# THE DIALOGUES OF THE CYROPAEDIA

by

Deborah Levine Gera

Volume One

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the

University of Oxford

Trinity Term 1987

Wolfson College, Oxford

# The Dialogues of the Cyropaedia

Deborah Levine Gera
Wolfson College, Oxford

D. Phil. Thesis
Trinity Term 1987

This thesis is an examination of the dialogues of Xenophon's Cyropaedia. Chapter I opens with a brief introduction to the Cyr. - its genre, date, epilogue and place in modern scholarship. The second half of the chapter is devoted to an overall survey of the work's dialogues. The dialogues are listed and divided into seven main categories; various formal features of the dialogues - their length, number of speakers, presence of an audience, dramatic background etc. - are noted.

The second chapter deals with the "Socratic" or didactic dialogues of the Cyr. These conversations are first compared to Xenophon's actual Socratic dialogues, particularly those of the Memorabilia, and are shown to have several of the same characteristics: a leading didactic figure, discussion of ethical questions, the use of analogies and a series of brief questions and replies etc. A detailed commentary on the "Socratic" dialogues of the Cyr. follows; some of these dialogues are seen to be livelier and more dialectical than Xenophon's genuine Socratic conversations and his hero Cyrus is not always assigned the role of teacher.

Symposium dialogues are the subject of the third chapter. These conversations are shown to have several features or themes in common, such as a blend of serious and light conversation, a discussion of poverty and wealth, a love interest and rivalry among the guests. The symposia of the Cyr. are compared to earlier literary symposia, including those of Plato and Xenophon, and some of the more Persian features of these parties are pointed out.

Chapter IV deals with the novelle or colourful tales of the Cyr. - the stories of Croesus, Panthea, Gobryas and Gadatas. The characters and plots of these stories are found to have much in common with the novelle of Ctesias and Herodotus. Nonetheless, it is argued in a detailed commentary on these dialogues that Xenophon displays considerable skill and originality in the telling of these tales.

The fifth chapter is a brief commentary on the remaining categories of dialogues: short or anecdotal conversations, negotiation, planning and information dialogues. These dialogues are compared to similar conversations in other works by Xenophon.

Finally, there are three appendices. The first questions whether Cyrus is portrayed as an ideal hero even after the conquest of Babylon, and the second discusses the problem of Persian sources in the Cyr. The third appendix is a list of the speeches of the Cyr.

# Preface

This thesis is an examination of the dialogues of Xenophon's Cyropaedia. The Cyr. is a much neglected work and is rarely used as a starting point for discussions of Xenophon and his writings. The dialogues of the Cyr., while an integral part of the work, are a large and varied group and merit investigation in their own right, particularly in view of Xenophon's considerable use of the dialogue form elsewhere.

The main body of the thesis - Chapters II, III and IV - is a close scrutiny of three kinds of dialogues in the Cyr.: "Socratic", symposium and novellistic conversations. In each instance, I first describe the characteristic features of this group of dialogues and then attempt to survey Xenophon's forerunners - direct and indirect "ancestors" - in the writing of conversations of this kind. In these surveys I have deliberately looked backwards and sideways, rather than forwards: that is, I have limited these discussions to Xenophon's predecessors and contemporaries and have not included writers who followed him. The third section of each of these chapters is a detailed, running commentary on the Cyr. dialogues in the category; the commentary is essentially a literary one. When commenting upon the individual dialogues, I have often summarized or paraphrased the text of the Cyr. (All actual quotations from the Cyr. are from Marchant's 1910 Oxford edition.) This method of presentation has added considerably to the bulk of the thesis, but it seemed a necessary price to pay in order to lend continuity and coherence to the discussions.

I should like to thank my supervisor, Professor D.A. Russell of St. John's College, for his learned interest, sage advice and patience.

Table of Contents

page

Volume One

Preface

Chapter I: An Introduction to the Cyr. and its Dialogues

The Genre of the Cyr. . . . . 1
Date and Epilogue . . . . . 13
Recent Scholarship . . . . . 19
Dialogues of the Cyr.: An Overall View . . . . . 22

Chapter II: The "Socratic" Dialogues of the Cyr.

Xenophon's Socratic Dialogues . . . . . 40
Cyr. 1.6.1-2.1.1: Cambyses' Conversation with Cyrus . . . . . 72
Cyr. 1.3.15-18 . . . . . 105
Cyr. 3.1: The Armenian King's Trial . . . . . 111
Cyr. 5.5.5-37: Cyaxares and Cyrus . . . . . 140
Cyr. 3.3.48-56 . . . . . 150

Chapter III: The Symposium Dialogues of the Cyr.

Themes and Motifs in the Symposia of the Cyr. . . . . 160
Earlier Symposia . . . . . 168
Cyr. 1.3.4-12 . . . . . 185
Cyr. 2.2.1-2.3.1 . . . . . 191
Cyr. 5.2.5-22 . . . . . 202
Cyr. 8.3.35-50 . . . . . 214
Cyr. 8.4.1-27 . . . . . 229

Chapter IV: The Novelle of the Cyr. - Croesus, Panthea, Gobryas and Gadatas

A Survey of the Novelle of the Cyr. . . . . 242
Novelle in Ctesias and Herodotus . . . . . 256
The Panthea Novella . . . . . 282
Gobryas and Gadatas . . . . . 313
Croesus . . . . . 338

page

Chapter V: A Survey of the Remaining Dialogues

Short Dialogues . . . . . 357
Information Dialogues . . . . . 366
Negotiation Dialogues . . . . . 372
Planning Dialogues . . . . . 381

Volume Two

Appendices

Appendix I: Cyrus of the Cyr. - An Ideal Ruler? . . . . . 389
Appendix II: Persian Sources in the Cyr. . . . . 402
Appendix III: The Speeches of the Cyr. . . . . 415

Notes

Notes to Chapter I . . . . . 418
Notes to Chapter II . . . . . 425
Notes to Chapter III . . . . . 441
Notes to Chapter IV . . . . . 450
Notes to Chapter V . . . . . 462
Notes to Appendix I . . . . . 464
Notes to Appendix II . . . . . 466

Bibliography . . . . . 470

# Chapter I

## An Introduction to the Cyropaedia and its Dialogues

What is the Cyropaedia? It can be described as a biography of Cyrus the Great, a history of the beginnings of the Persian empire, a romance, a military handbook, a political guide to the administration of an empire, a didactic work on ethics, morals and education etc, and it is, in fact, all of these things. Cicero's famous statement - Cyrus ille a Xenophonte non ad historiae fidem scriptus sed ad effigiem iusti imperi (Q.fr. 1.1.23) - is perhaps the best starting point when attempting to define or at least narrow down the genre of this work: the Cyr. was not written as history and is a portrait of a model, just ruler (cf. Dion. Hal. Ep. ad Pomp. 4). Cicero may have needed to point this out to Quintus because Xenophon himself nowhere indicates - either in his preface to the Cyr. or in the course of narrating the deeds of Cyrus the Great - that he is not presenting a purely historical account. Xenophon begins the Cyr. with a discussion of the instability of political regimes and observes that man is the most difficult of creatures to rule (Cyr. 1.1.1 ff.). Nonetheless, adds Xenophon, the example of Cyrus serves as proof that governing men is not an impossible task, since the Persian king successfully ruled a great empire and commanded the willing obedience of his many subjects. Hence Xenophon turned to an investigation of Cyrus the Great (cf. ἐσκεψάμεθα 1.1.6), concentrating on the Persian's family background, character and education (τίς ποτ' ὢν γενεὰν καὶ ποίαν τινὰ φύσιν ἔχων καὶ ποίᾳ τινὶ παιδευθεὶς παιδείᾳ1.1.6). The Cyr. is, according to Xenophon's preface, the result of these researches ὅσα οὖν καὶ ἐπυθόμεθα καὶ ἠσθήσθαι δοκοῦμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα πειρασόμεθα διηγήσασθαι(1.1.6).

In reality the Cyr. contains a great deal more than Xenophon has promised at the outset. There is a description in Book I of Cyrus' family, his appearance, personality and the education he received; so too part of Book VIII, the final book of the Cyr., is devoted to a detailed exposition of the way the Persian

ruler administered his vast empire and the means he used to school his many subjects to obedience. In the intervening books Xenophon tells of Cyrus' rise to power - of how he acquired useful allies, won important victories and established an empire. This is, however, only a small part of the Cyr., which includes much that is less directly related to Cyrus' actions and achievements. The story of Panthea and Abradatas (5.1.2 ff.; 6.1.31 ff.; 6.4.2 ff.; 7.3.2 ff.), Tigranes' sophistic debate with Cyrus (3.1.14-30), Cambyses' exposition of the various branches of tactics (1.6.43), Xenophon's own thoughts on the principle of division of labour (8.2.5-6) - to name just a few examples - all clearly reflect Xenophon's interests and enthusiasms and have little to do with the Persian's success as a ruler. The Cyr. touches upon many of the areas that Xenophon covers in his other writings and he uses here a variety of literary forms - philosophical dialogue, encomium, history, military memoirs, handbook or technical manual - that are found in his other works to present these favourite themes and topics. The Cyr. is above all a didactic work - the author's vehicle for developing and discussing his own cherished ideas and interests. The narration of the life and deeds of Cyrus the Great is, in essence, a convenient framework, a peg upon which Xenophon hangs reflections and ideas of his own. Cyrus is not then the real impetus for the Cyr. but is more like a dummy, a useful figure to be clothed as his author likes. Hence Xenophon plays about freely with the facts of Cyrus' life, altering historical circumstances to suit his literary and didactic purposes, even while making use of the narrative framework that the historical Persian's well-known deeds provide.

If this view of the Cyr. is correct, i.e. it is first and foremost the author's vehicle for presenting favourite themes and concerns to his readers, it remains to be asked how Xenophon came to choose this particular format. Why a biography? Why is his hero Cyrus, a Persian ruler of long ago? Why does

Xenophon begin the Cyr. with reflections on the instability of governments and the near-impossibility of ruling satisfied, grateful subjects? I shall deal with each of these questions in turn, looking at the writings of Xenophon's contemporaries and predecessors, in an attempt to find possible influences on Xenophon's choice of framework for the Cyr.

I begin with biography. The Cyr. opens with an account of Cyrus' boyhood and closes with his death, presenting in between a chronological narrative of many of Cyrus' deeds, and hence can be considered a biography. Xenophon deals selectively with the Persian's career, concentrating on certain periods (e.g. his visit as a teenager to Media, the conquest of Lydia and Babylon) and ignoring others (e.g. Cyrus' earliest childhood, most of the years after the capture of Babylon); nonetheless the work is recognizably a biography. In fact, one scholar terms the Cyr. "the most accomplished biography we have in classical Greek literature"[1] and it is an interesting question as to why Xenophon decided to cast his fictional account of the Persian ruler in the form of a full-fledged biography. Who were Xenophon's predecessors in the writing of biographies and which writings, if any, could have prompted or at least influenced the biographical form of the Cyr.?

Xenophon himself makes use of biographical materials in several of his other works.[2] The Anabasis is, of course, an autobiographical work, memoirs of a campaign (written, however, in the third person), and it includes several character sketches or portraits - i.e. of Cyrus the Younger (Anab. 1.9) and the dead Greek generals (2.6). The encomium Agesilaus is in part biography and contains a brief chronological survey of the Spartan king's deeds (Ages. 1-2). So too the Memorabilia, Xenophon's recollections, as it were, of Socrates and the conversations he held is a form of biography; as with Cyrus of the Cyr., the portrait of Socrates is often more idealized fiction than fact.[3]

Turning to other writers, we know, of course, that Herodotus presented a full account of Cyrus the Great, including details of his birth, youth, major conquests, final campaign and death (Hdt. 1.107-130, 177-191, 201-214), that is, included many biographical elements in his narrative.[4] So too it can be assumed the five books of the Persica devoted by Ctesias to Cyrus included much biographical material (see below, pp.187, 269 and p. 327 for Ctesias' account of Cyrus in the Persica). Both Ctesias and Herodotus, however, wrote history rather than biography and include an account of Cyrus as a part of their work; he is not the central axis.

Two early names associated with the writing of biographies are Scylax of Caryanda and Xanthus of Lydia. We know nothing of the work of Scylax, the explorer employed by Darius (Hdt. 4.44), may have written about a contemporary ruler, Heraclides of Mylasa, other than its name τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα (found in Suda; cf. FGrH 709 T 1). So too the account of Empedocles by Xanthus mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (8.63 = FGrH 765 F 33) may have been a monograph on - or life of - the Sicilian philosopher by Herodotus' contemporary, Xanthus of Lydia, but the matter is uncertain.[5]

A more interesting figure for our purposes is Herodorus of Heraclea Pontica, father of the sophist Bryson. Herodorus wrote the story of Heracles ( ὁ κατὰ Ἡρακλέα λόγος or τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλέα) in 17 volumes, at the very end of the fifth century.[6] He used a rationalizing approach when presenting the heroic deeds of Heracles and was a pioneer of allegorical interpretation of the Heracles myths (cf. e.g. FGrH 31 F 14 where the three apples of the Hesperides are said to represent three virtues). In Herodorus Heracles has become, apparently, an ethical figure, a model of some kind, as in the works on him by Prodicus and Antisthenes.[7] The extant fragments (FGrH 31 F 1-4, F 13-37; cf. 41, 60, 62, 63) describe Heracles' famous labours and touch upon the education he received (F 17)

but often deal with geographical, zoological and cosmological matters, i.e. Herodorus' own interests. Hence it seems that Herodorus used the story of Heracles' life and deeds as a convenient backdrop or framework for presenting discussions of topics that were close to his heart.[8] The similarity with Xenophon's approach in the Cyr. is evident: both writers narrate at length the life and acts of a well-known figure of old not so much for its own sake but as a means to present to their readers their views on a variety of subjects.

Our next writer of biographies, Stesimbrotus of Thasos, was perhaps closest of all to Xenophon in his approach to the biographical accounts of famous men of action. This fifth-century author[9] wrote a series of biographical portraits of contemporary (or near contemporary) Athenian politicians in his περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους. While the exact scope and intention of the work is not clear - scholars still debate whether Stesimbrotus' main interest was political or ethical[10] - the extant fragments (FGrH 107 F 1 - F 11) show clearly that Stesimbrotus discussed both the public and private faces of the men he portrayed. The surviving fragments - all but one derive from Plutarch - tell of Themistocles, Cimon and Pericles (but nothing remains on Thucydides son of Melesias). Stesimbrotus describes the political policies of these men (FGrH 107 F 2, F 8) and quotes some of their public pronouncements (F 7, F 9). He was also interested in the character and natural inclinations of these politicians (F 4), the teachers they had and the education they received (F 1, F 4). In addition, Stesimbrotus included details of the private lives and families of his subjects (F 3, F 5, F 10, F 11), some of them rather spicy. It is interesting to note that when portraying these men of action Stesimbrotus appears to have used a certain amount of direct speech - quoting the politicians' words directly (F 7, F 9) and reproducing conversations they held (F 5); in other words, Stesimbrotus probably included several dialogues in his work.

Plutarch makes it clear that Stesimbrotus was not a careful historian or painstaking biographer: he was careless about chronology (F 1) and did not always tell a consistent tale (F 3). In other words, Stesimbrotus played about with historical events in his biographies to a certain extent, just as Xenophon does with Cyrus. Stesimbrotus was known chiefly as a rhapsode, an interpreter of Homer (cf. T 3, T 4 = Pl. Ion 530 C-D, Xen. Symp. 3.6) and wrote a book on Homer which included elucidations of difficult passages (F 23-25), besides a discussion of the date and birthplace of the poet (F 21, F 22). In addition, he wrote a work on religious mysteries (περὶ τελετῶν; cf. F 12 - F 20), containing mythological material. It is likely, then, that Stesimbrotus, whose interests seemed to have been paedagogical and didactic rather than political, was as concerned with the moral characters of the politicians he portrayed as their actual deeds. If Stesimbrotus did indeed recount the lives and actions of these Athenian leaders partly in order to study questions of character, education[11] etc., the affinities with Xenophon's approach in the Cyr. are apparent.

Another fifth-century figure associated with the writing of biographies is Ion of Chios, a slightly older contemporary of Stesimbrotus.[12] In his Ἐπιδημίαι Ion described famous men of his time whom he had encountered either when they came to his native Chios or on his visits to Athens (and elsewhere). In these memoirs, which judging by the extant fragments, were written in a vivid and graceful fashion (cf. in particular FGrH 392 F 6 and F 13), Ion mentions not only important political personages, such as Cimon (FGrH 392 F 12-15), Pericles (F 15-16) and Themistocles (F 11, F 13), but also the leading cultural figures of his time, including Aeschylus (F 7; cf. F 22), Sophocles (F 6; cf. F 23) and Socrates (F 9). His portraits were wide-ranging and included descriptions of his subjects' physical appearance (F 12), character and manner (F 6,

F 15), travels (F 9), memorable deeds (F 7, F 13) and notable sayings, both in the public and private spheres (F 6, F 14). It is clear from the famous Sophocles fragment (F 6), that Ion included dialogue in some of his sketches. In these memoirs, Ion provides charming and vivid portraits of his contemporaries, as seen from his own personal vantage point (cf. in particular F 15), while in the Cyr. Xenophon presents a full-scale (seemingly) objective account of a famous figure who lived well before his own time, so that his account of Cyrus seems quie different from Ion's character sketches in the Ἐπιδημίαι. Nonetheless Xenophon may have been influenced by Ion's light touch and his use of anecdotes and conversations to illustrate the personalities he described. Hence Ion's effect on the Cyr. is probably to be found, if anywhere, in the work's lighter and more entertaining dialogues (cf. below, p. 177).

In sum, there were several earlier biographical writings which may have influenced Xenophon's approach in the Cyr. Cyrus of the Cyr. is, like Herodotus' Heracles, a famous figure of the past whose many achievements provide a convenient framework for the discussion of a variety of topics. Xenophon tells of the personality, character and development of Cyrus, as well as his more public actions, just as Stesimbrotus discussed both the private and public lives of the politicians he portrayed. In addition, Xenophon allows his model hero some light and playful moments, following, perhaps, in the footsteps of Ion of Chios. Finally, Xenophon may have turned to biography because of his belief in the value of teaching by means of personal example. He himself serves as such a model figure in the Anabasis (cf. e.g. 4.4.12; 7.3.44-45) and his Agesilaus and Socrates are two other such paradigms. A full-scale biography in which Xenophon's readers can follow the actions, character and behaviour of a model hero throughout most of his life is a further elaboration of this didactic method of presentation.

The next question to be asked is why Cyrus? Why did Xenophon choose the Persian king to serve as an idealized, didactic model? Cyrus and his achievements were well-known to the Greeks of Xenophon's time (cf. Isoc. Evag. 37) and his reputation among them had long been a good one, on the whole: cf. εὐδαίμων ἀνήρ... ἔθηκε... εἰρήνην... εὔφρων ἔφυ (Aes. Pers. 767-772); πατήρ (Hdt. 3.89); ἔδοξεν ἤθει καὶ πολιτείᾳ διενέγκειν ([Pl.] epist. 4.320 D; see too Pl. Leg. 694 A-B; Menex. 239 D-E; Isoc. Philip 5.66). We have already seen that the Persian king featured prominently in the popular works of Herodotus and Ctesias. More generally, Greeks of the fourth century seemed to have been fascinated by all things Persian (see e.g. [Pl.] Alc. I 120 E - 123 E)[13] and Xenophon had, of course, first-hand knowledge of the Persians and their ways. The author of the Cyr. could, then, rely upon his readers' interest in - and perhaps sympathy for - Cyrus. The fact that Cyrus was a Persian king of long ago, rather than a present-day Greek may have made it easier for Xenophon to fashion Cyrus' life, character and deeds as freely as he chose,[14] although elsewhere he does not hesitate to present contemporary Greeks, such as Agesilaus and Socrates, in an idealized way as well.

Antisthenes' Cyrus may have been the most influential factor when Xenophon chose Cyrus as the central axis of his didactic work. Antisthenes is an elusive figure in general and it is especially difficult to reconstruct his lost writings on Cyrus. So too there is no firm chronological evidence that his Cyrus was earlier than the Cyr., although it is generally considered to be so.[15] Nonetheless, since Antisthenes is often mentioned as Xenophon's chief predecessor or source of inspiration for the Cyr., it is worth examining his patchy and troublesome Cyrus fragments in some detail.

To begin with, Antisthenes apparently wrote more than one work entitled Κῦρος. Diogenes Laertius, in his list of Antisthenes' works (D.L. 6.15-18 =

fr.1),[16] knows of one Κῦρος which appeared (together with a work entitled Ἡρακλῆς ὁ μείζων) in volume 4, and another, with the double title Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας in volume 5. In addition, according to one MS. tradition of Diogenes Laertius, there are two other Cyrus works in the tenth and final volume of Antisthenes' collected writings: Κῦρος ἢ ἐρώμενος and Κῦρος ἢ κατάσκοποι. Most scholars do not think that the last two titles refer to actual works by Antisthenes on Cyrus; they either emend the reading Κῦρος in some way, accepting the alternate reading Κύριος of the better MSS. etc. or else reject the works as inauthentic.[17] We are left then with the two compositions of volumes 4 and 5, so that one of the difficulties raised by the Cyrus fragments is deciding to which of the two compositions each bit belongs. A further complication is that in one of the two works entitled Cyrus reference is made to Alcibiades - cf. fr.29 A Ἀντισθένης δ' ἐν θατέρῳ τῶν Κύρων κακολογῶν Ἀλκιβιάδην... - but there may have been another separate Alcibiades by Antisthenes as well (in volume 10 - cf. fr.1), and it is not clear how the various fragments mentioning Alcibiades are related to the Cyrus ones.

The next problem concerns the identity of Cyrus: did Antisthenes write about Cyrus the Great or Cyrus the Younger or both (with, for example, each Persian the main character in one of the two works)? Again, scholars are divided but here a look at the actual fragments seems to establish clearly what is important for our purposes, i.e. that at least one of the two compositions dealt with Cyrus the Great. One bit begins Κῦρος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρωτηθεὶς... (fr.21 A) and this can only mean Cyrus the Great for his younger namesake was never king. Another fragment touches upon the duties of a king - βασιλικόν, ὦ Κῦρε, πράττειν μὲν εὖ, κακῶς δὲ ἀκούειν (fr.20 A) - and again makes more sense if it is addressed to an actual king, i.e. our Cyrus. This latter fragment is interesting for another reason as well: the vocative ὦ Κῦρε shows that Cyrus is addressed

by another. In other words, this Cyrus composition contained conversations and may have been a dialogue. We know that Antisthenes wrote Socratic dialogues (fr.5) and several specific works of his are called dialogues (cf. frr.7, 36, 37, 43); not all of Antisthenes' dialogues need have been Socratic ones.[18]

A third Cyrus fragment tells us καὶ ὅτι ὁ πόνος ἀγαθὸν συνέστησε [sc. Antisthenes] διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἡρακλέους καὶ τοῦ Κύρου (fr.19), i.e. in his works about Heracles and Cyrus, Antisthenes used these two figures to demonstrate the rewards of hard labour. Once again Cyrus the Great suits the context of this fragment better than Cyrus the Younger, for his rise to power and conquest of an empire provides a most convincing illustration of the ὁ πόνος ἀγαθόν principle. It seems likely, then, that in one of his Cyrus works Antisthenes told of Cyrus the Great's ascent to the throne and used the life of Cyrus as an ethical model in order to convey ideas of his own: the similarities with (and hence possible influence upon) the Cyr. are apparent. Fr.20 in which Cyrus is advised on the duties of a king βασιλικὸν... πράττειν... εὖ etc. would fit the context of such a work well. The sentence was probably spoken by someone who advised or taught Cyrus at an early stage of his career; in the parallel Heracles work, Antisthenes tells of Heracles being educated by Chiron (fr.24). Thus Antisthenes' work probably included a certain amount of Κύρου παιδεία and perhaps had a conversation akin to the Cambyses-Cyrus teaching dialogue (Cyr. 1.6.1 ff.; see below, pp. 72-105). In fr.21, where Cyrus is termed a king, he is no longer being educated, but teaches others instead. When asked what is the most necessary thing to learn, Cyrus replies "to unlearn evil" (τὸ ἀπομαθεῖν... τὰ κακά). If this fragment belongs to the same Cyrus as the other two, Cyrus has changed or developed in the course of the work from pupil to teacher; a similar process takes place in the parallel Heracles composition (cf. fr.26 vs. fr.24). In the Cyr. too Cyrus, after his long conversation with his father, almost always

instructs others. If this interpretation of frr.19-21 is correct[19] then Antisthenes in a work - which included conversations and may have been a dialogue - called Cyrus described the Persian king's rise to power and showed how Cyrus learned, laboured and developed into a wise king. In other words Antisthenes used the Persian king and his deeds as a backdrop in order to present ethical ideas of his own. It is possible that Antisthenes discussed political matters in this Cyrus as well; elsewhere (cf. frr.1, 100-105) he investigates questions of νόμος and πολιτεία. In any event, according to this reconstruction of a Cyrus by Antisthenes, Xenophon took much from his fellow Socratic when composing the framework of the Cyr., if his work is indeed the later one. One answer to the question "Why did Xenophon choose Cyrus as a didactic model?" would be, then, that Antisthenes had already paved the way and done so.

Another possible influence behind Xenophon's choice of Cyrus the Great as hero is his personal acquaintance with Cyrus the Younger. It has long been recognized that the leading character of the Cyr. has much in common with Cyrus the Younger of the Anabasis. The two are similar in character and personality, both have undergone the same educational curriculum, and they even have friends and followers of the same name.[20] Xenophon's portrait of Cyrus the Younger (see in particular Anab. 1.9.1 ff.) makes it clear that he admired the Persian prince and he seems to have seen the younger Cyrus as taking after his famous ancestor in more than name alone - cf. Κῦρος [of Cunaxa] ... ἀνὴρ ὢν Περσῶν τῶν μετὰ Κῦρον τὸν ἀρχαῖον γενομένων βασιλικώτατός τε καὶ ἄρχειν ἀξιώτατος (Anab. 1.9.1). At first Xenophon compared Cyrus the Younger to his illustrious namesake and then later, when writing the Cyr., he apparently reversed the situation and projected qualities of the younger man backwards, assigning them to his ancestor of long ago. When painting the portrait of his model hero in the Cyr., Xenophon had the figure of an authentic Persian leader (actually named Cyrus), whose qualities of leadership he particularly admired, ready at hand.

The remaining question raised by the framework of the Cyr. is Xenophon's choice of introduction. Why does Xenophon present the Cyr. - a wide-ranging, varied work - as the end product of his reflections on the various types of constitutions and the difficulties involved in ruling men well? The answer appears to be that Xenophon wished to ensure the Cyr. a place within the tradition of theoretical writings on the best possible form of government. The debate on the three constitutions (democracy, aristocracy and monarchy) found in Herodotus (3.80-82) - a discussion, it should be noted, between Persian nobles - is the earliest extant example of such πολιτεία works[21] and Plato's Republic is, of course, the outstanding representative of writings of this kind. Xenophon apparently saw the Cyr. as belonging (in part) to the same category and wanted his readers to consider it another such work. In fact, the Republic has been described by one modern commentator as "a Cyropaedia without the historical setting of Xenophon".[22] Ancient commentators, too, see a link between Plato's political writings and the Cyr. Diogenes Laertius (3.34) describes Plato and Xenophon as two rivals who often wrote on the same subjects. He mentions each one's ethical works, Symposium and Apology and then pairs the Republic with the Cyr. - τὰ ὅμοια γεγράφασι... ὁ μὲν Πολιτείαν, ὁ δὲ Κύρου παιδείαν . In addition, Diogenes notes that in his Laws Plato objects to Xenophon's idealized portrait of Cyrus and his upbringing, calling it, according to Diogenes, a fiction (πλάσμα ).Aulus Gellius (14.3), writing even earlier than Diogenes, notes that some commentators describe the Cyr. as Xenophon's critical reaction to a part of Plato's Republic.[23] According to these commentators, an angry Plato then went out of his way to criticize Xenophon's description of Cyrus and his education in the Laws (at 694 C; cf. too Athen. 504 E - 505 A for a similar report).

It is true that in the passage quoted both by Gellius and Athenaeus, Laws 694 C, Plato does seem to be criticizing or correcting Xenophon's depiction of

Cyrus for he pointedly remarks that while Cyrus was a good general and a patriot, he knew nothing of education and the correct management of a household παιδείας δὲ ὀρθῆς οὐχ ἥφθαι τὸ παράπαν, οἰκονομίᾳ τε οὐδὲν τὸν νοῦν προσεσχηκέναι .[24] Apart from this brief dig, there is little evidence to indicate that Plato and Xenophon were rivals, vying with one another in producing an ideal state or form of government. The Cyr. is not at all like the Republic or the Laws in content or presentation; what the two authors do have in common, perhaps, is their disillusionment with the factional strife so prevalent in the Greek cities of their time and their desire to point to a better, more satisfactory form of government.[25] (Isocrates, another contemporary of the two, also addressed himself to these issues, e.g. in his Evagoras, To Nicocles and Aeropagiticus.) As we have seen (above, pp.1-2),Xenophon devotes but a small part of the Cyr. to an outline of good government and much of the work has little to do with political reflections of any kind. So too the precise political lessons to be learned from the life and actions of Cyrus are not always spelled out to the reader.[26] Nonetheless, in his introduction, Xenophon signals to his readers that he too has been troubled by the instability and fluctuations of government in the Greek world and that the Cyr. is his contribution to the political theory of the times and not simply an idealized portrait of a Persian ruler of long ago.

Date and Epilogue of the Cyr.

It is difficult to date Xenophon's writings and the Cyr. is no exception. There are several different approaches used to date the Cyr. and no one method leads to a certain or incontestable result. Most scholars would agree, however, that the Cyr. is a late work and should be assigned a date in the 360's.

The final chapter of the Cyr. (8.8) seems to give us a terminus post quem of 362/61 B.C. for there mention is made of two key figures in the satraps' revolt, Mithridates and Rheomithres and their treacherous behaviour towards their

closest relatives which took place during that year (Cyr. 8.8.4; cf. Diod.Sic. 15.90 ff.). This final chapter or epilogue, Cyr. 8.8, is a scathing attack on the degenerate Persians of Xenophon's time, who are compared most unfavourably with the Persians of Cyrus' day. The epilogue is, then, quite different in tone from the rest of the Cyr. where Xenophon always displays a positive attitude towards all things Persian. The decadent Persian empire of Xenophon's day, described in Cyr. 8.8, is a far cry from the well-run and admirable government created by Cyrus; in fact, according to the epilogue, Cyrus' empire begins to dissolve and decay immediately after his death (cf. εὐθὺς... πάντα δ' ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐτρέποντο 8.8.2). Many commentators are troubled by this abrupt and jarring postscript: by telling his readers that Cyrus' life-work began to crumble as soon as he was gone, Xenophon seems to undermine the value of many of the customs and institutions he has painstakingly outlined throughout the eight books of the Cyr. A further disturbing feature of this final chapter is that there are several contradictions between descriptions of Persian customs found in the main body of the Cyr. and those in the epilogue; these discrepancies occur even in relation to various practices instituted by Cyrus or common in his day, which Xenophon has specifically mentioned as still existing in his own time ἔτι καὶ νῦν .[27] In short, the epilogue seems to many a surprising, inconsistent and inappropriate ending to the Cyr.[28] Several modern commentators consider it a late addition, tacked on by Xenophon after he wrote the rest of the Cyr., in response perhaps, to criticisms of the Cyr.'s overly-favourable attitude towards the Persians, or because of a turnabout in his own attitude. Other commentators simply reject the epilogue outright, declaring that it is inauthentic.[29] If either of these views is correct, i.e. the epilogue is a later addition to the Cyr. either by Xenophon or some unknown author, then the reference to events of 362/61 found in the epilogue is, of course, of little use in determining the date of the Cyr.

I shall argue in detail below (cf. Appendix I, pp. 389-401) that the deterioration of the Persian empire described in the epilogue is, in fact, not all that surprising, since in the last part of the Cyr., well before the final chapter, Xenophon indicates to his readers that Cyrus is not always an ideal ruler and that the government he has created is, of necessity, less than perfect. In other words, Xenophon already hints in the main body of the Cyr. that the measures Cyrus took when constructing and administering his empire were not impeccable and that the empire he created was not built to last. The epilogue only serves to confirm this point, if in an outspoken and extreme way. Furthermore, since Xenophon begins the Cyr. by pointing out how unusual good government is, signalling out Cyrus' rule as an exception, it is only natural to find that the Persians have changed for the worse and that Persian mores have deteriorated by the time of the Cyr.'s writing, some 200 years later.[30] The contradictions found in the epilogue concerning the Persian way of life do not relate to terribly important matters and stem, perhaps, from a combination of carelessness and inconsistency on Xenophon's part. One way to idealize Cyrus is to claim that his influence on Persian habits is felt to this very day; a second method is to show how much better he was than present day Persians. In the main part of the Cyr., in the ἔτι καὶ νῦν passages, Xenophon uses the first method, while in the epilogue he uses the second. Finally, scholars are agreed that the epilogue cannot be faulted on linguistic grounds and is written in the style of Xenophon.[31] On balance, there is no compelling reason to reject the authenticity of Cyr. 8.8[32] and the epilogue should, in my view, be accepted, along with the chronological information it supplies, i.e. the Cyr. was written after 362/61 B.C.

A second approach used to date the Cyr. is based upon the assumption that Xenophon is addressing himself to an Athenian audience. Once, when referring (apparently) to Athenian education, Xenophon uses the phrase παρ' ἡμῖν (Cyr.

1.2.6; cf. 1.6.32). So too he includes in the Cyr. a description of an Armenian "Socrates" (3.1.38-40; see below, pp.129-131). The Armenian king thinks that this teacher or "sophist" is corrupting his son and has him executed. Cyrus, when hearing of the incident, declares that the Armenian ruler should be forgiven for his very human failing and commentators interpret the forgiving attitude displayed by the hero of the Cyr. as a placatory gesture made by Xenophon towards the Athenians after his own recall from exile, i.e. some time after 369.[33] This pair of assumptions - that the Cyr. was written first and foremost for an Athenian reading public and that Xenophon would address the Athenians sympathetically only after the repeal of his banishment - is difficult to substantiate.

A third argument used in assigning a late date to the Cyr. is the fact that the work sums up or has elements of many of Xenophon's other works.[34] We find in the Cyr. (pseudo-)history as in the Hell., a Persian background as in the Anab., an idealized military leader and ruler as in the Ages., philosophical and ethical conversations as in the Mem., light-hearted, convivial dinner-parties as in the Symp., discussions of horsemanship and hunting as in the περὶ ἱππικῆς and the Ἱππαρχικός etc. This consideration is, of course, a very hypothetical means of dating the Cyr. and certainly does not prove that the Cyr. was written after all (or even any) of these works. Xenophon often repeats himself and reworks the same material several times in different compositions so that it is usually quite difficult to determine which of two or more variations is earlier (see below, pp.85-89, 96-99, 240-241 for several specific examples).[35] In addition, scholars are agreed that the works of Xenophon do not lend themselves to stylometric analysis and his writings cannot be arranged in an approximate chronological order on the basis of a statistical investigation of linguistic features.[36] It is hazardous, then, to date the Cyr. according to its relation to other works

by Xenophon. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that no other work by Xenophon encompasses so many of its author's varied interests: it is difficult to resist the impression that the Cyr. is a kind of summary of Xenophon's literary activity.

Finally, some of the fictional military material included in the Cyr. also serves as an indication of the work's date. The descriptions of battles in the Cyr. do not reflect the real order, location or types of battles that the historical Cyrus fought, but constitute a fairly exhaustive military treatise on the various types of battles and ways to wage them, i.e. they are the product of Xenophon's own military interests and expertise. Xenophon invents almost all the details of these engagements, making use of the lessons he has learned from the actual battles of his time, in order to instruct his readers. The main battle of the Cyr., that which takes place between Cyrus and Croesus at Thymbrara (Cyr. 7.1.1 ff.), is particularly interesting in this respect, for it seems to have been written in light of the conflict between Thebes and Sparta at Leuctra in 371.[37] In other words, Xenophon includes in the Cyr. a clash which seems modelled upon the battle of Leuctra of 371 and this gives us a terminus post quem of 371, at the earliest, for the Cyr.[38]

To sum up, the Cyr. should be dated in the 360's; the two strongest arguments for this date are that the epilogue, if genuine, shows that the Cyr. was written after 362/61, while the indirect allusions to the tactics used at Leuctra point to a date after 371. I shall make use of this approximate date several times in what follows, specifically in order to argue that the Cyr. was written after Ctesias' Persica and the Anabasis (below, pp. 256-257; the Anabasis is generally dated in the 380's),[39] after Plato's Symposium (below, p. 169), after Isocrates' To Nicocles (below, p. 75) and after Aeschines' Aspasia (below, p. 287).

Recent Scholarship on the Cyr.

