

GIANLUCA CUNIBERTI

The Direct Participation of Xenophon
in the Narrated Events and His Historiographic Evaluation.
Hellenica III-IV, 1: the Continued and Overturned *Anabasis*

On a first reading of the *Hellenica*, the typical discontinuity of the narration about the scenery of the described events immediately strikes us. Athens, Asia and the Peloponnese follow one another, leaving the impression of a failure of understanding the simultaneity of the events in different places; on the contrary, the reader is led by the director-historiographer, who looks now here now there with his camera. But, which is the criterion that guides this selection?

Trying to answer this question, I follow the interpretative way that links the narrative choices of Xenophon to the direct presence of the historiographer in the places where the narrated events occur¹. Particularly centring on the whole of book III and the first chapter of book IV of the *Hellenica*, I suggest a reading aimed to underline in a new view the connection of these books with the *Anabasis* – thus attempting to revise those interpretations that highlight their continuity² –, in order to stress factors of discontinuity, which clearly emerge by analyzing the relationship between production and reception inside the Xenophontean historiographical work.

¹ Cf. SORDI 1988, 32-40.

² Cf. DE SANCTIS 1932; SORDI 1950-1951; RIEDINGER 1991, 61-65, 72-79; DILLERY 1995, 101-119. About specific linguistic questions in *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*, cf. BUIJS 2005; GOODALL 1976.

First of all, I take the starting-point from my recent notes³, in which I try to show the strategies carried out by Xenophon to control the reception of his own works by the readers/listeners. As I have already written, in the *Hel-lenica* the historiographer shows himself, with some very evident proofs, to be aware that the reception of his works is a meaningful moment for the transmission of the contents and for the achievement of his aims; in brief, he remembers very well that the author, underestimating the moment of the reception of the literary works, can frustrate by himself the efforts of writing⁴.

Consequently, the starting point of this research coincides with the questions I put to myself in the previous paper already quoted: for whom did Xenophon write? Who was the receiver of his works? With the answers given in that occasion, I firstly tried to verify if Xenophon poses to himself the problem of the reception and of the public, and then if he is in any way aware of it.

To sum up, I tried to show how far Xenophon proves his own ability of managing all those crucial moments of the processes of genesis and fruition of a literary work, including the reception, i.e. the moment that the reader realizes in absence of the author but not independently from him.

To better direct these questions, I proposed to think about the Lacedaemonians not only as the leading characters but also as the possible receivers of the work itself. I started with a remark which points out the specific nature of the case we are treating: looking at a question which can be vital for every writer and every literary work, I think it is possible that the aim of the research can become very interesting exactly in relation to Xenophon.

Even if his biography presents some chronological uncertainties, we know that the author we are dealing with wrote essentially in Sparta (in a small part), Skillous (in a great part) and Corinth, but it is unlikely in Athens⁵: in fact he left only to his sons the task of consolidating the relationship with the fatherland, the same relation which is irreparably compromised for him, even beyond the condemnation into exile, finally revoked. This condition is specific for the writer Xenophon and determines a meaningful split

³ CUNIBERTI 2007; 2012 (forthcoming).

⁴ The meaning of the reception time has even greater value in relation to the mostly didactic purpose which the work by Xenophon often assumes: cf. MOSSAY 1974; GRAYSON 1975; TUPLIN 1977.

⁵ Cf. BADIAN 2004.

between place of writing, setting and destination of his work: in a word, I believe that Xenophon well symbolizes the early overcoming of the *polis* as close and self-referring literary background. Obviously I do not mean that till then the literary works did not move out of the *polis* where they had been written, but surely the authors – most of all the Athenian ones – faced them, as reader (or listener), first of all their fellow citizens, that represented the first reference public. Certainly it was not the same for Xenophon.

After an analysis of the *Lakedaimonion Politeia* and the *Agésilaios*, I expressed an interpretative proposal: the Xenophontean works could have been written on two levels, for two different receivers which are simultaneously meant, but distinctly managed, the Spartans and the Greeks, perhaps not all the Greeks, but only, or principally, those who are friends of Sparta each time. As to this second and general receiver, I think that a reflection is evident: Xenophon looks upon the ample public as subordinate to a specific referent, which can change in the different works on the basis of a literary choice, always addressed to a dual public.

Xenophon intended to propose an essentially different message to the two categories of public, because the Spartan exceptionality, ascribed traditionally to Lycurgus, would have had to offer only to the Spartans the unique opportunity to realize the *eudaimonia*⁶, an ideal discovered by the young Xenophon in the association with Socrates; for this reason, he pervaded with this ideal the works originating from it and he made it the leading value to investigate the forms of government, even the extreme ones, as in the *Hiero*⁷. But above all Xenophon identified in Sparta, as in the Agesilaus' actions (unfortunately lonely and individual, never collective), the frustrated possibility of realizing the *eudaimonia*, that very *eudaimonia* sung by Alkman⁸ and peculiar to the sapiential tradition, of which Lykourgos was one of the most progressive and innovative protagonists.

Only they, the Spartans, if they had listened to Agesilaus, if they had followed Lykourgos' laws, would have been able to take their city to the *eu-*

⁶ On the theme of happiness cf. *Lak. Pol.* 1, 1; 9, 4; *Agés.* 7, 3; 11, 8-9. In general on the *eudaimonia*, with reference to Xenophon and respectively to Sparta, cf. LEFÈVRE 1971; RICHER 2001.

