonte tra commiato ed encomio*, Milan.
 Martindale, C. and Thomas, R. F. (eds)
 2006 *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, Malden, MA.
 Mercalli, C.
 2002 'Tyrannus philopolis in Xen. Hier. V 3', *Latinitas* 50, 207–209.
 Meulder, M.
 1989 'La date et la cohérence de la République des Lacedémoniens de Xénophon', *AC* 58, 71–87.
 Millender, E.
 2001 'Spartan literacy revisited', *CLAnt* 20, 121–164.
 Mossay, J.
 1974 'Humanisme et centres d'intérêt majeurs dans Xénophon', *L'EC* 42, 345–361.

- Nadon, C.
2001 *Xenophon's Prince. Republic and Empire in the Cyropaedia*, Berkeley.
- Plácido, D.
1989 'Economía y sociedad, polis y basileia: los fundamentos de la reflexión historiográfica de Jenofonte', *Habis* 20, 135–153.
- Pomeroy, S. B.
2002 *Spartan Women*, Oxford.
- Pontier, P.
2001 'Place et fonction du discours dans l'oeuvre de Xénophon', *REA* 103, 395–408.
- Pontier, P. (ed.)
2014 *Xénophon et la rhétorique*, Paris.
- Powell, A.
2001 *Athens and Sparta: Constructing Greek political and social history from 478 BC*, 2nd ed., London.
- Proietti, G.
1987 *Xenophon's Sparta: An introduction*, Leiden.
- Redondo, J.
1990–1992 'L'art retòrica de Xenofont i la composició de l'Agesilau', *Itaca* 6–8, 83–114.
- Reichel, M.
2005 'Ist Xenophons *Anabasis* eine Autobiographie?', in M. Reichel (ed) *Antike Autobiographien: Werke, Epochen, Gattungen*, Cologne, 45–73.
- Richer, N.
1998 *Les Éphores: études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte (VIIIe-IIIe siècle avant Jésus Christ)*, Paris.
- 2001 'Eunomia et eudaimonia à Sparte', *Dike* 4, 13–38.
- 2016 'Isocrate et Sparte: un parcours', *Ktema* 41, 59–86.
- Riedinger, J.-C.
1991 *Étude sur les Helléniques: Xénophon et l'histoire*, Paris.
- Ríos Fernández, M.
1984 'Los silencios de Jenofonte en el Agesilao de Plutarco', *Habis* 15, 41–70.
- Rood, T.
2004 'Panhellenism and self-presentation: Xenophon's speeches', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven, 47–67.
- Sevieri, R.
2004 'The imperfect hero: Xenophon's Hiero as the (self-)taming of the tyrant', in C. J. Tuplin (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*, Stuttgart, 277–288.
- Sordi M.
1950–1951 'I caratteri dell'opera storiografica di Senofonte nelle *Elleniche*', *Athenaeum* 28, 3–53 and 29, 273–348.
- 2001 'Religione e guerra nel pensiero di Senofonte', in ead. (ed.) *Il pensiero sulla guerra nel mondo antico*, Milan, 37–43.
- 2004 'Senofonte e la Sicilia', in C. J. Tuplin (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*, Stuttgart, 71–8.
- 2005 'Senofonte e la democrazia', in U. Bultrighini (ed.), *Democrazia e antidemocrazia nel mondo greco*, Alessandria, 305–14.
- Stenger, J.
2004 'Agesilaos als Heros (Xen. *Ag.* 11, 16)', *RhM* 147, 421–424.
- Tuplin, C. J.
1977 'Xenophon a didactic historian?', *PCA* 74, 26–27.
1990 'Persian decor in *Cyropaedia*: some observations', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J. W. Drijvers (eds) *Achaemenid History* vol. 5, Leiden, 17–29.
1994 'Xenophon, Sparta, and the *Cyropaedia*', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, Swansea and London, 127–181.
- Wencis, L.
1977 'Hypopsia and the structure of Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *CJ* 73, 44–49.
- Woronoff, M.
1993 'L'autorité personnelle chez Xénophon', *Ktema* 18, 41–48.