Xenophon is not a popular figure in modern scholarship; some of the reasons for this relative neglect can be found in the following characterization of his writings by one modern authority:

> The study of Xenophon is a slippery business... He was not a man of great intellect. One has only to compare his Socratic dialogues with those of Plato to see that. Nor did he have the lofty detachment or intellectual rigour of a Thucydides. His philosophy is second-hand and second-rate, his history moralizing memoirs... But though plain, he is never transparent. His fate has been to be read by schoolboys and to be puzzled over by scholars.[40]

In the eyes of many modern scholars Xenophon is second-rate, a mediocre philosopher and historian, particularly in comparison with Plato and Thucydides. So too, despite his deceptively simple and lucid style, it is not always easy to understand his exact meaning or intentions. Often commentators do not so much puzzle over Xenophon's writings, as dismiss them, almost at once, as uninteresting. Nonetheless, Xenophon has not, of course, been totally ignored and there have been several general works on him in the past few years. Breitenbach's long article in the Pauly-Wissowa[41] is by far the most comprehensive and useful work on Xenophon to have appeared in recent years; it includes both a summary of older scholarship and much new material. Nickel's more recent little book[42] is a briefer, general survey of Xenophon's life and works, conveniently summarizing new, post-Breitenbach works on Xenophon. The book's most original feature is the list of suggestions of further aspects of Xenophon's works which merit investigation, found at its end. Anderson's general book on Xenophon in the Classical Life and Letters series[43] is somewhat disappointing, presenting the traditional view of Xenophon as retired military officer, country squire and gentleman author. (Anderson's more specific work on Greek military theory and practice, which is

largely based on Xenophon's writings, is on the other hand, quite useful.[44]) A more original and perceptive approach is demonstrated by Higgins,[45] who reads Xenophon carefully and closely. Higgins is one of the few scholars who can be accused of over-estimating, rather than under-estimating, Xenophon's intellectual and literary capacities. In his respectful attitude towards the Athenian, Higgins, as he himself notes, is following in the footsteps of Leo Strauss, whose several books on Xenophon[46] are all based on a careful reading of the text; often, however, it is difficult to accept the conclusions or meanings Strauss draws from Xenophon's words. Gigon is another scholar who concentrates on Xenophon's Socratic works. In his commentary on the first two books of the Mem.[47] he approaches the work from a somewhat novel angle, for his main purpose is to reconstruct the writings of lost Socratics from the traces they have left in the Mem.; his discussions of recurring themes and τόπου in Xenophon are particularly hlepful. Delebecque's book on Xenophon[48] is a more general work, concentrating on the details of Xenophon's life and the chronology of his writings insofar as they can be adduced from his works; his results are often conjectural. Luccioni has written two general books on Xenophon - one on the Socratic elements of his works and the other on the Athenian's political ideas.[49] The latter work is a somewhat pedestrian book, which often summarizes rather than analyzes. Scharr's much older book on Xenophon's political thought[50] is a comprehensive, valuable work which is almost entirely devoted to the Cyr.

Among Xenophon's major works, the Cyr. is probably the one most neglected by modern students and scholars:[51] it is generally considered too dull to be troubled with. A not untypical judgement of the Cyr. is that it is "one of the most tedious books to have survived from the ancient world".[52] Another scholar more wistfully terms the Cyr. "a kind of Cinderella of Greek classical scholarship".[53]

Histories of Greek literature often deal with Xenophon under two headings, as historian and philosopher:[54] since the Cyr. is neither history nor philosophy it falls between the two stools, as it were, and is often discussed (or dismissed) in a few paragraphs. So too in general surveys of political thought, the Cyr. generally receives very short notice.[55] There are, however, several recent specific studies on the political content of the Cyr. Farber[56] has an excellent demonstration of how Cyrus' attitude towards his subjects in the Cyr. foreshadows the approach used by Hellenistic monarchs, while Carlier[57] has written a thoughtful study of the political message of the Cyr. The articles by Weathers,[58] Wood[59] and Breerbaart[60] are also useful, if less original investigations of the political content of the Cyr. The Cyr. also features briefly in studies of the Greek romance, but usually this forerunner of the Greek novel is, again allotted only a page or two.[61] The best discussion of the Cyr. as romantic history remains that of E. Schwartz.[62]

The one aspect of the Cyr. which has received considerable attention in recent years is its Persian background. Classicists have lately displayed an increased interest in the Achaemenids and their contacts with the Greeks and this has led to a renewed study of the Persian elements of the Cyr. Hirsch, in his new book on Xenophon and the Persians,[63] argues in rather general fashion that the Cyr. contains much authentic Persian material. A Dutch scholar, Sancisi-Weerdenberg, compares several Greek texts on the Persians (including some portions of the Cyr.) to Achaemenid inscriptions and archaeological remains and finds that the Greek sources, if properly interpreted, provide fairly reliable evidence for Persian practices.[64] While her arguments are not always convincing, she includes much interesting material. In a more recent article, Sancisi-Weerdenberg continues to investigate the question of Persian elements in the Cyr. and contends that Cyrus' deathbed scene (Cyr. 8.7) is based on Iranian oral

tradition.[65] A pioneer in the attempts to discover traces of lost Iranian epic in extant Greek sources is the Iranologist Christensen, who makes considerable use of the Cyr. in his somewhat speculative arguments.[66] The recent work by Knauth on the resemblance between the ideal qualities of Cyrus in the Cyr. and the characteristics of heroes in later Iranian epic[67] is perhaps the best documented attempt to find Persian influences on the Cyr. The Marxist scholar Briant is another classicist who has made use of the Cyr. in recent years as a source of information on the Achaemenids;[68] Iranologists have long done so.[69] (I discuss the question of Persian sources in the Cyr. in detail below; cf. Appendix II, pp. 402-414.)

While there has been a recent Budé edition of the Cyr.,[70] the last full-scale commentary on the work - that of Holden[71] - appeared almost a hundred years ago. Holden's commentary, a school edition, concentrates mainly on linguistic matters. I have also regularly consulted Dindorf's 1857 commentary[72] which conveniently includes a compendium of the comments of earlier scholars (Hutchinson, Schneider, Weiske etc.), and the edition of L. Breitenbach.[73] Hartman's discussion of the Cyr.,[74] particularly his list of parallels between the Cyr. and Xenophon's other writings still remains helpful, while the most useful work on Xenophon's language is that of Gautier.[75]

The Cyr. is generally approached by scholars with a specific interest or angle in mind, almost an axe to grind - be it the political, biographical, military, novellistic or Persian features of the work - and the composition is rarely viewed as a whole. So too there are next to no literary analyses or evaluations of the Cyr. Montgomery briefly analyzes Xenophon's narrative technique in the Cyr.;[76] Hirzel's short survey of the work's dialogues,[77] the topic of this thesis, remains invaluable. An updated commentary on the Cyr. and an intelligent appreciation of the work's literary qualities[78] are sorely lacking; it is to be

hoped that a prince will soon come to the rescue of this "Cinderella of... classical scholarship".

## The Dialogues of the Cyropaedia: An Overall View

The Cyr. contains a great deal of reported speech - formal discourses, conversational exchanges, commands, exhortations etc. My interest is in the conversations or, to be more exact, the dialogues of the Cyr. Since Xenophon's work is one long, continuous narrative, the conversations are in reported, rather than dramatic form: that is to say, all are part of a larger framework in which the speakers are identified and their statements are attributed to them. Some conversations are presented entirely in oratio recta, others in oratio obliqua and yet others in a combination of the two.[79] Not all of these conversations will be considered dialogues.

A dialogue, for my purpose, is a conversational exchange between two or more people, in which more than one person speaks (at least once) in oratio recta.[80] This is meant to be a working definition, not a precise lexicographical one. Thus conversations which are reported entirely in O.O. (cf. 1.3.13, 1.4.7, 2.3.18-20, 3.3.48, 4.6.1, 6.1.35, 6.3.5-6, 7.3.14, 7.4.7, 7.5.13-14) are not included, nor are exchanges in which only one interlocutor speaks in O.R. (cf. 1.3.2, 1.3.13-15, 3.2.8, 3.2.25-26, 3.3.56, 4.2.18, 4.2.20, 4.4.1-8, 4.5.18-22, 5.4.27, 5.5.41-44, 6.1.45-46, 6.3.36, 7.2.5-8, 7.4.3-5, 8.3.5-6).

Similarly excluded are "one-sided" conversations, that is remarks addressed by one person to another which seem to call for some response but which are answered (if at all) only indirectly, through the second person's actions (cf. 1.4.5, 1.4.8, 1.4.14, 1.4.20, 3.2.12-14, 3.2.27-31, 3.3.2-3, 3.3.24-25, 6.3.12, 7.5.2). Other isolated utterances can be categorized as statements or exclamations (cf. 1.4.25, 2.4.20, 3.1.8, 4.2.16, 7.1.3, 8.2.14), messages (1.4.26, 1.5.3,

2.4.1, 2.4.31, 3.1.3, 5.3.15, 5.5.1, 6.2.9-11; 4.5.27-33 is a letter quoted verbatim) or commands, instructions, exhortations and requests (2.4.21, 3.2.6, 3.3.59, 3.3.61, 3.3.62-63, 4.2.17, 4.2.32, 4.2.37, 4.5.1-3, 4.5.15-17, 4.5.23-25, 4.5.26, 4.5.34, 5.3.52, 7.1.10-14, 7.1.21, 7.1.22, 7.1.29, 7.4.11, 7.5.39-40, 8.7.2-3).

Finally, there are the speeches of the Cyr. These are self-contained, rather formal discourses delivered by one person, without interruption, before a group.[81] (A detailed list of the speeches in the Cyr. is appended below, pp. 415-417.) Generally speaking, it is not difficult to distinguish between speeches and dialogues in the Cyr. One speech may follow another in reply or reaction, but never as a response elicited by a question or proposal addressed to the specific speaker. Many dialogues contain long addresses by one speaker to another but these are not considered speeches because (a) they are an integral part of a conversational exchange and result from remarks addressed directly and specifically to the speaker and (b) they are directed towards individuals, not a group. Very rarely a dialogue develops after a speech has been delivered (cf. 4.5.50-55, 7.5.24-25) and conversely, a dialogue may end in a speech by one of the interlocutors to a wider audience (4.4.5-8, 6.3.22-34), but these are exceptions.

I turn now to a detailed list of the dialogues of the Cyr. The list is divided into 9 headings; the following is an explanation of the various headings.

A. Location of the Dialogue in the Cyr.: Reference (Ref.)

The reference given for each dialogue includes not only the actual conversation but enough of the introductory background and subsequent action so that, generally speaking, the dialogue can be read and analyzed as a self-contained unit. With the exception of the Symposium dialogues, the dialogues are divided

into small, self-contained units wherever possible. So, for example, the trial of the Armenian king (3.1.5-37) is in effect one long scene but it contains four separate "independent" dialogues (3.1.5-6; 8-13; 14-31; 31-37).

B. Length of the Dialogues: Number of Sections (No.S.)

The Cyr. is regularly divided into books, chapters and sections; I have used these sections as a measure of the dialogues' length. The division into sections is based on the content of the work rather than a fixed number of lines and consequently the sections are of unequal length. While the number of OCT lines or pages would undoubtedly have been a more accurate measure of length, I have found it much simpler to work with sections, particularly when checking the amount of actual speech in a dialogue (see below, p. 27). The sections are generally about 6 lines long or one quarter of an OCT page, but their length can vary considerably.

C. Names of the Speakers (Speakers)

Only the actual interlocutors in a dialogue are listed here. Thus in 5.4. 41-50, Gadatas is not listed as a speaker since, although he is addressed by Cyrus (along with Gobryas), he does not, in fact, say anything.

D. Others Present? (OP)

The dialogues frequently take place before a larger audience. Sometimes Xenophon clearly indicates the presence or absence of others, in which case I have simply written "yes" or "no" respectively. Often, however, the presence or absence of an audience must (and usually can) be inferred from the context of the dialogue. I have indicated this guesswork by enclosing the "yes" or "no" in brackets.

E. Content or Category of the Dialogue (Cat.)

I have classified the dialogues according to seven categories: Symposium (= Symp.), "Socratic" (= Soc.), Planning (= Plan.), Information (= Info.),

Negotiation (= Neg.), Novellistic (= Nov.) and Anecdotal or Short (= Short). The following is a brief description of each group.

Symposium dialogues are relaxed, semi-serious conversations which (usually) take place in large groups, round a dinner table.

"Socratic" dialogues are didactic conversations in which moral or ethical instruction is imparted or such issues are discussed.

Dialogues of Planning are simply conversations in which various plans and proposals are put forth, while in Information dialogues, information is requested and/or imparted. Negotiation dialogues too are similarly self-explanatory.

Novellistic dialogues are those dialogues related to the novelle of the Cyr., i.e. colourful stories dealing with the background and actions of the work's livelier characters. These conversations are often only indirectly related to the central plot of the Cyr., the tale of Cyrus' achievements. The novellistic dialogues are of two, rather different types: in some (e.g. 4.6.1-10) the novella is simply related while in others (e.g. 6.4.2-11) it is acted out for the reader.

Finally Anecdotal or Short Dialogues are brief conversations which do not fall into any of the above categories. Often they are tied to a specific incident and serve to illuminate the character of one of the speakers.

Many of the dialogues could be classified in more than one way. Nonetheless, for convenience's and clarity's sake, each dialogue has been assigned to only one category. So, for instance, Croesus' first conversation with Cyrus (7.2.9-29) is considered a novellistic one, despite its "Socratic" tone and the passages pertaining to information and negotiation. I have used an asterisk to indicate that a dialogue which is assigned to one category is discussed in a chapter devoted to another group.

Broadly speaking, the dialogues of planning, information and negotiation are "action" dialogues, i.e. dialogues that contribute directly to the action or

plot of the Cyr., while the sympotic, "Socratic" and short dialogues are ones of "speech" or "background"; novellistic dialogues are a mixture of both.

F. Dramatic Background? (DB)

The dialogues of the Cyr. are an integral part of a larger narrative framework and are introduced (and embedded) into the text in a natural fashion, e.g. one character approaches or summons another, they converse and part (cf., for example, 3.3.29-33). The placing of a dialogue in its setting, i.e. the introductory remarks preceding a conversation, will not, therefore, be considered dramatic background nor will the recording of whatever action follows upon a conversation. Similarly, within the conversation itself, indications of a change of speaker, which are a natural and necessary part of a narrated dialogue, will not be taken into account. Dramatic background is restricted, then, to added "unnecessary" description found within a conversational exchange.

This includes a speaker's reactions (e.g. καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος ἀναγελάσας εἶπεν... 5.1.9) or his thoughts (e.g. καὶ ὁ Γωβρύας θαυμάσας τε τί τοῦτ' εἴη καὶ ὑποπτεύσας μὴ τὴν θυγατέρα λέγοι οὕτως ἤρετο... 5.2.9) or actions (ἅμα δὲ ταῦτα λέγοντα πολλὰ αὐτῷ παραφέρειν καὶ θήρεια καὶ τῶν ἡμέρων 1.3.6). In addition, descriptions of the setting or background of a conversation (cf. e.g. 3.1.13, 6.4.10) and clarifications or explanations introduced by Xenophon himself (e.g. 1.3.8) which are found in the middle of a dialogue, also fall under the heading of dramatic background.

This heading of dramatic background is meant to show how often Xenophon takes advantage of the fact that his dialogues are in narrated, rather than dramatic form.

G. Direct or Reported Speech? (Sp)

We have seen above that some of the dialogues of the Cyr. are reported entirely in oratio recta while others are a combination of direct and indirect

speech. (Conversations reported entirely in indirect speech are not considered dialogues.) Mixed dialogues are indicated by an "M" while those entirely in oratio recta are marked "R".

II. Number of Sections Containing Speech: Speech Sections (SS)

The second heading on this list (No.S.) gives the length (or number of sections) of the entire dialogue, including the introductory background, dramatic additions in the middle etc. Here only those sections of the dialogue that actually include (or are composed entirely of) speech are counted. A comparison of the number in this column (SS) with that of the second (No.S.) will give a fair indication of the proportion of speech in the dialogue unit.

I. Number of Exchanges (Ex)

A dialogue between two people is said here to contain n exchanges when each person speaks n times. Thus for example 3.1.41 contains two exchanges because Tigranes and his wife both speak twice but 5.1.1 contains only one exchange, despite the fact that Cyrus speaks twice, because his partner, the music-loving Mede, speaks only once. The number of exchanges in a 3 person (or more) dialogue is counted in similar, if less precise, fashion.

This count of exchanges, taken in conjunction with SS (no. of sections containing speech) gives a fair indication of the liveliness of a conversation. Thus, for instance, 3.3.13-20 which has 8 speech sections but only one exchange, must contain at least one fairly long speech, while 1.4.10 which is only one section long and contains two exchanges, is clearly a more lively, if briefer conversation. In general, a ratio of 1:1 (or even higher) between the no. of exchanges and the no. of speech sections would seem to indicate a rapid, fairly brisk dialogue.

Let us turn, finally, to the list of dialogues.

The Dialogues of the Cyr.

| Ref. | No.S. | Speakers | OP | Cat. | DB | Sp | SS | Ex |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3.4-12 | (9) | C., Astyages and Mandane | Yes | Symp. | Yes | R | 8 | 13 |
| 1.3.15-18 | (4) | C. and Mandane | (No) | Soc. | No | M | 4 | 4 |
| 1.4.8-9 | (2) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Short | Yes | M | 1 | 2 |
| 1.4.10 | (1) | C. and Astyages | (No) | Short | Yes | R | 1 | 2 |
| 1.4.11-13 | (3) | C. and Mede Children | (No) | Plan. | Yes | R | 2 | 3 |
| 1.4.13-14 | (2) | C. and Astyages | (No) | Soc. | Yes | R | 1 | 3 |
| 1.4.18-20 | (3) | C. and Astyages | (Yes) | Plan. | Yes | R | 1 | 3 |
| 1.4.27-28 | (2) | C. and Artabazus | (No) | Nov. | Yes | R | 2 | 8 |
| 1.6.1-2.1.1 | (47) | C. and Cambyses | (No) | Soc. | Yes | R | 45 | 32 |
| 2.1.2-10 | (9) | C. and Cyaxares | (No) | Info. | No | M | 8 | 10 |
| 2.2.1-2.3.1 | (32) | C., Hystaspas, 6 Taxiarchs, Aglaitadas, Chrysantas, Sambaulas and Ugly Friend | Yes | Symp. | Yes | R | 31 | 14 |
| 2.3.22-24 | (3) | C. and Taxiarch | Yes | Short | No | R | 3 | 2 |
| 2.4.5-6 | (2) | C. and Cyaxares | (No) | Short | Yes | R | 2 | 1 |
| 2.4.6-8 | (3) | C., Cyaxares and Indian Delegates | (No) | Neg. | No | M | 2 | 2 |
| 2.4.9-17 | (9) | C. and Cyaxares | (No) | Plan. | No | R | 9 | 6 |
| 3.1.5-6 | (2) | C. and Armenian King | Yes | Neg. | No | M | 2 | 3 |
| 3.1.8-13 | (6) | C. and Armenian King | Yes | Soc. | Yes | R | 5 | 8 |
| 3.1.14-31 | (18) | C. and Tigranes | Yes | Soc. | Yes | R | 17 | 17 |
| 3.1.31-37 | (7) | C., Armenian King and Tigranes | Yes | Neg. | Yes | R | 7 | 6 |
| 3.1.38-40 | (3) | C., Armenian King and Tigranes | Yes | Nov.* | No | R | 3 | 3 |
| 3.1.41 | (1) | Tigranes and Wife | (No) | Nov. | No | R | 1 | 2 |
| 3.1.42-43 | (2) | C., Armenian King and Tigranes | (Yes) | Short | Yes | M | 2 | 3 |
| 3.2.1 | (1) | C. and Tigranes | (Yes) | Info. | No | M | 1 | 2 |
| 3.2.14-23 | (10) | C., Armenian King and Chaldeans | (Yes) | Neg. | Yes | M | 8 | 10 |
| 3.3.13-20 | (8) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Plan. | No | R | 8 | 1 |
| 3.3.29-33 | (5) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Plan. | No | R | 3 | 1 |
| 3.3.46-48 | (3) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Plan. | No | M | 2 | 1 |
| 3.3.48-56 | (9) | C. and Chrysantas | Yes | Soc. | No | R | 8 | 2 |
| 4.1.10-12 | (3) | C. and Taxiarchs | Yes | Plan. | No | R | 3 | 2 |
| 4.1.12-22 | (11) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Plan. | Yes | R | 9 | 3 |
| 4.1.23-24 | (2) | C. and Artabazus | No | Short | No | R | 1 | 2 |
| 4.2.3-8 | (6) | C. and Hyrcanian Messengers | (Yes) | Neg. | Yes | M | 5 | 3 |

| Ref. | No.S. | Speakers | OP | Cat. | DB | Sp | SS | Ex |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.2.13-14 | (2) | C. and Hyrcanians | Yes | Plan. | No | M | 1 | 1 |
| 4.5.9-12 | (4) | Cyaxares and Mede Officer | (Yes) | Plan. | Yes | M | 3 | 2 |
| 4.5.36-55 | (20) | C. and Mede and Hyrcanian Leaders | Yes | Plan. | Yes | M | 18 | 3 |
| 4.6.1-10 | (10) | C. and Gobryas | (Yes) | Nov. | No | R | 9 | 3 |
| 5.1.1 | (1) | C. and Mede | Yes | Short | No | R | 1 | 1 |
| 5.1.2-18 | (17) | C. and Araspas | No | Nov. | Yes | M | 14 | 6 |
| 5.2.6-22 | (17) | C. and Gobryas | Yes | Symp. | Yes | R | 10 | 5 |
| 5.2.23-37 | (15) | C., Hyrcanian Leader and Gobryas | (No) | Plan. | No | M | 15 | 9 |
| 5.3.2-4 | (3) | C. and Persian Officer | Yes | Short | No | R | 3 | 1 |
| 5.3.5-7 | (3) | Gobryas and Assyrian King | Yes | Neg.* | No | M | 3 | 1 |
| 5.3.8-14 | (7) | C. and Gobryas | (No) | Plan.* | No | M | 7 | 5 |
| 5.3.18-23 | (6) | C., Gadatas and Hyrcanian Leader | (No) | Nov. | Yes | M | 5 | 3 |
| 5.3.26-29 | (4) | C. and Gadatas | (No) | Info. | No | M | 3 | 3 |
| 5.4.10-14 | (5) | C. and Gadatas | (No) | Nov. | No | R | 5 | 3 |
| 5.4.29-40 | (12) | C. and Gadatas | (No) | Nov. | Yes | R | 9 | 3 |
| 5.4.41-50 | (10) | C. and Gobryas | Yes | Plan. | No | M | 10 | 2 |
| 5.5.5-36 | (32) | C. and Cyaxares | No | Soc. | Yes | R | 29 | 10 |
| 6.1.1-5 | (5) | C., Gadatas and Hystaspas | (Yes) | Plan. | Yes | M | 4 | 4 |
| 6.1.36-44 | (9) | C. and Araspas | No | Plan.* | No | R | 8 | 5 |
| 6.1.47 | (1) | Abradatas and Panthea | (No) | Nov. | No | M | 1 | 1 |
| 6.1.48-49 | (2) | C. and Abradatas | (No) | Nov. | No | R | 2 | 1 |
| 6.2.1-3 | (3) | C. and Indian Messengers | (Yes) | Plan. | No | M | 2 | 1 |
| 6.3.9-11 | (3) | C. and Captured Assyrians | Yes | Info. | Yes | R | 3 | 6 |
| 6.3.14-21 | (8) | C. and Araspas | Yes | Info. | Yes | R | 7 | 5 |
| 6.4.2-11 | (10) | Abradatas and Panthea | Y & N | Nov. | Yes | R | 7 | 2 |
| 7.1.6-9 | (4) | C. and Chrysantas | Yes | Plan. | No | R | 4 | 4 |
| 7.1.15-18 | (4) | C. and Abradatas | Yes | Plan.* | Yes | R | 4 | 1 |
| 7.1.19-20 | (2) | C. and Hystaspas | (Yes) | Plan. | Yes | R | 2 | 1 |
| 7.1.41-44 | (4) | C. and Egyptian Soldiers | Yes | Neg. | No | M | 4 | 5 |
| 7.2.9-29 | (21) | C. and Croesus | (No) | Nov. | No | R | 20 | 7 |
| 7.3.2-7 | (6) | C. and Servant | Yes | Nov. | Yes | R | 4 | 1 |
| 7.3.8-14 | (7) | C. and Panthea | Yes | Nov. | Yes | R | 5 | 2 |
| 7.4.12-13 | (2) | C. and Croesus | (Yes) | Short* | No | R | 2 | 1 |
| 7.5.7-9 | (3) | C., Chrysantas and Gobryas | Yes | Plan. | No | R | 3 | 2 |
| 7.5.24-25 | (2) | C. and Gobryas' Men | Yes | Info. | No | R | 2 | 2 |

| Ref. | No.S. | Speakers | OP | Cat. | DR | Sp | SS | Ex |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8.2.15-23 | (9) | C., Croesus and Hystaspas | Yes | Soc.* | Yes | M | 9 | 4 |
| 8.3.3-4 | (2) | C. and Officer | Yes | Short | No | M | 2 | 1 |
| 8.3.7-8 | (2) | Pheraulas and Officer(s) | No | Short | Yes | M | 2 | 2 |
| 8.3.26-30 | (5) | C. and Sacian | (Yes) | Nov.* | Yes | M | 5 | 5 |
| 8.3.30-32 | (3) | Sacian and Pheraulas | (No) | Nov.* | Yes | M | 3 | 3 |
| 8.3.35-48 | (14) | Sacian and Pheraulas | No | Symp. | No | R | 13 | 6 |
| 8.4.6-27 | (22) | C., Gobryas, Hystaspas, Artabazus and Chrysantas | Yes | Symp. | Yes | R | 21 | 34 |
| 8.4.31 | (1) | Two Groups of Soldiers | Yes | Short | No | R | 1 | 1 |
| 8.5.17-20 | (4) | C. and Cyaxares | Yes | Plan. | Yes | M | 4 | 2 |

An Analysis of the List of Dialogues

The purpose of the following analysis is to examine the relationship between the form and content of the various dialogues. In practical terms, this means first obtaining overall results for each of the headings on the list of dialogues (e.g. the average length of the dialogues, the number of dialogues containing dramatic background etc.) and then comparing the general figures with specific results for each of the seven categories of content, to see whether there are any substantial differences (for example, symposium dialogues are longer than average, information dialogues rarely have any dramatic background etc.). The different types of dialogues (sympotic, "Socratic" etc.) can then, perhaps, be characterized by their deviations from the overall average.

This method of analysis involves the repeated use of mathematical tables which may lend a pseudo-scientific air to the procedure. The method used is not, of course, a rigorous statistical analysis and the results are far from being mathematical or precise.

I begin, then, with a summary of the categories of content of the dialogues and then turn to examine each of the other headings in relation to the various categories of content.

1) Content of Dialogues

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

Returning to the distinction made earlier between "action" dialogues (or dialogues of planning, information and negotiation) and "speech" or "background" ones (i.e. symposium, "Socratic", short and novellistic[82] dialogues), it is interesting to note that about half (35) of the dialogues fall into the first category and close to half (41) into the second.

2) Length of the Dialogues

| Length (in sections) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of Dialogues | 6 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | |
| Length (in sections) | 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 32 | 47 |
| No. of Dialogues | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

On the whole the dialogues are short. Over half are 4 sections long or less and 63 of the 76 dialogues (over 80%) are under 10 sections (= 3 OCT pages) long. The average length is 7.3 sections.

3) Relation between Length and Content

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Range of Length (in sections) | 1-47 | 9-32 | 1-3 | 2-20 | 2-47 | 2-10 | 1-21 | 1-9 |
| Average Length (in sections) | 7.3 | 18.8 | 1.9 | 6.2 | 15.9 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 4.5 |
| Median | 4 | 17 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 4 |

To begin with the most obvious results, the short dialogues are of course quite short while symposium dialogues are long. The "Socratic" dialogues too can be rather long and those of information and negotiation are generally short. The planning dialogues are also fairly short but their range is wider since this is

a large category. The novellistic dialogues also vary considerably in length and are slightly longer than average.

In sum, there is a certain relation between the content of a dialogue and its length although there are many exceptions.

4) Number of Speakers

There are 76 dialogues in all. The overwhelming majority (62) are conversations between two people; 12 are between three people, while the remaining 2 involve groups of five or more. Cyrus participates in almost all of the conversations, in 67 of the 76 listed. This is to be expected as the narrative of the Cyr. is almost always focussed on Cyrus and his doings.[83] The "typical" dialogue of the Cyr. is, then, one between Cyrus and another person.

12 dialogues include groups (rather than individuals) as interlocutors and 8 dialogues have an anonymous speaker.

5) Relation between Number of Speakers and Content

The majority of the dialogues, as we have seen, are between two people. My interest is, therefore, in the smaller group of conversations between three or more people and their distribution among the various types of dialogues.

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of Dialogues with 3 or more people | 14 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Total no. of Dialogues | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

Dialogues of information are always between two people, while "Socratic", short and novellistic dialogues are, like the dialogues as a whole, usually between two speakers. Symposium dialogues generally involve large groups and dialogues of planning and particularly of negotiation can include more than two speakers (i.e. two sides and a mediator as in 3.2.14-23).

Turning to dialogues with group speakers the distribution according to content is as follows: Plan. - 5, Neg. - 4, Info. - 2, Short - 1; Nov. Soc. and Symp. - 0. Generally speaking it is the "action" rather than the "background" or "speech" dialogues that have group spokesmen - the groups participate in planning or negotiation or impart information. (The short anecdotal 8.4.31 is an exception.)

The distribution of the 8 dialogues with anonymous speakers is: Symp. - 1, Short - 5, Plan. - 1 and Nov. - 1. It is not surprising that the short, anecdotal dialogues have the highest percentage of anonymous interlocutors for the point of such dialogues is often, in fact, what the other (named) speaker has said in reply.

6) Public vs. Private Conversations

We have seen that Xenophon often does not indicate whether conversations are held in public or in private and that the presence (or absence) of others besides the interlocutors must be inferred. We are told of an audience being present at 36 of the dialogues while 6 conversations are specifically said to be private ones. If the bracketed guesses for the remainder of the dialogues are included the figures become 48 public vs. 27 private conversations, roughly 2/3 vs. 1/3.

7) Relation between Presence of Audience and Content

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of public Dialogues | 48 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Total no. of Dialogues | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

Most of the symposium dialogues are public ones, as are almost all the negotiation dialogues. So too most plans are discussed in front of an audience, but some are (naturally enough) more secret. The "Socratic" and novellistic

dialogues seem to be more private; while many of these conversations do take place in public, a higher than average number are not overheard by others. In short, there is some connection between the content of a dialogue and the presence of an audience but it is not a very strong one. The most interesting dialogue in terms of its audience is 6.4.2-11 for this conversation begins in front of others, turns into a private discussion, only to end in front of an audience (see below, pp.299-304).

8) Dramatic Background and Content of Dialogues

38 of the dialogues include dramatic background; 38 do not. In other words, the dialogues are evenly divided on this point. Checking this overall result with the various categories of content, we find:

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dialogues with dramatic background | 38 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| Total no. of Dialogues | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

The most interesting result is that of the symposium dialogues - almost all have a dramatic background. "Socratic" conversations, too, often include extra background. Negotiation, planning, short and novellistic dialogues include some background about half the time - i.e. there is no special correlation. Information dialogues have less background than the average, perhaps because they are purposeful "action" dialogues.

9) Direct vs. Mixed Speech

46 of the 76 dialogues are reported entirely in oratio recta and the remaining 30 conversations are mixed. The distribution according to content is:

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of Dialogues in O.R. | 46 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 3 |
| Total no. of Dialogues | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

The most noteworthy feature is, again, the high figure for the symposium dialogues - all 5 are entirely in direct speech. In general those dialogues whose chief interest lies in what is said, rather than the plans or actions resulting from the conversation, i.e. the "speech" dialogues, are more likely to be in O.R. The action dialogues, on the other hand, have a higher proportion of mixed speech. (This is true in particular of the negotiation dialogues where often one party is simply shown as agreeing to the terms set by the other side.) In sum, the distinction between "action" and "speech" (or "background") dialogues is shown here to be a real one.

10) Framework of the Dialogues - Indirect vs. Direct Narration

Generally Xenophon narrates the framework of the Cyr.'s dialogues - the identification of speakers, attribution of their words etc. - directly and only rarely is the setting of the dialogues presented indirectly, subordinated to a word such as λέγεται, φασί etc. Since these indirect frameworks are so rare (i.e. in 7 of the 76 dialogues), I have not noted them on the list of dialogues. Four of these 7 conversations are found in the first book of the Cyr. (including the first 3 dialogues of the work), one is in Book 4 and the remaining two are in the last book. It seems as if Xenophon made use of a mixed or indirect setting in the very beginning of the Cyr., discarded it for a direct presentation and then turned to it again only very occasionally afterwards.

11) Number of Exchanges Per Speech Section and Content of Dialogues

We have seen above (p. 27) that the ratio of the number of exchanges (Ex) to the number of speech sections (SS) in a dialogue is a rough indication of the liveliness of a conversation. Dialogues having a proportion of 1:1 (or higher) in this count of exchanges vs. speech sections are said to be "rapid" ones. 33 of the 76 dialogues are "rapid"; the remaining 43 conversations are not. The more detailed distribution is:

| | Total | Symp. | Short | Plan. | Soc. | Neg. | Nov. | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "Rapid" Dialogues | 33 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| Total no. of Dialogues | 76 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 6 |

The most "rapid" dialogues of all are the information ones; the short, anecdotal dialogues and those of negotiation also have a relatively high number of exchanges. Planning dialogues are much less "rapid" than average, while the remaining categories - symposium, Socratic and novellistic - do not differ much from the overall average. These results make sense, for information and negotiation dialogues must involve exchanges of questions and answers, while short, anecdotal conversations are characterized, in part, by their light repartee. In the planning dialogues, on the other hand, one person (usually Cyrus) normally presents the plan and does most of the talking.

12) Conclusions

In sum, the symposium dialogues are most unique in their form, for they are longer than average, have more speakers, almost always have a dramatic background and are reported entirely in direct speech. To a lesser extent, the information dialogues also follow a recognizable pattern, for they always take place between two interlocutors, have little dramatic background and are "rapid", lively conversations. It is less simple to identify the remaining types of dialogues on the basis of their structure or external form, for they fluctuate considerably in relation to length, number of speakers, presence of an audience etc. These dialogues were not written according to any obvious pattern.

The distinction between "action" dialogues (i.e. dialogues of planning, negotiation and information) and "background" or "speech" dialogues (symposium, "Socratic", short and novellistic conversations) is, at times, a real one for the "action" dialogues have more group speakers, less than average dramatic

background and - most interesting of all - less direct speech than the "speech" ones.

Attribution of Speeches and the Use of Vocatives in the Dialogues

We have already noted that the dialogues of the Cyr. are an integral part of the narrative as a whole, and consequently are narrated conversations rather than dramatic ones. This means that in every conversation the interlocutors are identified by Xenophon, their words are attributed to them, changes of speaker are indicated etc. I turn now to the mechanics of such technical background information in the dialogues, to what Plato calls τὰ μεταξὺ τῶν ῥήσεων (Rep. 393 B) or αἱ μεταξὺ τῶν λόγων διηγήσεις (Theat. 143 B).[84]

I shall begin with the question of how a statement is attributed to its speaker in the dialogues of the Cyr. and the related problem of indicating a change of speaker. The simplest case (and a fairly frequent one) is when a phrase equivalent to "X said" precedes X's statement (καὶ ὁ Κῦρος ἔφη... ) or is inserted into the middle of his words (... ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος... ) - this leaves very little room for misunderstanding. Often, however, the more general ἔφη ("he/she said" rather than "X said") is used to assign a speech to an interlocutor, once he has been named. Not every occurrence of ἔφη, however, indicates that the speaker has changed for Xenophon often interpolates more than one ἔφη in the course of a single speech by one speaker (cf. e.g. 1.4.13, 1.6.8, 1.6.37-39, 2.1.9, 2.3.22 etc. etc.). In addition, not every instance of a change of interlocutor is indicated by the use of ἔφη or some similar phrase. Sometimes only a direct address by name to another participant in the conversation, i.e. a vocative, serves to warn the reader that someone else is now speaking (cf. e.g. 1.6.21, 22, 26, 27 etc.), while at other times we find a direct, juxtaposed reply (cf. e.g. 6.3.20, 7.1.8 etc.) or (more rarely) a whole series of them (see e.g. 3.1.10-12, 3.1.38, 8.4.9, 8.4.14) with no external indication of who is speaking.

In short, often it is the sense of a passage, the content of a speaker's remarks, rather than his name attached to them, that reveals the identity of a speaker. Hence, while in theory these narrated dialogues (unlike dramatic conversations) should need no further elucidation (i.e. an external indication of change of speaker, the beginning of a speech etc.), modern editors, when printing the text of the Cyr., generally use typographical aids and careful punctuation to indicate to the reader to whom the speeches should be assigned. (The most common device is the use of a capital Greek letter at the beginning of a new speaker's remarks.) Ancient readers, too, seem to have found such aids convenient, for if we examine 5 papyri of the Cyr. that contain portions of a dialogue that include a change of speaker - P.Oxy. 1018 (= Pack$^2$ 1548), P.Oxy. 697 (= Pack$^2$ 1546), P.Oxy. 2101 (= Pack$^2$ 1545), P.Hawara 15 (= Pack$^2$ 1550) and Rainer M. 6, 81-97 (= Pack$^2$ 1551) - we find that all but one (= the last) use (albeit inconsistently) paragraphoi or dicolons or both to signal a change of interlocutor.[85] It is natural, under the circumstances, that there should be some disagreement among modern editors on the attribution of some passages of dialogue, but the number of such disputed passages is remarkably low.[86] In other words, on the whole, Xenophon manages to indicate very clearly, in one way or another, who says what.