⁷ Cf. PLÁCIDO 1989; WORONOFF 1993; GELENCZEY-MIHÁLCZ 2000; MERCALLI 2002; SEVIERI 2004.

⁸ Fr. 5 Page.

daimonia; only they would have been able to do it, if they had heeded the advice, also that of Xenophon. On the contrary, they behaved exactly as Isocrates had described them⁹: satisfied with the literary celebration of exploits and battles, and deaf to any informed and wise reflections. In this way, probably, the historiographer knew the impossibility of communication and the futility of writing and history when they remain ineffective, misunderstood and unheard.

A) The *Hellenica*

With reference to this, and thinking about the role of historiography regarding the possibility of the historiographer of making his mark on today's world, the *Hellenica* provide us with important data to be analysed¹⁰.

From the same point of view we could read all the so-called pro-Lacedaemonian attitude of the *Hellenica*, that evidently cannot answer just to the instinctive partiality of the writer; instead it bases itself on the possibility of guiding the reader-listener not only through a careful selection of the events, but also through an expert use of the rhetorical instruments. With this strategy, Xenophon works out a narrative *iter* that legitimates the Spartan hegemony, exalts its supremacy and finally explains its failure determining responsibilities also inside Sparta itself¹¹. The incidentally mention of the battle of Knidos, the silence about the creation of the second Attic league, and about the foundation of Megalopolis, the limited mention of the Theban Epaminondas are only the most meaningful cases of a systematic selection of the events addressed to an ideologically oriented public¹².

As it is shown by the fictitious attribution to Themistogenes the Syracusan¹³ of the *Anabasis*, the selection of the events is not the only way which

⁹ Isocr. *Panath.* 208-209; 250-252.

¹⁰ For the detailed analysis of the passages quoted here, cf. CUNIBERTI 2012 (forthcoming).

¹¹ Cf. HAMILTON 1982; GIRAUD 2000.

¹² With regard to the omissions and their function within the Xenophontean *Hellenica*, cf. RIEDINGER 1991, 41-60. See also LÉVY 1990, 125-157.

¹³ See Xen. *Hell.* III, 1, 2 (cf. III, 2, 7); Plut. *De Glor. Ath.* 345e: these passages will be analysed later. Xenophon could have advertised the *Anabasis* with a pseudonym,

Xenophon uses to shape the opinion of his public about the told facts; in fact the *Hellenica* provide us with an excellent synthesis of the different narrative manners used by the historiographer, that correspond to the various constituent parts of this historical work.

Coming to a detailed analysis, we can divide the author's interventions with respect to the public, or the receiver, into three categories – rhetorical questions, direct and indirect interventions of the author. All the categories lie over a narrative level in the background, which can be defined as an informative narration: with this primary level, Xenophon meant to present an objective historical chronicle, a sober sequence of facts; in fact, it was exactly among these facts that he disseminated those rhetorical instruments which aim to give a controlled reception of the historical work.

a) *The rhetorical questions*

Consistently with what we have examined in the quoted paper about the *Agesilaus* and the *Lakedaimonion Politeia*, even in the *Hellenica* the author speaks through the formulation of rhetorical questions, which anticipate objections or reflections of the reader.

In particular, five meaningful cases can be determined¹⁴: making a synthesis by the interrogative form, these five interventions of the author briefly refer to the three key issues (that I will highlight later in this essay): 1) the potential excellence of Sparta – which spreads, in part and in the final phase, over the “small cities” opposing Thebes; 2) the attribution of a “historical” role to the fate and to the gods; 3) the evaluation of the strategic choices of the various commanders and armies. In the same way, the presence and distribution inside the historical work of these interrogative forms is meaningful: while they are absent in the first two books, Xenophon uses them in

Themistogenes the Syracusan: in fact he knows that revealing himself to be the author of the work would compromise the credibility of the work itself and of his role as the protagonist of the most crucial stages of the expedition. With regard to the autobiographical characteristics of the *Anabasis*, especially in view of the defence of its author, cf. ERBSE 1966; REICHEL 2005. About the culture of suspicion that, very significantly, runs throughout the whole work ending by involving the same Xenophon, see WENCIS 1993.

¹⁴ III, 4, 18; IV, 4, 12; VI, 5, 52; VII, 2, 16 (cf. VII, 3, 1); VII, 5, 16.

books III-IV and VI-VII to express some points of his political thought, that cannot be renounced, in specific narrative moments¹⁵.

b) *The direct and personal intervention of the author*

The personal intervention of the author can be divided on the basis of three different functions, all aimed to provide explanations to the reader: first, the connection of sentences while he makes a digression and the explanation of the narrative choices¹⁶; then, the justification of a likely coming objection of the reader¹⁷; at last, the evaluation about an episode, or a character, in the historical narrative. With regard to this last function, especially in the second half of the *Hellenica*, the author intervenes in person to express, certainly not in an accidental way, his evaluation about specific facts or figures¹⁸.

c) *The indirect intervention of the author*

Other pieces can be placed next to those quoted above: albeit in an indirect way, in these passages the point of view of the author is surely expressed. I am referring to those expressions, often peremptory, which qualify: historical characters¹⁹; situations²⁰; historical stages with reference to

¹⁵ As it is obvious in the rhetoric praxis, the use of questions is widely present in the speeches proposed within the historical narrative: I, 7, 25-26. 31; II, 3, 22. 31. 33-34. 43-44. 46-47. 56; 4, 20. 40-41; III, 1, 11; 5, 10-14; IV, 8, 5. 14; V, 1, 17; 2, 16. 18. 33; VI, 1, 7. 11. 13; 3, 5-6. 8. 12-15; 4, 23; 5, 37. 42-43. 47; VII, 1, 7. 11-14; 3, 6-11; 4, 25. 40; 5, 2. Cf. also III, 1, 25-26. 28; 3, 2; 3, 5-6; IV, 1, 4-13. 36-37; 3, 2 (simple interrogative function within dialogues).