Xenophon employs a variety of phrases to express the simple idea of "X said" regularly using ἔφη, ἔλεξεν and εἶπεν,[87] preceded or followed by X's name (e.g. καὶ ὁ Κῦρος εἶπεν or ἔλεξεν ὁ Τιγράνης ὧδε etc.) and often using other verbs of questioning and answering as well (e.g. Κυαξάρης δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο or καὶ ὁ Κῦρος ἐπήρετο αὐτούς etc.). He is clearly at pains, sometimes, to vary these necessary (but cumbersome) insertions.[88] The conversations at 1.4.10, 3.1.14-31, 5.3.26-29, 5.4.10-14 and 6.1.36-44 are all good examples of dialogues containing a variety of insertions, short and long. Sometimes, by varying the length of

these expressions or omitting them altogether, Xenophon contributes to the overall tone of the dialogue. So, for example, a series of short questions and answers, when combined with a few, very brief indications of the speakers, produces the effect of a cross-examination (see e.g. 1.3.11, 1.4.13, 1.6.9, 3.1.6, 5.5.13-14 and 8.4.9-10; cf. 6.3.9-11), but if such questions and answers are coupled with longer background insertions, the resulting effect is one of a negotiation, with long pauses for thought in between (so e.g. 7.1.41-44).

Xenophon uses these formulas of speaking to achieve other literary effects as well. Normally a speaker is identified by his name, but in some dialogues an attribute of the interlocutor is used instead, to characterize him and his words. So, for example, in Cambyses' long didactic conversation with his son (1.6.1-2.1.1), he is never referred to by name - all the longer attributions of his statements are of the form ἔφη ὁ πατήρ , for the point is that he is a father teaching his son. Similarly, Araspas, in conversation with his contemporary Cyrus, is more often identified as ὁ νεανίσκος than by his name (5.1.8, 9, 13, 18 vs. 5.1.4, 16) because his words are those of an impetuous and inexperienced young man.

Thus Xenophon, at times, uses the conventional formulas of "X said", a necessary part of narrated dialogues, for his own literary purposes. He also occasionally employs another conversational convention, vocatives, to similar effect.

We have already seen that the employment of a vocative, serves, at times, as the sole (formal) indication of change of speaker; at other times it is used to signal out the addressee of a remark from a group (cf. e.g. 7.1.6). Normally, however, the vocative does not add any essential information but is simply a natural part of polite exchanges - a type of greeting at the opening of a conversation or a gentle request for special attention on the part of the listener at

a critical juncture of the conversation. (Presumably these uses of the vocative reflect the normal conversational practices of Xenophon's time.)

Generally, speakers address one another in the vocative by name, or in the case of close family kinship, by the term of relationship - so, for example, Cyrus addresses Mandane as ὦ μῆτερ (1.3.2), Astyages as ὦ πάππε (1.3.4) and Cambyses as ὦ πάτερ (1.6.3) etc. This convention can be used more subtly. Cyrus addresses his uncle Cyaxares as ὦ θεῖε when he is a young boy in Media (1.4.9) but then calls him by his name as an adult (2.4.6 etc.). Only when they quarrel and Cyrus wishes to appease Cyaxares does he return to the original form of address (5.5.8, 35), thus reminding him of their close bonds. Another instance is Cyrus' seemingly polite address ὦ σύγγενες, to Artabazus, his newly-discovered "relative" (1.4.28). This correct form of address is tinged with irony.

The opening vocatives of a conversation also help to establish the relationship between the interlocutors. Cyrus is addressed as ὦ δέσποτα by Croesus at their first meeting (7.2.9) but he later uses the familiar ὦ Κῦρε ; the same is true of Gobryas. Cyrus' men almost always turn to him with the simple ὦ Κῦρε (2.2.5, 11, 18 etc.) but after the conquest of Babylon he becomes ὦ Κῦρε βασιλεῦ (8.2.17).

The frequent use of vocative also stresses, occasionally, a literary idiosyncrasy of the Cyr. Not all of the characters of the Cyr. are named and consequently some are addressed by their nationality - ὦ Ἀρμένιε for the Armenian king (3.1.5), ὦ Σάκα for Astyages' Sacian cupbearer (1.3.9) etc. - or by their function, e.g. ὦ ταξίαρχε for an anonymous taxiarch (2.2.16). Normally this type of vocative does not jar, but it is surprising to find that Tigranes, in an intimate moment, addresses his wife as ὦ Ἀρμενία (3.1.41) or that Pheraulas turns over his entire fortune to someone known to him simply as ὦ Σάκα (8.3.40).

After this general survey of the dialogues of the Cyr. I turn to a detailed commentary on the various categories of dialogues, in the following four chapters.

# Chapter II

## The "Socratic" Dialogues of the Cyropaedia

In this chapter I shall look closely at the didactic or "Socratic" dialogues of the Cyr.: that is to say, dialogues which in content - ethical, moral, philosophical or didactic - or in the techniques of argument and discussion, or both, remind us of Xenophon's Socratic works.

I begin with a short and seemingly simple conversation, Cyr. 1.4.13-14, which well illustrates the Socratic influence to be found in the Cyr. The young Cyrus, visiting his grandfather Astyages in Media, has been asked by his playmates to intercede on their behalf with Astyages so that they all may receive permission to go hunting outside the royal παράδεισος, the enclosed park. Cyrus feels too shy and tongue-tied to approach his grandfather but, pressed by his companions, he summons up his courage and plans how best to achieve his aims and yet annoy his grandfather as little as possible (ἐπιβουλεύσας ὅπως ἂν ἀλυπότατα εἴποι πρὸς τὸν πάππον καὶ διαπράξειεν αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς παισὶν ὧν ἐδέοντο 1.4.13).

Cyrus opens the conversation with a hypothetical question, one apparently unrelated to his present quest, asking his grandfather how he would treat a runaway servant (οἰκέτης) who had been caught. Astyages replies that he would put him to work in chains and Cyrus then asks how a runaway slave who had returned of his own free will would be handled, again requesting his grandfather's verdict upon a (seemingly) theoretical case, having little to do with the two of them. Only after Astyages replies that he would flog such a servant (to prevent him from running away again) and then treat him as before, does Cyrus reveal that the despot is, in fact, pronouncing judgement on his own grandson, for he is the runaway οἰκέτης who plans to go off hunting with his friends and then return. Astyages then forbids Cyrus to carry out his plan, for he does not want his

grandson lost through carelessness. Cyrus' conversational ploy has failed; later (1.4.14) sulking proves to be a more effective means of achieving his aim.

This technique of having an interlocutor pass judgement upon a hypothetical question, one apparently unrelated to his own situation and then suddenly applying the (analogous) verdict to him personally, is one frequently used by Socrates ion the Memorabilia.[1] Mem. 2.1.1-7. 16-17; 2.2.1-3, 12-13; 2.3.11-13; 2.9.1-3; 2.10.1-3 and 3.7.1-2 are all instances of Socrates employing this method (cf. too 1.4.2-9) and Mem. 2.1.16-17 and 2.10.1-3 make similar use of slaves as hypothetical examples. Socrates' "teacher" in the Oec., Ischomachus, is also shown questioning his wife in this fashion (Oec. 10.3-7). The technique may well be genuinely Socratic[2] - Plato in his Laches (187E-188A) has Nicias say

> ΝΙ. Οὔ μοι δοκεῖς εἰδέναι ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἐγγύτατα Σωκράτους
> ἢ [λόγῳ ὥσπερ γάνει] καὶ πλησιάζῃ διαλεγόμενος, ἀνάγκη
> αἰτῷ, ἐὰν ἄρα καὶ περὶ ἄλλου του πρότερον ἄρξηται διαλέ-
> γεσθαι, μὴ παύεσθαι ὑπὸ τούτου περιαγόμενον τῷ λόγῳ,
> πρὶν (ἂν) ἐμπέσῃ εἰς τὸ διδόναι περὶ αὑτοῦ λόγον, ὁντινα
> τρόπον νῦν τε ζῇ καὶ ὁντινα τὸν παρεληλυθότα βίον βεβί-
> ωκεν.

No matter what the starting point of the discussion is, Socrates' interlocutors always end up having to give an account of themselves. Even Cyrus' casual opening words to his grandfather εἰπέ μοι echo Socratic usage, for every instance in the Mem. of Socrates first inviting an interlocutor to judge a hypothetical case and then having him apply the judgement to himself begins with Socrates' εἰπέ μοι (Mem. 1.4.2; 2.1.1; 2.2.1; 2.9.2; 2.10.1; 3.7.1; cf. Oec. 10.3).[3]

Our short dialogue, Cyr. 1.4.13, can, then, reasonably be termed a Socratic one. The young Cyrus plays the role of Socrates here, while his grandfather is the partner who unwittingly gives a verdict affecting himself, while discussing an analogous situation (runaway servant : master = Cyrus : Astyages). It is interesting to note that Cyrus thought such indirect questioning the best way

to achieve his desire without paining his grandfather. Perhaps it would not be too far-fetched to say that Xenophon is characterizing Socrates' method here: it is a technique carefully designed to achieve certain aims (i.e. instruct and correct Socrates' interlocutors), without causing undue annoyance.

Cyrus, in our dialogue, fails to win over Astyages and has to resort to sulking in order to gain his wish (Cyr. 1.4.14). Why does Xenophon have Cyrus fail? Surely not because he wishes to impugn Socrates' method as ineffective in the hands of others. One could well imagine Astyages delighting in his grandson's cleverness and granting him his request at once. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the old ruler's final remark χαρίεν γάρ... εἰ ἕνεκα κρεαδίων τῇ θυγατρὶ τὸν παῖδα ἀποβουκολήσαιμι - he does not want to lose his daughter her son, as one loses a stray sheep, for the sake of a bit of meat. With these words we have moved suddenly from the world of Socrates to that of Herodotus. In Herodotus' version of Cyrus' childhood, Astyages sets out to destroy his daughter's child and Cyrus is almost left to die of exposure at the hands of a βουκόλος (Hdt. 1.108 ff.). There bits of meat play a gruesome part in the subsequent tale (1.119). Xenophon, by his use of the colourful ἀποβουκολήσαιμι here seems to hint at Herodotus' tale of Cyrus' cruel grandfather, even while presenting Astyages in an altogether more positive light.(More such oblique references in the Cyr. to the alternate versions of Cyrus' youth will be seen below - cf. pp. 187-188 and p. 327).

Cyr. 1.4.13 is then a "Socratic" dialogue but incorporates other influences as well. This is true of the other dialogues of the Cyr. that have Socratic features. The conversations in question are: 1.3.15-18; 1.6.1-2.1.1; 3.1.8-13, 14-31; 3.3.48-56; 5.5.5-36.[4] Before examining these dialogues, it is perhaps a good idea to summarize the chief features of some actual Socratic dialogues of Xenophon, to see what "Socratic" means. The dialogues of the Mem. seem particularly

close to those of the Cyr. for both groups are fairly short conversations, found in a larger framework which centres round an idealized hero. I begin, then, with a list of the dialogues, semi-dialogues, speeches and anecdotes of the Mem.

## Dialogues of the Memorabilia

| Ref. | Speakers | Ex | SS | OP | DB | B&E | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2.32-38 | Soc., Charicles & Critias | 6 | 5 | | Yes | SB | A |
| 1.2.40-46 | Alcibiades and Pericles | 9 | 6 | | No | AlcBE | A QR |
| 1.3.8-15 | Soc. & Xenophon | 5 | 5 | Yes | No | SBE | B An |
| 1.4.2-19 | Soc. & Aristodemus | 11 | 17 | | No | SBE | A LSE An |
| 1.6.1-10 | Soc. & Antiphon | 1 | 10 | Yes | No | SE | A FE LSE An |
| 1.6.11-14 | Soc. & Antiphon | 1 | 4 | Yes | No | SE | A FE LSE An |
| 2.1.1-34 | Soc. & Aristippus | 19 | 34 | | No | SBE | A LSE An QR |
| 2.2.1-14 | Soc. & Lamprocles | 15 | 14 | | No | SBE | A LS LSE An QR |
| 2.3.1-19 | Soc. & Chaerecrates | 10 | 19 | | No | SBE | A LSE An QR |
| 2.5.1-5 | Soc. & Antisthenes | 1 | 4 | Yes | No | SBE | B FE An |
| 2.6.1-39 | Soc. & Critoboulos | 31 | 39 | | No | SB | A LS Pe An QR |
| 2.7.1-14 | Soc. & Aristarchus | 12 | 13 | | Yes | SBE | B LS Ad Pe An QR |
| 2.8.1-6 | Soc. & Eutherus | 5 | 6 | | No | SBE | A Ad An |
| 2.9.1-8 | Soc. & Crito | 3 | 3 | | Yes | SE | B Ad Pe An |
| 2.10.1-6 | Soc. & Diodorus | 3 | 6 | | No | SBE | B Ad Pe An QR |
| 3.1.1-11 | Soc. & Ambitious Youth | 8 | 10 | Yes | Yes | SBE | B LS An QR |
| 3.3.1-15 | Soc. & Hipparch | 20 | 15 | | No | SB | B Pe An QR |
| 3.4.1-12 | Soc. & Nicomachides | 16 | 12 | | Yes | SBE | A LSE An QR |
| 3.5.1-28 | Soc. & Pericles (Jr.) | 22 | 28 | | No | SBE | A LS An QR |
| 3.6.1-18 | Soc. & Glaucon | 18 | 17 | | Yes | SBE | A LSE An QR |
| 3.7.1-9 | Soc. & Charmides | 6 | 9 | | No | SBE | A An |
| 3.8.1-3 | Soc. & Aristippus | 4 | 2 | Yes | Yes | SE | A QR |
| 3.8.4-7 | Soc. & Aristippus | 6 | 4 | Yes? | No | SE | A |
| 3.10.1-5 | Soc. & Parrhasius | 10 | 5 | | No | SB | B QR |
| 3.10.6-8 | Soc. & Clito | 4 | 3 | | Yes | SBE | B QR |
| 3.10.9-15 | Soc. & Pistias | 8 | 7 | | No | SB | B |
| 3.11.1-18 | Soc. (& Followers) & Theodote | 20 | 18 | Yes | Yes | SBE | B Ad An QR |

| Ref. | Speakers | Ex | SS | OP | DB | B&E | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.12.1-8 | Soc. & Epigenes | 1 | 8 | | No | SBE | A FE LSE |
| 4.2.1-40 | Soc. & Euthydemus | 69 | 38 | No (8ff.) | Yes | SB | A LS Pe An QR |
| 4.3.1-18 | Soc. & Euthydemus | 14 | 15 | | No | SBE | B LS QR |
| 4.4.1-25 | Soc. & Hippias | 36 | 21 | Yes | Yes | SE | A LS Pe? An QR |
| 4.5.1-12 | Soc. & Euthydemus | 19 | 10 | | No | SBE | B An QR |
| 4.6.1-11 | Soc. & Euthydemus | 54 | 10 | | No | SBE | B QR |
| 4.8.4-10 | Soc. & Hermogenes | 4 | 7 | | No | SE | A LSE |

Explanation of Abbreviations

Ex - Number of exchanges between speakers (as defined in Chapter I , p. 27).

SS - Number of OCT sections containing speech; speech sections.

OP - Others present at the conversation? (Note: Xenophon's claims to have been present at certain conversations are not taken into account.)

DB - Dramatic Background? (I.e. Background information supplied by Xenophon within the dialogue, other than assignments of speakers; cf. Chapter 1, p. 26 ).

B&E - Beginning and End.

SB - Socrates begins the conversation.

SE - Socrates ends the conversation.

SBE - Socrates begins and ends the conversation.

Comments - Brief characterization of the dialogue.

A - Argumentative, i.e. a real discussion in which the interlocutor disagrees with Socrates at times.

Ad - Advice dialogue.

An - At least one analogy in the dialogue.

B - Bland exchange, with Socrates' interlocutor generally agreeing with what is said.

FE - Few exchanges between interlocutors.

LS - Dialogue includes a long speech (i.e. 2/3 of an OCT page or more) by Socrates.

LSE - Dialogue includes long speech by Socrates at the end.

QR - Dialogue contains a series of brief questions and replies.

Pe - Interlocutor is shown to be persuaded or convinced by Socrates.

## Speeches of the Mem.

| Ref. | Theme | Audience | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.5.1-6 | Self-control | Companions | Cf. 2.1.1-7; 4.5 |
| 1.7.1-5 | Pretence | (Companions?) | 4-5 paraphrased; cf. 2.6.37-39; 3.9.10-13 |
| 2.4.1-7 | Friends | (Companions?) | 1-4 paraphrased; cf. 2.3 |
| 3.2.1-4 | Leadership | New strategos | |
| 3.9.9 | Leisure | (Companions?) | Paraphrased statement |
| 3.14.7 | Good eating | (Companions?) | Paraphrased statement |
| 4.1.1-5 | Importance of education | 1) Noble & 2) Rich | Paraphrased statement |
| 4.7.1-10 | Subjects to be studied | (Companions?) | Paraphrased |

## Anecdotes and One-Sided Conversations of the Mem.

| Ref. | Participants | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1.6.15 | Soc. and Antiphon | One-sided conv. |
| 2.9.4-8 | Watchdog Archedemus & Critics | One-sided conv. |
| 3.8.8-10 | Soc. and anonymous persons | One-sided conv.; ends in paraphrase |
| 3.9.1-3 | Soc. and anonymous person | One-sided conv. |
| 3.9.4-7 | Soc. and anonymous person(s) | One-sided conv.; begins in paraphrase |
| 3.9.8 | Soc. and anonymous persons | One-sided conv.; paraphrased |
| 3.9.10-13 | Soc. & anonymous person(s) | One-sided conv.; mainly paraphrased |
| 3.9.14-15 | Soc. & anonymous person(s) | One-sided conv.; paraphrased at end |
| 3.13.1 | Soc. & angry young man | One-sided conv. |
| 3.13.2 | Soc. & unhungry man | Anecdotal dialogue |
| 3.13.3 | Soc. & complaining man | Anecdotal dialogue |
| 3.13.4 | Soc. & unfit master | Anecdotal dialogue |
| 3.13.5 | Soc. to frightened traveller | One-sided conv. |
| 3.13.6 | Soc. & weary traveller | Anecdotal dialogue |
| 3.14.1 | Soc. & picnic friends | |
| 3.14.2-4 | Soc. & dinner companions | Anecdotal dialogue |
| 3.14.5-6 | Soc. to dinner companions | |
| 4.6.13-14 | Soc. & "typical" interlocutor | Dialogue |

The dialogues of the Mem. are all fairly short, ranging in length from ¾ of an OCT page, to 10½ pages, with the average length about 2½-3 OCT pages. Socrates participates in all but one of the dialogues (1.2.40-46), and in each he converses with only one other person, with the exception of one conversation (1.2.32-38).

Socrates almost invariably initiates the discussion - approaching his interlocutor in order to advise, guide, exhort or reprove him (or, very rarely, in order to request information). Only once does a friend, in need of advice, open the conversation, turning to Socrates with his problem (2.9.1). Those in the Mem. who do begin a discussion with Socrates are generally antagonistic towards him and wish to attack or belittle him in some way (e.g. Antiphon, Aristippus and Hippias in 1.6, 3.8, and 4.4 respectively); once too Socrates is approached by a friend who wishes to give him advice (Hermogenes in 4.8). Socrates always appears to be in complete control of the discussion, no matter who begins it. Nonetheless the question of who initiates a dialogue in the Mem. is not an idle one, for the opening speaker is the one who has some aim in mind, something he wishes to accomplish through the discussion.

All the conversations are almost exclusively functional: that is to say, they are constructed with a specific purpose in view (generally that of showing Socrates instructing his interlocutor in an area in which the latter is deficient) and little else is allowed to intervene. Hence there is no light chitchat leading up to the (main) conversation and little background description of the circumstances, locale or speakers is included in the dialogues. Xenophon generally introduces Socrates' interlocutor and his problem - e.g. the impious Aristodemus, undisciplined Aristippus, unfilial Lamprocles, shy Charmides etc. - the essential background information, in a short opening frame which precedes the actual dialogue (see Mem. 1.3.8; 1.4.2; 2.1.1; 2.2.1; 2.3.1; 2.5.1; 2.9.1;

3.6.1; 3.11.1; 3.12.1; 4.2.1; cf. too 1.6.1; 3.8.1; 4.8.4). Sometimes we are simply given the name (and profession) of Socrates' partner at the outset (2.7.1; 2.8.1; 2.10.1; 3.4.1; 3.5.1; 3.10.1; 3.10.6; 3.10.9; 4.4.5; cf. 1.2.40) or the specific circumstances of the conversation (1.2.32-33; 3.1.1; 3.3.1) and the discussion follows with no further ado. Only two of the dialogues have more elaborate prefaces: Socrates' encounter with the courtesan Theodote (3.11.1-3) and his first conversation with Euthydemus (4.2.1-8). The latter dialogue, by far the longest in the Mem., is meant to record a process, the "conversion" of Euthydemus and therefore includes a step by step description of Socrates' preliminary attempts to interest Euthydemus through his discussions with others. The Theodote conversation, with its elaborate opening, vivid background detail and large surrounding audience, is similar to a sympotic dialogue (cf. below, pp. 182-183).

Once Xenophon turns to the narration of the conversation itself, he generally does not include any dramatic background, i.e. any information beyond the speakers' actual words and the indications of change of speaker, which are a necessary feature of narrated dialogues. Only about one third of the dialogues include any further details of the scenic background, speakers' reactions, gestures, thoughts etc. One of Socrates' interlocutors is said to be angered by him (1.2.35) while two others are at first shown to be flattered by the old master (3.6.3; 4.2.9) only to find themselves at a loss to answer his questions (3.6.4; 4.2.10; cf. 3.10.7). One interlocutor (Nicomachides) is skillfully characterized by a single gesture (3.4.1) and another's rich surroundings and dress are described (Theodote - 3.11.4). We are also told, at times, the tone of certain remarks, e.g. Socrates is teasing his fellow conversationalist (3.1.4) or mocking himself (3.11.16) or being ridiculed by another (4.4.6). Once or twice the reasoning behind a speaker's words is revealed (3.8.2). Another type of dramatic

background is found in certain dialogues of advice. These dialogues fall into two parts: (1) advice given by Socrates to his interlocutor and (2) the successful application of Socrates' advice (2.7.12; 2.9.4-8; 2.10.6; cf. 3.1.4). On the whole, though, Xenophon does not utilize the narrative framework of the Mem. for dramatic purposes and does not attempt to create a scenic background or characterize Socrates' interlocutors.

One of the background details generally omitted by Xenophon is the presence (or absence) of an audience at Socrates' conversations. Ignoring Xenophon's references to his own presence at these discussions (for they are meant to lend authority and authenticity to the Mem., not to reflect reality[5]), we find that only in 10 of the 35 dialogues is there any indication of the presence (or absence) of others. In general, it seems that Xenophon chose to mention an audience only when there was a good reason for doing so. Thus when Socrates encounters his critics Antiphon (1.6), Aristippus (3.8), and Hippias (4.4), we learn that an audience of Socrates' followers is present,[6] for one of the objectives of these opponents is to discredit Socrates in the eyes of his supporters. (Cf. 1.6.1 in particular.) Sometimes, when the conversation is in a lighter vein, a wider group of listeners is invited to join in the fun (3.1.4; 3.11.2). In another type of dialogue, the presence of a (silent) third party is significant. In these conversations (1.3.8-15; 2.5.1-5; 4.2.1-7; cf. 1.2.30 and 3.14.2-4) Socrates addresses didactic or admonitory remarks to his interlocutor but his words are, in fact, intended to serve as an indirect reproach or warning to another who is present.[7] Perhaps the most interesting reference in the Mem. to the presence or absence of others is to be found in Socrates' first long conversation with Euthydemus (4.2). In their early encounters, Socrates tries to speak to Euthydemus only indirectly, addressing the words meant for the youngster's ears to his followers (4.2.2, 3-5, 6-7), i.e. Socrates uses the

indirect "third person" technique of instruction. Later, when Socrates feels that Euthydemus is ripe for instruction or "conversion", he approaches the young man by himself (μόνος ἦλθε 4.2.8) and submits him to a long and searching ἔλεγχος, in private (4.2.8-39). Thus Socrates of the Mem. is sensitive to the presence of others, when conversing with an individual, and tailors his remarks accordingly. Xenophon refers to these bystanders when their presence affects the tenor of the conversation in some way.

Since the overall impression one receives of the Mem. is that of Socrates discoursing and exhorting at great length, it is perhaps surprising to see how few pure speeches there are in the work: it is composed mainly of dialogues. Over half of the conversations, however, contain a fairly long, continuous speech by Socrates (marked LS on the chart)[8] and this speech frequently comes at the end of the dialogue (LSE on the list). Such final speeches are not countered or answered in any way by Socrates' interlocutor and thus contribute to the general effect of Socrates' predominance. Often, too, Socrates' partners do not disagree with him in any serious way and their participation in the conversation is restricted to an acknowledgement of Socrates' words or simple, affirmative replies to his questions. (Such conversations are indicated by a B on the chart.) These dialogues, which contain no real exchanges, no genuine give-and-take, differ only in form, but not in substance, from a continuous speech.[9]

Furthermore, in some of the dialogues (marked FE on the table) Socrates' partner barely speaks at all and interjects only one or two sentences in the whole of the conversation. Socrates' discussion with Epigenes (3.12) is the most extreme example of such a "degenerate" dialogue. Epigenes contributes only one short sentence - a mild objection to Socrates' reprimand that he is not physically fit - to the conversation: the rest is an exhortation to εὐεξία by

Socrates. Mem. 2.5 is another such "non-dialectical" conversation. There is only one exchange between Socrates and his partner Antisthenes and the latter does little more than affirm and illustrate Socrates' point. Both these conversations, it seems, could easily have been cast in the form of a speech, a simple exhortation by Socrates.

It is worth mentioning in this context a passage of Demetrius (De Eloc. 296-298) in which he demonstrates how in different Socratic authors the same point is made in various ways. Aristippus, says Demetrius, states the problem (viz. men bequeath to their children money but not the knowledge of how to use it well) and accuses his audience (ἀποφαινόμενος καὶ κατηγορῶν 296), whereas Xenophon puts the same idea in the form of advice (ὑποθετικῶς 296). Plato and Aeschines on the other hand convey the problem by asking the young heir a series of questions designed to make him recognize his ignorance. This last approach, the interrogative one, is considered by Demetrius particularly Socratic (τὸ δὲ ἰδίως καλούμενον εἶδος Σωκρατικόν 297). Nonetheless, in essence, all three methods mentioned by Demetrius - admonition, advice and cross-examination - have the same aim and lead to the same result, more or less.

This brings us to the question of the relation between form and content in the dialogues of the Mem., or more specifically the relation between the number of exchanges in a dialogue and its dialectical quality. Can we postulate a direct link between the two? Is it correct to assume the more exchanges there are in a discussion, the more wide ranging and controversial the conversation?

The use of a series of short leading questions, which generally can be answered with a brief "yes" or "no" is, of course, particularly associated with Socrates, in Plato,[10] the pseudo-Platonic works,[11] the minor Socratics[12] and here in the Mem. as well. 21 of the 35 dialogues of the Mem. contain such a series of questions by Socrates (indicated by QR on the chart). See, in

particular Mem. 2.1.1-3; 2.2.1-3, 7-9, 11-12; 2.3.11-14; 2.6.1-4, 2.7.3-5; 2.10.1-2; 3.1.10-11; 3.3.1-15; 3.4.7-10; 3.5.1-3; 3.6.3-13; 3.8.2-3; 3.10.3-5, 6-8; 3.11.4; 3.13.3, 6; 4.2.8-22, 31-39; 4.3.3.-8; 4.4.10-14, 20-25; 4.5.2-9; 4.6.2-11, 13-14 and cf. 1.2.40-46. This "question and reply" form of discussion is frequently linked in Plato with the ability to speak briefly (see Prot. 329B, Gorg. 461E; cf. too Δισσοὶ Λόγοι DK 90 8.13) and contrasted with μακρολογία, the use of lengthy (continuous) speeches (see Prot. 334D-335A, Gorg. 449B-C, Phaedr. 267B; cf.Δ.Λ.8.1).[13] This is, in essence, a contrast between dialogues and continuous speeches and the Platonic Socrates favours the former. Furthermore, in the early "Socratic" dialogues of Plato,[14] this form of questioning is always used by Socrates to conduct a cross-examination or refutation, an ἔλεγχος which reduces his interlocutor to bafflement, to ἀπορία. What happens in the Mem.? Xenophon refers to this complex of problems - continuous speeches versus exchanges of questions and answers, negative teachings as opposed to positive ones - only once in the Mem. and the passage (1.4.1) is worth a detailed look.

IV Εἰ δέ τινες Σωκράτην νομίζουσιν, ὡς ἔστοι γράφουσί τε καὶ λέγουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ τεκμαιρόμενοι, προτρέψασθαι μὲν ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ἀρετὴν κράτιστον γεγονέναι, προαγαγεῖν δ' ἐπ' αὐτὴν οὐχ ἱκανόν, σκεψάμενοι μὴ μόνον ἃ ἐκεῖνος κολαστηρίου ἕνεκα τοὺς πάντ' οἰομένους εἰδέναι ἠρώτων ἤλεγχεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἃ λέγων συνημέρευε τοῖς συνδιατρίβουσι, δοκιμαζόντων εἰ ἱκανὸς ἦν βελτίους ποιεῖν τοὺς
2 συνόντας.

"If any think that Socrates was excellent at turning people towards virtue, but incapable of leading them to it - as some people speak and write of him, basing themselves on conjecture[15] - let them consider not only the way he used to question and refute (as a means of correction)[16] those who thought they knew everything, but also the way he used to spend the whole of the day in conversation with his close friends, and then judge if he was capable of making his companions better men".

This passage describes, then, the contrasting approaches Socrates uses with different types of people; it is perhaps easiest to study the two different approaches in tabular form:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Audience | Know-it-alls | Companions |
| | τοὺς πάντ' οἰομένους εἰδέναι | τοῖς συνδιατρίβουσι, τοὺς συνόντας |
| Type of Discussion | Questioning, Cross-Examination | Leisurely Discourse |
| | ἐρωτῶν ἤλεγχεν | λέγων συνημέρευε |
| Purpose | Correction | |
| | κολαστηρίου ἕνεκα | |
| End Result | Different Attitude | Different Behaviour |
| | προτρέψασθαι... ἐπ' ἀρετήν | προαγαγεῖν... ἐπ' αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ἀρετήν), βελτίους ποιεῖν |

Socrates, Xenophon says here, tailors his approach to his audience. His interlocutors are of two types: friends or companions and (presumably) opponents, those who think they know everything. The latter are interrogated and refuted by Socrates who wishes to correct their mistaken view of themselves and thus turn them towards virtue. This critical, rather destructive method of teaching used by Socrates is, of course, amply demonstrated by Plato in the early dialogues and is mentioned twice more in the Mem. - by Hippias (4.4.9) and Xenophon again (4.8.11).[17] A second means of discussion is used by Socrates with his companions and he achieves different results. He spends, we are told, the whole of the day with them in discourse and actually leads them on to virtue, turns them into better people. Here, Socrates' teachings clearly must have a more positive content and they seem to be in the form of a lengthy exposition, rather than brief questions and answers.[18] Disregarding the question of the precise difference between προτρέψασθαι and προαγαγεῖν ἐπ' ἀρετήν,[19] we should expect, on the evidence of 1.4.1, to find in the Mem. either negative

cross-questioning directed at opponents, or positive, more discursive teachings addressed to friends.

In actual practice, the division into brief, hostile questions and longer, more hortatory discussions is not firmly adhered to in the Mem. There are, to be sure, a few instances of pure, Platonic-style ἔλεγχοι[20] in the Mem. Socrates' examination of Euthydemus in Mem. 4.2 (in particular 8-21, 31-39) is the most outstanding one, along with Alcibiades' refutation of Pericles in 1.2.40-46, but there is some harsh questioning at 3.8.2-3; 3.6.3-16 and 3.13.3, 6.[21] All of these interrogations are directed against people with an inflated view of themselves. Nonetheless rapid exchanges of question and reply are often used for other, more constructive purposes as well.

Such rapid exchanges are sometimes found when there are open differences of opinion between Socrates and his fellow conversationalist - the two discuss, debate and argue by means of question and reply. In these cases (2.2.7-9; 2.7.3-5; 3.4.7-10; 3.5.1-3; 4.4.10-14, 20-25) Socrates does not want simply to refute his opponent, as in an elenchus, but to establish a contrary thesis as well. Hence Socrates attempts to convince and persuade his interlocutor of the truth of his own position. These dialectical discussions are held with relatives (Lamprocles 2.2), friends (Aristarchus 2.7) and acquaintances (Nicomachides 3.4, Pericles son of Pericles 3.5), besides opponents (Hippias 4.4). Another group of brief exchanges in which it is important to Socrates to elicit agreement from his partners is that of the applied analogies (in particular: 2.1.1-3; 2.2.1-3, 11-12; 2.3.11-14; 2.10.1-2) discussed at the beginning of this chapter. When Socrates asks his seemingly innocuous questions,[22] he wants his respondent to answer in a certain way, i.e. to produce a verdict against himself.[23] These questions are indeed κολαστηρίου ἕνεκα but they are not meant to refute, nor are they necessarily directed against a know-it-all opponent.

Finally, sometimes Socrates teaches his interlocutor through his questions, using the interrogation to instruct his respondent in all sorts of areas, e.g. evaluating friends (2.6.1-4), citizens (4.6.13-14) and soldiers (3.1.10-11); leading a cavalry troop (3.3.1-15), producing better paintings (3.10.3-5) and sculpture (3.10.6-8), appreciating the gods (4.3.3-8), practising self-control (4.5.2-9), or defining various virtues (4.6.2-11). In these exchanges Socrates imparts information while asking questions. This is, of course, a reversal of the usual teaching situation in which the pupil asks the questions and the teacher supplies the answers.[24] Hence Socrates' questions in these conversations are almost always of a rhetorical "Isn't it true that...?" kind and his respondent has little to do other than agree. Such conversations (2.6.1-4; 3.1.10-11; 3.3.1-15; 3.10.3-5; 3.10.6-8; 4.3.3-8; 4.5.2-9; 4.6.2-11, 13-14), or bits of conversations may be quite rapid-fire, i.e. contain a great many exchanges of short questions and answers, but they are not dialectical (cf., in particular, 4.5 and 4.6).[25] The two interlocutors are in complete agreement - or, to be more exact, Socrates' partner follows his lead wholeheartedly and produces precisely the responses required or desired by Socrates.[26] Furthermore, the addressee in this group of didactic dialogues is generally a friend or companion of Socrates', never an opponent.

A series of brief questions and replies, a high number of exchanges does not, then, indicate that there is real disagreement or discussion between the two participants of a dialogue. Nor is the converse true: a speech, or a discussion with only a few statements by Socrates' interlocutor, is not always a positive one aimed at a friendly audience. So, for instance, Antiphon in his two jousts with Socrates (1.6.1-10; 11-14) asks only one question, but the debate and conflict between the two men is a real one. Of the four full-fledged speeches in the Mem. (1.5; 1.7; 2.4; 3.2),[27] two are positive exhortations (2.4 and 3.2)

but the remaining two (1.5 and 1.7) are more negative than positive, i.e. are meant to dissuade rather than persuade.[28] Furthermore, three of the four speeches (1.5; 1.7; 2.4) have fairly close parallels, insofar as their content is concerned, in the dialogues (2.1.1-7 and 4.5; 2.6.37-39; 2.3 respectively). Despite the programmatic statement of 1.4.1, the link between form and content in the Mem. is not a strong one.

Most of the dialogues of the Mem. are not composed entirely of brief exchanges of question and reply, nor (naturally) are they simply a long speech by Socrates; they are a combination of longer and shorter exchanges, with Socrates invariably doing most of the talking. Very often Socrates wishes to persuade his fellow conversationalist either to change his attitude or behaviour in some way, or to undertake a certain course of action (exceptions are: 1.2. 32-38; 1.2.40-46; 3.8; 3.10; 4.5; 4.6) and the question naturally arises as to whether Socrates is successful and his interlocutor has indeed been convinced. There are a few dialogues (marked Pe on the chart) in which we are specifically told that Socrates' partner has been persuaded. Such information generally comes at the end of the conversation (cf. 2.6.39; 3.3.15 and 4.2.39-40) or at the end of the earlier, advising section of a two-part advice dialogue (2.7.11; 2.9.4; 2.10.5-6), in the form of words of agreement by Socrates' interlocutor.[29] These final avowals of acceptance comprise most of the rare instances in which Socrates does not have the last word in a conversation.[30] Generally, however, there is no real indication at the end of a dialogue as to how effective Socrates' arguments or exhortations have been. It is worth distinguishing here between A and B dialogues, i.e. those conversations in which Socrates' partner argues and disagrees with him to some extent, and those in which he does little other than express agreement and interest in what Socrates is saying. Clearly the task of persuading applies only to the first group. Most of these dialectical

conversations end in a long, somewhat rhetorical speech by Socrates (LSE on the chart): see 1.4.15-19; 1.6.4-10; 1.6.13-14; 2.1.18-34; 2.2.13-14; 2.3.17-19; 2.8.5-6; 3.4.11-12; 3.6.15-18; 3.7.8-9; 3.12.1-8; 4.8.6-10.[31] How should we understand this final address by Socrates? At first sight, since the Mem. is an apologetic work, meant to demonstrate the value of Socrates' teachings,[32] the implication is that Socrates' last words are not answered because they cannot be countered or criticized in any way. Socrates has silenced his opponent, who is now, presumably, convinced.

One bit of evidence to support this view of Socrates' final speeches would be his reworking of the tale by Prodicus of Heracles at the crossroads (2.1.21-34; see below, pp. 78-79), which comes at the end of a long discussion with Aristippus. In Socrates' version the fable ends with a lengthy address by Ἀρετή calling upon Heracles to choose her path (2.1.30-33) and we are not told what Heracles subsequently decides. We know from another source (Σ ad Aristoph. Nub. 361 = DK 84B1) that in Prodicus, Heracles does indeed indicate his preference for Virtue over her rival. Socrates (or, in all likelihood, Xenophon) prefers to omit any mention of the final, obvious outcome and expects his listener to understand that Arete's final exhortation has persuaded the youth. So too, it can be argued, Xenophon means us to understand that Aristippus in this dialogue (and the rest of Socrates' interlocutors in the other dialogues under discussion) has been won over by Socrates' culminating speech. Xenophon does not wish to labour the obvious by actually mentioning the interlocutor's agreement or capitulation.

Unfortunately, it is clear that Socrates does not always persuade his interlocutor with his closing speech. We know specifically in the case of Aristippus that he has not been won over or convinced by Socrates: he feels only temporarily defeated and later stages a return match Ἀριστίππου δὲ ἐπιχειροῦντος

ἐλέγχειν τὸν Σωκράτην ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὑπ' ἐκείνου τὸ πρότερον ἠλέγχετο... (3.8.1). So too, it seems that Antiphon the sophist has not been persuaded by Socrates' concluding speech in their first encounter (1.6.1-10), for he is shown attacking Socrates on two later occasions (1.6.11-14, 15). Silence on the part of Socrates' interlocutor at the end of a dialogue cannot, then, be taken for tacit consent: not all of Socrates' opponents are in fact convinced by him. In this way, some of Xenophon's Socratic dialogues end in aporia - not in the aporia felt by the participants in Plato's early Socratic dialogues because of their inability to solve the specific problem (generally, that of defining a concept) discussed by them, but in a more general feeling of inconclusiveness. Has Socrates said all that he might on the subject? What is his listener's reaction? What are we, the readers, meant to think?[33]

I turn now to the techniques and methods of argumentation used by Socrates in the Mem. We have already touched upon some of the more general methods: the indirect reproof through a third person, the use of brief questions and replies in refutations (and elsewhere) and having an interlocutor pass judgement on a hypothetical situation which can then be (analogously) applied to himself.

The last technique is part of a more general phenomenon, the widespread use of analogies by Socrates in the Mem. The Platonic Socrates was, of course, famous, even notorious, for his arguments by analogy,[34] particularly analogies taken from the crafts (cf. Gorg.490E-491A; Symp. 221E). In Xenophon too, Socrates' opponents are tired of hearing about the cobblers, carpenters and smiths (Mem. 1.2.37) not to mention the ethical discussions that follow τῶν ἑπομένων τούτοις, τοῦ τε δικαίου καὶ τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων .[35] About two thirds of the dialogues (those marked An) contain at least one analogy of some sort, and many contain a whole cluster of them. These analogies are generally drawn from the world of slaves and animals, besides the crafts and

are chiefly used in two rather different (if not always distinguishable) ways - (1) to explain and illustrate and (2) to infer or demonstrate a point from the preceding case(s), i.e. epagoge.[36]

The most simple type of analogy found in the Mem. is a one-to-one comparison of two different objects. These analogies are sometimes of the form ὥσπερ... οὕτω that is, from the qualities of the first object we learn about the second. Thus Socrates says that a cosmopolitan man belonging to no city is as vulnerable as a slave (2.1.15-16); adulterers are as lascivious and greedy as quails and partridges (2.1.4-5); brothers, like horses, are won over by good behaviour (2.3.7); friends, like servants, can have a price put to them (2.5.2-5); justice, like carpentry, has tangible products (ἔργα - 4.2.12); good generals are like good shepherds (3.2.1) etc. Sometimes these comparisons are rather carefully and fully elaborated - see for example 1.6.13 (beauty and wisdom, prostitutes and sophists); 2.1.9 (Aristippus speaking: cities behave towards their rulers as masters to slaves); 2.7.13-14 (Aristarchus is like a watchdog in his household); 3.1.7 (arranging soldiers in battle: building materials in a house); 3.4.7-12; 3.11.6-10 etc. - with many corresponding details inferred from one case to the other. Elsewhere, the comparisons are brought in as a contrast, rather than a likeness: a lover's kiss is more harmful than a spider's sting (1.3.12-13); brothers are more valuable than possessions (2.3.1); friends are more deserving of care and solicitude than servants (2.4.3 and 2.10.2); an untaught general is more dangerous than an untaught sculptor (3.1.2) etc. Comparisons are also used as a counter-argument. Thus Socrates argues that changing laws is no more reprehensible than changing political alliances (4.4.14); an overseer of an estate is no less free than a public servant (2.8.3-4); a soul is as invisible as the gods and yet its actions are not random ones (1.4.9) etc.

Generally these analogies are brought in without any particular preliminaries, but they are sometimes introduced by ὥσπερ... οὕτω (2.3.7; 2.5.2-5; 3.2.1; 3.5.13; 4.2.25), ὥσπερ (2.1.9; 2.3.18; 3.1.7; 4.2.12; 4.2.20) or οὕτω (4.2.3-5). Often too the analogies are introduced in the form of a hypothetical situation, "if / supposing it were a question of..." as in 2.3.9; 2.10.1-2; 3.1.2; 3.1.9-10; 3.5.8; 3.7.1-2 and 3.6.14 (ὥσπερ εἰ...). More rarely there is a technical reference to the actual process of inference, e.g. ὥστε κατά γε τοῦτο ἔξεστί σοι λέγειν (1.4.9) or τεκμήραιο δ'ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ναυσίν (3.5.6), or to the aptness of the comparison ἀλλὰ πάνυ... ὅμοιον... εὕρηκας (3.1.8). In one dialogue, Socrates' argumentative interlocutor Nicomachides twice rejects an analogy (ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὅμοιόν ἐστι... 3.4.3; cf. 3.4.7) and Socrates is led to suggest a joint investigation of the appropriateness of the comparison ἴθι δὴ... ἐξετάσωμεν τὰ ἔργα ἑκατέρου αὐτῶν ἵνα εἰδῶμεν πότερον τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν ἢ διαφέρει τι (3.4.7).

Another type of analogy found in the Mem. is the use of a series of cases or instances in order to establish another case. Sometimes the proposition adduced is a co-ordinate one, i.e. another, parallel single case, and sometimes it is a universal one, a generalization based on the preceding examples. There is also one instance of an inference from a universal to a new particular case, which follows an inference from cases to the universal. It is illuminating to compare four passages in the Mem. (1.7.2-3; 2.6.38-39; 3.3.9; 3.9.11) where the same point is made, albeit in different ways, through the use of a series of examples. Socrates wishes to demonstrate that the best way to seem knowledgeable in a certain field and persuade others that one is so, is, in fact, to be knowledgeable. In 2.6.38-39 Socrates first brings a series of examples - a navigator, political leader, estate administrator - to prove his point (ἐκ τῶνδε σκέψαι 2.6.38) and then states the general conclusion based on these instances.

1.7.2-3 begins with the generalization, which is then demonstrated (ὧδ' ἐδίδασκεν 1.7.1, says Xenophon) through the cases of an unqualified flautist, general, ship captain etc. 3.3.9 begins with the general statement ( ἐν παντὶ πράγματι οἱ ἄνθρωποι τούτοις μάλιστα ἐθέλουσι πείθεσθαι οὓς ἂν ἡγῶνται βελτίστους εἶναι ) which is then illustrated by means of a series of examples (doctors, sailors, farmers) only to lead to the conclusion that the rule holds true for another particular field, horsemanship, as well (οὐκοῦν εἰκός... καὶ ἐν ἱππικῇ ). At 3.9.11, the purpose is again to establish the truth of this statement for a specific occupation - that of a ruler - and this conclusion is inferred (ἐπεδείκνυεν ) through a long series of parallel examples (ship captain, farmer, doctor, exercise master, woolworker), without any reference to a more general rule. In each of these four cases very similar analogies from the crafts are used to establish one and the same point, but the formal methods of inference employed vary considerably.

Other instances of analogies used to establish a parallel or co-ordinate case are found at 2.6.6-7 (friends, like sculptors and horsemen, can be judged by their past performance), 3.1.4 (one who has studied to be a general, like one who has studied to be a flautist or a doctor, is one, even if he does not actually practise his profession), 4.1.3-4 (the best types of people, like best bred horses and dogs, need training to become useful; note: ἐπιδεικνύων τῶν τε ἵππων... καὶ τῶν κυνῶν... ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων);see too 1.5.1-3. At 2.3.11-14 there is a particularly interesting example of inference through parallel cases, for Socrates proceeds in maieutic fashion, having his interlocutor Chaerecrates demonstrate through his answers to questions about analogous situations (getting invited to dinner, having one's property guarded by a friend, being entertained abroad) that he does indeed know of a magic formula to win over his brother.[37]

Elsewhere analogies are used to adduce neither a similar, co-ordinate case nor a general proposition, but a single, more powerful case. Thus Socrates argues that it is prudent to be on good terms with a neighbour or fellow-traveller, but even more so with one's mother (2.2.12-13); brothers are meant to work together and not against each other, even more than hands, feet and eyes are intended to do so (2.3.18-19); cf. too 2.4.5. Similarly Socrates contends that aspiring politicians need the guidance of experts even more than would-be musicians and horsemen, who regularly seek out teachers, do (4.2.6). This type of climactic argument, proceeding from two or more analogous instances to a final, stronger case is, of course, a kind of a fortiori argument. Sometimes, as in the case of one-to-one comparisons, such analogies are used to stress a difference, rather than a similarity. Socrates points out that musicians, singers, dancers, boxers and wrestlers all learn their craft, but generals are self-taught (3.5.21); teachers of tanning, carpentry, smithing and horsemanship are easily found, but there are no teachers of justice (4.4.5). These contrasting analogies are also combined at times with an a fortiori argument: pilots, carpenters and musicians are not chosen by lot - why then should politicians, who can cause much greater damage to the city, be chosen this way? (1.2.9; see too 3.6.14-15).

Analogies are, then, an outstanding feature of Socrates'[38] arguments in the Mem., along with the use of a series of brief questions in the course of an argument and a long, rhetorical speech at its close. One particular method he favours when pleading a case by question-and-reply is the setting of either/or ( πότερον... ἢ... ), polar questions. When asked such questions, Socrates' respondent is made to choose between two mutually exclusive alternatives. Often only one of the two possibilities seems at all feasible so that the interlocutor, while ostensibly given a choice by Socrates, has his answer dictated to him. Cf.

e.g. 4.6.7 εἰπέ μοι, πότερά σοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ σοφοί, ἃ ἐπίστανται ταῦτα σοφοὶ εἶναι ἢ εἰσί τινες ἃ μὴ ἐπίστανται σοφοί; (and see too 1.4.4; 2.1.1-4; 2.7.4, 7, 8; 3.10.4-5; 4.2.22 etc.). At times the polar question is so obviously rhetorical, Socrates' interlocutor does not bother to respond (3.9.13; cf. 1.6.15), and series of rhetorical, polar questions are often found in Socrates' longer discourses (see e.g. 1.6.5, 9; 2.7.7-9). Elsewhere this reduction of a problem into two mutually exclusive and exhaustive alternatives enables Socrates to dispose of the question altogether, by eliminating both the possibilities; see e.g. 1.2.34 (a good example of reductio ad absurdum) and 4.8.8. Once, in his first conversation with Euthydemus (4.2.13 ff.), Socrates demonstrates that such polar divisions (into "just" and "unjust") are too simplistic and that further, more flexible distinctions must be made. Once, too, Socrates' respondent (Aristippus 2.1.11) refuses to reduce a situation to two antithetical or polar opposites (οἱ ἄρχοντες ἢ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι) and argues for a middle way (μέση τούτων ὁδός). Generally, however, these questions offer a choice between an obviously correct answer and a patently wrong one, i.e. offer no real choice at all.

Summarizing very briefly then, the Socratic dialogues of the Mem. are short conversations between Socrates and another person, with Socrates doing most of the talking. These narrated dialogues generally have little dramatic background and the conversation is restricted to the (one) topic at hand. Usually no attention is paid to the presence (or absence) of an audience, while some significance may be attached to the choice of opening and closing speakers. In the course of the conversation Socrates often asks a series of short, sharp questions, and he frequently makes at least one fairly long speech as well. The use of analogies and arguments from everyday experience are found in many of the

dialogues. Finally, the end results of such arguments, i.e. the final outcome of the conversation is not always clear.

Recent scholarship postulates the existence of a literary sub-genre of Socratic dialogues, Kurzdialoge or Short Dialogues, which probably were written from the first half of the fourth century onwards. It is worth comparing the main features of these dialogues, as pointed out by scholars, to those of the Mem. conversations.[39] These short dialogues are, naturally, quite brief ($1\frac{1}{2}$-6 OCT pages) and are usually duologues, i.e. conversations between Socrates and one other person. Often Socrates' interlocutor is not named or, if identified, not characterized in any way, and there is very little scenic background in these conversations, which are generally presented directly or dramatically, rather than being narrated. The discussion in these dialogues is restricted to one central theme or question - such as τί τὸ καλόν; - which is often introduced at the very start of the conversation. Finally, Socrates' interlocutor is little more than a "yes man" in these short dialogues, agreeing with Socrates' thesis and raising no arguments or objections of his own. The main difference, then, between such short dialogues and the conversations of the Mem. seems to be the more substantial and argumentative role assigned, at times, to Socrates' fellow-conversationalist in the Mem. So too our dialogues are narrated and not dramatic, and Xenophon puts his role as narrator to literary use at times.

Before returning to the "Socratic" dialogues of the Cyr. I shall look briefly at the three other dialogues by Xenophon, the Hiero, Oeconomicus and Symposium. These works, unlike the dialogues of the Mem. and the Cyr., are not subordinated to a larger framework, but are longer, independent entities. None of these works, as we shall see, is constructed altogether according to the pattern found in the Socratic dialogues of the Mem.

The Hiero is, properly speaking, not a Socratic dialogue at all, but the record of a long (25 OCT pages) conversation between the tyrant Hiero and poet Simonides. It begins with a short, very simple opening frame Σιμωνίδης ὁ ποιητὴς ἀφίκετό ποτε πρὸς Ἱέρωνα τὸν τύραννον. σχολῆς δὲ γενομένης ἀμφοῖν εἶπεν ὁ Σιμωνίδης κ.τ.λ. (Hiero 1.1) and has very little further dramatic background (see 1.31 ὁ δὲ Σιμωνίδης ἐπιγελάσας... ἔφη... ; cf. 8.6), so that Xenophon does not make any literary use of his role as narrator and the dialogue could have been, for all intents and purposes, in direct dramatic form.[40] The dialogue falls into two uneven parts. In the first (1-7), Hiero describes the difficult life of a tyrant, while in the second (8-11) Simonides suggests how a tyrannical regime might be improved. The tyrant does most of the talking and leads the conversation in the longer, earlier part, but Simonides takes over the role of chief interlocutor in the second section. The two do not strongly disagree with one another and there are not many exchanges between them (only 20 in the 25 pages). Most of these exchanges (14) are limited to the opening chapter, which contains the only instance of a series of questions and replies (1.21-25).[41] In this "elenctic" passage Hiero asks the leading questions and refutes Simonides' contention (viz. that tyrants enjoy their food more than private individuals do). Simonides, on the other hand, both opens the dialogue and is assigned a long, closing exhortation (10.2-11.15), besides doing the lion's share of the talking in the second part. Thus there is no dominant figure, no Socrates in the Hiero. So too there are only a few analogies used in the work (cf. 1.36; 6.15-16; 9.3-6; 10.2-3) and these are evenly divided between Hiero and Simonides. The argumentation used in the conversation is generally based on references to everyday experience, exemplified by Simonides' remark at 9.3 ὡς δὲ ταῦτα καλῶς ἔχει μαρτυρεῖ τὰ γιγνόμενα (see too e.g. 3.6-9). The dialogue

ends somewhat inconclusively, since we do not know for certain whether Hiero accepts Simonides' closing suggestions.

In sum, the Hiero has some features in common with the dialogues of the Mem. (two speakers, little dramatic background, an "open" ending), but is quite different in some respects (long, no dominant speaker, few analogies, different method of argument). The work is not truly Socratic and it is not by chance that Socrates does not appear in it.[42]

The Oec., on the other hand, must be considered a Socratic dialogue, if only because it is the record of a conversation Socrates has had. Like the Hiero, the Oec. is quite long (68 OCT pages) and falls into two uneven parts. The first, the outer frame of the dialogue, is a conversation between Critoboulus and Socrates (Oec. 1-6) on household management, οἰκονομία. The conversation is introduced by Xenophon rather abruptly ἤκουσα δέ ποτε αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ οἰκονομίας τοιάδε διαλεγομένου· Εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὦ Κριτόβουλε... (Oec. 1.1) and proceeds directly to the main theme of the dialogue, in the fashion of the Mem.[43] There is next to no dramatic background in this part of the Oec. (see only 2.3; cf. 2.9) and the presence of an audience is alluded to (ἐναντίον τῶν φίλων τουτωνί 3.1; cf. 3.12) but not felt in any way.[44] Socrates leads and channels the conversation in this earlier part, but Critoboulus is an active partner and contributes questions and objections of his own (see in particular 1.15-2.5; 3.6-11; 5.18; 6.1, 11), just as he does during his conversation with Socrates in the Mem. (2.6).

The second and longer part of the Oec. (7-21), is a conversation that has taken place earlier, between Socrates and Ischomachus, which is now repeated to Critoboulus by Socrates. Hence Socrates is now the narrator, instead of Xenophon, and he continues in that role until the very end of the dialogue:[45] there is no return to the opening framework of the Oec. This second section has

a more elaborate introduction ἰδὼν οὖν ποτε αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ἐλευθερίου στοᾷ καθήμενον, ἐπεί μοι ἔδοξε σχολάζειν, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ καὶ παρακαθιζόμενος εἶπον... (7.1), which is reminiscent of the more detailed settings found in Plato (e.g. the openings of the Lysis, Charmides and Republic) and, perhaps, the other Socratics (see Aeschines, Alcibiades fr. 2 (Dittmar) and Miltiades-P.Oxy. 39.2889). So too in this part of the Oec. there is a little more dramatic background, usually in the form of a description of a speaker's reactions or observations (see 7.3; 7.38; 17.10; and cf. 10.1 and 20.26). There is also a series of dialogues-within-the-dialogue: reported conversations between Ischomachus and his wife (7.10-43; 10.2-8; cf. 8.1-10), Ischomachus and a tidy sailor (8.15-16) and one between Socrates and a horse's groom (11.4-5).

The last two conversations are, of course, anecdotes and there are in the Oec. two further anecdotes, both with Oriental settings (4.20-25 and 12.20). The former, the story of Lysander's visit with Cyrus the Younger is particularly interesting for it is the closest thing to a novella to be found in Xenophon's Socratic writings. Again we are reminded of other Socratic writers, in particular of Aeschines' Aspasia, which seems to have included at least two novelle, the stories of Thargelia and Rhodogyne (cf. below, pp. 286-287).[46] Another feature of the Oec. which is unusual in Xenophon's Socratic dialogues, but not, for example, in Plato's work, is the short, joking interlude at 12.1-2 which serves as a smooth and natural transition to the next topic to be discussed.

In the later, main part of the Oec., Ischomachus is the chief interlocutor. Socrates, of course, is an active partner, who asks difficult questions (e.g. at 12.8), raises new points (cf. e.g. 11.1; 15.1-2, 9) etc., but the conversational reins are in Ischomachus' hands. He, in his role as Socrates' instructor in the art of farming, talks most of the time - demonstrating, for example, how he trained his wife to be a good mistress of the household, answering Socrates'

queries and putting, in turn, questions to him. So too the dialogue ends (21.2-12) in a long discourse by Ischomachus (on the different types of rulers). Ischomachus, it would seem, is the "Socrates", the talkative teaching figure, of this part of the Oec. He even uses some of Socrates' favourite techniques, such as the discussion of a hypothetical question which is then applied suddenly to his fellow conversationalist's own actions (10.2-5), repeated use of analogies to demonstrate or illustrate his point and a maieutic teaching method.

The two latter techniques call for a closer look. In the first part of the Oec. where Socrates directs the conversation, Socrates employs some nine analogies (cf. 1.1-3; 1.7-11; 1.22-23; 2.12-13; 2.15; 3.9; 3.11; 5.5-8, 13-16; 5.18-20) to Critoboulus' one (6.3), but in the second section it is Ischomachus who makes frequent use of analogies (cf. 7.17; 7.30; 7.32-38; 8.3-10; 9.14-15; 10.2-5; 10.7; 12.17-18; 13.2; 13.6-8; 17.14; 19.16; 20.6-11; 20.18-19; 21.3-9).[47] One specific comparison made by Ischomachus (weeds that choke grain and steal its nourishment should, like drones who rob bees of their food, be destroyed) causes Socrates to reflect on the value of an apt simile ἀτὰρ ἐνθυμοῦμαι... ὦ Ἰσχόμαχε, οἷόν ἐστι τὸ εὖ τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπάγεσθαι... (17.15). Thus Xenophon playfully has Socrates congratulate Ischomachus for using a favourite Socratic device.

Socrates appreciates and comments upon another method of his used by Ischomachus - the awakening of latent knowledge, unwittingly possessed by an interlocutor, through questioning. Ischomachus "reminds" Socrates (cf. 16.8 πόθεν οὖν βούλῃ... ἄρξωμαί σε τῆς γεωργίας ὑπομιμνήσκειν ;) through his questions, of all that he unconsciously knows about farming techniques (see 17.6, 11; 18.1, 3, 5, 9-10 and especially 19.14-16). Ischomachus' questioning in this section is often of the brief "question and reply" form - cf. 16.8-12; 17.7-8; 18.6-8; 19.3-7. Socrates gradually realizes that he is being taught through

Ischomachus' questions, and "innocently" asks, "Can it be, Ischomachus, that asking questions is teaching?" ἆρα... ὦ Ἰσχόμαχε, ἡ ἐρώτησις διδασκαλία ἐστιν; (19.15).[48] Again, Socrates is made to underline and applaud Ischomachus' appropriation of his own techniques. Xenophon appears to be playing with the student-teacher, Socrates-partner relationships in the Oec. If in the Hiero neither of the two interlocutors can be considered a "Socrates", in the Oec. we seem, at times, to have two of them.[49]

Ischomachus' use of maieutic questioning is particularly interesting not only in relation to the Socratic problem,[50] but as an alternate way of having the teacher figure of a dialogue both impart information and ask questions at the same time. We have seen (above, p. 55) that in the Mem. Socrates is often reduced to asking "feed" questions of a "Isn't it true that...?" form, in order to transmit positive teachings to his interlocutor. The Oec. is, in part (16-19), almost a manual or handbook of farming techniques, a περὶ γεωργίας[51] and this technical instruction is fitted neatly into the framework of a didactic dialogue precisely because the information is imparted in a convincing question-and-answer form.

Before leaving the Oec. we should note that its ending is a (slightly) inconclusive one of a type already familiar to us. Ischomachus, the chief interlocutor of the inner dialogue, addresses Socrates in a long, concluding speech. We do not hear of Socrates' reaction to this discourse, nor do we return to the outer dialogue in order to learn of the effect the entire Socrates-Ischomachus exchange has had on Critoboulus. The Oec. is, then, a Socratic dialogue similar in many ways to those of the Mem., except for its greater length and more complex structure.[52]

The Symposium will be discussed in detail in the following chapter on sympotic dialogues (below, pp. 165-168), so that only its more Socratic features

will be noted here. This narrated dialogue is, of course, a Socratic one, for Socrates is one of the guests at Callias' party. Another guest, Antisthenes, seems even more Socratic than Socrates - "plus royaliste que le roi", as one commentator puts it[53] - in his attempts to cross-examine and refute his fellow-symposiasts. Antisthenes interrogates Niceratus (Symp. 3.6; 4.6) and Callias (3.4; 4.2-5), asking them sharp, pointed questions in elenctic fashion (μάλα ἐλεγκτικῶς 4.2; cf. 4.3, 4 and 6.5) in order to reprove them. In both instances, Socrates intervenes, restraining his over-zealous follower and restoring the friendly party atmosphere (3.6 and 4.5; cf. 2.10; 4.62). Thus Antisthenes seems to demonstrate destructive cross-examination at its worst - Callias even terms him a sophist ( ὦ σοφιστά 4.4) - while Socrates behaves in much more urbane fashion. Socrates himself conducts several discussions in question-and-reply form, admonishing or instructing other party-goers: the Syracusan impresario (4.52-54), Critoboulus (5.1-8), Hermogenes (6.1-5) and Philippus (6.9-10), but his touch is lighter and his didactic methods more skillful, as Hermogenes notes (8.12). In these discussions, Socrates' interlocutors often make contributions of their own, replying to him in kind (cf. e.g. 5.5-7 and 6.2-3), so that these exchanges have a real "give-and-take" to them.

When the guests at Callias' symposium take turns describing their proudest possession or asset (3.2 ff.), Socrates is the only one to proceed by means of question and answer, eliciting his listeners' agreement to the various stages of his argument (4.56 ff.),[54] just as Xenophon describes his method of argument in the Mem. (4.6.15; cf. 4.5.12). So too, Socrates uses analogies in the Symp. when propounding his ideas (cf. e.g. Symp. 2.10; 2.25-26; 8.15), but these are not found very frequently. Socrates makes a long speech at the party (cf. 8.1-3, 6-11, 13-42), as he often does in the Mem., and his oration is by far the longest speech in the Symp., with Antisthenes in second place (4.34-44). The speech,

an ἐρωτικος λόγος comes towards the close of the work, but the Symposium ends with a dance, not Socrates' words (9.2-7).

In sum, Socrates of the Symp. is undoubtedly the didactic or teaching figure of the dialogue and he converses as he does in the Mem.: asking questions, using analogies in his arguments and speaking at length as well; nonetheless his manner is more playful than in the Mem., as befits the light-hearted occasion (see below, pp. 166-167). Antisthenes, Socrates' follower, tries to use his master's elenctic technique, but is shown to be too rigid and rude in his approach. Xenophon seems to contrast the two figures deliberately, showing the difference between Socrates' constructive and Antisthenes' destructive cross-examinations.[55]

We are finally ready to return to the "Socratic" or didactic dialogue of the Cyr., better equipped to recognize the Socratic elements in their structure and methods of argument. The following is a table of the dialogues, constructed along the lines of the Mem. chart with parallel abbreviations (cf. pp. 44-45 above).

"Socratic" Dialogues of the Cyr.

| Ref. | Speakers (BE) | SS | Ex | DB | OP | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3.15-18 | Mandane (B) & Cyrus (E) | 4 | 4 | No | No | A |
| 1.4.13-14 | Cyrus (B) & Astyages (E) | 1 | 3 | No | No | A QR An |
| 1.6.1-2.1.1 | Cambyses (BE) & Cyrus | 45 | 32 | No | No | B An LSE (Camb.) |
| 3.1.8-13 | Cyrus (BE) & Armenian King | 5 | 8 | Yes | Yes | A An QR |
| 3.1.14-31 | Tigranes (BE) & Cyrus | 17 | 17 | Yes | Yes | A An LSE (Tig.) |
| 3.3.48-56 | Chrysantas (B) & Cyrus (E) | 8 | 2 | No | Yes | A An FE LSE (Cy.) |
| 5.5.5-36 | Cyrus (B) & Cyaxares (E) | 29 | 10 | Yes | No | A QR An |

Cyrus, the much extolled hero of the Cyr., participates in all of the dialogues and seems, at first glance, a likely candidate for the role of "Socrates"

or teacher in these didactic conversations. It will be seen, however, that the exclusive prerogatives of Socrates in the Mem. - to initiate and terminate conversations, to use analogies, give advice, ask brief questions, do most of the talking, make long (closing) speeches, etc. - are more evenly distributed between the various interlocutors of the Cyr. dialogues and finding a leader, a "Socrates" for each dialogue is not always easy. As in the Oec., Xenophon seems to play at times with the teacher-student relationship below the surface of these conversations, and the apparent teacher is not always the real one.

Cyr. 1.6.1-2.1.1: Cambyses' Conversation with Cyrus

I begin then with Cyr. 1.6.1-2.1.1, the longest and probably most widely quoted dialogue[56] of the Cyr. This conversation between Cambyses and Cyrus takes place on a journey to the Persian-Median border. Cyrus has been summoned by his uncle Cyaxares, the Median king, to head a Persian force in a joint venture against the Assyrians. Cyrus is setting out on his first major campaign and his father accompanies him to the border, discussing military matters and offering general advice along the way.

This is Cambyses' first actual appearance in the Cyr. From earlier references to him we know that he dresses modestly (1.3.2), drinks moderately (1.3.11), and rules as a "constitutional monarch", not a tyrant (1.3.18). In his second and final appearance in the Cyr. much later on (8.5.22-27), Cambyses tries to ensure that Cyrus, who has conquered a vast empire in the meantime, will preserve the delicate balance between ruler and subjects in Persia itself. Thus Cambyses of the Cyr. is presented as a wise and moderate man who teaches and guides his son and their dialogue is the most explicit example of Κύρου παιδεία - the education of Cyrus - found in the Cyr.

Their discussion begins (1.6.2-6) as it ends (44-46) with religion. Cambyses reminds Cyrus how he has been taught to honour the gods at all times, interpret

omens, and request divine intervention only after he has done all that is humanly possible. Father and son then (7-11) recall an earlier discussion they have had on the difficulty of ruling (large numbers of) men well ( ὑπερμέγεθες... ἔργον τὸ καλῶς ἄρχειν 8). Cambyses questions Cyrus about the actual arrangements he has made for providing his men with food, and warns him that he must be self-sufficient and not rely upon Cyaxares' generosity.

The story of the incompetent teacher of generalship ( στρατηγεῖν ) who taught Cyrus tactics, but none of the other branches of knowledge required of a general, follows next (12-14). Cyrus recalls how his father pointed out to him the limitations of his teacher's instruction and listed for him all the other necessary qualifications. A military commander must concern himself with: supplies ( οἰκονομία), health and fitness ( ὑγίεια καὶ ῥώμη), military techniques (αἱ εἰς πόλεμον τέχναι), inspiring soldiers ( τῇ στρατιᾷ προθυμίαν ἐμβαλεῖν ), and making them obedient ( πείθεσθαι τὴν στρατιάν). Cyrus deals with each of these last four topics in turn (15-26), outlining his plans and arrangements, with Cambyses suggesting improvements or changes. Thus while Cyrus thinks his soldiers' health will be ensured by having doctors accompany them, Cambyses recommends choosing camp sites carefully and having the soldiers follow a strict regimen of diet and exercise (15-18). Cyrus plans to encourage his soldiers by continually raising their hopes, but his father advises him to save his exhortations for times of crisis (19-20). Cambyses points out to Cyrus that his proposal to inculcate obedience by rewarding the obedient and punishing those who disobey will lead only to compulsory obedience. Men will follow his orders willingly if he seems to be wiser than them, and he will seem wiser to them if, in fact, he actually is so (20-23). Cyrus can earn his army's affection by always sympathizing with them and by demonstrating that he can endure hardship better than they (24-25).

Cambyses then introduces a new (and to Cyrus, somewhat shocking) area of expertise that a good commander must acquire if he wishes to gain the upper hand ( πλέον ἔχειν, πλεονεκτεῖν) over the enemy - deception. He explains that Persian youths are not taught to deceive and lie to people since past experience has shown that this can lead to bad results; instead they learn to use trickery and guile on animals while hunting (26-34). Cyrus must try to catch the enemy at a disadvantage, make use of known military techniques, and attempt to invent new stratagems. He should apply the devices he has used against animals to hunting the enemy (35-42).

Finally, after a brief review of the subject of tactics, with which Cyrus is already acquainted (43), Cambyses again turns to religious matters. He warns his son never to do anything contrary to signs from the gods, for human knowledge is limited and the turn of events unpredictable (44-46).

It is clear that our dialogue in which Cambyses guides, corrects and instructs Cyrus by means of question and discussion, closely follows the pattern of the Socratic dialogues of the Mem. with Cambyses firmly established in the role of "Socrates" in this conversation. Furthermore, as we shall see in detail below, there are many parallels, both in content and methods of argument, between Cyr. 1.6.1 ff. and various passages of the Mem., so that our dialogue can safely be termed a "Socratic" one. Nonetheless, the Cambyses-Cyrus conversation should perhaps also be viewed from a slightly different perspective - that of works of moral instruction and guidance, ὑποθῆκαι .[57]

Early ὑποθῆκαι were written in verse and were apparently strings of maxims, exhortation and advice, loosely linked together, which were addressed to an individual (although a wider public, of course, was meant to benefit from them). No work entitled ὑποθῆκαι survives but such collections of precepts on the right way to live are associated with the names of Hesiod, Theognis and

Phocylides (cf. Isoc. Ad Nic. 43). The lost composition Χείρωνος ὑποθῆκαι attributed to Hesiod (frr. 283-285 Merkelbach-West) seem to have been a fair representative of its kind: in it the wise centaur Chiron teaches and advises young Achilles.[58] In these ὑποθῆκαι, the precepts and instruction are usually addressed by an older man to a younger relative, friend or pupil - cf. Hesiod and Perses, Theognis and Cyrnus, Chiron and Achilles - and this resembles the situation in our dialogue.[59]

By the time of the Cyr.'s writing, verse ὑποθῆκαι were, it seems, a thing of the past (cf. Isoc. Ad Nicocl. 3 τῶν ποιητῶν τινες τῶν προγεγενημένων ὑποθήκας... καταλελοίπασιν ); instead there were prose works of moral instruction and advice. Democritus may have written a prose ὑποθῆκαι (DK 68 B 119 with note) and Isocrates' To Nicocles, a series of precepts addressed to a young man on the duties of a king and its companion piece, Nicocles, on the proper conduct of his subjects are two further examples of this new prose form. The Isocratean Ad Demonicum, a treatise on the proper way of life, again addressed to a young man, is a more general work of the same kind. Of the three Isocratean treatises, To Nicocles is closest in theme to our dialogue and the work is likely to have appeared shortly before the Cyr.;[60] some specific similarities between the two will be noted below in the running commentary.

Two lost sophistic works, Hippias' Τρωϊκος λόγος and Prodicus' tale of Heracles at the crossroads, also seemed to have belonged to this group of works of advice and instruction. The mythical setting of these compositions links them with the earlier poetical ὑποθῆκαι, while their use of prose points ahead to the new Isocratean adaptation of the genre. Furthermore, unlike any of the verse or prose ὑποθῆκαι mentioned so far, both these works may well have been in dialogue form, the form which Xenophon chose for Cambyses'

instructions and advice to Cyrus. In fact some scholars see the two compositions as the forerunners of Socratic dialogues.[61] Hence it is worth studying the evidence for these lost works, and in particular the question of their form, in some detail.

Our main source of evidence for Hippias' work is the Platonic[62] Hipp. Mai. 286 A ff. (= DK 86 A9).

> III. Καὶ ναὶ μὰ Δί', ὦ Σώκρατες, περί γε ἐπιτηδευμάτων
> καλῶν καὶ ἔναγχος αὐτόθι ηὐδοκίμησα διεξιὼν ἃ χρὴ τὸν
> 5 νέον ἐπιτηδεύειν. ἔστι γάρ μοι περὶ αὐτῶν παγκάλως λόγος
> συγκείμενος, καὶ ἄλλως εὖ διακείμενος καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι·
> πρόσχημα δέ μοί ἐστι καὶ ἀρχὴ τοιάδε τις τοῦ λόγου.
> ἐπειδὴ ἡ Τροία ἥλω, λέγει ὁ λόγος ὅτι Νεοπτόλεμος
> b Νέστορα ἔροιτο ποῖά ἐστι καλὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα, ἃ ἄν τις
> ἐπιτηδεύσας νέος ὢν εὐδοκιμώτατος γένοιτο· μετὰ ταῦτα δὴ
> λέγων ἐστὶν ὁ Νέστωρ καὶ ὑποτιθέμενος αὐτῷ πάμπολλα
> ῥύμμα καὶ πάγκαλα.

The only further bit of evidence is Philostratus, VS 1.114 (= DK 86 A 2.4): ἔστιν δὲ αὐτῷ (sc. Hippias) καὶ Τρωικὸς διάλογος, οὗ (Diels: οὐ MSS.) λόγος· ὁ Νέστωρ ἐν Τροίᾳ ἀλούσῃ ὑποτίθεται Νεοπτολέμῳ τῷ Ἀχιλλέως ἃ χρὴ ἐπιτηδεύοντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν φαίνεσθαι. This is generally discounted as independent evidence, since it seems to be based entirely on the Platonic passage. Thus Philostratus' statement that the Trojan work is a dialogue, means in all likelihood, no more than that he so understood the Hipp. Mai. text.

Returning to the first pasage, we see that Hippias has an exhibition piece, an ἐπίδειξις(cf. τοῦτον... ἐπεδειξάμην καὶ... μέλλω ἐπιδεικνύναι 286 B) that he uses on his various lecture tours. The piece, termed a λόγος , has a mythological setting ( πρόσχημα[63]): after the capture of Troy, Neoptolemus asked Nestor which noble pursuits would best aid a young man in winning a name for himself and Nestor then proceeded to advise him. The Τρωϊκὸς λόγος, then, has all the characteristics of earlier ὑποθῆκαι - an old and wise man

advises a young one (ὑποτιθέμενος αὐτῷ) on proper conduct (ἃ χρὴ τὸν νέον ἐπιτηδεύειν). His advice is noble but general (πάμπολλα νόμιμα καὶ πάγκαλα) - general enough, in fact, to be appreciated both in Athens and in Sparta - and the characters involved are well-known mythological figures.