¹⁶ IV, 8, 1; VI, 1, 19; 5, 1 (cf. VI, 4, 37); VII, 2, 1; 3, 4; 4, 1; 5, 27.

¹⁷ II, 3 56; V, 1, 4.

¹⁸ V, 3, 7; 4, 1; VI, 2, 39; 5, 51; VII, 5, 8. 19.

¹⁹ IV, 8, 22 (Diphridas); IV, 8, 31 (Thrasylbulos); V, 2, 28 (Phoebidas); V, 2, 37 (Teleutias); V, 3, 20 (Agesipolis); VI, 1, 2 (Polydamas); VI, 3, 3 (Kallias); VI, 4, 32 (Jason); VII, 1, 23 (Lycomedes); VII, 3, 12 (Euphron), besides a widespread attention to Agesilaus: cf., for example, V, 4, 13. Remember also the close correspondence traceable in the *Hellenica* about the qualities of the king highlighted in the *Agesilaos*: religious practice (sacrifices) III, 4, 3. 15. 23; IV, 5, 2. 10; 6, 10; V, 4, 47. 49; VI, 5, 12. 17. 18; friends III, 4, 9. 24; IV, 1, 10. 40; simplicity of life III, 4, 8; IV, 1, 30. 35-36.

²⁰ III, 1, 9; 3, 1; IV, 4, 2. 17; 5, 6; V, 2, 6; 4, 24; VII, 1, 32.

Sparta²¹; the role of the fate and of the gods in the history²²; military strategies²³.

Analysing these data, it is immediately evident that, beyond one significant exception (regarding Theramenes), no passages are catalogued from the early two books, where Xenophon at first entrusts only the speeches with the function of commentary of the facts, offering interpretations he puts into the mouth of the various characters. Soon, nevertheless, the author supports this “classic” form of historical narrative by other tools that made his intervention more direct and especially explicit, while orienting the reception of the exposed contents²⁴.

If we look closely at the classified passages, at once we can note that Xenophon explicitly admits his intentional selection of the narrated facts (IV, 8,1); we can also clearly identify the public which the author constantly thinks about in the elaboration of the historical narration, and in this case too we can assume a dual public.

Sparta is evidently the centre of attention: not only the exceptional and exemplary nature of Sparta (III, 4, 18; Agesilaus as a whole, but especially in books III and IV; III, 1, 5; IV, 5, 6; V, 1, 4. 36; 2, 6; 3, 27; VII, 1, 32), but also the mistakes, which could teach Sparta a lesson (III, 3, 1; IV, 4, 17; V, 3, 7; 4, 1. 24), are the foundations of Xenophontean interventions. Referring to a Lacedaemonian audience, the author feels the need to explain his narrative choices, a necessity that increases as the telling proceeds. Thus the interventions become more intense when the narration unavoidably withdraws from Sparta to make room for other interests of the author (Iphikrates, VI, 2, 39; 5, 51-52²⁵; Phliasians, VII, 2, 1. 16²⁶; *Thessalika*, VI, 1, 19; 5, 1; Euphron of Sikyon, VII, 3, 4; 4, 1): it's not surprising that these interests coin-

²¹ III, 1, 5; V, 1, 36; 3, 27; VII, 5, 26.

²² II, 4, 14 (θεοί); VI, 4, 8 (τύχη); VII, 4, 32 (θεός); 5, 12-13 (θεῖον); 5, 26 (θεός).

²³ II, 4, 27; III, 4, 12. 27; IV, 3, 19; V, 3, 5; VI, 4, 21. Cf. SORDI 2001, 37-43.

²⁴ In the following books the speeches remain in the narrative structure: however, in this case, they are often anticipated by explicit judgments about people who pronounce them. Cf. VI, 1, 2 (Polydamas); 3, 3 (Kallias); VII, 1, 23-24 (Lykomedes).

²⁵ About Iphicrates, cf. BIANCO 1997.

²⁶ About the role of the Phliasians in the *Hellenica*, cf. DAVERIO ROCCHI 1991, 2004.

cide with the last two books and are sometimes personal, but more often they are specified in constant reference to Sparta (for example, when the author mentions the absolute loyalty of the Phliasians to Sparta or the Spartan consideration for Euphron²⁷).

As a matter of fact, from the end of Book IV a negative evaluation of Sparta matures: it may be represented briefly in the failure of Sparta to establish relations between the greatest achieved power and the collaboration with the allies, who are, on the contrary, even despised. Formulating this judgement, Xenophon indicates the identity of the wider public he addresses, nearer to author's thinking, and which looks like him; a public which is Peloponnesian (as he was by adoption), friend of Sparta, *micros* but longing for autonomy, endangered in front of the voracious hunger for conquest by the most powerful *poleis*. Disappointed by Sparta and being sure of the irrecoverable situation, Xenophon directs his writing to other protagonists: he seems to experience a historical chronicle where the reader would not find at once Sparta and, in the reception, would not consequently make the identification between Greek and Spartan history. So the very gods too, after having favoured Sparta, now punish it and also Thebes (II, 4, 14; IV, 4, 12; V, 4, 1; VI, 4, 8; VII, 4, 32; 5, 12-13. 26); the interest of the narration becomes only strategic and military, according to a point of view evident from the first books (see VII, 5, 8. 16). Soon, however, after Mantinea, nothing more is worth being told, because there is nothing interesting to receive and understand; only *akrisia* and *taraché* could be narrated, but they too could not become constructive in the reception of the public. For this reason Xenophon himself thinks the narration should conclude there.