Hippias seems, however, to have introduced some innovations. His work is a prose one and not only the wise counsellor, but also the recipient of the advice is heard, for Neoptolemus, at the very least, opens the discussion (Νεοπτόλεμος Νέστορα ἔροιτο Hipp. Mai. 286 A8 - B1). Thus while earlier ὑποθῆκαι seem to have been in the form of advice given by one (older and wiser) individual to another (younger) one, Hippias is apparently the first to give voice to the second figure. We do not know whether Neoptolemus spoke again - possibly asking further questions or interposing suggestions of his own - or if Nestor simply replied in one long, continuous exhortation. It should be remembered that the versatile Hippias is supposed to have written epic verses, tragedies and dithyrambs as well as many writings of all kinds in prose (καὶ καταλογάδην πολλοὺς λόγους καὶ παντοδαποὺς συγκειμένους DK 86 A 12 = Hipp. Min. 368D), so that a prose dialogue, to be read aloud to his audience, would not have been beyond his scope. It has been argued[64] that there is no real room for dialogue, beyond the initial question in the Τρωϊκὸς λόγος because a second, opposing speech following upon Nestor's call to virtue would spoil the work's didactic effect. The conversation between Nestor and Neoptolemus need not, however, have taken the (Protagorean) form of speech and counter-speech, but could have been a friendly dialogue of advice and instruction.[65] Our own dialogue, Cyr. 1.6, shows that such a congenial exchange is certainly feasible and Hippias' Τρωϊκὸς λόγος may have been an early example of conversations of this kind. It is perhaps worth noting that both in the Cyr. dialogue and in Hippias' tale, it is the younger man who initiates the conversation and

actually seeks the counsel of the older man: not only does Neoptolemus turn to Nestor, but Cyrus, we are told, expressly seeks out his father in order to learn about military matters before setting out on his campaign πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πρόειμι δή, ὅπως τἀ τῶν πολεμίων ὡς τάχιστα μαθὼν... παρασκευάζωμαι Cyr. 1.5.14). It is only natural that the young men, in both instances, should heed the advice they have requested, or at least attend to their elders carefully and discuss matters amicably. Elsewhere - in Socrates' conversations in the Mem. and in the prose and verse ὑποθῆκαι - it is generally the wise adviser who offers his unsolicited counsel, approaching the young man in need of guidance on his own initiative.

Such is the situation in the second lost sophistic work dealing with counsel given to a mythological young man on the verge of manhood, Prodicus' story of Heracles' encounter with Virtue and Vice at the crossroads. This tale is, perhaps, less directly related to the ὑποθῆκαι genre (and hence to the Cambyses-Cyrus dialogue), but is more obviously a real dialogue. Our main source for the work is Xen. Mem. 2.1.21-34 (= DK 84 B 2), where Socrates paraphrases Prodicus' edifying fable in the course of his attempt to persuade Aristippus to be more moderate in his habits. In addition, there is a passing reference in Pl. Symp. 177 B to the fact that Prodicus wrote Ἡρακλέους... ἐπαίνους in prose (καταλογάδην συγγράφειν[66]), while a scholiast to Aristoph. Clouds 361 (= DK 84 B1) gives a more detailed description of the work, which is, he says, found in Prodicus' ὧραι :

> πεποίηκε τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ Ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ Κακίαι συντυγχάνοντα καὶ καλούσης ἑκατέρας ἐπὶ τὰ ἤθη τὰ αὑτῆς, προσκλῖναι τῇ Ἀρετῇ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνης ἱδρῶτας προκρῖναι τῶν προσκαίρων τῆς κακίας ἡδονῶν.

The scholiast includes information not found in the Mem. (namely that the story is found in the ὧραι and that Heracles' final decision was to follow

Virtue) and so may be treated as an independent source.[67] It seems clear from this account that the composition included at least three speeches: Virtue and Vice each addressed Heracles, and he then announced his decision to choose the labours of Arete over the pleasures of Kakia. The version in Xenophon has a more complicated structure: (1) Κακία addresses Heracles (2) Heracles asks her her name (3) Κακία replies (4) Ἀρετή addresses Heracles (5) Κακία answering Ἀρετή, again turns to Heracles and (6) Ἀρετή first replies to Κακία and then speaks to Heracles again. (We should, perhaps, on the evidence of the scholiast, add (7) Heracles decides in favour of Ἀρετή.) On the face of it, then, Prodicus' moralizing fable must have been in dialogue form for it includes not only speeches, but an exchange of question and answer, and the reactions or replies of one speaker to another. Nevertheless, Xenophon freely admits to having reworked Prodicus' composition, so that we cannot be sure that the original work had the same structure as that in the Mem.

Socrates repeats twice, at the beginning and the end of the tale, that he is not quoting Prodicus exactly. He introduces the story with καὶ Πρόδικος... ὧδέ πως λέγων, ὅσα ἐγὼ μέμνημαι. φησὶ... Mem. 2.1.21 and concludes οὕτω πως διῴκει Πρόδικος τὴν ὑπ' Ἀρετῆς Ἡρακλέους παίδευσιν· ἐκόσμησε μέντοι τὰς γνώμας ἔτι μεγαλειοτέροις ῥήμασιν ἢ ἐγὼ νῦν (2.1.34). Socrates' first disclaimer of accuracy is a general one which could apply both to form and content, but the second seems to refer only to the style or choice of words and therefore does not concern us here.[68] There is one clear indication in the Mem. passage that Prodicus' original version included more than the simple speech and counter-speech of Vice and Virtue, depicted by the scholiast, for we are specifically told that according to Prodicus, Kakia takes up Arete's challenge and addresses Heracles once again καὶ ἡ Κακία ὑπολαβοῦσα[69] εἶπεν, ὥς φησι Πρόδικος (Mem. 2.1.29). Thus Prodicus should, it seems, be credited with a dialogue of advice and exhortation directed towards a young man.

It is time to return to our dialogue of advice and exhortation in the Cyr. The conversation between Cambyses and Cyrus not only opens and closes with a discussion of religious matters, but is framed at both ends by auspicious omens sent by the gods: thunder and lightning when father and son set out (Cyr. 1.6.1) and an eagle flying overhead to the right when they cross the Persian border and arrive in Media (2.1.1). Cambyses begins their talk by reminding his son that he has taught him to interpret divine signs, so that he will not be dependent upon soothsayers ( μὴ ἐπὶ μάντεσιν εἶῃς 1.6.2), who may either trick him or else not be available when needed. This reference to dishonest soothsayers is seen by the commentators as an allusion to Xenophon's own experience at the hands of the treacherous Silanus described by him in the Anabasis (5.6.29) and this may well be true. Xenophon himself is not without experience in interpreting the signs of a sacrifice (Anab. 5.6.29) and his Socrates also recommends to his followers to take up μαντικήν (Mem. 4.7.10). Nonetheless, Cambyses may have instructed his son in the art of reading divine signs for a special reason: performing sacrifices seems to have been one of the main functions of a Persian king.[70] Indeed, many years later, when Cambyses arranges a compact between his son, the conqueror of an empire, and the Persian people (Cyr. 8.5.22 ff.), one of his chief concerns is who is to perform sacrifices on behalf of the Persian people after he is gone ( θύειν τὰ ἱερὰ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἅπερ νῦν ἐγὼ θύω 8.5.26), and we find Cyrus performing these rites even as an old man (8.7.1). As a future king, then, Cyrus must be well acquainted with sacrifices, rituals, omens etc., besides needing to understand the signs that will be sent by the gods in the course of his forthcoming campaign. Cyrus replies that he does his best to propitiate the gods at all times, so that he feels as if the gods were his friends ( ὡς πρὸς φίλους μοι ὄντας 1.6.4), reminding us of Hermogenes in the Symposium

(3.14; 4.46-49), who prides himself on his good and powerful friends, the gods. Cyrus remembers his father saying that men should think of the gods in good times, rather than bad, for the gods, like human beings, appreciate this kind of attention. This statement by Cambyses once again has parallels in the words of Xenophon (Hipparch. 9.9) and his Socrates (Mem. 1.4.18; cf. 2.1.28).

Cyrus "remembers" hearing this from Cambyses ( μέμνημαι γὰρ... ἀκούσας ποτέ σοῦ Cyr. 1.6.3) and in the earlier part of this dialogue both father and son repeatedly refer back to earlier conversations they had had (cf. 1.6.3. 5, 6, 7, 8, 12). This device of having the young Cyrus recall previous discussions he has had with his father apparently serves a dual purpose. First, Xenophon demonstrates indirectly how thoroughly and carefully Cambyses has educated his son in the past. In addition, Cyrus is able to play a more active role in the dialogue and present some of Cambyses' teachings under the guise of recalling or reviewing what he has already learned. In this way, the long, didactic dialogue is more evenly divided between the two interlocutors and Cyrus, who has already demonstrated his ability to hold his own in conversation with his elders(cf. in particular 1.3.4-11, 15-18), contributes something to the talk while still remaining the "pupil".

After discussing the interpretation of divine signs and the right way to approach the gods, Cambyses now turns to those areas where men should not trouble the gods, i.e. fields in which they can help themselves (1.6.5-6). Cyrus, again recalling earlier talks with his father (οἶδά σε λέγοντα ἀεί 1.6.6), knows that it is wrong (οὐδὲ θέμις) for men - be they horsemen, archers, navigators, farmers or warriors - to ask the gods for success in their endeavours without mastering the basics of their profession. Such requests are contrary to the ordinances of the gods (παρὰ... τοὺς τῶν θεῶν θεσμούς / ἀθέμιτα 1.6.6). The Mem.-like series of examples - taken from the crafts -

used by Cambyses here, already hints at the fact that once again there is a close similarity between the Persian's words and statements attributed by Xenophon to Socrates in the Mem. (1.1.6-9). Socrates, Xenophon tells us, considers it wrong (cf. ἀθέμιτα ποιεῖν 1.1.9) for men to consult the gods about matters which they can learn through the use of their own intelligence (ἃ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔδωκαν οἱ θεοὶ μαθοῦσι διακρίνειν Mem. 1.1.9; cf. Ischomachus at Oec. 11.8).[71] Of the two examples Socrates uses to illustrate this point, one (navigation) is found in our dialogue as well.

Cambyses' next topic is another subject that he and Cyrus have talked about in the past: the difficulty of ruling other men well, i.e. seeing that their daily needs are supplied and that they behave as they should (Cyr. 1.6.7 ff.). Cyrus agrees that this is an exceedingly difficult task (ὑπερμέγεθες... ἔργον 1.6.8) and thus the two Persians seem to share one of the chief preoccupations of their author. In his introduction to the Cyr., Xenophon notes that no creature is more difficult to rule than man and he then presents the story of Cyrus the Great precisely because he is a rare kind of ruler, one who is able to make even the most faraway subjects obey him willingly. In this preface, Xenophon only mentions one task of the ruler, making one's subjects behave properly - ὅπως ἔσονται πάντες οὕτους δεῖ in the words of Cambyses (1.6.7) - but the Persian king refers to a second: tending to the physical needs of those ruled. In the Mem. Socrates also discusses these two tasks of a leader - tending to the physical and spiritual welfare of his "flock" - in a similar situation, i.e. when talking to a man who has just been chosen to command an army (ἐντυχὼν δέ ποτε στρατηγεῖν ἠρημένῳ τῳ Mem. 3.2.1 ff.; cf. 3.1.6; 3.4.8). This conversation (or to be more exact, monologue) is one of five discussions at the beginning of Book 3 of the Mem. in which Socrates converses on military affairs and there are, as we shall see, several parallels between this section of the Mem. and our dialogue in the Cyr.

Cyrus, while aware of the difficulties involved in leading others, thinks that he has little to fear as far as the enemy and their rulers are concerned. Other leaders, including Cyrus' ally Cyaxares - ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων φίλων (Cyr. 1.6.8) is how Cyrus politely puts it - suppose that the task of a ruler is to lead an easier, richer and more luxurious life than his subjects. Cyrus, on the other hand, considers that a leader should differ from those he leads in his foresight and willingness to exert himself (τῷ προνοεῖν καὶ φιλοπονεῖν 1.6.8). Here Cyrus is making his first original contribution to the conversation and not simply repeating his father's teachings, but his point - that a good leader must be hard-working and in control of his appetites - is hardly a novel one. Herodotus' Croesus, for example, is well aware of the connection between a luxurious life-style and military weakness (Hdt. 1.155) and Isocrates tells Nicocles that he must be more self-restrained than his subjects (Ad Nic. 29; cf. 31). The need for a ruler (or any individual) to exercise self-control is a favourite theme in the Mem., and this idea is perhaps most fully elaborated in a discussion between Socrates and Aristippus, where Socrates demonstrates, point by point, how a young man trained to self-control would make a far better ruler than a self-indulgent one (Mem. 2.1.1-7; cf. 1.5.1; 3.1.6; 3.2.3; 3.4.9). So too Cyrus himself returns to this point several times (see e.g. Cyr. 7.5.74-78) and this emphasis on the need for a ruler to practise ἐγκράτεια appears in Xenophon's other works as well.[72]

While Cyrus seems to look down upon his pampered enemies, the Assyrians are in fact rather formidable opponents. We often hear of the young Assyrian king's cruelty and insolence, but never of his soft, luxurious life-style; Cyaxares and to a lesser extent, Croesus, are the spoiled, weak rulers of the Cyr. Cambyses does not take issue with his son's words but he seems to feel that Cyrus' approach is overly theoretical. The Persian king points out that

sometimes leaders have to grapple with the facts themselves (αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα Cyr 1.6.9) rather than men, and circumstances are not always easy to control. Hence, adds Cambyses, Cyrus' authority will come to nought if he does not feed the army: father and son, as we have seen, consider providing one's subjects with a good supply of the necessities of life (ὅπως ἔξουσι πάντα τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἔκπλεω 1.6.7) one of the chief duties of a ruler. In a brief and pointed cross-examination (1.6.9), Cambyses now discovers that Cyrus has made no provisions of his own for feeding the Persian army and has put himself entirely in the hands of Cyaxares. This will not do, as Cyrus himself admits, and he asks his father's advice on how he can obtain supplies by himself. Here, then, Cambyses conducts a Socratic-type ἔλεγχος asking Cyrus a series of awkward questions and reducing him to ἀπορία, or at least bringing him to the realization that he is in need of guidance. We have seen above (p. 52 ) that this kind of cross-examination is found in the Mem., even if it is more regularly associated with the Platonic Socrates. Cyrus, in any event, is made to see that he does not yet possess the qualities he has just assigned to true leaders - forethought and the ability to plan ahead (προνοεῖν), insofar as supplies are concerned.

Cambyses then gives his son practical advice on the acquisition of supplies, recommending that he use the Persian infantry and Median cavalry in order to secure provisions from neighbouring peoples. Cyrus should make a habit of procuring supplies before he actually needs them, Cambyses suggests, and his son promises not to neglect the problem (Cyr. 1.6.10-11).[73] Indeed, later in the Cyr. we often find him arranging to raise funds or acquire rations for his army (cf. 2.1.21; 2.4.9-13, 32; 3.1.34; 3.2.28-30 etc.; note in particular 6.2.26-30).

The Persian king, continuing to review, so to speak, earlier conversations

he has had with Cyrus, asks his son what other important issues he recalls, thus giving young Cyrus another opportunity to present some of his own teachings. Cyrus reminds him of an incident involving a teacher he once had, a man who claimed to teach the art of military command. When Cyrus came to his father for money to pay the man, Cambyses discovered that the instructor had omitted all the other branches of knowledge that a good general must acquire and simply taught tactics. There is a striking parallel to our passage, Cyr. 1.6.12-15, in the Mem. when Socrates similarly unmasks the pretensions of one who claims to teach generalship (Mem. 3.1). Commentators have made much of this similarity, comparing the two versions closely in an attempt to shed some light on the vexed questions of the historicity of Socrates' conversations in the Mem. and the relative chronology of Xenophon's works.[74] Which of the two passages was written first? Is Xenophon putting his own views on military matters into the mouth of Socrates (as well as Cambyses)? I begin with a comparison of the two passages and then shall try to see what conclusions, if any, can be reached on the basis of this comparison.

The overall framework of the two passages is the same. Cyrus and one of Socrates' followers (τινα τῶν συνόντων Mem. 3.1.1) have both gone to a teacher who professes to teach generalship (ἐπαγγελλόμενον στρατηγεῖν διδάξειν Mem. 3.1.1; τῷ φάσκοντι στρατηγεῖν με πεπαιδευκέναι Cyr. 1.6.12; cf. 14) for a fee (ἀργύριον /μισθόν Cyr. 1.6.12 ἀργύριον Mem. 3.1.11) Socrates sends his disciple to study with the expert, Dionysodorus, while Cyrus apparently approached his teacher on his own initiative. Through Cambyses'/Socrates' questioning it becomes clear that, in fact, all Cyrus/Socrates' nameless follower has been taught is tactics. Cambyses uncovers this fact gradually, Socrates is told so at once. Both point out that the study of tactics is only a part of στρατηγία. Through Cambyses' series of questions we learn what he

thinks a course in military command should comprise (Cyr. 1.6.12-14). Socrates summarizes his ideas in one long sentence (Mem. 3.1.6) and then goes on to discover that even the tactical theory has been poorly taught. Cambyses suggests that Cyrus learn more about the subject by conversing with men who are knowledgeable about military affairs, while Socrates sends his companion back to the teacher, Dionysodorus, to receive full value for his money.

The discussion in the Cyr. is fuller and longer. In our dialogue Cyrus undergoes a "Socratic" cross-examination at the hands of Cambyses, concerning the tuition he has received. Even though the interrogation is summarized only indirectly by Cyrus, the presentation is dramatic: the reader can sense Cambyses' increasing incredulity as Cyrus is forced to acknowledge again and again that his teacher has neglected yet another important concern of the general. In the Mem. it is not Socrates who established how little the expert has taught, but his follower, who announces at once τὰ γὰρ ταικτικὰ ἐμέ γε καὶ ἄλλ' οὐδεν ἐδίδαξεν (Mem. 3.1.5). Thus this part of our dialogue, with its brief ἔλεγχος is, in a way, more Socratic than the corresponding passage in the Mem. (although later in the conversation Socrates does interrogate his disciple about what he has learned of tactics - Mem. 3.1.9-11). Cambyses' survey of what a good general needs to know is more detailed, and continues, in fact, for most of the dialogue. At Cyr. 1.6.26 the Persian king introduces a new branch of knowledge that a good στρατηγός must master: the art of deception and trickery. Socrates simply lists the qualities that he thinks a military commander must possess, pairing together seemingly contradictory characteristics in a paradoxical way - cf. καὶ φιλόφρονά τε καὶ ὠμόν, καὶ ἁπλοῦν τε καὶ ἐπίβουλον, καὶ προετικὸν καὶ ἅρπαγα, καὶ φιλόδωρον καὶ πλεονέκτην (Mem. 3.1.6; cf. Cyr. 1.6.27) - without explaining his reasoning in any way. The characteristics required of a general by Socrates correspond only in part to Cambyses'

list, but in the next four dialogues of the Mem. (3.2, 3, 4, 5) Socrates continues to discuss military matters and covers many points raised by the Persian king in our dialogue.[75]

What is the relationship between Cyr. 1.6 and Mem. 3.1? Since the Cyr. passage is more detailed and more readily intelligible than its Mem. parallel and also fits its context well, it has been taken to be the original version of the two, which Xenophon later adapted and abbreviated in the Mem. A more elaborate exposition is not, however, necessarily an earlier one,[76] so that the sketchier Mem. discussion may have come first. Another argument used to establish the priority of the Cambyses-Cyrus conversation is that while Xenophon was well-versed in strategy and tactics, Socrates had little interest in these matters and was unlikely to discuss them. Hence Xenophon is supposed to have written this discussion of the art of command for the Cyr., making use of his own experiences, and then put the same words into the mouth of Socrates. Nonetheless the historical Socrates who fought at Potidaea, Delium and Amphipolis was not unacquainted with soldiering and was certainly qualified to discuss what makes a good general, just as he investigated experts in other fields and crafts (cf. e.g. Mem. 3.10). In other words, the discussion of military affairs by Socrates that Xenophon brings in the Mem. (3.1-5) need not be rejected out of hand as totally inauthentic or alien to Socrates. It is at least possible that Xenophon knew of a conversation in which Socrates pointed out the limitations of the teachings of a self-appointed expert in στρατηγία such as Dionysodorus, and that Xenophon later included a version of the incident in the Cyr.

If we look at the framework or background of both passages, it seems clear that the setting is more Athenian than Persian. Dionysodorus is probably to be identified with the sophist of the same name who appears in Plato's Euthydemus.

He and his brother Euthydemus first instructed young men in hoplite warfare as well as warfare in general, and then taught forensic rhetoric and eristic (Pl. Euthyd. 271 D; 273 C) for pay, of course (Pl. Euthyd. 272 A, 304 A, C; cf. Mem. 3.1.11), so that, in essence, in the Mem. passage, Socrates is demonstrating that a sophist has not really earned his fee. Indeed the conversation in the Mem. ends on this note - ἀργύριον εὐληφῶς ἐνδεᾶ σε ἀποπέμψασθαι (Mem. 3.1.11). In the Cyr. we are specifically told that Cambyses' interest in his son's lessons arose when Cyrus approached him for money to pay the teacher's fee, but in the world of Cambyses and Cyrus, commerce and education should not really mix. Earlier in the Cyr., Xenophon has attributed to the Persians a carefully constructed system of education in which culture and business are totally separate. The four groups of the Persian ruling class - children and young, mature and elderly men - spend most of their time in the ἐλευθέρα ἀγορά so called because the sounds of the market τὰ μὲν ὤνια καὶ οἱ ἀγοραῖοι καὶ αἱ τούτων φωναὶ καὶ ἀπειροκαλίαι (Cyr. 1.2.3) have been banished elsewhere so that the disorder they induce will not disturb the well-ordered life of men of culture (cf. Hdt. 1.155). Teachers of the Persian young are chosen from the older members of the ruling class, who clearly volunteer their services (παρέχουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς χρῆσθαι 1.2.13) and are not paid. There is no mention of any subject akin to tactics or generalship being taught to Persian youths. Although the reference to a teacher's fee does not blend in well with Persian practices in the Cyr., the consultation by a Persian of an outside expert on military matters is less surprising. Phalinus, the Greek expert of the Anabasis, who is admired by Tissaphernes for his alleged knowledge of tactics and hoplite warfare (Anab. 2.1.7) immediately comes to mind. In the Cyr. itself, the Assyrians have a Greek ( Ἕλλην τις ἀνήρ Cyr. 6.3.11) as one of the three men in charge of drilling their army.

In sum, a comparison of the two similar passages, Cyr. 1.6.12 ff. and Mem. 3.1, does not lead to any far-reaching conclusions on the relationship between the two works. There is no clear evidence as to which version was written first, nor is there any definite way to establish from the two passages whether or not the historical Socrates ever discussed the art of being a good general. A self-proclaimed expert who does not deliver value for money seems to belong to the world of Socrates in Athens, but a professional teacher of warcraft would be in demand both in Greece and in Persia (in Xenophon's time, if not in that of Cyrus the Great). A tentative hypothesis to explain the correspondence between the two passages is that Xenophon knew of an occasion when Socrates showed a follower of his that he had been taught very little in an expensive course of instruction in στρατηγία. Xenophon subsequently made use of this recollection twice: once when describing the education of young Cyrus in the Cyr. and again (either earlier or later) when writing up Socrates' conversations in the Mem. This is one possible explanation; other conjectures may be offered.

After Cyrus is shown by his father how little he has actually been taught by his teacher of generalship, he asks Cambyses to instruct him in these matters. The Persian king does not teach his son himself, but sends him to speak with men considered most knowledgeable in military affairs (τοῖς στρατηγικοῖς νομιζομένοις ἀνδράσι Cyr. 1.6.14; cf. μάλιστα φρονίμους περὶ τούτων 1.6.15) instead, and now, on their journey to Media, he discovers what Cyrus has been taught by these experts. It soon becomes apparent in a point-by-point review of the areas that Cambyses thinks need concern a general - supplies, health, the martial arts, inspiring soldiers and rendering them obedient - that they have omitted many important points and the Persian king must guide his son and fill in the missing gaps: even the Persian professionals

are not as well-versed in military matters as their king. In other words, Cambyses, the "Socrates" of our dialogue, sends his son to military experts to learn the art of generalship, just as Xenophon's real-life Socrates sends his friends and followers to be instructed by men more knowledgeable than himself (πολὺ ἄλλους ἐμοῦ δεινοτέρους Oec. 2.16; cf. Mem. 1.6.14; 2.2.6; 4.7.1 and compare 3.1.1-3). In Plato, too, we find Socrates recommending teachers to his followers (Laches 180 C-D; cf. 200 D). Thus the Persian king would seem to share Socrates' modesty, his unwillingness to claim any real knowledge of his own. The reverse side of Socrates' ignorance is, of course, his recognition of how little supposed experts in various fields know: the classic description of this is found in Pl. Apol. 21 C - 22 E. Cambyses shares this trait of Socrates as well, for having already shown how little Cyrus' first teacher of generalship knew, he now (indirectly) demonstrates that the other experts have their failings as well.

Father and son now turn to the question of the health and welfare of the army. Cyrus tells Cambyses that he is taking professional doctors along with him for his soldiers, but Cambyses replies that doctors, like menders of torn clothes, repair damage that has already been done. Cyrus should take preventive measures to ensure his men's health - e.g. camping in a healthy location, watching their diet and having them take exercise - for such steps are even more conducive to good health. The army should not be left idle, the Persian king adds, and Cyrus earns his praise (κάλλιστα λέγεις Cyr. 1.6.18), for the first and only time in the dialogue, when he suggests warlike contests with prizes for his men in order to keep them fit and occupied.

We see Cyrus' doctors at work several times later on (Cyr. 3.2.12; 5.4.18; cf. 8.2.24) and doctors did, apparently, accompany army expeditons in Xenophon's own time (cf. Lac.Pol. 13.7 and Anab. 3.4.30).[77] Cambyses' reference to the

many discussions of healthy locations καὶ γὰρ λέγοντες οὐδὲν παύονται ἄνθρωποι περί τε τῶν νοσηρῶν χωρίων καὶ περὶ τῶν ὑγιεινῶν (Cyr. 1.6.16) would seem to reflect the widespread interest in medicine in Xenophon's time - περὶ τῶν νοσηρῶν χωρίων καὶ περὶ τῶν ὑγιεινῶν sounds almost like the title of a Hippocratic treatise. The Persian king's statement that the salubrity of a location can be judged by the physique and complexion of the inhabitants and his use of the more technical medical term μάρτυρες in this context[78] derive, in all likelihood, from a medical source. The other more general dietary recommendations found here - on eating moderately, "working off" one's meals and taking exercise - appear often in works by Xenophon (cf. e.g. Mem. 1.2.4; Oec. 11.11-12). The organizing of prizes and contests, suggested here by Cyrus is another favourite theme in the Cyr. - cf. 1.2.12; 2.1.22-23; 8.2.26; 8.3.25 ff.[79]

Cyrus plans to imbue his soldiers with enthusiasm (προθυμίαν ἐμβαλεῖν στρατιώταις 1.6.19) by inspiring them with hopes, but once again Cambyses finds it necessary to correct him. Repeatedly arousing false expectations among the troops is, the Persian king says, like constantly crying "wolf" - in the end, when Cyrus really needs to encourage his men, he will no longer be believed. Cyrus should save his words of encouragement for times of grave danger and let his subordinates make use of promises at other times. Cyrus has just finished exhorting and encouraging the Persian officers who are to accompany him (1.5.6-14; note in particular 1.5.13 πιστεύω... μὴ ψεύσειν με ταύτας τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἐλπίδας) but he readily accepts his father's advice. Indeed, later on we see him making use of his lieutenants, such as Chrysantas, to encourage the soldiers (see especially 6.2.21-22). So too Cyrus himself saves his most rousing exhortation for the most crucial conflict - the Battle of Thymbrara (7.1.10 ff.; note in particular 7.1.17 τοιαῦτα δ' ἐμεγαληγόρει, μελλούσης τῆς

μάχης γίγνεσθαι· ἄλλως δ'οὐ μάλα μεγαλήγορος ἦν).Nonetheless, there are many hortatory speeches, pep talks and harangues by Cyrus throughout the Cyr. and the Persian leader does not save his inspiring addresses for special occasions; this point will be discussed below (pp. 150 ff.), in relation to Cyr. 3.3.48 ff.

Cyrus does not consider the next task of a good general - that of keeping his soldiers obedient - difficult, for he has been taught, even compelled, to obey others from earliest youth. The young Persian thinks a system of reward and punishment the best way to ensure his men's obedience, but, again, his father improves upon his plan. Cyrus' method will guarantee only compulsory obedience, but he will win his soldiers' willing submission to his orders if he seems to be wiser than them (φρονιμώτερον 1.6.21), says Cambyses. Just as those who are ill readily follow their doctors' orders and men at sea willingly submit to the ship's captain, the Persian king explains, so in other circumstances men are eager to obey those who seem more knowledgeable.

As Cambyses' use of analogies from the crafts (doctors, ship-captains) already hints, the Persian king echoes here an idea expressed by Socrates. In the Mem., Socrates, when conversing with a newly-elected cavalry commander about his duties, also states that men are most anxious to obey those whom they consider best informed and he uses almost identical examples (doctors, navigators, farmers) to illustrate his point (Mem. 3.3.8 ff.; cf. Hippar. 6.1 ff. where Xenophon, speaking in his own person, uses this argument a third time). Ischomachus, Socrates' "teacher" in the Oec., holds rather simplistic views on exacting obedience, views that are close to those of Cyrus (Oec. 13.6 ff.). He uses a system of carrot and stick, or reward and punishment, with his servants, comparing them to colts and puppies who are also trained by this method. When dealing with other kinds of men, Ischomachus also explains to them the advantages of compliance, but there is no hint that the Athenian

gentleman is himself better than those who serve him. Isocrates, on the other hand, comes closer to the views of Socrates and Cambyses, advising Nicocles that he should demonstrate his authority not by means of harsh punishments, but by proving superior to his subjects (Ad Nic. 24; cf. 10).

Cyrus, convinced by his father that he must seem wiser than his troops, now asks Cambyses the best way to acquire such a reputation for sagacity (φρονιμώτερον δοκεῖν Cyr. 1.6.22). Cambyses' answer is a simple one: the best way to seem wise is to be so. The Persian king illustrates the truth of his words by a series of examples (καθ' ἓν δ' ἕκαστον σκοπῶν 1.6.22). A man who claims to be a good farmer, horseman, doctor or flute-player without actually being so, can acquire a fine reputation and all the external appurtenances of his craft, but nonetheless will be found out in a short time and revealed as an impostor (ἐξεληλεγμένος ἂν... ἀλαζὼν φαίνοιο 1.6.22). Once again, the Persian presents a Socratic idea in a Socratic way, making use of analogies from the crafts. In the Mem. Socrates argues on four separate occasions that the shortest path to seeming knowledgeable is to be so, and each time he uses a series of examples from various professions to adduce this claim - see Mem. 1.7.2-3; 2.6.38-39; 3.3.9 and 3.9.11 (and compare 3.6.16-17) and see the discussion above (pp. 60-61) on the different methods of inference employed by Socrates in the four passages. Cambyses continues to echo ideas attributed to Socrates in the Mem. in the next bit of advice he offers his son. Cyrus can become wise by learning what can be learned and consulting the gods on matters beyond human ken (Cyr. 1.6.23; cf. Mem. 1.1.6-9; 4.3.12; 4.7.10).

Cyrus now makes a contribution of his own to the conversation, saying that the best way to win the love of his subjects is to prove himself their benefactor, but again, his father cannot let his words stand as they are. The young Persian will not always be able to do good to his men, Cambyses warns;

instead he should show sympathy and interest in the soldiers' affairs and prove himself their superior in physical exertions. A commander must be hardier (καρτερώτερον Cyr. 1.6.25) than his men, readily enduring heat, cold and hardships; the respect and admiration that Cyrus will win, Cambyses adds reassuringly, will make this task seem lighter. In this exchange one senses not so much the presence of Socrates as that of Xenophon, the veteran leader of the Ten Thousand. In the Anabasis we find Xenophon splitting wood, naked, in the snow, thus rousing the other men to action in the cold (Anab. 4.4.12; cf. 7.3.44-45 where he again inspires his men by personally undergoing hardship) and elsewhere he specifically mentions his soldiers' ability to withstand heat, cold and hardship (καὶ ψύχη καὶ θάλπη καὶ πόνους φέρειν Anab. 3.1.23), the three factors listed in our dialogue. According to Xenophon, Socrates too is able to endure these discomforts (πρὸς χειμῶνα καὶ θέρος καὶ πάντας πόνους καρτερικώτατος Mem. 1.2.1; cf. Pl. Symp. 219 E ff. for a description of Socrates in the snow), as is another hero of his - Agesilaus (Ages. 5.2-3).[80] When Cambyses emphasizes here that a general must be able to endure hardship, he is returning to Cyrus' early observation that a leader must be superior to his subordinates in his love of labour τῷ φιλοπονεῖν (Cyr. 1.6.8; cf. above, p. 83 ).

Cambyses has reviewed with his son all five areas that were mentioned as essential for a good general to know and Cyrus now wonders if a commander who has attended to all these matters should attack the enemy as soon as possible. His youthful impetuousness is checked by his father, for Cambyses advises initiating military action against an enemy only if one has the advantage (πλέον ἔχειν 1.6.26) over him. The way to gain such advantage, Cambyses warns, is not simple: one must plot and dissemble, be wily and deceitful, a thief and a robber, taking advantage of the enemy in every area - δεῖ... καὶ ἐπίβουλον

εἶναι καὶ κρυφίνουν καὶ δολερὸν καὶ ἀπατεῶνα καὶ κλέπτην καὶ ἅρπαγα καὶ ἐν παντὶ πλεονέκτην τῶν πολεμίων (1.6.27; cf. Mem. 3.1.6 [quoted above, p. 86 ] where Socrates too assigns some of these paradoxical qualities to a good general). Cyrus is amused and surprised (ὁ Κῦρος ἐπιγελάσας εἶπεν· Ὦ Ἡράκλεις... - a rare oath in the Cyr.) by this statement and Cambyses compounds the surprise by adding that such a man is at the same time most just and law-abiding (δικαιότατός τε καὶ νομιμώτατος Cyr. 1.6.27). Cyrus notes that Persian youths are taught just the opposite qualities and his father explains that this sort of tricky behaviour is permitted only towards enemies, but not in relation to friends and fellow-citizens. Cyrus has been trained to use deception and duplicity while hunting animals and has also been taught the use of weapons so that he would be well-prepared if ever the need arose to fight an enemy. Nonetheless, young Persians were not allowed to practise these arts on human beings for fear of their harming their friends. Perhaps, Cyrus replies, he should have been taught to harm men as well as do them good, if both kinds of knowledge are useful. Cambyses then tells his son that he has heard that once, in the days of their forefathers, there was indeed such an instructor (λέγεται... ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων γενέσθαι ποτὲ ἀνὴρ διδάσκαλος 1.6.31). This teacher taught Persian boys justice by instructing them in both kinds of activities: to lie and not to lie, to cheat and not to cheat etc., according to the individual circumstances of a situation. Some types of behaviour were supposed to be directed towards friends, others towards enemies, and even friends were to be tricked or cheated if it were for their own good. The Persian youths were made to practise these negative arts, just as the Greeks have their children practise deception when wrestling - the Persian king rather unexpectedly adds - but some lads became overly proficient in cheating and took advantage even of their friends. Hence the Persians passed a law (ῥήτρα 1.6.32) that children,

like servants, should be taught only to tell the truth, with no lessons in deception or taking advantage. This law is still in force, Cambyses adds, but he thinks that Cyrus is now old enough to be taught tricks to be used against the enemy with no fear of his using these weapons against his fellow-citizens (1.6.21-34).

Even without Cambyses' reference to the Greeks training their children to use trickery (when wrestling),[81] it is immediately apparent that the Persian teacher of old described here is, in fact, a very Greek figure. The problem that Cambyses raises in our dialogue, i.e. that justice is a complex concept, best defined in relation to a specific situation and that one can be righteous or law-abiding even when indulging in deception or trickery, is not only discussed by Socrates in the Mem. (4.2.12 ff.), but is also found in the early fourth-century sophistic work Δισσοὶ Λόγοι (Chapter 3).[82] There are traces of such discussions elsewhere as well (e.g. Pl. Rep. 331 C; [Pl.] De Iusto 374 B-E). Hence commentators once again raise the question of Xenophon's sources for this section of the dialogue and they try to determine which Greek figure - Socrates, Gorgias, Protagoras etc. - appears here in the guise of an ancient Persian teacher of justice.[83] Nonetheless, once more, a close look at the parallel texts does not lead to any firm conclusions.

In the related passage in the Mem. (4.2.12 ff.), Socrates questions Euthydemus about the nature of justice. Using a series of illustrations, Socrates forces the young man to change his original position that lying, cheating and doing wrong are always unjust and makes Euthydemus admit that such actions can rightfully be used in relation to one's enemies. Next Euthydemus agrees that these same negative measures can even be justly employed against one's friends. In the end (Mem. 4.2.19; cf. 23, 39) Euthydemus does not know how to answer Socrates' questions at all and this seems to have been Socrates' real

purpose in discussing justice with him: he wishes to demonstrate to the young and self-satisfied Euthydemus that he has much to learn and that defining justice is a complex matter. In this passage of the Mem. Socrates has conducted an ἔλεγχος and reduced Euthydemus to helplessness or ἀπορία.