B) Book III: the narrative turn

Within the described evolution, I believe that the second section (III-IV, 1) of the *Hellenica* has a particular meaning, whereas Xenophon exactly begins the history he wants first of all to narrate: the first two books have been required to give account of what happened in Athens (on the one hand to complete the history by Thucydides, on the other also to implicitly explain the author's political choices), but now he needs to change the place and

²⁷ VII, 1, 44.

time to start a new narration. He finds the connection between the first and second sections by the event of Cyrus and the expedition of the 10,000, i.e. in the most extraordinary event of his own life.

III, 1 [1] ... *So ended the civil strife at Athens. Shortly after this Cyrus sent messengers to Lacedaemon ...* [2] *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*²⁸.

The break point is clear: Xenophon omits almost two years, and very quickly summarizes the expedition and death of Cyrus, and the return of the army; finally he justifies this synthesis with the statement: *all this has been written by Themistogenes the Syracusan*. I have already reported about this attribution to Themistogenes the Syracusan of the *Anabasis*²⁹. As follows Plutarch explains it in the *De gloria Atheniensium* (1 e = 345 c):

Xenophon, to be sure, became his own history by writing of his generalship and his successes and recording that it was Themistogenes the Syracusan who had compiled an account of them, his purpose being to win greater credence for his narrative by referring to himself in the third person, thus favouring another with the glory of the authorship.

Now, why is Xenophon concerned to attribute the *Anabasis* to Themistogenes exactly in this passage of the *Hellenica*? I think he does it not only to give objectivity to the narration of the *Anabasis*: it is a decisive choice in order not to weaken this section of the historical work, which could be considered biographical or autobiographical by the reader, like the *Anabasis*³⁰. If the *Anabasis* exalts the presence of the historiographer, the *Hellenica* don't mention him at all: here he seems to tell us that only different authors can

²⁸ The translations are based on the editions available in *Perseus Digital Library* (www.perseus.tufts.edu).

²⁹ Cf. KRENTZ 1995, 157. About Xenophon-Themistogenes and the Sicily cf. SORDI 2004, 71-78.

³⁰ About biography and autobiography in Xenophon, cf. MOMIGLIANO 1974, 49-60.

make such different narrative choices, and that he excludes himself to write an objective historical work and not an autobiography.

In my opinion, the interpretation is clear by comparing the three witnesses about the supplement of the men of Cyrus' expedition, *hoi anabates meta Kyrou*³¹, in the army of Thibron:

a) Xenophon *Anabasis* VII, 8, 23-24

[23] *After that they came back again to Pergamus. And there Xenophon paid his greeting to the god; for the Laconians, the captains, the other generals, and the soldiers joined in arranging matters so that he got the pick of horses and teams of oxen and all the rest; the result was, that he was now able even to do a kindness to another.* [24] *Meanwhile Thibron arrived and took over the army, and uniting it with the rest of his Greek forces, proceeded to wage war upon Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus.*

First of all, Xenophon describes as his important role has been officially recognized; then, with a quick simplification, the author recalls the union of the armies for the war against Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus.

b) Diodorus XIV, 36-37

36 [1] *The Lacedaemonians appointed Thibron commander of the war against the King ...* 37 [1] *At this same time a group of the soldiers who had served in the campaign with Cyrus and had got back safe to Greece went off each to his own country, but the larger part of them, about five thousand in number, since they had become accustomed to the life of a soldier, chose Xenophon for their general.* [2] *And Xenophon with this army set out to make war on the Thracians who dwell around Salmydessus ...* [4] *After this, when Thibron sent for the soldiers with the promise to hire them, they withdrew to join him and made war with the Lacedaemonians against the Persians.*

Also in Diodorus (who quotes Ephorus, perhaps Sophocles' *Anabasis*), command and merits of Xenophon are the keys to the integration of the armed forces under Thibron's orders.

³¹ *Hell.* III, 1, 6.

c) Xenophon *Hellenica* III, 1

... [3] ... [*Tissaphernes*] straightway demanded that all the Ionian cities should be subject to him. But they, both because they wanted to be free and because they feared *Tissaphernes*, inasmuch as they had chosen *Cyrus*, while he was living, instead of him, refused to admit him into their cities and sent ambassadors to *Lacedaemon* asking that the *Lacedaemonians*, since they were the leaders of all *Hellas*, should undertake to protect them also, the Greeks in *Asia*, in order that their land might not be laid waste and that they themselves might be free. [4] Accordingly, the *Lacedaemonians* sent them *Thibron* as governor, giving him an army made up of a thousand emancipated *Helots* and four thousand of the other *Peloponnesians* ... [6] When, however, the men who had made the march up country with *Cyrus* joined forces with him after their safe return, from that time on he would draw up his troops against *Tissaphernes* even on the plains, and he got possession of cities ...

Just in *Hellenica* the figure of Xenophon is completely absent, while, according to other sources, he is a leading character of the narrated events. Besides, exactly the *Hellenica* also show the link between *Cyrus*' expedition and the events after 401, that has a double reason: first of all the Greek *poles* of *Asia* ask *Sparta* for help, because they are divided between the desire to be free and the fear of *Tissaphernes*, to whom they have preferred *Cyrus*; secondly, *Thibron* confronts in the open field *Tissaphernes*, achieving victories and conquests, only when he joins his troops with the men of *Cyrus*' army who had managed to save themselves. Therefore, *Cyrus*' expedition explains both the demand for intervention which leads to sending *Thibron* and the only successes of *Thibron*, who necessarily needed the contribution of the survived men of the *Cyrus*' expedition, amid which there was *Xenophon*.

Chapter 1 of book III attests also two key factors in understanding the *Xenophontean* point of view. On the one hand, concerning the ease of gathering troops from the Greek cities, the historian says that *for at that time all the cities obeyed any command a Lacedaemonian might give*. On the other hand, however, *Xenophon* reports that, when he's replaced by *Dercylidas*, *Thibron was condemned and banished: for the allies accused him of allowing his soldiers to plunder their friends*. The historian comments: *and from the outset he [Dercylidas] was so superior to Thibron in the exercise of command that he led his troops through the country of friends all the way to the Aeolis, in the territory of Pharnabazus, without doing any harm whatever to his allies*.

Only on the basis of this first example, the absence of Xenophon in the *Hellenica* clearly cannot hide that the whole selection of the narrated events is based on the presence of Xenophon to that very events (in this way, it would be possible to explain the fundamental differences between this section of Xenophon's *Hellenica* and the *Oxyrinchia Hellenica*). In fact here, Xenophon – the writer but also the leader of the soldiers who fought in Cyrus' expedition – reveals his approval for the changeover in the supreme command of the army: the freedom, later described specifically as autonomy, of the Greek *poleis* and the protection of the allies are the essential points of his political program for the realization of Spartan hegemony.

Altogether, throughout the third book two narrative elements constantly emerge; they both refer to Xenophon's experience and his political thought: first the helpful contribution of the men of Cyrus' expedition, and therefore of Xenophon too, to the Spartan initiatives in Asia; secondly the realization of a positive hegemonic function of Sparta to foster freedom and protection of the allies, function that only afterwards would be betrayed by the Lacedaemonians themselves.

In the following chapters (III 1, 10-28) the narration continues with the episode, in Aeolis, of the killing of Mania by her son-in-law, Midia: Xenophon describes in detail this event. The intervention by Dercylidas restores a state of law, violated by Midia, and Dercylidas himself becomes, under the military victory, the legitimate owner of everything managed by Mania on behalf of Pharnabazus, so the army can be rewarded: nothing is due to Midia. The Lacedaemonian intervention is certainly desired, or even recommended, by Xenophon, and it allows Dercylidas not to be a burden for the allies and to prevent the plunder of the Greek cities by Pharnabazus. Xenophon punctually notes this advantage:

III, 2 [1] *After Dercylidas had accomplished these things and gained possession of nine cities in eight days, he set about planning how he might avoid being a burden to his allies, as Thibron had been, by wintering in a friendly country, and how, on the other hand, Pharnabazus might not, despising the Lacedaemonian army because of his superiority in cavalry, harm the Greek cities.*

The following event concerns the terrible assault of the Bithynians on the camp of the Odrysians sent by Seuthes, well-known to Xenophon (see *Anabasis* VII, 2, 32-34). The point of view of the narration clearly belongs to the Greeks who have been informed of the event: in this way the historian

indicates the source of his information and also his attention to the Thracian population he had previously met and that now was allied.

The theme of loyalty with the allies comes back on the occasion of the confirmation of Dercylidas as commander for the year 398:

III, 2 [6] *At the opening of the spring Dercylidas departed from Bithynia and came to Lampsacus. While he was there, Aracus, Naubates, and Antisthenes arrived under commission of the authorities at home. They came to observe how matters stood in general in Asia, and to tell Dercylidas to remain there and continue in command for the ensuing year; also to tell him that the ephors had given them instructions to call together the soldiers and say that while the ephors censured them for what they had done in former days, they commended them because now they were doing no wrong; they were also to say in regard to the future that if the soldiers were guilty of wrong-doing the ephors would not tolerate it, but if they dealt justly by the allies they would commend them. [7] When, however, they called together the soldiers and told them these things, the leader of Cyrus' former troops replied: "But, men of Lacedaemon, we are the same men now as we were last year; but our commander now is one man, and in the past was another. Therefore you are at once able to judge for yourselves the reason why we are not at fault now, although we were then."*

As it is immediately obvious, the passage is of fundamental importance: the previous disloyal behaviour is totally due to Thibron; the soldiers are always the same, the one who has changed is the commander. For our analysis one fact is crucial: the leader of the veterans of Cyrus' expedition, and thus, probably, Xenophon himself, says these things, thereby confirming the central idea of his military and political project.

Moreover, the presence of Xenophon could be the input of the expedition that Dercylidas undertakes in Thrace, after he has ensured the peace to the *poleis* (III, 2, 9): Xenophon's help is crucial for Dercylidas, satisfying the solicitation that the Lacedaemonian ambassadors had privately expressed (III, 2, 8)³².

³² Cf. WATERFIELD 2006, 169-180; in general about the campaigns of Dercylidas, cf. DELEBECQUE 1957, 132-138; GRAY 1989, 29-35.

On returning to Asia, the situation becomes difficult for Dercylidas: Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus join their forces. In view of the fight, the not-Peloponnesian part of Dercylidas army has no intention to resist the possible battle: the expression used by Xenophon reveals the *autoptikon* knowledge of the writer (δηλοὶ ἦσαν οὐ μενοῦντες). Fortunately for Dercylidas, a truce is reached because Tissaphernes remembers the value of the troops of Cyrus, he believes it is characteristic of all the Greeks and for this reason he doesn't want to fight (III, 2, 17).