Cambyses too reveals the paradoxical, "immoral" side of justice as part of the instruction and guidance he gives throughout the dialogue to his young pupil, his son, but his purpose is a more practical one. The Persian king encourages Cyrus actually to use these deceitful, unprincipled measures against the enemy in the forthcoming campaign, and Cyrus must first be made to understand that all is fair - or just - in war. This is not, of course, Socrates' message in the Mem. In addition, Cambyses warns of the dangers of introducing young boys to this twilight world of right and wrong and he (along with his author perhaps) seems to agree with his Persian forefathers that it is better to train young men in accordance with simplistic, straightforward concepts of virtue and justice, leaving their acquaintance with greyer, more complex notions for their maturity. The use of the Spartan term ῥήτρα for the law forbidding Persian youths to engage in lying, stealing etc. (Cyr. 1.6.33) brings to mind Xenophon's own reports on the Spartan practice of having youths supplement their meager diet by stealing (Lac.Pol. 2.5-9; cf. Anab. 4.6.14-15). Here Cambyses apparently disapproves of such thefts[84] even though, as Xenophon notes elsewhere, they help train boys in the martial arts (cf. μηχανικωτέρους... ποιεῖν καὶ πολεμικωτέρους Lac.Pol. 2.7). Cambyses prefers to have the Persian youngsters learn deception, trickery and the skills of warfare by hunting down and trapping animals and he compares an early introduction to cheating to initiation in sexual matters at too young an age. The Persian king's approach to justice here - simple virtues for the young, deception and wrongdoing to be practised by older men against the enemy - ignores one of the problems he

himself raises, for he makes no provisions for the Persians to learn to deceive friends for their own good.

Socrates uses a series of examples to indicate the many facets of justice, while Cambyses simply summarizes the teachings of the Persian instructor: διώριζε δὲ τούτων (i.e. lying and not lying, cheating and not cheating etc.) ἅ τε πρὸς τοὺς φίλους ποιητέον καὶ ἃ πρὸς ἐχθρούς. καὶ ἔτι γε ταῦτα ἐδίδασκεν ὡς καὶ τοὺς φίλους δίκαιον εἴη ἐξαπατᾶν ἐπί γε ἀγαθῷ, καὶ κλέπτειν τὰ τῶν φίλων ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ (Cyr. 1.6.31) and this is, in fact, an exact description of what Socrates has done when discussing justice with Euthydemus in the Mem. The word διώριζε used here by Cambyses reminds us of Socrates' actually listing the various qualities under two separate headings α (for ἀδικία) and δ (for δικαιοσύνη; Mem. 4.2.13). All of the illustrations used by Socrates - enslaving and harming one's enemy, tricking one's son into taking a beneficial drug, stealing a weapon from a suicidal friend - are also found in the parallel passage περὶ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου in the Dissoi Logoi (cf. 3.2, 4, 5). The example of keeping a weapon from a friend intent upon killing himself is also used by Plato's Socrates in the Republic (331 C; cf. 334 A, 382 C) when he tries to show Cephalus that his definition of justice is overly simple. The author of the Dissoi Logoi is, of course, merely bringing the arguments for and against identifying the just with the unjust and he is deliberately paradoxical. Cambyses, the Platonic Socrates and the Xenophontic one all have different ends in mind when discussing justice, but their initial intention is, in each case, the same as that of the author of the Δ.Λ. - to awaken their audience to an awareness of the complex, many-sided nature of justice, i.e. to tease, rather than to enlighten. The origin of all these discussions may well have been a debate on the justice of lying, cheating, deceiving etc., making use of such examples as the suicidal friend, which arose in the 5th century, either in

Socratic or sophistic circles. This is not to say that Socrates cannot be distinguished from the sophists, but he often reacted to the controversies of his day and at times used sophistic kind of arguments for his own purposes,[85] so that we cannot be certain who first embarked on this particular analysis of justice. The means used to present the argument in the Dissoi Logoi (3.2-8) - a series of leading questions, similar to those Socrates asks Euthydemus in the Mem. (4.2.13 ff.; cf. Cambyses' string of questions at Cyr. 1.6.28) - approximate the form of dialogue, even if no responses are given, and this may possibly point to Socrates as the source.[86]

In sum, the Persian teacher of justice cannot be identified with any one Greek figure, be it Socrates or one of the older sophists, and Xenophon probably did not intend to refer to any particular person, but just introduced arguments popular in the time of Socrates, assigning them to an imaginary Persian instructor (termed a διδάσκαλος, rather than a σοφιστής; cf. 3.1.14, 38-40) of old. A comparison of the parallel texts with the passage in our dialogue does not lead to the discovery of their source, but it is instructive to see how Xenophon himself uses the paradox of "unjust" justice in very different contexts.

Since Cyrus has come late to the learning of trickery, he asks his father for specific tips on the best way to gain the upper hand over the enemy. Cambyses recommends catching one's opponents unawares and at a disadvantage, or luring them to an unfavourable position. Cyrus should, his father adds, not only make use of military techniques that he has learned, but devise new stratagems of his own (καὶ αὐτὸν ποιητὴν εἶναι τῶν πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους μηχανημάτων 1.6.38). In this way he will win greater renown, just as musicians are esteemed when they go beyond what they have been taught and introduce new and flowery touches of their own (τὰ νέα καὶ ἀνθηρά 1.6.38). It is interesting

that Xenophon chose music as an area especially noted for its inventiveness and experimentation and perhaps he has musicians such as Phrynis, Timotheus and Philoxenus in mind; the adjective ἀνθηρά - flowery or elaborate - would suit them well. While the praise of innovation in music is a commonplace going back to Homer (Od. 1.351-352),[87] Xenophon may also be taking a stand on the music of his time: unlike Plato for instance (cf. Laws 669 D-E; 700 D-E; Rep. 424 B - 425 A), Xenophon seems to appreciate the modern composers.[88]

The Persian king also reminds his son that he has had much practice in hunting small game such as birds and hares and that the many stratagems he has used to decoy and track down these creatures can be employed against human foes as well (Cyr. 1.6.39-41). Cambyses describes the means used by Cyrus to hunt these animals in great detail, either in order to demonstrate his son's application and ingenuity even when occupied in less challenging pursuits than war, or else because of the intrinsic interest such matters held for the author of the Cyr. (and, of course, the Cynegeticus, if that work should indeed be attributed to Xenophon).[89] Cambyses' point, that hunting is excellent training for war, recurs elsewhere in the Cyr. (1.2.9-11; 8.1.34-36; cf. Lac. Pol. 4.7 and Cyneg. 12.1-9), while the three types of pursuit mentioned here - of birds, of hares and of human enemies - are again associated together (in a different way) in the Mem. Socrates, when advising Critoboulus on how to "hunt" friends, mentions some methods that should not be used - οὐ κατὰ πόδας ὥσπερ ὁ λαγῶς οὐδ' ἀπάτῃ, ὥσπερ αἱ ὄρνιθες, οὐδὲ βίᾳ, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐχθροί (Mem. 2.6.9; cf. Mem. 3.11.7-8 where Socrates again compares the efforts put into the tracking down of hares to the wooing of friends).

After urging Cyrus once again to tend to his soldiers' welfare - their physical condition, good spirits and military training - day and night, Cambyses reviews the whole of the subject of tactics in one very long (2/3 OCT page),

rhetorical sentence (1.6.43). He mentions the various tactical problems facing the general of an army - how to lead his forces by day and night, how to travel through different kinds of terrain, how to confront the enemy or withdraw etc. - in a series of short clauses, which sound like the chapter headings or table of contents of a treatise on military tactics (cf. e.g. ὅπως ἱππικὸν φυλάττεσθαι ἢ ὅπως ἀκοντιστὰς ἢ τοξότας etc. 1.6.43).[90] It is likely that there were military manuals available when the Cyr. was written, and Xenophon's own guides to horsemanship and to the command of a cavalry provide evidence for other such specialist handbooks being current at the time. The Πολιορκητική of Aeneas Tacticus probably appeared a little after the Cyr.[91] and it deals with siege operations, rather than tactics, but Aeneas seems to have written several treatises on military matters - cf. his mention of ἡ παρασκευαστικὴ βύβλος (Aen. Tact. 7.4) and ἡ πορισττικὴ βύβλος (14.2; see too 26.6, 12 for possible allusions to earlier military works by others). Cambyses does not review tactics in any detail with his son since he relies on the knowledge that Cyrus has acquired both from their earlier discussions and the instruction he has received from others. In a similar passage in the Mem., Socrates tells Pericles, son of the Pericles, that while most military commanders have not been taught their craft at all and simply improvise at need, he knows that Pericles has preserved a collection of stratagems from his father and also spares no effort to acquire further knowledge from any likely quarter. Pericles replies that he realizes that Socrates does not really believe that he devotes himself so wholeheartedly to the study of military matters, but is trying to show him that he should do so (Mem. 3.5.21-24). One would expect that in the Cyr. too, Cambyses would urge Cyrus (directly or obliquely) to continue to master the subject of tactics and that the Persian king would talk of tactics in some detail. Thus far in their conversation none of the supposed experts

that Cyrus has consulted, including, it should be remembered, the incompetent teacher of tactics, has proved overly helpful. Nonetheless here the Persian ruler does not find it necessary to do more than sketch the various kinds of tactics and this may be because Xenophon considered such military advice too technical to be included in our didactic dialogue. It is difficult to combine the two forms of Socratic dialogue and specialist handbook: the section of the Oec. in which Ischomachus instructs Socrates in the art of farming by means of a series of questions (Oec. 15.6-19.19) is perhaps the closest marriage of the two.

Finally, Cambyses returns to the most important subject of all (τὰ μέγιστα 1.6.44) - man's proper attitude towards the gods. Cyrus should never make any move contrary to the signs he receives from the gods, for choices made by men are no more than the random selections of a lottery, says Cambyses, providing five instances of the unpredictable consequences of human actions. The gods, on the other hand, are omniscient and thus best qualified to counsel men about what should and should not be done, if they so choose (1.6.44-46). These closing remarks by the Persian king once again have fairly close parallels in works by Xenophon. Socrates also stresses that the gods know everything and refers to the signs they send to men (Mem. 1.1.19; 1.4.18; 4.3.12; Apol. 13) and he too is careful never to act against their directions, for that would be like preferring a blind and ignorant guide over a seeing, knowledgeable one (Mem. 1.3.4; see too Mem. 1.1.8 and 4.2.33 on the limitations of mortal knowledge). So too Socrates points out that the gods send omens only selectively, to those whom they favour (Mem. 1.1.9). Hermogenes, the symposiast at Callias' party whose greatest source of pride is his friendship with the gods, also expresses similar ideas (Symp. 4.47-48). In the Anabasis, while there are few theoretical reflections on theological matters, omens, dreams and signs from

the gods play an important role. Time and again, we find that an important question - such as the choice of a leader for the Ten Thousand or whether to despatch forces to forage for badly-needed provisions - is determined solely by the outcome of sacrifices (see e.g. Anab. 6.1.20-25 and 6.6.35-36; 6.4.9 ff.) and the gods are consulted about a variety of matters (cf. e.g. 3.1.5-7; 4.3.9; 5.6.16; 6.5.21 etc.). Xenophon himself is twice stirred to decisive action as a result of dreams sent to him by the gods (3.1.11-13; 4.3.8) and even a sneeze is taken to be a sign from heaven (3.2.9). In the Cyr., Cyrus regularly sacrifices to the gods before important expeditions and battles (see e.g. Cyr. 1.6.1; 3.2.3; 3.3.21, 34-35; 6.2.5, 40 etc.) and is always careful to apportion to the gods their due share of the spoils of victory (see e.g. 4.1.2, 6; 4.5.14-17, 51; 5.3.2, 4). So too omens appear several times (e.g. 1.6.1;4.2.18-19; 7.1.3) and once, when Cyrus' end draws near, a vision appears to him in a dream (8.7.2). Thus the gods do, in fact, indicate to Cyrus ἃ τ' ἐχρῆν ποιεῖν καὶ ἃ οὐκ ἐχρῆν as he states at the close of his life (8.7.3). Nonetheless, despite Cyrus' consistently pious attitude - his regular sacrifices and thank-you offerings, his constant use of the expression σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς (2.1.15; 2.4.14; 4.6.8; 5.2.8; 5.4.22 etc.) - his respect for the claims of religion seems superficial and automatic, the fruit of habit. Religion in the Cyr. is not the living, motive factor that it is in the Anabasis. This is because the omens Cyrus receives are always propitious and his sacrifices all turn out favourably - ἐπεὶ δὲ καλὰ τὰ ἱερὰ ἦν recurs almost as a formula at the depiction of each sacrifice Cyrus performs (cf. 2.4.18; 3.2.3; 6.3.1; cf. 6.4.13). There is not even one instance of the Persian leader having to postpone or change his plans because of an unfavourable indication from heaven, so that his consultation of the gods seems mechanical and their approval automatic. Possibly Xenophon arranges matters this way because all must run smoothly for the idealized

hero of the Cyr. or possibly Xenophon's own attitude towards religion has changed over the years and his own observance has become more routine and unthinking. Cyrus, in any event, does follow Cambyses' advice on religious affairs faithfully throughout the Cyr.

Before leaving Cyr. 1.6, I return once again to the Socratic form of the conversation. The dialogue ends in a fairly lengthy address (Cyr. 1.6.37-46 = 3½ OCT pages) by the teacher or didactic figure, Cambyses, just as many conversations in the Mem. conclude with a long speech by Socrates. If Socrates' interlocutors do not seem to be persuaded by him at times, there is little doubt that Cyrus is a willing and enthusiastic pupil. Indeed, Xenophon devotes much of the following book of the Cyr. to illustrating how Cyrus goes about putting his father's advice into action, point by point.[92] The roles of teacher and pupil are very clearly demarcated in our dialogue and Cambyses is the knowledgeable one who advises, guides and corrects his son. Cyrus, the pupil, speaks up fairly often (rather more often than Socrates' interlocutors in the Mem. do), either summarizing earlier conversations he has had with his father or else making suggestions of his own. Cyrus' contributions are almost always corrected or amplified by his father, so that for all practical purposes he barely adds anything useful to Cambyses' teachings on the art of commanding an army. Xenophon could have, then, furnished the same information (i.e. how a general should best prepare for war) by means of a speech by Cambyses to his son. A comparison of a speech of this kind (Cyr. 6.2.24-41) with our dialogue, shows how much more effective the dialogue form is. When Cyrus readies his forces for their long march to Thymbrara, he addresses them at length, giving them practical instructions on preparations to be made for the journey. The Persian leader touches upon many of the topics Cambyses discusses here: provisions for the army's health and welfare, the food, drink, clothing and equipment

to be taken along. Cyrus' speech, like our dialogue, contains much practical information for those embarking on a military campaign, but unlike our conversation, his address is unrelievedly dry and dull. In the Cambyses-Cyrus exchange Xenophon not only passes along to his reader useful advice, but also characterizes father and son and depicts the relationship between the two: Cambyses is shown to be a wise and conscientious father, while Cyrus is young and eager, but still untutored, and father and son apparently enjoy an easy and untroubled relationship. In sum, the Socratic form of this conversation enhances and enlivens its content.

Cyr. 1.3.15-18

Cyr. 1.3.15-18, our next dialogue, is a conversation between the young Cyrus and his mother, Mandane, which takes place during their stay in Media. Cyrus has just accepted his grandfather's most persuasive invitation to remain in Media after his mother's departure, and Mandane wishes both to know why her son would like to stay on and to warn him of the consequences of an extended stay. The conversation, which follows immediately upon Astyages' invitation to Cyrus, is introduced rather abruptly (ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς κ.τ.λ. 1.3.15) and only gradually does it become clear that the talk is a private one between mother and son, with Astyages no longer present.[93] While there is no one teaching figure, no "Socrates" in 1.3.15-18, the content of the conversation is reminiscent of more than one passage of the Mem.

Cyrus, in reply to his mother's question as to why he would like to remain in Media, explains that he wants to improve his horsemanship. Back in Persia he is the best bowman and spearman of his age, but here in Media he is inferior to his contemporaries in riding, for in Persia there are few horses (1.3.3).[94] Naturally Cyrus is anxious to remedy this failing and his acquired

skill as a horseman will later stand him in good stead, when he introduces a cavalry into the Persian army (4.3.4-23). Mandane is more concerned with her son's progress in learning justice, which is the first and foremost element of the Persian curriculum for boys of Cyrus' age (1.2.6-8; Cyrus was about 12 when he first came to Media 1.3.1).

The juxtaposition of horses, bows, spears, and justice (or truth) found here seems to be peculiarly Persian: it is in these four areas that Persian nobles were encouraged to excell, according to both Persian and Greek sources. Besides Herodotus' famous statement παιδεύουσι δὲ τοὺς παῖδας... τρία μοῦνα ἱππεύειν καὶ τοξεύειν καὶ ἀληθίζεσθαι (1.136.2), we have Xenophon's description of Cyrus the Younger's upbringing (Anab. 1.9.5; cf. 1.9.7) and the formulas in the Old Persian autobiographical inscriptions of Darius (DNb lines 5-11, 40-45) and Xerxes (XP1 lines 5-14, 44-50),[95] in which both Achaemenid kings, using almost identical words, pride themselves upon being good horsemen, bowmen, spearmen as well as "friends to right, upholders of justice".[96]

Cyrus assures his mother that he is already well-versed in justice (ἀκριβῶς ταῦτά γε οἶδα 1.3.16), so much so that he has been appointed by his teacher to judge others. This is unusual, for while Persian youngsters are encouraged to bring wrongdoing contemporaries to trial, the judging and punishment of such children is normally left to their adult teachers (1.2.5-7). Cyrus was quite successful as a judge and was punished only once for producing an ill-judged verdict. (Although the circumstances are quite different, it is interesting to note that in Herodotus, too, the young Cyrus is taken to task for a verdict he has given - Hdt. 1.114-115.) The case is an interesting one and Xenophon adroitly makes use of it to turn from the Persian interest in justice to very Greek controversies on the topic.

When a tall boy forcibly exchanged his too-small coat for a smaller boy's

too-large one ( παῖς μέγας μικρὸν ἔχων χιτῶνα παῖδα μικρὸν μέγαν ἔχοντα χιτῶνα ἐκδύσας... Cyr. 1.3.17 - the elaborately rhetorical wording is noteworthy), Cyrus decided that each should keep the better-fitting coat. His teacher then flogged him for the verdict, explaining that it was his task to judge not the fit of the garment, but its rightful owner. The coat had been taken by force, and since what is lawful is just and what is unlawful is violent or unjust ( τὸ μὲν νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἄνομον βίαιον 1.3.17),[97] Cyrus must always decide a case according to the law (σὺν τῷ νόμῳ ).

The question of the relation between τὸ νόμιμον and τὸ δίκαιον, the legal and the just, positive law and morality, was, of course, a topic avidly discussed by the Greeks, from the early sophists onwards, as a part of the more general nomos-physis controversy.[98] The solution to the problem offered here by Cyrus' Persian teacher of justice is identical to the one given by Socrates in a discussion with Hippias in the Mem. (4.4.12 ff.). There Socrates, when asked to define justice, states categorically: φημὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι (4.4.12; cf. 4.4.18, 25) and proceeds to demonstrate to Hippias, by means of a series of brief questions (4.4.13-14) and a long speech (4.4.15-18) that ὁ μὲν ἄρα νόμιμος δίκαιός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ἄδικος (4.4.13), so that Hippias is finally made to accept the equation (4.4.18; see too the exchange between Socrates and Euthydemus at Mem. 4.6.5-6).

This definition of justice has been termed "a view held by the man in the street"[99] and Xenophon has been taken to task for not realizing that the laws and customs of a city may be unjust, and for attributing to Socrates such a simplistic and unthinking attitude.[100] So too the point of the coat anecdote in the Cyr. has been understood simply to be that "justice was in general to be conceived as adequately represented by the law of the land - justice is justice according to law".[101] That Xenophon considered the νόμιμον - δίκαιον

equation an important one is clear from the Mem. and Cyr. passages, but it is also clear from our text that he was aware of some of the difficulties arising from the identification of the two. It is significant that the only mistake in justice made by the young Cyrus - who is already a paragon of wisdom and deportment (see e.g. Cyr. 1.3.4-5, 10-11) - is one involving a conflict between "natural" possession ( τὸν ἁρμόττοντα... ἔχειν ) and technical ownership ( ποτέρου ὁ χιτὼν εἴη ), i.e. a conflict between τὸ δίκαιον and τὸ νόμιμον or physis and nomos. By portraying Cyrus as first having erred in this way, only to be chastised by his teacher of justice, rather than, for example, having Cyrus simply state the νόμιμον - δίκαιον equation to his mother as proof of his expertise in δικαιοσύνη , Xenophon demonstrates that his identification of justice with the laws of a land is not an unthinking one. The point of the coat anecdote is, then, that the law may seem unfair or unreasonable at times, but it must be obeyed, if justice is to prevail. This is a lesson that Xenophon may well have had impressed on him by Socrates' behaviour after his trial[102] - Socrates' trial was sufficient evidence of the injustice of a city's laws. The advantage of obedience to the laws for both the community and the individual is the argument used by Socrates to support his contention that τὸ νόμιμον and τὸ δίκαιον are one and the same.

Cyrus, then, feels that he is sufficiently schooled in justice ( τά γε δίκαια παντάπασιν ἤδη ἀκριβῶ Cyr. 1.3.17) but adds that he can always turn to his grandfather if the need for further instruction arises. Mandane is not reassured and hastens to explain to her son that Persian principles of justice are quite different from Median norms. Astyages has made himself master of everything in Media ( τῶν ἐν Μήδοις πάντων... δεσπότην ) whereas in Persia, τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν δίκαιον νομίζεται , fair possession (i.e. due property rights) is considered just.[103] Cambyses is a "constitutional monarch", both ruling and

ruled according to the precepts of his city (τὰ τεταγμένα μὲν ποιεῖ τῇ πόλει, τὰ τεταγμένα δὲ λαμβάνει 1.3.18), with the law, rather than his own desires, as a guideline (μέτρον δὲ αὐτῷ οὐχ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀλλ' ὁ νόμος ἐστίν ).[104] Astyages, on the other hand, is a tyrant who rules by whim, is unfettered by laws and is interested mainly in self-aggrandizement - or so we are led to understand, for Xenophon does not have Mandane condemn her father outright; instead she speaks more generally of τὸ τυραννικὸν as opposed to τὸ βασιλικόν.

This contrast between king and tyrant is found, of course, elsewhere in Greek writings (cf. e.g. Pl. Pol. 291 E; Arist. Pol. 1279 a 32 ff., 1285 a 18 ff., 1313 a 1-3 etc.); more particularly, Socrates of the Mem. is said to have distinguished between the two. In a somewhat isolated passage on the various types of government, we are told that Socrates τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἑκόντων τε τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατὰ νόμους τῶν πόλεων ἀρχὴν βασιλείαν ἡγεῖτο τὴν δὲ ἀκόντων τε καὶ μὴ κατὰ νόμους, ἀλλ' ὅπως ὁ ἄρχων βούλοιτο, τυραννίδα (Mem. 4.6.12). Only one of the elements of the Mem. definition is found in our passage (i.e. rule according to law vs. whim), while the question of the attitude of those ruled does not arise in the Cyr. There is no hint that the Medes feel oppressed by Astyages (see e.g. Cyr. 1.3.10) and even Cyaxares, Astyages' much less capable son, thinks that the Medes are willing to be ruled by him because they recognize his overall superiority, rather than his greater strength of arms (Cyr. 5.5.34). Here the tyrants of Media seem to rule over willing subjects and in this way remind us of Simonides' "ideal" tyrant in the Hiero (Hier. 11.9).

Cambyses' limited kingship, on the other hand, is reminiscent of the Spartan constitution (cf. below, pp. 393-394 ). Xenophon tells us that Agesilaus chose οὗκοι τὰ νόμιμα μὲν ἄρχειν, τὰ νόμιμα δὲ ἄρχεσθαι over being the most powerful man in Asia (Ages. 2.16) and more generally discusses the Spartan

king's oath κατὰ τοὺς τῆς πόλεως κειμένους νόμους βασιλεύειν (Lac.Pol. 15.7; cf. Cyr. 1.6.20; Ages. 1.4; Arist. Pol. 1285 a 3 ff.; Plut. Mor. 212 B-C; 215 D).

There are only a few further references in the Cyr. to the Persian constitution as it was in Cambyses' time. The kingship is hereditary (8.5.26) and the king's main duties appear to be religious ones (4.5.17; 8.5.26). Other participants in the government of Persia are elders who have gone through the entire state curriculum (as described in 1.2.3-15) and magistrates chosen from the group of mature men ( τέλειοι ἄνδρες 1.2.13): both these groups of men are termed πολῖται, fellow-citizens, by Cambyses (8.5.24). Cambyses' powers seem to have been fairly circumscribed for the elders serve as judges of both public and private affairs, even in capital cases, and choose all the other magistrates (1.2.14). In addition these elders (οἱ βουλεύοντες γεραίτεροι ) deal with requests for military aid and troops (1.5.4-5; cf. 4.5.16-17) while the (other?) authorities ( αἱ ἀρχαί) also fix the amount of war booty that must be contributed to the state treasury (4.5.17). Cambyses, as ruler, is clearly subject to many rules and thus resembles the ideal leaders described by Plato in the Laws (see e.g. 715 D: ἄρχοντες δοῦλοι τοῦ νόμου ; cf. 643 E) and Aristotle in the Politics (e.g. 1277 b 9 δεῖ τὸν ἄρχοντα ἀρχόμενον μαθεῖν... οὐκ ἔστιν εὖ ἄρξαι μὴ ἀρχθέντα ).[105]

Mandane warns Cyrus that he must not learn to be overly acquisitive ( τὸ πλέον οἴεσθαι χρῆναι πάντων ἔχειν Cyr. 1.3.18) from Astyages, for this is the trait of a tyrant, not a king.[106] It is interesting to note that much later, after Cyrus conquers his empire and returns to visit Persia, Cambyses again warns him that the Persians must not be ruled ἐπὶ πλεονεξίᾳ ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων (i.e. the subject countries of Cyrus' empire - Cyr. 8.5.24). Cyrus retorts that his learning πλεονεξίαfrom Astyages is far from likely, for his grandfather is

an expert on teaching others to have less rather than more, having taught all the Medes to do so. Later, in fact, during Cyrus' stay in Media we twice find the old man ignoring the rights of others, only to have Cyrus curb his πλεονεξία cf. 1.4.14 and 1.4.26. Mandane does not reply to Cyrus' clever argument[107] and thus tacitly consents to his remaining in Media.

It is difficult to find a leading figure in this conversation. Mandane, who initiated the conversation, questions and instructs her son throughout, but Cyrus does a great deal of the talking and has his own didactic contribution to make (if only to quote the words of another, his Persian teacher of justice); so too he has the last word. Both mother and son seem to be teachers and both repeat Socratic ideas found in the Mem. The discussion of Greek concepts of justice and tyranny in a Persian (or actually Median) setting is perhaps the most interesting feature of Cyr. 1.3.15-18 and it is reminiscent of the famous constitutional debate by three leading Persians in Herodotus (Hdt. 3.80-82).

Cyr. 3.1 : The Armenian King's Trial

The next "Socratic" section of the Cyr. is a series of conversations, all relating to the capture and trial of the Armenian king. The Armenians were neighbours of the Medes who had been defeated in battle by Astyages, Cyrus' grandfather (Cyr. 2.4.13; 3.1.10) and consequently had to pay tribute to the Medes and supply them with troops on demand (Cyr. 3.1.10). Originally Cyaxares and Cyrus had counted on the Armenians as allies against the Assyrian forces (Cyr. 2.1.6), but the Armenian king hearing of the many enemies gathering against the Medes, treats Cyaxares contemptuously (καταφρονεῖ) and sends neither tribute nor troops (Cyr. 2.4.12, 22).

Cyrus, discussing the matter with Cyaxares (Cyr. 2.4.12-17), decides to

try and make the Armenian king send the tribute and troops and hopes, in addition, to win back his affections ἔτι δ' ἐλπίζω καὶ φίλον αὐτὸν μᾶλλον ἡμῖν γενήσεσθαι ἢ νῦν ἐστι (Cyr. 2.4.14). It is clear from the context of the conversation (Cyr. 2.4.9-11) that Cyrus has another aim in mind as well - he would like to increase his own personal fortune on this venture. (Cf. too 3.3.5 where, in a summary of the Armenian affair, Cyrus' improved financial status is stressed.) Cyrus thinks that he is more likely to succeed with the Armenians than Cyaxares is, for he has once hunted with the Armenian's children. Cyrus decides to take his Persian troops and some Median cavalry to the Armenian border on the pretext (πρόφασιν ) that they are on a great hunting expedition so as to catch the Armenians unawares. Cyaxares will be a short distance away, waiting with back-up forces. The Persian leader, when formulating his plan, may have remembered an incident in his youth when the Assyrian prince turned a hunting expedition into a foray against the Medes (1.4.17; see below, pp.315-316).

Cyrus' plans proceed smoothly (Cyr. 2.4.18-32). At first he and his men hunt near the Armenian border. He then reveals to his officers that their real prey is the Armenian king ( νῦν οὖν τοῦτον θηρᾶσαι... ἦλθομεν 2.4.22) and sends Chrysantas ahead with some of the infantry to capture the king's mountain refuge. Cyrus himself proceeds with the rest of the army towards the king's palace, prepared to fight and pursue the Armenians if necessary. He sends a messenger to the Armenian king ordering him to send the tribute and men at once, since, we are told, he considers it more friendly to warn the king in advance before marching against him (2.4.32).

The Armenian is shocked, conscience-stricken and frightened (ἐξεπλάγη ἐννοήσας ὅτι ἀδικοίη... καὶ... ἐφοβεῖτο 3.1.1) upon receipt of Cyrus' message. He hesitates and then rushes about - gathering his forces, sending his family and precious possessions to the mountains, spying on Cyrus' movements and

organizing his men. His outburst of activity, emphasized by the twice-repeated ἅμα μὲν... ἅμα δὲ... (3.1.2) is to no avail. His frightened men scatter to their homes, his family and treasures are captured by Chrysantas' troops in the mountains and he himself flees to a hill ἀπορῶν ποῖ τράποιτο ἐπὶ λόφον τινὰ καταφεύγει (3.1.4), which is then surrounded by Cyrus' army. We are reminded of an omen Cyrus has seen just as he left for Armenia - an eagle swooped down, seized a fleeing hare, struck it and carrying it off ἐπὶ λόφον τινὰ... ἐχρῆτο τῇ ἄγρᾳ ὅ τι ἤθελεν (2.4.19; cf. Aes. Ag. 111 ff.). So too, as Cyrus himself tells the king, the gods have placed the Armenian at Cyrus' mercy to do with him as he pleases χρῆσθαί σοι ὅ τι βούλοιτο (3.1.6).

Cyrus, however, offers the king the opportunity to stand trial (ἐπὶ δίκην ). The Armenian is naturally reluctant to face a trial where Cyrus will be the judge but he has no real choice. In the world of the Cyropaedia it is clear to everyone νόμος γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀίδιός ἐστιν (7.5.73) that to the victor goes all - the lives, families and property of the vanquished. Both Cyrus and his arch-enemy, the Assyrian king, explicitly agree on this point (cf. 2.3.2; 4.2.26; 7.5.73 with 3.3.44-45). Thus Cyrus is indeed being kind in offering the Armenian a trial. The king descends from his hill and is carried off by Cyrus' forces to be judged.

Tigranes, the king's elder son and a childhood companion of Cyrus now opportunely arrives on the scene ἐξ ἀποδημίας τινός (3.1.7). He is both brave (unlike most Armenians, cf. e.g. 3.2.8) and a loyal friend of Cyrus (see e.g. 3.1.42; 5.1.27). Xenophon neatly solves the dilemma Tigranes would have had to face when Cyrus and his troops overran his country (i.e. whether he should fight against his old friend to defend his country or submit meekly to the dictates of a (well-loved) outsider) by removing him from the country at the crucial time and thus dissociating him from his father's actions. One may even

assume that he either did not know of his father's rebellion against the Medes or, at least, attempted to dissuade him from it. Tigranes, when he learns of his family's fortune, bursts into tears ὥσπερ εἰκός (3.1.7).[108] Cyrus does not comfort or welcome his old friend οὐδὲν ἐφιλοφρονήσατο αὐτῷ . He merely notes that Tigranes has come back in time for the king's trial (3.1.18) - presumably he is preserving a façade of judicial impartiality.

Cyrus then sets the scene for the trial itself, summoning Persian, Mede and Armenian leaders to attend the proceedings. Even the women, seated in their carriages, are allowed to listen. When all is arranged to his satisfaction ( ὁπότε δὲ καλῶς εἶχεν 3.1.9)[109] the trial begins. One receives the impression that Cyrus is deliberately arranging a dramatic backdrop for the trial, acting as stage manager as well as judge. While the trial was offered to the Armenian king as an alternative to being disposed of at Cyrus' pleasure (3.1.6), we begin to sense that Cyrus is using the trial for that very purpose.

Cyrus is to be judge (ὁ δικάζων 3.1.6) at the trial. Like all Persians he has learned δικαιοσύνη from a young age and as a boy practised bringing charges against other boys (1.2.6-7). We have already seen that in his youth he was considered an expert in justice ( ἀκριβοῦντα τὴν δικαιοσύνην 1.3.16) and was appointed by his teacher to judge others (cf. above, pp. 106-107 ). The present trial is the only instance in the Cyr. of the adult Cyrus actually sitting in judgement, although he does act as mediator between the Chaldeans and Armenians in the following section (3.2.17-24) and holds hearings at his royal court in Babylon (8.1.18).

More generally, it is not surprising to find Cyrus acting as judge, for the exercise of judicial functions by a ruler was widespread among ancient peoples - Greeks, Persians and others as well.[110] In Xenophon's time Athens had long gone over to a jury system, with a single magistrate found only in

preliminary hearings, while in Persia we hear of a number of βασιλήιοι δικασταὶ sitting in judgement together[111] but a local ruler, too, could mete out punishment, as Xenophon himself bears witness (Anab. 1.9.13).

The trial opens with Cyrus advising the king in very strong terms to tell the truth. Lying, he says, is deservedly the most hated of things (τὸ εὐμισητότατον) and if the king is caught in a lie, his friends and family, who are present, will know that he shall have only himself to blame for suffering the most dire consequences. The Armenian agrees to speak the truth (Cyr. 3.1.9).

The Persian emphasis on truthfulness is, of course, well-known from both Greek and Persian sources. Herodotus tells us that the Persians abhorred lying αἴσχιστον δὲ αὐτοῖσι τὸ ψεύδεσθαι νενόμισται (1.138.1; truth-telling, ἀληθίζεσθαι , is according to Herodotus, one of the three things that Persian children are taught - 1.136.2; cf. above, p. 106 ). This is corroborated by the hymns (Gāthās) of Zoroaster himself, where Asha (Truth) and Druj (Lie) represent the two antithetical forces of good and evil, righteousness and impiety.[112] So too Darius, in his Res Gestae (the Behistun inscription), equates rebellion against his empire with the Lie and tells us that he himself is a friend of Truth.[113] Xenophon describes the importance the younger Cyrus attached to keeping his word (Anab. 1.9.7; cf. Cyr. 8.8.2-3).

Thus Cyrus' opening words to the Armenian on truth place him firmly in the Persian tradition. They may, however, reflect another tradition as well - that of a solemn oath taken by the parties of a dispute on the overall truth of their statements. In ancient Greece the entire trial once consisted of an exculpatory or evidentiary oath taken by the accused and this practice survived down to the classical period in Gortyn. In classical Athens litigants were required to take an oath at the preliminary hearing before a magistrate (ἀνάκρισις) and sometimes witnesses were required to confirm their statements

by oath as well.[114] New evidence indicates that in the time of Darius and Xerxes, oath-taking by litigants was an important feature of Achaemenid justice too.[115] In effect, the Armenian king is taking such an oath here. He knows that the penalty for lying will be τὰ ἔσχατα παθεῖν i.e. death (3.1.9; cf. 3.1.12), yet seems to take a fatalistic attitude towards the proceedings (καὶ γενέσθω ὅ τι βούλεται 3.1.9).

The first part of the king's trial consists of a series of questions, actually an interrogation, by Cyrus (who is prosecutor as well as judge) and the Armenian's brief replies (3.1.10-13). The king seems to expect that the trial will be conducted in the form of questions and answers (rather than long speeches by the participants) for when promising to speak the truth he says to Cyrus ἀλλ' ἐρώτα... ὅ τι βούλει, ὡς τἀληθῆ ἐροῦντος (3.1.9).

Cyrus' first questions establish the facts of the case. The Armenian admits that he was defeated in battle by Astyages and has promised to pay tribute, supply an army when asked and not to build fortifications, replying with a simple "yes" ( ἔγωγε, ἦν ταῦτα 3.1.10) to Cyrus' questions. When he is then asked why he has not kept his word, his answer is longer: ἐλευθερίας ἐπεθύμουν· καλὸν γάρ μοι ἐδόκει εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν ἐλεύθερον εἶναι καὶ παισὶν ἐλευθερίαν καταλιπεῖν (3.1.10). He longed for freedom both for himself and his children.

One wonders what freedom means to the Armenian. He is king of the Armenians (3.1.5, 29), controls a large army (3.1.30, 33) and vast sums of money (3.1.30, 33; cf. 3.3.2-3) and wages his own wars independently of the Medes (3.1.34). Clearly his freedom is restricted by having to pay tribute to Media and this is why he stops sending them money and soldiers. The Armenian king goes even further, however, and both fortifies his own country (3.1.1, 10) and cooperates with Cyaxares' enemies (3.1.12). While the first step may simply be a move

undertaken in self-defense in anticipation of punitive action by the Medes, his second action - joining the forces ranged against the Medes - seems to constitute a more aggressive policy on the part of the Armenian. Freedom for the Armenian would then be not only the independence of his own country but the ability to dominate others, i.e. his ex-conquerors, the Medes.[116]

Cyrus does not care to discuss the joys of freedom with the king but points out the duties of an underling instead. He answers the Armenian's statement καλὸν... ἐδόκει... ἐλεύθερον εἶναι (3.1.10) with ἐστιν... καλὸν μάχεσθαι ὅπως μήποτέ τις δοῦλος μέλλοι γενήσεσθαι (3.1.11). Freedom, Cyrus implies, belongs to the stronger man, the victor, and once someone has been enslaved (by war or other means) he does not have the right to rebel (3.1.11). Surprisingly, although Cyrus' attitude here is a harsh one (and totally inconsistent with the actions of the historical Cyrus who rebelled against his Mede grandfather and gave the Persians their freedom), it is apparently shared by the Armenian king. With his next questions Cyrus invites the king to pass judgement on his own actions and the king is forced to condemn himself (3.1.11-13), for he must answer the painful questions truthfully. The Armenian must adopt the viewpoint of a master judging a subject, i.e. Cyrus' view of the matter, and the usual perspective of the king himself; no one presents the subject's view of things.

Under Cyrus' examination the king admits point by point (καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον), under oath (οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷς σὺ ψεύδεσθαι 3.1.11) and with rather brief replies, that he would punish a rebellious servant, replace a wrongdoing commander and deprive him of his money. If this underling, in addition, joined the king's enemies he would kill him. καταιτιάομαι, the Armenian says, implicitly condemning himself to death: he prefers to die telling the truth rather than by being caught in a lie (ἐλεγχθέντα ὅτι ψεύδομαι 3.1.12).

At this last admission, the king's family fearing that all is lost, give way

to grief. The king's son, presumably Sabaris rather than Tigranes, tears off his tiara and rends his robes, and the women lament aloud and lacerate their cheeks in mourning. Cyrus orders them to be silent and again one receives the impression of a carefully orchestrated scene, with Cyrus as conductor. The judge has one final question to ask of the Armenian: how is the Persian to apply the king's own verdict against himself - τὰ μὲν δὴ σὰ δίκαια ταῦτα... ἡμῖν δὲ τί συμβουλεύεις ἐκ τούτων ποιεῖν;(3.1.13). The Armenian is silent, at a loss (ἀπορῶν 3.1.13; cf. 4, 6,14) whether to advise Cyrus to put him to death or to be inconsistent and recommend a different course of action. He remains silent and his part in the trial is over.

This first part of the trial, Cyrus' cross-examination of the Armenian king bears obvious resemblances to a Socratic dialogue.[117] The conversation between Cyrus and the Armenian king is in the form of questions and answers, with Cyrus, the prosecutor, asking leading questions and holding the upper hand. His interlocutor, the Armenian, answers briefly and virtually against his will, disliking the conclusions he is forced to draw; he is finally reduced to a state of aporia. So too Cyrus makes use of a hypothetical case in order to have the Armenian employ the analogous verdict against himself, thus using the Socratic device of applied analogies, discussed at the very beginning of this chapter (above, pp. 42-43). Here, of course, the relation between Cyrus' hypothetical questions and the Armenian king's immediate plight is obvious from the start. This part of the Armenian's court-martial seems, then, particularly Socratic and we find that other cross-examinations in the Cyr. also make use of Socratic methods of investigation. Cyrus' interrogation of Cyaxares in their reconciliation scene (5.5.13 ff.; cf. below, pp.144-145 ) is perhaps the most outstanding example, but the less formal cross-examinations at 1.6.9, 2.1.2 ff., and 8.4.9-10 (and cf. 1.6.12-14) should also be noted. In general, the trial or

cross-examination scenes found in Xenophon's non-Socratic works - such as Orontas' trial in the Anabasis (1.6.4-11) or Dercylidas' interrogation of Meidias in the Hellenica (3.1.25-26) - are usually those that strike commentators as being peculiarly Socratic.[118] It is perhaps worth looking at the trial scenes in Xenophon and then examining actual instances of legal questioning in Athens in order to understand why this is so.

I begin with the trial of the Persian trator Orontas described in the Anab. (1.6.4-11). Orontas' trial, too, was conducted in a dramatic setting with 3,000 Greek hoplites surrounding Cyrus' text where the proceedings were held in camera. Present were Cyrus and his advisers - seven distinguished Persian nobles - and Clearchus, as representative of the Greeks (Anab. 1.6.4-7). Cyrus, the prosecutor and chief judge, opened the trial with a short speech, explaining that he wants to do to Orontas ὅ τι δίκαιόν ἐστι καὶ πρὸς θεῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων(Anab. 1.6.6). He then turns to the facts of the case. Orontas, he says, although under his command, had, at the instigation of Artaxerxes, attacked him at Sardis. Orontas was defeated there by Cyrus and the two exchanged pledges of friendship (Anab. 1.6.6). Cyrus then turns to question Orontas directly (Anab. 1.6.7-8). The questions put to Orontas by Cyrus are in the familiar "question and reply" form: that is to say they are brief, straightforward questions that generally can be answered with a simple "yes" or "no". Orontas is made to admit (cf. ὡς αὐτὸς σὺ ὁμολογεῖς 1.6.6; καὶ ταῦθ' ὡμολόγει 'Ορόντας 1.6.7; ὁμολογεῖς οὖν... ; 1.6.8) each of his past misdeeds, and further agrees, in response to the Persian ruler's questions, that he has not been wronged by Cyrus in any way but has himself sinned against him. Finally, in answer to Cyrus' last question ("Could you still possibly be my brother's enemy and my loyal friend?"), Orontas is, in essence, forced to condemn himself ("Even if I were to be your friend, you could not believe me" 1.6.8). Cyrus then turns to the others saying: ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ τοιαῦτα

μὲν πεποίηκε, τοιαῦτα δὲ λέγει (1.6.9) and asks Clearchus for his verdict. Clearchus recommends the death penalty and the others all agree. Orontas is taken by his belt and condemned to death. This sample of Persian justice,[119] in particular Cyrus the Younger's cross-examination, which uses short, sharp questions and elicits the interlocutor's agreement, step-by-step, is very much like a Socratic dialogue.

Another cross-examination in the Anabasis is conducted by Xenophon himself. He has been accused of ὕβρις, more specifically of beating several men without due cause. Xenophon interrogates his first accuser, a mule driver, interspersing a series of short, factual questions (see especially 5.8.2-6) into a longer description of the circumstances of the incident (cf. 5.8.7 οἷον δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐγένετο ἀκούσατε). The mule-driver retorts sharply to some of the questions (5.8.6, 11) and barely answers others (5.8.5), and is a more vocal opponent than Orontas or the Armenian king (or a typical interlocutor of Socrates). Nonetheless it is interesting to find a cross-examination as part of the judicial procedure here.[120] Elsewhere (5.7.1 ff.) Xenophon is again called upon to defend himself (although he is not actually on trial), and he chooses to do so by means of a long, continuous speech - perhaps because he faces a large body of accusers. In a third scene (Anab. 7.2.23-28), Xenophon interrogates Medosades, the emissary sent to him by the Thracian king, Seuthes, in the presence of the king himself. Xenophon wishes to clear up any misunderstandings before arranging an alliance with Seuthes and he questions Medosades on their earlier dealings. Xenophon, in his questions, reviews their past negotiations and Medosades' role is to confirm Xenophon's account and repeat the Athenian's earlier responses, i.e. Medosades acts as a witness, whom Xenophon cross-examines in order to establish his case. While the interrogation is neither searching nor hostile, there is an air of the courtroom about the proceedings.

Turning to the Hellenica, we find two trials which consist solely of a speech by the accuser followed by a counterspeech, or defense by the accused: the case of Critias vs. Theramenes (Hell. 2.3.24-34, 35-49) and that of the Theban officials against one of Euphron's murderers (Hell. 7.3.6, 7-11). These trials do not concern us here for they contain no interrogations or cross-examinations. (Cf. too the proper trial which Euryptolemus would like to see arranged for the generals of Arginusae. The trial day would be divided into three parts: one for the prosecution, one for the defense, and one for the deliberations and voting of the jury - Hell. 1.7.23.) The trial of the Spartan Cinadon is reported only indirectly, but the wording of the passage suggests that the trial was in essence an interrogation in which Cinadon was forced to confess his crime and reveal his co-conspirators: ὡς δὲ ἀνήχθη ὁ Κινάδων καὶ ἠλέγχετο καὶ ὡμολόγει πάντα καὶ τοὺς συνειδότας ἔλεγε, τέλος αὐτὸν ἤροντο... ὁ δ' ἀπεκρύνατο... (Hell. 3.3.11). Xenophon does not report the proceedings of another famous trial at Sparta, that of Sphodrias, but as the accused was not present, it could hardly have contained an interrogation (Hell. 5.4.24).

Dercylidas' cross-examination of Meidias (Hell. 3.1.24-28) takes place not in a courtroom setting, but while awaiting dinner. Nonetheless it is, in fact, a trial of one vanquished, at the hands of his conqueror (as with the Armenian king of the Cyr.). Dercylidas begins with the suggestion that they examine the situation together fairly ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ τὰ δίκαια πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ διασκεψώμεθα καὶ ποιήσωμεν (3.1.24), and then proceeds to question Meidias. His questions - which open with an εἰπέ μοι (and cf. 3.1.26), as in Socrates' applied analogies: here too Meidias' replies will be used against him - are short, factual ones, meant to establish the limits of Meidias' property. When the questioning turns (3.1.25), to more uncomfortable topics (i.e. Meidias' illegitimate claims to Manias' property), Meidias evidently falls silent and

the others present, the men of Scepsis, reply in his stead. Dercylidas' final verdict, termed by him δικαιότατον (cf. 3.1.22), is based directly on the answers to his leading questions.

It is worth inquiring why then these scenes of (legal) cross-examination in Xenophon seem especially influenced by Socrates. A brief comparison with Herodotus on this point is illuminating. Herodotus' history contains several scenes of investigation and cross-examination and there is not a single instance of a trial of the speech and counter-speech sort.[121] Nonetheless the interrogations in Herodotus seem far from Socratic. Generally the examiner is a powerful figure, often a ruler (cf. Astyages in 1.115 and 1.117; Darius in 3.130 and Prexaspes in 3.63), so that there is not even the pretence that the inquiry is a joint one between equals. Usually too the interrogator asks only one factual question to which the respondent answers at some length, so that the exchanges are not of the "question and reply" sort. Thus Herodotus' cross-examinations do not seem Socratic, while Xenophon's do. One possible explanation of this is that Socrates' methods of investigation, particularly his use of a "question and reply" form of interrogation, was, in fact, strongly influenced by the forensic questioning regularly found in Athenian legal procedures, and Xenophon's work reflects this influence as well.

Scholars often discuss the possible influence of sophistic eristic on Socrates' question-and-answer technique but ignore almost entirely (in this context) the various types of legal questioning that were well established in Socrates' time.[122] There were three different types of forensic interrogation practised in Socrates' Athens: (1) The magistrate's questioning of the plaintiff and defendant and their questioning of each other, at the ἀνάκρισις, the pre-trial hearing, (2) the ἐρώτησις, i.e. the litigants' interrogation of one another at the actual trial, (3) the examination of witnesses at the trial. I shall examine the evidence for each of these in turn.

At the ἀνάκρισις, the initial hearing of a case before a magistrate, proceedings were probably entirely oral in Socrates' time.[123] The magistrate, in his attempt to clarify the issue at hand and determine whether the case was admissible, would question both parties to a dispute, as the very name ἀνάκρισις implies. (Cf. Isaeus 5.32; Dem. 48.31; Arist. Ath.Pol. 56.6; Harpokration s.v. ἀνάκρισις etc.) The litigants would also question each other. There is no interrogation by a magistrate extant - possibly because the proceedings were oral - but we do have one sample of the questions put by a plaintiff to defendants in Isaeus 6.12-13. The plaintiff asks who the mother of the two boys who are claiming an estate was (τίς εἴη αὐτῶν μήτηρ καὶ ὅτου θυγάτηρ 6.12). The defendants could not answer at first but are then ordered to do so in accordance with the law καὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος κελεύοντος ἀποκρίνασθαι κατὰ τὸν νόμον (6.12). The plaintiff then continues to investigate the family background, asking further questions about the boys' maternal grandfather ... ὅστις εἴη καὶ εἰ ζῇ ἢ μή (6.13).

Two main points emerge from this sample of an ἀνάκρισις: (1) The legal opponents are compelled to answer each other's (and the magistrate's) questions. (2) The questions asked are short factual ones requiring brief answers. The first of these points is confirmed by another passage from Isaeus (10.2) in which the litigant tells at his trial of a point (damaging to his case) which he was forced to admit to at the pre-trial hearing (ἠνάγκασμαι μὲν οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες... ἐν τῇ ἀνακρίσει... προσγράψασθαι ). Andocides 1.101 which contains an imaginary cross-examination at an ἀνάκρισις serves to confirm the second of our points. The questions supposedly put to Andocides are again short and circumstantial and all but the last of them (which is a rhetorical question) is answered by Andocides with a simple "no" (εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Ἀνδοκίδη, ἦλθες...

καὶ ἐπετείχισας... ; Οὐκ ἔγωγε. Τί δέ; ἔτεμες... καὶ ἐλῇσω... ; Οὐ δῆτα. Οὐδ' ἐναυμάχησας... οὐδὲ συγκατέσκαψας... οὐδὲ συγκατέλυσας... οὐδὲ βίᾳ κατῆλθες ... ; Οὐδε τούτων πεποίηκα οὐδέν).

I turn now to the second form of legal questioning regularly found in 5th century Athens, the ἐρώτησις or interrogation of one legal opponent by another at the trial itself.[124] Here too it is compulsory for the litigants to answer each other's questions (τοῖν ἀντιδίκοιν ἐπάναγκες εἶναι ἀποκρίνασθαι ἀλλήλοις τὸ ἐρωτώμενον Dem. 46.10; cf. Socrates' words to his accuser Meletus in Pl. Apol. 25 D:... ἀποκρίνου ὦ ἀγαθέ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμος κελεύει ἀποκρίνεσθαι ). The short exchanges in Lysias 12.25 and 22.5 are the most authentic examples of such interrogations to have survived. They indicate that the questions asked were, again, generally short, polar (i.e. "yes or no?", "A or B?") and related to the facts of the case. So too the replies are quite brief and often echo phrases used in the question (cf. e.g. 12.25 ἦσθα... ; ἦν. πότερον συηνγόρευες... ἢ ἀντέλεγες; ἀντέλεγον. ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν; ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνητε etc.). The questions are leading ones and the respondent is left very little scope for argument or elaboration in his reply.[125] The other instances of such interrogations in the orators - which are not actual ones, either because the speaker provides both questions and answers (as in Dinarchus 1.83: ἔγραψας... ; ἔγραψας. ἐγένετο... ; ἐγένετο. τεθνᾶσι... ; τεθνᾶσι. etc.; cf. Dem. 43.48-49) or because the opponent's answers are not recorded (Isaeus 11.5; cf. Lysias 13.30, 32) - also exhibit very similar features.

There are several more literary examples of an ἐρώτησις, such as the interrogation of Meletus by Socrates in the Apologys of Plato (24 C ff.) and of Xenophon (19-21), and the questioning of Orestes by the Erinyes in Aeschylus (Eum. 585 ff.). In Plato, while some of Socrates' questions seem quite long because they include a lengthy preface, the actual questions asked are all of concise, polar form and Meletus' responses are correspondingly brief. It is

interesting to note that this is not true of the ἐρώτησις in Xenophon. His Socrates uses long rhetorical questions, which are not a choice between alternatives, and his Meletus answers neither concisely nor exactly to the point. Similarly, in the mock beauty competition between Socrates and Critoboulus in Xenophon's Symp. (5.1-10), although Socrates pretends that they are engaged in a legal contest - cf. 5.2 εἰς ἀνάκρισιν τοίνυν σε... πρῶτον τῆς δίκης καλοῦμαι and the references to the κριταί (5.1,9) and their votes (5.10) - his questions (and Critoboulus' answers) are not of the spare legal kind.

The Erinyes' examination of Orestes in Aeschylus is very like a judicial ἐρώτησις,particularly Eum. 585 ff.

Chorus: πολλαῖ μέν ἐσμεν, λέξομεν δὲ συντόμως
ἔπος δ' ἀμείβου πρὸς ἔπος ἐν μέρει τιθείς·
τὴν μητέρ' εἶπε πρῶτον εἰ κατέκτονας.

Orest.: ἔκτεινα...

Note too in the same play Athene's interrogation of the chorus at the pre-trial ἀνάκρισις, as opposed to the speech and counter-speech questioning of Orestes (Eum. 415 ff.). Palamedes' interrogation of Odysseus in Gorgias (Pal. 22-26) seems another good instance of the kind of questions asked at an ἐρώτησις, for all that Odysseus' replies are missing and supplied rhetorically by his questioner. Finally, mention should be made of perhaps the shortest ἐρώτησις on record, the single life-and-death question put to the Plataeans by their Spartan judges (Thuc. 3.68; cf. 3.52) at their trial: εἴ τι Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἀγαθὸν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ δεδράκότες εἰσίν. A negative response led to immediate execution.

The last of the three types of forensic questioning practised in Athens is the interrogation of witnesses at a trial. As with the proceedings at the ἀνάκρισις written affidavits replaced the earlier oral testimony sometime in

the beginning of the fourth century.[126] In Socrates' time, however, witnesses at a trial were examined orally. There is only once instance of the cross-examination of a witness to be found in the Attic orators - Andocides 1.14. The questions put by Andocides to Diognetus are again short, factual ones and the answers given are simple affirmations: ἦσθα... ; ἦν. οἶσθα... ; οἶδα. ἔστι ταῦτα... ; ἔστι ταῦτα. Literary sources provide further evidence for such "question and reply" interrogation of witnesses. In Aristophanes' Wasps (962-966), the cheese-grater is examined in just this fashion by Bdelykleon in the dog-trial scene: ἀπόκριναι σαφῶς, εἰ μὴ κατέκνησας... φησὶ κατακνῆσαι and this is surely a parody of actual forensic practices. Sophocles' OT, while far removed from the courtroom, contains several cross-examinations by Oedipus: of Creon (99 ff.; 555 ff.), of Jocasta (732 ff.), of the Corinthian messenger (1017 ff.), and of the shepherd (1115 ff.). Oedipus' interrogation of one witness, the shepherd (1115 ff.) seems particularly influenced by forensic forms: Oed.: δεῦρό μοι φώνει βλέπων ὅσ' ἂν σ' ἐρωτῶ. Λαΐου ποτ' ἦσθα σύ;Shepherd: ἦ... (1121-1123).[127]

It seems, however, that witnesses were not always examined by means of leading questions. At times, apparently, they were allowed to testify freely, telling their stories in their own way - cf. Andoc. 1.69: αὐτοὺς κάλει... ἄριστα γὰρ ἂν εἰδότες τὰ γενόμενα λέγοιεν εἰς τούτους... μέχρι τούτου ἀναβήσονται καὶ λέξουσιν ὑμῖν ἕως ἂν ἀκροᾶσθαι βούλησθε (and cf. Lysias 17.2). Perhaps the stricter form of interrogation, by means of leading questions which required only "yes" or "no" for an answer, was generally used when a litigant called upon a hostile witness to testify on his behalf, for this would allow him much greater control over the evidence elicited (as with the questioning of an opponent at the ἀνάκρισις or trial).[128] Friendly witnesses, on the other hand, could be permitted to speak freely with no fear of the consequences. (There was

no cross-examination of an opponent's witnesses.) There is no example extant in the orators of this looser kind of testimony.

To sum up, both direct and indirect (or literary) sources seem to show that all three types of legal questioning regularly found in 5th century Athens strongly resemble the "question and reply" form of interrogation (i.e. short, leading questions that can generally be answered with a brief "yes" or "no") particularly associated with Socrates. It would therefore probably be more correct to say that Socrates' questioning technique is very like (and is probably modelled upon) such forensic examinations. When many of the cross-examinations that appear in Xenophon's writings remind scholars of Socrates, it is, it seems, because Socrates' most typical interrogations are quite similar to legal ones, in their form, if not their content.

Finally, the strong link between legal questioning and eristic contests (which are more generally recognized as having influenced Socrates in some way) should be noted. Plato's Euthydemus is the best illustration of what an eristic competition was like[129] and it is perhaps not a coincidence that the brothers Euthydemus and Dionysodorus (cf.above,pp.87-88), who have only recently acquired their skill in eristic (Pl. Euthyd. 272 B) have long been known as experts in legal wrangling (272 A, 273 C). In an eristic contest (as in a legal one) the object is to win - by refuting one's opponent (272 A; cf. 275 E) and reducing him to ἀπορία, to silence (275 D, 286 B). The practitioner of eristic always asks the questions, while his opponent always responds and they may not change roles (275 C, 287 C-D, 295 A-B etc.); this is, of course, true of forensic cross-examinations as well. Again, as in legal examinations, the questions asked are framed in such a way that the respondent must choose between a pair of opposite alternatives, or simply answer "yes" or "no" (cf. Aristot. Soph.El. 175b 8-9) and he may not add to or clarify his answer in any way (Pl. Euthyd.

296 A-B). Furthermore, the eristic's partner is compelled to respond to his interrogator's questions (297 B; cf. 276 E), again reminding us of the court-room situation. The eristic contest, with its well-defined rules has, then, much in common with the procedures of forensic questioning and it seems reasonable to assume that the development of its methods and regulations was influenced to a certain degree by legal practice.

In sum, when Xenophon chose to cast the Armenian king's trial in the form of a dialogue between Cyrus and the king, rather than having long Athenian-style forensic speeches by the two, he was probably influenced by two related kinds of questioning: the ἐρωτήσεις of Athenian courts and the interrogations conducted by Socrates. Both the facts of the case and the king's excuses for his behaviour could have been set forth in speeches (by Cyrus and the king respectively), but the most effective part of the scene, the Armenian's progressively harsher verdict on his own action, could only have been achieved through a series of questions and answers.

Before leaving this part of the Armenian king's trial, it is worth looking at one further episode in the Anabasis: the encounter between Phalinus and the commanders of the Greek forces (Anab. 2.1.7 ff.). Immediately after the death of Cyrus the Younger, Phalinus, a Greek military expert who advises the Persian army ranged against the Ten Thousand, approaches the Greeks, as part of a delegation sent by Tissaphernes and Artaxerxes. His message is that the Greeks should surrender their arms and present themselves at the royal court. Several of the Greek leaders present reply to this request, skilfully presenting their arguments for and against surrender. (Phalinus is particularly delighted at Theopompus' words - cf. ἀλλὰ φιλοσόφῳ μὲν ἔοικας, ὦ νεανίσκε, καὶ λέγεις οὐκ ἀχάριστα Anab. 2.1.13). When Phalinus asks Clearchus, the acknowledged leader, for a final decision, he does not reply directly, but asks Phalinus to advise him.

Phalinus' counsel will be discussed by all of Greece, Clearchus says, and should bring him great honour. Clearchus would like Phalinus, the king's emissary,to speak out against surrender but he is disappointed: the military expert tells the Greeks to give up their arms, for there is no chance of their defeating the king.

Clearchus' request that Phalinus advise him and judge a critical situation in his stead is somewhat like Cyrus' efforts to extract a final verdict from the Armenian king - cf. σὺ οὖν... συμβούλευσον ἡμῖν Anab. 2.1.17; ἡμῖν δὲ τί συμβουλεύεις ἐκ τούτων ποιεῖν; Cyr. 3.1.13. Both Clearchus and Cyrus remind their "adviser" that many eyes are upon them, awaiting their reply (Anab. 2.1.17; Cyr. 3.1.9), but despite this public pressure neither Phalinus nor the Armenian king co-operates and both are unwilling to produce the counsel that their questioner is after. Clearchus and Cyrus are unable to abdicate their responsibilities and assign the difficult task of judging to another; the ploy, in each case, has failed.

Since the Armenian king has been reduced to silence by Cyrus' last question, his son Tigranes now asks permission to speak in his father's stead (Cyr. 3.1.14). Tigranes and Cyrus used to hunt together as boys (3.1.7, 14; cf. 2.4.15) but Cyrus has not acknowledged their old bond so far (3.1.7). Now, however, recalling from their hunts together that Tigranes used to spend time with a certain sophist whom he admired σοφιστήν τινα αὐτῷ συνόντα καὶ θαυμαζόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Τιγράνου (3.1.14) Cyrus is very eager ( πάνυ ἐπεθύμει) to hear what Tigranes has to say and bids him to speak freely.

It is rather unexpected to find a sophist and his enthusiastic pupil here and later (3.1.38-40) we learn even more surprising details about Tigranes' teacher, who is, it seems a Socrates in Armenia.[130] He was a noble man ( καλὸς κἀγαθός 3.1.38) but, as Tigranes tells Cyrus, his father has had him put to death

for corrupting him (διαφθείρειν αὐτὸν ἔφη ἐμέ 3.1.38), immediately reminding us of the indictment of Socrates (ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης... τοὺς νέους διαφθείρων Mem. 1.1.1; cf. Pl. Apol. 24 B). The Armenian king hastens to justify his action to Cyrus by explaining that he was jealous of the sophist for he caused Tigranes to regard him more highly than his own father. The sophist had alienated Tigranes' affections and had to be killed, just as a husband kills a man caught in adultery with his wife, not because he has made her more lustful[131] but because he has taken away her love for her husband (Cyr. 3.1.39). Socrates too is accused of causing young people to admire him more than anyone else (Mem. 1.2.52) and Meletus expressly says that Socrates' νέων διαφθοραί consist of persuading young men to obey him rather than their parents (Xen. Apol. 19-20; cf. Mem. 1.2.49). It will be seen that Cyrus too is made to face this same charge, alienation of affections from their proper recipient, by Cyaxares (Cyr. 5.5.27-31; cf. below, pp. 146-147 ).

In view of the close resemblance between Socrates and Tigranes' teacher, it is interesting to note Cyrus' reaction to the execution of the sophist. When he learns of his death he says φεῦ τοῦ ἀνδρός (3.1.39) but after hearing the Armenian king's explanation, Cyrus says to him ἀλλὰ ναὶ μὰ τοὺς θεούς... ὦ Ἀρμένιε, ἀνθρώπινά μοι δοκεῖς ἁμαρτεῖν (3.1.40; cf. the Persian leader's similar attitude towards human frailty elsewhere - 5.4.19; 6.1.37) and urges Tigranes to forgive his father. Are Xenophon's readers meant to take Cyrus' view of the matter or is it the unforgiving Tigranes who is right? What does Xenophon himself think? One scholar suggests that Cyrus' words here show that Xenophon has now pardoned the Athenians many years after the death of Socrates while Tigranes is a fictional version of his younger self.[132] Other scholars think that Cyrus' call for forgiveness is part of Xenophon's own attempt to re-establish good relations with his fellow Athenians at about the time his

banishment was revoked,[133] but since we do not know the exact date of the composition of the Cyr. or of Xenophon's recall from exile, we cannot verify such an assumption. It is probably wrong simply to identify Cyrus as the mouthpiece of his author here. Xenophon may be indicating a greater understanding of the execution of Socrates here, but he does not allow any of his readers to forget it.

The sophistes of the Cyr. seems to share some of Socrates' ideas as well. Before he was executed he told Tigranes not to be angry with his father for he was acting out of ignorance not maliciousness ( οὐ γὰρ κακονοίᾳ... ἀλλ' ἀγνοίᾳ ). He continues: ὁπόσα δὲ ἀγνοίᾳ ἄνθρωποι ἐξαμαρτάνουσι πάντ' ἀκούσια ταῦτ' ἔγωγε νομίζω 3.1.38). The Armenian king's wrongdoing is due to ignorance and must therefore be considered involuntary. Although this is not a formulation of the Socratic paradox "no one does wrong willingly" - since for Socrates, surely, κακόνοια would be equivalent to, not contrasted with ἄγνοια , and ὁπόσα δὲ ἀγνοίᾳ ἄνθρωποι ἐξαμαρτάνουσι would, in fact, be all wrongdoing - this pronouncement by the Armenian sophist is in accord with the paradox. Hence Cyr. 3.1.38 is, perhaps, additional evidence that Xenophon knew the Socratic paradoxes so frequently found in Plato.[134] Xenophon's Socrates does state that "virtue is knowledge", but only rarely and in rather vague terms (Mem. 3.9.4-5; cf. 4.6.6). He often stresses an altogether different notion, i.e. the bearing natural gifts and practice have on the acquisition of ἀρετή (Mem. 1.2.19; 2.1.1-2; 3.9.1-3 etc.) and he frequently calls for the exercise of self-control, ἐγκράτεια (cf. e.g. Mem. 1.5).[135]

Tigranes' teacher is, then, modelled upon Socrates. He is called a σοφιστής and while this is not a word Xenophon uses to describe the real Socrates, the term is not necessarily a pejorative one in Xenophon.[136] At times Xenophon links σοφισταί closely with σοφοί (Mem. 4.2.1, 8) or φιλόσοφοι (Poroi 5.4;

cf. Cyr. 6.1.41 πεφιλοσόφηκα μετὰ τοῦ ἀδίκου σοφιστοῦ ), or uses the word to describe natural philosophers (Mem. 1.1.11), so that the word can be neutral or even positive. Elsewhere in Xenophon the term has more negative connotations, e.g. at Mem. 1.6.13 where Socrates attacks τοὺς σοφιστάς for prostituting their wisdom and selling it to anyone who can pay their fee; in the Cynegeticus, a work of doubtful authenticity (cf. above, p. 100), there is a sweeping attack on sophists (Cyneg. 13.1-9). Antisthenes is called a sophist by Callias in the Symposium, when he tries to refute his host by cross-examination (Symp. 4.4; cf. 4.2 καὶ ὁ Ἀντισθένης ἐπαναστὰς μάλα ἐλεγκτικῶς αὐτὸν ἐπήρετο ) and it is perhaps this meaning of σοφιστής - skillful debater or expert with words - which comes closest to what is meant in our dialogue. Cyrus looks forward to hearing Tigranes, the sophist's pupil, and he is not disappointed for Tigranes is a lively debater and uses several "sophistic", i.e. clever, but specious, arguments.

At the opening of their exchange we find Tigranes ready to advise Cyrus on what should be done, with the Persian eager to listen (Cyr. 3.1.14). The matter under discussion is no longer forensic (for all agree that the Armenian king is guilty as charged) but deliberative (i.e. what should be done to him?), or in Aristotelean terms, the discussion deals with the future rather than the past (Rhet. 1358 b 13 ff.). This change in rhetorical category is significant since, as Aristotle tells us, forensic and deliberative discussions have different aims in mind: the former are concerned with justice and the latter expediency (τέλος δὲ... τῷ μὲν συμβουλεύοντι τὸ συμφέρον καὶ βλαβερόν... τοῖς δὲ δικαζομένοις τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἄδικον (Rhet., ibid.). Tigranes seems well aware of these rhetorical rules for, when requesting permission to speak, he indicates that he is going to discuss Cyrus' interests (rather than justice), asking ἢ συμβουλεύσω... ἃ οἶμαί σοι βέλτιστα εἶναι;(Cyr. 3.1.14). He continues to emphasize Cyrus' self-interest throughout (see especially 3.1.15-16, 27-30).

Here too, in this, the deliberative part of the trial scene, one might at first sight have expected a speech (by Tigranes) or a pair of speeches (Tigranes' appeal and Cyrus' reply), but we find instead that the deliberations are conducted in dialogue form. Perhaps the discussion is a dialogue because Tigranes has been taught to argue by the σοφιστής. It is only natural to find a pupil of "Socrates" using dialogue rather than a set speech to make his point and sophists too trained their pupils to argue by a question and answer method.[137] Dialogue, however, was usually reserved for private intellectual discussions and was not used for deciding affairs of state. The closest parallel to this deliberative dialogue in terms of its form seems to be Thucydides' Melian Dialogue (Thuc. 5.84-113). Although the Melian Dialogue is, of course, very different from our conversation there is a certain similarity in content, especially in the way the Athenians, like Tigranes, are interested in expediency, as opposed to justice - cf. Thuc. 5.89, 90, 98, 104 etc.[138]

Tigranes opens the discussion somewhat elliptically, telling Cyrus that he should imitate his father only if he admires what he has done in the past. He means, presumably, that Cyrus should not be guided by the verdict of death the Armenian king has to all intents just brought against himself (cf. 3.1.12-13) but decide his case independently. Cyrus responds, however, that by doing justice he would not be following in the footsteps of the wrongdoing Armenian, and Tigranes is forced to concede the point. Cyrus then goes on to argue that since it is just to punish unjust people then, according to Tigranes himself (κατά γε τὸν σὸν λόγον 3.1.15), he must punish the king. Again the argument here is somewhat compressed but Cyrus probably means that by doing a just thing (i.e. punishing the wrongdoing king) he will not be doing as the Armenian king did and hence will be following Tigranes' advice.

Tigranes does not refute Cyrus, who seems to have won this first round

nor does he seem interested in doing so. Punishment of the Armenian king may well be just but Cyrus must consider whether it is to his advantage or not (σὺν τῷ σῷ ἀγαθῷ... ἢ σὺν τῇ ζημίᾳ 3.1.15). Tigranes, as has already been noted, is basing his plea on what is expedient for Cyrus, not on abstract principles of justice. The Persian leader, on the other hand, at first introduces arguments based on justice, but later also concentrates solely on what seems advantageous.[139] In doing so, Cyrus is perhaps not so much following Tigranes' lead as returning to his own initial objectives when setting out on the Armenian expedition (cf. above, p. 112).

Tigranes next argues (3.1.16) that his father should not be killed for he is now more valuable than ever to Cyrus. Because the Armenian king has been caught in a misdeed, he has been brought to his senses, become σώφρων and therefore is even more useful to Cyrus. All the other qualities that Cyrus may wish to make use of in a friend or subject - strength, bravery, wealth and political power - are worthless, says Tigranes, without σωφροσύνη, i.e. a realistic appraisal of one's powers.[140] This stress on the importance of sophrosyne is reminiscent of Socrates' teachings in the Mem. - note especially Xenophon's statement that Socrates was in no hurry for his companions to become eloquent or capable or resourceful, but thought they should first acquire σωφροσύνη (Mem. 4.3.1; cf. 4.2.34-35). Cyrus too recognizes the value of σωφροσύνη (Cyr. 8.1.30; 6.1.47; cf. 1.2.8-9) but he does not believe that it is a quality that can be acquired overnight οὐ γὰρ ἂν δήπου... παραχρῆμα ἐξ ἄφρονος σώφρων ἄν τις γένοιτο (3.1.17). Tigranes, says Cyrus, thinks that sophrosyne is an emotion (πάθημα ) of the soul, like sorrow, but the Persian views it as something that must be learned ( μάθημα) since it entails reasonableness ( εἴγε φρόνιμον δεῖ γενέσθαι τὸν μέλλοντα σώφρονα ἔσεσθαι).

The debate between Tigranes and Cyrus is, essentially, whether σωφροσύνη

is an intellectual or a moral virtue. Tigranes, who claims that his father has acquired the necessary knowledge through his recent misfortunes, is upholding, in a way, the Socratic "virtue is knowledge" doctrine. Cyrus, on the other hand, thinks that sophrosyne is a moral quality and hence can only be instilled slowly by study and repeated practice. This is the more traditional approach to virtue[141] - see Cyr. 3.3.50 ff. where Cyrus repeats his conviction that men cannot acquire good qualities αὐθημερόν (discussed below, p. 156 ) and compare Croesus' attitude at 7.2.20-25 (noted below, p. 350 ). As we have seen above (p. 131 ), Cyrus' view is one that Xenophon's Socrates sometimes expresses (e.g. Mem. 1.2.19-23; 2.6.39) even though it is not consistent with the claim that "virtue is knowledge".

The use here of the terms πάθημα and μάθημα immediately reminds us of the Aeschylean πάθει μάθος (Ag. 177) and of Croesus' statement in Herodotus (1.207.1): τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα ἐόντα ἀχάριτα μαθήματα γέγονε i.e. of the proverbial idea that one learns through suffering. Here, however, πάθημα and μάθημα are seen as opposites rather than cause and effect, and πάθημα now seems to mean emotion, rather than suffering or experience. Cyrus is putting forth a fourth-century variation on the old proverb.[142]

Tigranes tries to demonstrate to Cyrus that sophrosyne can be acquired very rapidly by adducing two general examples. A man who foolishly attacks a stronger man will soon repent of his folly, once he is defeated. Similarly, a city at war is willing to submit to the enemy, immediately after being vanquished (Cyr. 3.1.18). Defeat acts as a catalyst to bring a man to his senses (σωφρονίζειν - cf. 2.2.14 and 8.4.14 for similar remarks). Cyrus, accepting Tigranes' premises for the moment, objects that the Armenian king has not suffered any real defeat (ποίαν δὲ... καὶ σὺ τοῦ πατρὸς ἧττον λέγων οὕτως ἰσχυρίζει σεσωφρονίσθαι αὐτόν 3.1.19). Tigranes replies that the king's self-knowledge

(σύνοιδεν ἑαυτῷ ) - the realization that he has lost all freedom and been foiled in every attempted move, while Cyrus has fooled him as completely as if he were blind, deaf and a fool, and captured his country swiftly and by stealth - is defeat enough.