After these events, Xenophon uses Thucydides' links (τούτων προτομένων III, 2, 21; μετὰ ταῦτα III, 4, 1) to change the setting: the aim is to describe the war between Eleans and Lacedaemonians (III, 2, 21-31), and subsequently the death of Agis, the choice of Agesilaus as a king and the conspiracy of Cinadon. These episodes serve not only to complete the historical description and to explain the subsequent changes in the Asian front: the events in Elis and the new king Agesilaus are crucial for Xenophon and the following occurrences of his life. After the Peloponnesian parenthesis, Xenophon begins again the narration of the Asian events with a new reference to Cyrus' expedition: the presence of those men is a fundamental reason given by Lysander to persuade Agesilaus to undertake a new expedition in Asia.

III, 4 [2] *Lysander, thinking that the Greeks would be far superior on the sea, and reflecting that the land force which went up country with Cyrus had returned safely, persuaded Agesilaus to promise, in case the Lacedaemonians would give him thirty Spartiatae, two thousand emancipated Helots, and a contingent of six thousand of the allies, to make an expedition to Asia.*

However, as to Lysander and Agesilaus, Xenophon immediately underlines their different intentions (III, 4, 2-5): *[Lysander] wanted to make the expedition with Agesilaus on his own account also, in order that with the aid of Agesilaus he might re-establish the decarchies which had been set up by him in the cities, but had been overthrown through the ephors, who had issued a proclamation restoring to the cities their ancient form of government;* on the contrary, when Tissaphernes asked Agesilaus what purpose urged him, the Lacedaemonian king answered: *“That the cities in Asia shall be independent (autonomous), as are those in our part of Greece”*. This sentence immediately announces the full sharing of aims by Agesilaus and Xenophon.

Against the background of this contrast, Xenophon describes the confusion in the political situation of the *poleis* (III, 4, 7): Agesilaus puts Lysander

on one side and finally sends him to the Hellespont where Lysander gains the alliance with Spithridates (III, 4, 10).

In the subsequent facts, Xenophon shows the determination of Agesilaus and the effectiveness of his actions. In this respect, the most meaningful page describes the troops that are gathered at Ephesus in the spring of 395³³:

III, 4 [16] *After this, when spring was just coming on, he gathered his whole army at Ephesus; and desiring to train the army, he offered prizes ... [17] In fact, he made the entire city, where he was staying, a sight worth seeing; for the market was full of all sorts of horses and weapons, offered for sale, and the copper-workers, carpenters, smiths, leather-cutters, and painters were all engaged in making martial weapons, so that one might have thought that the city was really a workshop of war. [18] And one would have been encouraged at another sight also – Agesilaus in the van, and after him the rest of the soldiers, returning garlanded from the gymnasia and dedicating their garlands to Artemis. For where men reverence 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?*

This page narrates all the excitement of Xenophon, who was present at Ephesus: the Athenian, who grew up with Socrates but had been personally transformed by the experience in Asia, recognizes Agesilaus as the realization of the Spartan myth. Not by chance, when Xenophon proceeds to outline the composition of the army and the command positions in the new year, he emphasises the presence of the soldiers of Cyrus' expedition and points out that the command – the most important matter in Xenophon's opinion – is taken by Herippidas, the leader of the new group of thirty Spartiatae coming from Sparta to replace those of the previous year (III, 4, 20).

After an entire chapter about the events in Greece, in the first chapter of book IV Xenophon, according to his personal knowledge, completes to outline the figure of Agesilaus: the entire Spithridate and Otys episode (and also the wedding of Spithridates' daughter and Otys on the will of Agesilaus) is narrated to underline the care of Agesilaus for his friends (IV, 1, 3-15)³⁴; the

³³ Cf. DILLERY 2004, 264-267.

³⁴ See *Ages.* 1, 18. 32. 34; 2, 23. 31; 3, 2; 6, 5. 8; 11, 3. 15. Cf. AZOULAY 2004, 305-310, 340-342.

meeting and the speeches between Pharnabazus and Agesilaus are marked by the topic of freedom and show the difficulty of Pharnabazus in front of the simplicity of life of the Lacedaemonian king (IV, 1, 30).

These motivations are the same as those in Agesilaus' praise³⁵, that in the *Hellenica* are indeed underlined when Xenophon identifies them in Agesilaus. The historian, or better the soldier, has found in the Lacedaemonian king the man who can realize a lawful and faithful hegemony of Sparta towards the allies (including the Asian *poleis*): so Agesilaus' Sparta can reach freedom, *autonomia* and, in the end, *eudaimonia* (IV, 1, 36: dialogue between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus)³⁶.

But this agreement is broken by the forced return of Agesilaus to Greece: among his followers, Xenophon returns as well. After a last painful military action against other Greeks, Xenophon finds in Scillus a happy place of residence, from where watching (and writing about) the mistakes of the Lacedaemonian hegemony. Actually, it's not accident that Xenophon, with direct intervention in the narration, begins to report these mistakes from book IV onwards, i.e. from those events that he doesn't experience anymore as a protagonist beside the king or the Lacedaemonian commanders.

In this perspective, I think I can bring out the relationship between the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis*. Xenophon has needs that cannot be ignored: the overturning of the *Anabasis* point of view as well as the suggestion of an inverted narration of the Asian events. In this way the author begins book III ascribing the fatherhood of the *Anabasis* to a third person, going on showing not only a detailed knowledge, but also a specific care to keep the narration away from himself and his presence in Asia. Xenophon thus shows this awareness: he has to separate the narration from the proof of one's direct participation in the facts; this is the only valid method for his work to be received as objective, authentically historical and not autobiographical. For this reason the protagonist of the *Anabasis* has to deny he coincides with the author, while the author of the *Hellenica* asserts his role, hiding his direct presence in the narrated events.

³⁵ About the correspondence with *Lakedaimonion Politeia* and *Agesilaos*, cf. RIOS FERNÁNDEZ 1984; LUPPINO MANES 1991a; 1991b, 9-36; STENGER 2004.

³⁶ With regard to Agesilaus in Asia, cf. DELEBECQUE 1957, 136-145; GRAY 1989, 46-58.

In the end we can better understand this narrative choice adding a further note. We have seen Xenophon keeps separate the *Anabasis* and the *Hellenica* and, again in the *Hellenica*, he omits his own presence in the narrated events. This choice has to be evaluated together with the identification, in section III-IV, 1, of the strongest feeling between Xenophon and Sparta: Xenophon dreams of an integrated hegemony of Sparta and the Greek allies that would reproduce the agreement originated from the coalition of the armies under the command of Dercylidas first, then of Agesilaus; Xenophon dreams that what has been experienced in Ephesus could spread to Greece, with some participation of the allies in the Lycurgus social model too. Also for this reason, Xenophon cannot explicitly personalize a narration that he suggests as a paradigmatic and exemplary one for his own reader.

But, in order to point out the excellence of the historical experience he has matured in Asia, Xenophon needs to narrate those events as an historian and not as a protagonist of that army. As a matter of fact the historian needs to keep the listener/reader from this thought: isn't the historical excellence written by Xenophon primarily due to the fact that this is his own historical experience? Isn't the very excellence of Agesilaus due mainly to the presence beside him of all those who lived the extraordinary experience of the expedition of the 10.000 and, in the first place, of Xenophon?

Certainly, with the inclusion in the *Hellenica* of the examined section, presumably near to the time of writing of the *Agesilaus*, Xenophon establishes a rhetorical play with his public, which for the most part knows his biography and works. The aim is clear: Xenophon affirms the objectivity and the truthfulness of his own historical narrative in the pages where he writes about his enthusiasm (book III), which soon however becomes pessimism (book IV) provoked by the opportunity that Sparta and Greece have lost.

Gianluca Cuniberti
gianluca.cuniberti@unito.it

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AZOULAY 2004: V. AZOULAY, *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir. De la charis au charisme*, Paris 2004.
- BADIAN 2004: E. BADIAN, *Xenophon the Athenian*, in TUPLIN 2004, 33-53.
- BIANCO 1997: E. BIANCO, *Ificrate, rhetor kai strategos*, «MGR», XXI, 1997, 179-207.
- BUIJS 2005: M. BUIJS, *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse: the Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis*, Boston 2005.
- CUNIBERTI 2007: G. CUNIBERTI, *Per chi scrive Senofonte? Il ruolo dei Lacedemoni nella produzione e ricezione delle opere di Senofonte*, «Ktema», XXXII, 2007, 379-390.
- CUNIBERTI 2012 (forthcoming): G. CUNIBERTI, *The role of the Lacedaemonians in the production and reception of the historiographer Xenophon*, in *Xenophon and Sparta*, ed. by N. RICHER - A. POWELL, Swansea-London 2012 (forthcoming).
- DAVERIO ROCCHI 1991: G. DAVERIO ROCCHI, *Le poleis megalai e mikrai come tema letterario, motivo politico e rapporto giuridico*, «Acme», XLIV, 1991, 53-71.
- DAVERIO ROCCHI 2004: G. DAVERIO ROCCHI, *La città di Flunte nelle Elleniche. Caso politico e modello letterario*, in *Il Peloponneso di Senofonte*, a cura di G. DAVERIO ROCCHI - M. CAVALLI, Milano 2004, 41-56.
- DELEBECQUE 1957: É. DELEBECQUE, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*, Paris 1957.
- DE SANCTIS 1932: G. DE SANCTIS, *La genesi delle Elleniche di Senofonte*, «ASNP», ser.2, I, 1932, 15-36 (= *Studi di storia della storiografia greca*, Firenze 1951, 127-161).
- DILLERY 1995: J. DILLERY, *Xenophon and the History of his Times*, London-New York 1995.
- DILLERY 2004: J. DILLERY, *Xenophon, the Military Review and Hellenistic Pompai*, in TUPLIN 2004, 259-276.
- ERBSE 1966: H. ERBSE, *Xenophons Anabasis*, «Gymnasium», LXXIII, 1966, 485-505.
- GELENCZEY-MIHÁLCZ 2000: A. GELENCZEY-MIHÁLCZ, *Thoughts on Tyranny: Xenophon's Hiero*, «AAntHung», XL, 2000, 113-121.
- GIRAUD 2000: J.-M. GIRAUD, *Xénophon et l'explication de la défaite spartiate*, «DHA», XXVI, 2000, 85-107.

- GOODALL 1976: B. GOODALL, *The Reflexive Pronoun in Xenophon's Anabasis and Hellenica*, «CSCA», IX, 1976, 41-59.
- GRAY 1989: V. GRAY, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, London 1989.
- GRAY 2003: V. GRAY, *Interventions and Citations in Xenophon, Hellenica and Anabasis*, «CQ», LIII, 2003, 111-123.
- GRAYSON 1975: C.H. GRAYSON, *Did Xenophon Intend to Write History?*, in *The Ancient Historian and his Materials. Essays in Honour of C. E. Stevens*, ed. by B. LEVICK, Farnborough 1975, 31-43.
- HAMILTON 1982: C.D. HAMILTON, *Agesilaus and the Failure of Spartan Hegemony*, «AncW», V, 1982, 67-78.
- KRENTZ 1995: P. KRENTZ, *Xenophon, Hellenika II.3.11-IV.2.8*, Warminster 1995.
- LEFÉVRE 1971: E. LEFÉVRE, *Die Frage nach dem βίος εὐδαίμων. Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos bei Xenophon*, «Hermes», IC, 1971, 283-296.
- LÉVY 1990: E. LÉVY, *L'art de la déformation historique dans les Helleniques de Xénophon*, in *Purposes of history: studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries B.C.: proceedings of the international Colloquium Leuven, 24-26 May 1988*, ed. by H. VERDIN - G. SCHEPENS - E. DE KEYSER, Leuven 1990, 125-157.
- LUPPINO MANES 1991A: E. LUPPINO MANES, *Agesilao re di Sparta: immagine e realtà*, in *L'immagine dell'uomo politico: vita pubblica e morale nell'antichità*, a cura di M. SORDI, «CISA», XVII, Milano 1991, 89-107.
- LUPPINO MANES 1991B: E. LUPPINO MANES, *L'Agesilao di Senofonte tra commiato ed encomio*, Milano 1991.
- MARTINDALE - THOMAS 2006: C. MARTINDALE - R.F. THOMAS, *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, Malden-Oxford-Victoria 2006.
- MERCALLI 2002: C. MERCALLI, *Tyrannus philopolis in Xen. Hier. V 3*, «Latinitas», L, 2002, 207-209.
- MOMIGLIANO 1974: A. MOMIGLIANO, *Lo sviluppo della biografia greca*, trad. it., Torino 1974.
- MOSSAY 1974: J. MOSSAY, *Humanisme et centres d'intérêt majeurs dans Xénophon*, «LEC», XLII, 1974, 345-361.
- PLÁCIDO 1989: D. PLÁCIDO, *Economía y sociedad, polis y basileia: los de la reflexión historiográfica de Jenofonte*, «Habis», XX, 1989, 135-153.
- PONTIER 2001: P. PONTIER, *Place et fonction du discours dans l'œuvre de Xénophon*, «REA», CIII, 2001, 395-408.

- REDONDO 1990-1992: J. REDONDO, *L'art retòrica de Xenofont i la composició de l'Agésilau*, «Itaca», VI-VIII, 1990-1992, 83-114.
- REICHEL 2005: M. REICHEL, *Ist Xenophons Anabasis eine Autobiographie?*, in *Antike Autobiographien. Werke - Epochen - Gattungen*, hrsg. M. REICHEL, Köln 2005, 45-73.
- RICHER 2001: N. RICHER, *Eunomia et eudaimonia à Sparte*, «Dike», IV, 2001, 13-38.
- RIEDINGER 1991: J.-C. RIEDINGER, *Étude sur les Helléniques. Xénophon et l'histoire*, Paris 1991.
- RIOS FERNÁNDEZ 1984: M. RIOS FERNÁNDEZ, *Los silencios de Jenofonte en el Agésilao de Plutarco*, «Habis», XV, 1984, 41-70.
- SEVIERI 2004: R. SEVIERI, *The Imperfect Hero: Xenophon's Hiero as the (Self-)Taming of the Tyrant*, in TUPLIN 2004, 277-288.
- SORDI 1950-1951: M. SORDI, *I caratteri dell'opera storiografica di Senofonte nelle Elleniche*, «Athenaeum», XXVIII, 1950, 1-53; XIX, 1951, 273-348.
- SORDI 1988: M. SORDI, *Gli interessi geografici e topografici nelle Elleniche di Senofonte*, in *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico*, a cura di M. SORDI, «CISA», XIV, Milano 1988, 32-40.
- SORDI 2001: M. SORDI, *Religione e guerra nel pensiero di Senofonte*, in *Il pensiero sulla guerra nel mondo antico*, a cura di M. SORDI, «CISA», XXVII, Milano 2001, 37-43.
- SORDI 2004: M. SORDI, *Senofonte e la Sicilia*, in TUPLIN 2004, 71-78.
- STENGER 2004: J. STENGER, *Agésilaios als Heros (Xen. Ag. 11, 16)*, «RhM», CXLVII, 2004, 421-424.
- TUPLIN 1977: C.J. TUPLIN, *Xenophon a Didactic Historian?*, «PCA», LXXIV, 1977, 26-27.
- TUPLIN 2004: *Xenophon and his World. Papers from a Conference held in Liverpool in July 1999*, ed. by C.J. TUPLIN, *Historia Einzelschriften* 172, Stuttgart 2004, 33-53.
- WATERFIELD 2006: R. WATERFIELD, *Xenophon's Retreat. Greece, Persia, and the End of the Golden Age*, Cambridge 2006.
- WENCIS 1977: L. WENCIS, *Hypopsia and the Structure of Xenophon's Anabasis*, «CJ», LXXIII, 1977, 44-49.
- WORONOFF 1993: M. WORONOFF, *L'autorité personnelle chez Xénophon*, «Ktema», XVIII, 1993, 41-48.