Cyrus is sceptical as to whether the knowledge that someone else is superior (τὸ γνῶναι ἄλλους ἑαυτῶν βελτίονας ὄντας ) is indeed enough of a lesson, but the Armenian prince argues that such knowledge is a much greater deterrent than actual physical defeat in battle, and again tries to prove his point by reference to more general examples, using, in fact, the same two illustrations as earlier. A man who has been overpowered by force will sometimes try to fight his opponent again, if he has trained in the meantime, and vanquished cities too will renew their fight if they acquire new allies, but men will willingly obey those whom they believe are superior (οὓς δ'ἂν βελτίους τινὲς ἑαυτῶν ἡγήσωνται 3.1.20); this is, as we have seen, a claim made both by Cambyses and Socrates of the Mem. (cf. above, p. 93). Sophrosyne, Tigranes is saying, is the recognition of one's true capabilities in relation to others. Misfortune and defeat turn men sensible and the continuing recognition that others are superior keeps them so. Cyrus counters Tigranes' argument by replacing the word βελτίονας (better or superior) with σωφρονεστέρους (morally superior) and asks the Armenian prince if he really thinks that thieves, liars and unjust men do not realize that others are (morally) better than they. Surely the Armenian king broke his word and violated his treaty with the Medes knowing fully well that the Medes had done no wrong (3.1.21). Tigranes, who does not seem to see that Cyrus has changed his argument a bit, rather lamely retorts οὐδ' ἐγὼ τοῦτο λέγω ὡς τὸ γνῶναι μόνον τοὺς βελτίονας σωφρονίζει ἄνευ τοῦ δίκην διδόναι (3.1.22). He is now forced to take justice (or at least retribution) into consideration and he uses the word δίκη for the first time (cf. 3.1.15 where he

speaks of τιμωρίας instead). Knowledge alone, he concedes, is not enough without punishment. But, the Armenian prince immediately adds, his father has been punished. Cyrus objects that the king has suffered no harm at all other than fear of being punished. Tigranes, who seems to have his lines here fed to him by Cyrus, replies that the fear of suffering is worse than the actual suffering itself. He again tries to prove his point by using several examples - men who are about to be exiled or captured in war or enslaved can neither eat nor sleep for fear of the future, but those who are already in exile or enslaved eat and sleep quite well. Further proof of the burden that fear is ( οἷον φόρημα ὁ φόβος 3.1.25) is the fact that men who are afraid of being captured and killed, kill themselves first - by jumping to their death, hanging themselves or cutting their throats[143] οὕτω... ὁ φόβος μάλιστα καταπλήττει τὰς ψυχάς (3.1.25). This graphic description of φόβος at work may have been a rhetorical topos (cf. Gorg. Hel. 16-17 and Dio Chrys. 6.41-42).[144] Cyrus is acquainted with the sobering and oppressive influence fear has (cf. e.g. 3.3.19 and 1.1.5) but he thinks that the king will be subdued only for a short while and that afterwards he will regain his confidence and be up to mischief again ( πάλιν αὖ μέγα φρονῆσαι καὶ πάλιν αὖ πράγματα παρασχεῖν 3.1.26; cf. again Croesus at 7.2.20 ff.). Cyrus is stating once more (cf. 3.1.17) that the Armenian has been taught only a short-term lesson.

Tigranes, admitting that Cyrus has good cause to be suspicious of the Armenian royal family, says that they will blame only themselves for any military restrictions Cyrus may choose to impose. (Here, for the first time, Tigranes is identifying himself with his father's actions, probably in order to arouse Cyrus' sympathy.) If, however, Cyrus installs a new ruler in Armenia, he is likely either to arouse his enmity by being too suspicious, or allow him to cause even greater damage by being too lenient. When Cyrus then objects that he

wants servants that are motivated by good will εὐνοίᾳ καὶ φιλίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ not by constraint,[145] Tigranes' reply reaches new heights of sophistry. Using a series of rhetorical questions the Armenian prince argues that the king will be more friendly and more grateful to Cyrus than anyone else could possibly be. Another ruler, one who has done Cyrus no harm, will not appreciate it if Cyrus does not kill him or his family, nor will he be made as grateful by having the kingdom handed over to him, for he has never lost it. The Armenian king, who has the most to lose, will be gaining the most and his gratitude to Cyrus will be in direct proportion to the favours granted. Finally, turning again to Cyrus' immediate self-interest, Tigranes points out that his father is an experienced king and best acquainted with Armenia. Under his rule the country will be most stable, the greatest possible army will be raised, and all the country's hidden resources will be made available to Cyrus. He concludes: ὦγαθέ... Κῦρε φύλαξαι μὴ ἡμᾶς ἀποβαλὼν σαυτὸν ζημιώσῃς πλεύω ἢ ὁ πατὴρ ἐδυνήθη σε βλάψαι (3.1.30; cf. 15).

Cyrus, Xenophon tells us, is extremely pleased (ὑπερήδετο ) to hear Tigranes' final plea, for by acceding to it he will achieve all that he has promised Cyaxares to accomplish. The Armenian king - so Tigranes has just promised and so it turns out - will be more of a friend than before, besides furnishing the money and troops. Tigranes has persuaded Cyrus, not by the twists and turns of his arguments, but by recommending the very course of action Cyrus had decided upon before leaving for Armenia. The whole of their debate has been no more than a diversion for Cyrus, for he had never intended to execute the king, despite his talk of τὰ δίκαια. He had entered into the discussion with Tigranes not because he needed advice but from curiosity and a love of rhetorical argument πάνυ ἐπεθύμει αὐτοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ὅ τι ποτ' ἐροίη (3.1.14). When the rhetorical match is over, he emerges unconvinced perhaps, but with his objectives handed to

him, as it were, on a silver platter. Cyrus now pardons the Armenian king, releases his family and re-establishes him on his throne, a willing ally (3.1.32-37).

The discussion between Tigranes and Cyrus is a lively duel of wits and the debate between the two has a give and take, or thrust and parry, rarely found in Xenophon's dialogues. This exchange between Tigranes and the Persian leader is pure fiction, invented by Xenophon for his readers, for Tigranes is not a historical figure.[146] Tigranes' chief appearance in the Cyr. is in this chapter (3.1) and henceforth he plays a minor, fairly passive role as leader of the Armenian contingent in Cyrus' army (cf. e.g. 4.2.9; 5.1.27; 8.3.25 and 8.4.1 ff. - where, interestingly, Tigranes does not join in the lively sympotic banter). Xenophon uses the Armenian prince to construct a lively argument, which not only includes Socratic echoes but also makes use of rhetorical and sophistic techniques.

Who is the "Socrates" of this dialogue? At first sight Tigranes, who has been taught by an Armenian replicate of Socrates, seems the more likely candidate. He both initiates the discussion and ends it, closing with a long speech - two regular functions of Socrates in his conversations in the Mem. In addition Tigranes apparently emerges the winner, convincing his opponent to do as he asks, and of the two, his ideas seem more Socratic. Nonetheless Cyrus, in effect, is the victor for he too gains his objectives, while earning a reputation for benevolence and magnaminity. While Tigranes takes the offensive at first in their conversational "thrust and parry", almost immediately thereafter it is Cyrus who does the thrusting and Tigranes who must parry, modifying his position in the light of the Persian's remarks. Tigranes may have been trained in dialectic but Cyrus is the hero of the Cyr. and is not easily rivalled. There is no leading wise figure, no "Socrates" in this dialogue, and perhaps

the exchange is particularly dialectic and vivid precisely because the two rivals are so well-matched.

Cyr. 5.5.5-37: Cyaxares and Cyrus

Cyr. 5.5.5-37, a long conversation between Cyaxares and Cyrus, is one of the most dramatic and interesting of the "Socratic" dialogues. Cyrus and his uncle are reunited on the Median-Syrian border (5.4.51), following a long separation in which Cyaxares has remained at home with a reduced Median force, while Cyrus has conquered enemy strongholds, acquired many new allies and established a Persian cavalry - all with the aid of Cyaxares' soldiers who have volunteered to join him. The meeting between the two follows angry exchanges via messenger (4.5.9-11, 18) and letter (4.5.27-33), in which Cyaxares requests the return of his men and Cyrus refuses him.

Cyrus now summons Cyaxares so that they can discuss future plans together (5.5.1). Cyaxares, accompanied only by a small retinue, rides out to join Cyrus, who awaits him with an elaborate display of the best mounted and best armed of his forces, including Cyaxares' own Median cavalry. Cyaxares feels slighted and is deeply distressed (καὶ ἄχος αὐτὸν ἔλαβεν 5.5.6).[147] Hence he turns away from Cyrus' attempt to greet him with the customary embrace (ὡς φιλήσων αὐτὸν κατὰ νόμον 5.5.6 - see 1.4.27-28 and Hdt. 1.134; cf. too Cyr. 2.1.2; 8.5.17) and openly cries. Cyrus then dismisses his entourage, draws his uncle aside to some palm trees off the road and orders Median carpets to be spread for him to sit on. The scene is now set for a private discussion between the two. This dramatic prelude to the actual conversation is used by Xenophon to characterize the two interlocutors; we see Cyrus naively and thoughtlessly glorying in his newly-won gains while Cyaxares reacts emotionally, almost childishly to the sight. A particularly apt touch is the Median carpets which Cyrus orders to be brought out especially for Cyaxares ( τῶν τε Μηδικῶν πύλων ὑποβαλεῖν ἐκέλευσεν

[sc.] Cyrus αὐτῷ [sc.] Cyaxares 5.5.7). Many commentators are reminded of the meeting between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus in the Hell. (4.1.30), where Pharnabazus' servants spread soft carpets on the ground for their richly attired master.[148] There Pharnabazus is ashamed to sit on rugs while Agesilaus and his men are sitting on the grass, but here Cyaxares is, in all likelihood, somewhat mollified by Cyrus' gesture (see, in contrast, Cyr. 5.2.15). Cyaxares' love of luxury and finery is repeatedly stressed in the Cyr. (cf. 1.6.8; 2.4.5-6; 4.1.13, 18; 6.1.1, 6) and Cyrus caters to it more than once (4.5.51-52; 5.5.2, 39-40; 8.5.17, 20; note in particular Cyrus' assertion at 4.5.21: καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ οὖν αὕτη [sc. of Cyaxares] σαφ' οἶδα ὑπό τε τῶν ἀγαθῶν πεπανθήσεται.

After they are seated, Cyrus asks his uncle why he is so angry with him and Cyaxares replies that he, the scion of a long line of royal ancestors, is ashamed to appear with such a lowly retinue, while Cyrus makes a magnificent impression, partly with the aid of Cyaxares' own forces. The emphasis here on Cyaxares' ancient royal lineage (ἐφ' ὅσον ἀνθρώπων μνήμη ἐφικνεῖται καὶ τῶν πάλαι προγόνων καὶ πατρὸς βασιλέως πεφυκέναι 5.5.8) is curious for Cyrus of the Cyr. is also the son of a long-established royal house (cf. 7.2.24). Perhaps Xenophon has Cyaxares hint here at an alternate (Ctesian) version of Cyrus' origins, according to which Cyrus comes from a lowly, far from regal, background (see the detailed discussion below, p. 187). This would, of course, make the Median king's present plight all the more unpalatable. In fact, in this section of the Cyr. we are given the strongest hints of what was the actual, historical sequence of events - i.e. the conquest of the Median empire by Cyrus. According to all the other (non-Xenophontean) accounts of Cyrus' rise to power, the Persian leader took the Median empire by force, defeating the reigning king, Astyages. Our Cyaxares, the son of Astyages and Cyrus' uncle,[149] is found only in the Cyr. and one of his functions is to serve as a link in the quiet

transfer of power, for he is without sons and Cyrus marries his only daughter, thereby peacably inheriting the Median empire. Xenophon does, however, allow a few traces of the actual Median-Persian conflict to remain in the Cyr.,[150] since Cyrus does detach most of the Median forces from Cyaxares and refuses to release them when the Mede king asks for their return, thus leading to their present angry confrontation. More generally, Cyrus gradually usurps Cyaxares' power and authority, taking charge of the expedition against the Assyrians in his stead. In our dialogue we hear of the Mede's angry reaction to this turn of events and while Xenophon quickly reconciles the two, he does show Cyrus overriding a hostile Median king.[151]

Returning to our dialogue, the injured Mede explains that he feels humiliated, ridiculed and even threatened by his own men, and states that he would prefer sinking into the ground ten times over (δεκάκις ἂν κατὰ τῆς γῆς καταδῦναι 5.5.9; cf. 6.1.35, 37; Anab. 7.1.30; 7.7.11) to his present situation. Cyaxares then bursts into tears, and Cyrus too is led to cry. While some of the heroes of the Cyr. do weep in sad or trying circumstances - e.g. Tigranes cries at his family's capture (3.1.7), Cyrus and Panthea mourn Abradatas (7.3.8-11); cf. 1.4.25-26 and 7.5.32 - tears are normally the province of women (Armenian royal ladies 3.1.13), children (the young Cyrus 1.4.2) and weak or humiliated men (Gadatas 5.4.31 and Araspas 6.1.35); Cyaxares belongs in the latter category.

Cyrus' tears are perhaps less heartfelt: at any rate, he is the first to recover from crying. He hastens to reassure his uncle that the Medes certainly intend their king no harm. He will not defend them - for that will only serve to anger Cyaxares still further - but offers a general piece of advice: a ruler should not be constantly angry with his subjects, for that will only unite them against him. Cyaxares' short temper is notorious (cf. 4.5.9, 18, 19); interestingly Herodotus' Cyaxares, grandfather of our fictitious one, was also known for

his ὀργή Hdt. 1.73.4), and consequently Cyrus was afraid to have the Medes face it on their own.

Cyrus now turns to the charges Cyaxares has levelled against him. He suggests that they carefully examine the wrong he has done together ( σαφέστατα κατίδωμεν ποτόν ἐστι τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀδίκημα 5.5.13), rather than accuse one another at random (μὴ οὕτως εἰκῇ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς αἰτιώμεθα 5.5.13). In addition, Cyrus makes his uncle a proposal, the fairest possible among friends ( τὴν ἐν φίλοις δικαιοτάτην ὑπόθεσιν ): if Cyaxares concludes that his nephew has done wrong, he will accept the verdict without question ( ὁμολογῶ ἀδικεῖν ). Cyaxares, on the other hand, must agree ( οὐ καὶ σὺ αὖ ὁμολογήσεις...) that he has suffered no wrong, if Cyrus is shown to have neither done nor intended him any harm. If, in addition, it appears that Cyrus has benefited his uncle as much as possible, the Median king must concede this point as well. Cyaxares agrees to these terms for their joint investigation, and uncle and nephew are ready to examine Cyrus' past actions one by one ( σκοπῶμεν τὰ ἐμοὶ πεπραγμένα πάντ' καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον 5.5.15), in order to distinguish the good from the bad ( οὕτω γὰρ μάλιστα δῆλον ἔσται ὅ τι τε αὐτῶν ἀγαθόν ἐστιν καὶ ὅ τι κακόν).

The ground rules Cyrus lays down for the discussion of his past conduct with Cyaxares are reminiscent in many ways of the two theoretical descriptions of Socrates' methods of investigation that appear in the Mem. - Mem. 4.5.11-12 and 4.6.13-15. Socrates too stresses that those examining a question must search jointly (cf. τοῦ συνίοντας κοινῇ βουλεύεσθαι 4.5.12; τί οὖν... ἐπεσκεψάμεθα 4.6.14),[152] avoiding unclear or unproved assertions ( μηδὲν ἔχων σαφὲς λέγειν ἀλλ' ἄνευ ἀποδείξεως 4.6.13). The investigators, says Socrates, should also distinguish deeds, classifying them according to their kind as good or bad ( διαλέγοντας κατὰ γένη τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ προαιρεῖσθαι, τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἀπέχεσθαι 4.5.11; διαλέγοντας κατὰ γένη τὰ πράγματα4.5.12). In addition, we are told that

Socrates himself always tried to proceed through agreed points (διὰ τῶν μάλιστα ὁμολογουμένων ἐπορεύετο 4.6.15) when discussing a question. In our dialogue, then, Cyrus seems to be giving a practical demonstration as to how these theoretical principles of Socrates are applied to a real situation.

Thus Cyrus' call to Cyaxares ἄγε τοίνυν... σκοπῶμεν (Cyr. 5.5.15) is perhaps an echo of many such addresses by Socrates to his interlocutors (see Mem. 1.6.4; 2.1.1, 10; 3.1.10; 3.4.7; 3.5.1; 4.6.14 etc. and cf. Oec. 3.14; 4.5; 17.7). Generally, such an invitation introduces a series of questions by Socrates, just as Cyrus now begins to interrogate Cyaxares. Here, in fact, even the preliminary "rules" for the discussion suggested by Cyrus, are framed by him in "question and reply" form. Cyaxares responds to the fairly lengthy leading questions with very brief, positive replies (ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη 5.5.13; δίκαιον γοῦν 5.5.14).

In this joint investigation conducted by Cyrus and Cyaxares, the Persian leader is in effect on trial, facing a charge of ἀδικία (see 5.5.12, 13, 17, 20, 21; cf. too πλεονεξίαν καταγορῆσαι 5.5.19 and αἰτίας ἄξιον 5.5.22), for the question to be decided is whether or not Cyrus has done wrong. The first part of the investigation or trial takes the form of a "question and reply" interrogation, so that once again, as with the Armenian king's trial (and the further examples discussed above, pp. 118-127), we find that Socratic methods of investigation are used in a legal context. Cyrus now proceeds to review with Cyaxares his past actions, deed by deed, καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον[153] beginning with Cyaxares' original request for Persian military aid (cf. 1.5.2-6). Cyaxares is led by Cyrus' questioning first to admit the facts - his nephew did indeed come to his aid with as large a force as possible ( ἦλθες γὰρ οὖν 5.5.17) - and then to classify Cyrus' action as a good one (δῆλον... ὅτι... εὐεργεσίαν 5.5.17) rather than a bad one ( ἀδικίαν). Next Cyaxares is made to acknowledge that in

battle with the enemy Cyrus did not shirk his duty in any way (οὐ μὰ τὸν Δί'... οὐ μὲν δή 5.5.19). Cyrus' next two questions (5.5.19-20) as to whether he was wrong in suggesting: (1) that they pursue the defeated army jointly, and, subsequently (2) that Cyaxares should lend him some of the Median cavalry for such a pursuit, touch on more sensitive points and Cyaxares remains silent and does not answer them. Cyrus, despairing of receiving answers to his questions, now abandons his cross-examination of his uncle and continues his defense in a speech (Cyr. 5.5.21 ff.). Any further questions put by Cyrus are purely rhetorical and the trial takes on the more usual form of speech and counter-speech.

Cyrus briefly reviews the events leading up to his acquiring Median volunteers for his campaign (5.5.21-22; cf. 4.1.13-24) and then stresses the importance of his subsequent victories for Cyaxares himself (cf. τῶν ἐπὶ σὲ ἐλθόντων..., χρήματα... τὰ σά..., τοὺς σοὺς φίλους..., τὰ μὲν σοί..., τὴν σὴν ἀρχήν... etc. 5.5.23). Cyaxares, says Cyrus, has seen his territory increased and his enemy's diminished and this is τὸ δὲ πάντων μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον (5.5.24). This glorification of victory over enemies as the greatest good is repeated by Cyrus elsewhere in the Cyr. (see 6.1.55; 7.3.11; 7.5.79; cf. too 4.2.26 and 7.1.10, 13), and while it is not surprising to find this sentiment expressed by the conqueror of a great empire, this scheme of values is hardly a Socratic one (cf. below, p. 154 ). In conclusion Cyrus says that he cannot imagine that he has done anything but good for Cyaxares: nonetheless he is willing to hear his uncle's point of view.

Cyaxares' reply is the most interesting and curious feature of our dialogue. The Median king as we have seen is not a historical figure and he was invented by Xenophon, in all likelihood, to serve as a pallid counter-figure to his more successful nephew. From the very start of the Cyr. the two characters are contrasted with one another (cf. 1.4.5, 7, 9, 20-22; 1.6.8; 2.4.1-8; 3.3.24-25,

29-33, 46-47, 56; 4.1.13-24; 4.5.26-34 etc.) in order to demonstrate Cyrus' superiority. Cyaxares is often merely a figure of fun (e.g. 6.1.1, 6). Here, however, Cyaxares uses powerful arguments that are not answered by Cyrus, and he presents his case in a way that reminds us of Socratic techniques in the Mem.[154]

Cyaxares begins his speech (5.5.25) by conceding that it cannot be said that Cyrus has done anything bad. Nonetheless he would have much preferred being the one to confer such benefits, rather than being their passive recipient. Having such blessings showered upon him by Cyrus weighs on Cyaxares for it is somehow disgraceful ( ἐμοὶ δέ γέ ἐστί πῃ ταὐτὰ ἀτιμίαν φέροντα 5.5.26). This is a point of view that Cyrus should well understand for he often expresses the desire to outdo his friends in granting favours (2.3.12; 5.1.1, 28-29; 5.3.2; 8.2.7) and he too is ashamed to be on the receiving rather than the giving end (5.1.28-29; 5.4.32).

Next Cyaxares turns to his second main complaint against Cyrus: the alienation of his soldiers' affections. Cyaxares states that he would have been less displeased to discover his subjects actually wronged a bit by Cyrus than he is now, by seeing them so deeply indebted to his nephew. Realizing that this statement must sound unreasonable ( ἀγνωμόνως ), Cyaxares suggests that Cyrus put himself in his place ( μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ αὐτὰ ἀλλ' εἰς σε τρέψας πάντα καταθέασαι οἷά σοι φαίνεται 5.5.28), and asks him a series of (rhetorical) questions. How would Cyrus feel if another were to treat (1) his dogs, (2) his attendants, (3) his wife or - the example most analogous to Cyaxares' case τὸ μάλιστα τῷ ἐμῷ πάθει ἐμφερές (5.5.31) - (4) his Persian soldiers, so well that they would love him more than Cyrus himself? Clearly, argues Cyaxares, Cyrus would not be grateful.

The method of argument used here by Cyaxares is a variation on Socrates' technique of applied analogies (discussed above, pp. 42-43) which is frequently

found in the Mem. Socrates, as we have seen, asks his interlocutor to judge a series of hypothetical situations and then makes use of the (analogous) verdict in relation to the speaker himself. Cyaxares, however, first announces that he wishes to apply the situation to Cyrus himself and only then presents a series of analogous instances for his partner to judge - rhetorically, if not in fact, for his questions are not meant to be answered. The Median ruler concludes: ἐγὼ... εἰ μὴ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ τοιαῦτα ὑπὸ σοῦ δοκῶ πεπονθέναι (5.5.33).

The very issue raised by Cyaxares - the alienation of affections from their rightful recipient - is also reminiscent of Xenophon's Socrates. In both the Mem. (1.2.49, 51) and the Apol. (19-20) Socrates faces the charge of causing young people to regard him more highly than their parents and relatives (see too Libanius, Apol.Soc. 102-103), and as we have seen, this is also the case with Tigranes' teacher, who is executed by the Armenian king because he is jealous of his son's greater admiration for the sophist (Cyr. 3.1.38-40; cf. above, p. 130).[155] Socrates' answer to this accusation seems to be, according to Xenophon, that in his field of professional competence, i.e. παιδεία (cf. Apol. 20), he is indeed more deserving of respect and attention than the young people's parents, just as other professionals (e.g. doctors or legal experts) are normally preferred over one's kin when one is in need of specialist advice. Xenophon shows his readers quite clearly that Cyrus too has succeeded in attracting the Median soldiers because he is a far more capable leader than Cyaxares, but that is an argument that Cyrus cannot (and does not) use under the present circumstances, for it would only wound his uncle further. On this point, Xenophon's Cyrus is, it seems, a better psychologist than his Socrates.

In the final part of his speech Cyaxares returns to his complaint that it is demeaning to receive gifts rather than give them, especially when his own men have been used to gain these advantages. Cyaxares feels that he has been put in

a passive, womanlike position ( παρέχειν ἑμαυτὸν ὥσπερ γυνῇ εὖ ποιεῖν 5.5.33) while Cyrus appears a true man ( σὺ μὲν ἀνὴρ φαίνῃ ), a hero. It is interesting (and surprising) that Cyaxares explicitly rejects this feminine role for elsewhere, as we have seen (above, p. 141), great stress is placed upon his love of luxury, finery, fancy dress etc. A particulary noteworthy instance is Cyr. 6.1.1-6 where Cyaxares keeps all the allied leaders waiting while he puts on a suitably elaborate costume. Furthermore, Croesus, another leader in the Cyr. who is made to present a sorry contrast to Cyrus, is more than happy to be treated as a woman for he has always considered his wife's life of luxury without anxiety, the happiest one possible (7.2.27-28; cf. below, pp. 351-353) and one would expect a similar view from Cyaxares. Instead the Median king argues that he is interested in a good reputation and honour ( ἀξιώματος καὶ τιμῆς ) rather than increased wealth, and he specifically rejects Cyrus' statement (5.5.24) that the extension of his realm is the greatest good one can wish for. Finally, Cyaxares explains that his reputation is of foremost importance because his power over the Medes rests upon their recognition of his overall superiority, rather than his greater force of arms οὐ γάρ τοι ἐγω Μήδων ἦρχον διὰ τὸ κρείττων αὐτῶν πάντων εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ αὐτοὺς τούτους ἀξιοῦν ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν πάντα βελτίονας εἶναι (5.5.34). Again, it is curious that Cyaxares, a despot of demonstrably weak character, views himself and his position in these terms.

Cyrus interrupts his uncle (5.5.35) and allows him to continue no further. He does not argue with Cyaxares for, as we have seen, the most cogent argument available to him (i.e. Cyaxares is in his present inferior position because he is, in fact, inferior) is the one most likely to pain and humiliate Cyaxares even further. Instead, Cyrus suggests that his uncle should end his reproofs and judge his conduct towards him only after putting Cyrus to the test

(ἐπειδὰν δὲ πεῖραν ἡμῶν λάβῃς πῶς ἔχομεν πρὸς σέ... ). Cyaxares, suddenly capitulating, agrees to this plan and consents to Cyrus' embracing him as well. The two kiss and the Median and Persian soldiers, who are carefully following the proceedings from a distance, cheer. Uncle and nephew ride off together, with the Median troops falling in behind Cyaxares (not, as Xenophon points out, spontaneously, but because Cyrus has signalled them to do so). Cyaxares is brought to the tent set aside for him and his Median soldiers come to him, bearing gifts (again, partly at Cyrus' prompting). The reconciliation is complete, with the conclusion of the dialogue illustrated as vividly and dramatically as the opening.

Cyr. 5.5.5-37 has, as we have seen, many Socratic features, but as with the Tigranes-Cyrus debate, there is no real "Socrates" in our dialogue. Cyrus, to be sure, is the more likely candidate of the two, for he opens the conversation, tries to guide the talk in accordance with Socratic methods of investigation, and he emerges the winner in the end. In addition, Cyrus is made to face an accusation very similar to one levelled against Socrates. Nonetheless Cyaxares, too, plays an important part in the conversation, a more serious role than that usually alloted to Socrates' interlocutors in the Mem. He too uses Socratic techniques of argument (if somewhat labouriously) and he presents his case in a surprisingly forceful and convincing manner. In addition, Cyaxares' scale of values seems better, more "Socratic" than that of Cyrus. Finally, Cyaxares' surrender at the close of the conversation is not so much the result of Cyrus' persuasive powers, as the author's need to end the impasse between the two. It is noteworthy that Xenophon chose to make the normally wooden figure of Cyaxares come alive for this debate, and confront Cyrus with real, at times unanswerable, arguments. Xenophon's Socratic conversations (in the Mem.) are generally more biased in Socrates' favour.

Cyr. 3.3.48-56

The last of our Socratic dialogues is Cyr. 3.3.48-56, a conversation between Cyrus and his chief aide Chrysantas (whose role in the Cyr. is discussed below, pp. 231-232). Their conversation takes place as the Persians and their allies are about to do battle with the Assyrians for the first time. Chrysantas, along with some of his fellow homotimoi, brings several Assyrian deserters up to Cyrus for interrogation. These Assyrians tell the Persian leader that the Assyrian forces are already armed and arrayed for battle and that the king himself accompanies his troops as they set out, exhorting them vigorously and at length (αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς... παρακελεύοιτο... πολλά τε καὶ ἰσχυρά Cyr. 3.3.48). Xenophon has in fact already given his readers a sample of the Assyrian king's pre-battle oratory at 3.3.43-45 (in a rare glimpse behind the enemy lines) and this report by the Assyrian defectors is probably meant to refer back to the Assyrian king's speech. Chrysantas then suggests that Cyrus, too, gather up his forces and address them before the battle in order to make the men better soldiers; this leads to a discussion between the two on the value of pre-battle exhortations.

Cyrus replies to his aide that no one speech, excellent though it may be, can turn bad men into good on the spot (αὐθημερόν 3.3.50; cf. 51). The soldiers will not become good archers, lancers or cavalrymen if they have not practised their art in the past. Chrysantas then suggests that such an exhortation by Cyrus would improve the men's souls (if not their physical prowess) but the Persian leader again rejects the notion that a single speech (εἷς λόγος ῥηθείς) 3.3.51) can have any lasting effect on its audience. A speech is not the way to instill ideals - such as loyalty, honour and courage - in men, and oratory will not ensure that these values will abide, imprinted upon men's hearts (3.3.50-52).

The objections Cyrus raises here to military exhortations addressed to

soldiers before a battle are surprising, to say the least. In this very section of the Cyr. Cyrus delivers two such orations and there are many other pre-battle παρακελεύσεις or παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι by him scattered throughout the work - cf. 3.2.3-5; 4.2.21-26; 6.2.13-20; 6.4.12-20; 7.5.19-24 etc. Cyrus not only regularly addresses his soldiers before military engagements but encourages and exhorts them on a variety of occasions - cf. 2.1.14-18; 2.3.1-4; 3.3.7-8; 4.1.1-6; 7.5.71-86; 8.6.10-13. This hardly seems consistent with the attitude he demonstrates here. Furthermore, the Persian leader believes that a soldier's state of mind when fighting is even more important than his physical fitness and this conviction is shared by those who surround him - καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αἰεὶ λέγει καὶ σὺ [sc. Cyaxares] φῄς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι δὲ πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν ὡς αἱ μάχαι κρίνονται μᾶλλον ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἢ ταῖς τῶν σωμάτων ῥώμαις (Cyr. 3.3.19; cf. 2.1.11; 5.2.33-34). One would expect Cyrus to take up Chrysantas' advice and make every effort to reach the souls of his men and bolster their confidence. Earlier both Cyrus and Cambyses have agreed that one of the chief tasks of a good general is to inspire his soldiers with enthusiasm ( προθυμίαν ἐμβαλεῖν 1.6.19) and while the Persian king warns his son against indulging too often in attempts to arouse (false) expectations ( ἐλπίδας ἐμποιεῖν ) he does think that exhortation and encouragement (cf. παρακέλευσιν 1.6.19) should be used by a leader in times of crisis. (Cf. Oec. 5.16 where Socrates takes it for granted that a general must exhort ( παρακελεύειν ) his army and that soldiers are in need of good hopes (ἐλπίδων... ἀγαθῶν ). The forthcoming battle with the Assyrians is certainly one such critical occasion, as Cyrus himself seems to think for he has earlier summoned the ὁμότιμοι and asked them to address the Persians who have only recently joined their ranks (Cyr. 3.3.34 ff.). The Persian leader tells the homotimoi, his peers and companions from earliest youth, that he would be ashamed to exhort them (παραινῶν... αἰσχυνοίμην ἄν 3.3.35) for they have known, trained for and

practised (ἐπισταμένους καὶ μεμελετηκότας καὶ ἀσκοῦντας 3.3.35) the martial arts throughout their lives, just as he has. Instead, Cyrus would like the homotimoi to try to make the new recruits better soldiers (βελτίους ποιεῖν 3.3.38) by reminding them of why they have been invited to join their ranks and of the crucial test of valour awaiting them on the battlefield. Cyrus thinks it only natural that these men, newcomers to military matters (ὀψιμαθεῖς) should need such reminders and he hopes that these admonitions or suggestions will indeed make the new recruits fight more valiantly. In this address to the ὁμότιμοι, which takes place only a short time before his exchange with Chrysantas, Cyrus recommends the use of exhortations, reminders (ὑπομιμνήσκειν Cyr. 3.3.36, 37; cf. Thuc. 4.95 where ὑπόμνησιν is used in a similar context), and advice, at least for inexperienced soldiers. So too immediately after urging the homotimoi to speak to their forces, Cyrus himself exhorts and encourages other members of his army, the rear-guard officers (3.3.40-43). Why then does he firmly reject Chrysantas' suggestion of yet another hortatory address?[156]

The answer is, apparently, that the Persian leader's objections to exhortations are influenced by two factors: Xenophon's desire to distinguish between, or contrast, Cyrus and his foe, the Assyrian king, and his interest in the well-known debates on how virtue can be taught and the proper use of rhetoric. I begin with the contrast between Cyrus and the Assyrian king. As we have seen, reports of the Assyrian king's forceful address are what prompted Chrysantas to suggest a counter-exhortation, as it were, by Cyrus. Pairs of rousing speeches by the two opposing sides in a clash are found already in Homer (cf. Il. 15.485-500; 501-514 for addresses by Hector and Ajax respectively, in the midst of battle) and appear several times in Thucydides (Thuc. 2.87, 89; 4.92, 95; 7.61-64, 66-68).[157] It is perhaps this tradition of presenting the viewpoints of both parties to a conflict which led Xenophon to deviate from his usual

practice and allow his readers a look at the Assyrian side for normally events in the Cyr. are related only from the Persian perspective. It is only natural to compare two such opposing speeches and if Cyrus were to address his troops in the wake of the Assyrian king's exhortation (and Chrysantas' advice), we would expect his words to be a reply to - or even refutation of - the oration by the Assyrian king. A closer look at the speech by the king will show why it is difficult for Cyrus to counter or contradict his enemy's words.

The Assyrian ruler begins by urging his men to be brave and reminding them that the forthcoming struggle is for their very lives, land, homes and families, i.e. all the good things that they possess. If the Assyrians are the victors they will continue to retain these things, but if they are defeated all will go to the enemy. Consequently, the king urges his forces, they must remain on the battlefield and fight to the last. Running away is foolish the king stresses rhetorically - cf. μῶρον γὰρ... μῶρος δὲ... μῶρος δὲ... 3.3.45 - for it will mean exposing their unseeing and unarmed flank to the enemy so that death is even more likely than on the battlefield. Winners take all, the Assyrian reminds his men in conclusion, while the vanquished forfeit their lives and property (3.3.43-45).

The attitude towards victory, defeat and flight displayed here by the Assyrian king differs in no way from Cyrus' own outlook. The Persian leader too stresses on various occasions that winners are entitled to all the spoils of victory (cf. 4.2.26; 7.1.13; 7.5.73) while those defeated are left with nothing (2.3.2) and he too thinks that an enemy caught fleeing should be executed at once (cf. 3.1.3; 4.2.32; 4.4.6; 4.5.5-6). The two opponents, the Assyrians and Persians, go to war according to the same rules, then, and have the same values, insofar as behaviour on the battlefield is concerned. Cyrus is no more humane or noble than his foe in these matters and any exhortation of his would simply echo the sentiments expressed here by the Assyrian king.

These cold realities of wartime behaviour are presented as an immutable law in the Cyr. - cf. 7.5.73 νόμος γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀΐδιός ἐστιν - and as we have seen above (p. 145 ), victory over an enemy is considered the greatest of accomplishments - cf. Cyrus' remark in our dialogue that courage on the battlefield is τὴν μεγίστην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρετήν(3.3.54). This attitude towards enemies, part and parcel of the more general precept of "do good to your friends and harm to your enemies", is found very often in Xenophon's other works as well - see e.g. Mem. 4.5.10; Hiero 2.15; Hell. 2.4.17; 5.1.16 (on the joys of defeating foes) and Hiero 2.2; Hell. 4.1.8, 10; Mem. 2.3.14; Anab. 1.3.6; 1.9.11 etc. (on the desire to benefit friends and harm enemies). It is interesting nonetheless that these principles need to be stated by the Persian leader (and his enemy): if the attitude were thoroughly taken for granted by all the characters of the Cyr., we would not expect it to be mentioned so often and so explicitly. Xenophon is perhaps slightly uneasy with these simplistic black-and-white values and aware of other, more humane approaches. Although Xenophon's Socrates appears to accept the "help friends, harm enemies" maxim (cf. Mem. 2.3.14; 2.6.35; 3.9.8), Xenophon notes that Socrates himself benefits his friends and does no harm to any one (Mem. 4.8.11).[158] So too although Socrates points out to Euthydemus that it is just to capture and enslave an enemy's city, he is careful to add the proviso that the hostile city is also an unjust one - cf. ἄδικόν τε καὶ ἐχθρὰν πόλιν (Mem. 4.2.15; cf. 2.2.2).[159]

Here the Assyrians are certainly unjust aggressors since they are the ones who have been gathering together forces to attack the Medes and Persians (Cyr. 1.5.2). Cyrus decides, however, not to await the Assyrian onslaught passively and he arranges to confront the enemy on their own territory, in a pre-emptive strike (3.3.13-20). Hence the Assyrians will now be fighting for their own land, families etc., as their ruler points out in his exhortation, and this is, of

course, the strongest possible reason for fighting to their utmost. The Persians and their allies, on the other hand, are less obviously doing battle for their own survival, land, wives or children, since they have now taken the initiative against the Assyrians. If Cyrus were to exhort his forces before this battle he would not be able to make use of the same powerful arguments - the soldiers' immediate need to protect their homes and loved ones from invaders - that his foe does and thus could not counter or match the emotional appeal used by the Assyrian king.

In his hortatory address, the Assyrian repeatedly urges his men not to flee from the battlefield, stressing how foolish such a move would be. Great numbers of the Assyrians and their allies do, in fact, run away from the Persians during and after the battle (3.3.63, 66; 4.1.8), so that Cyrus' contention here that a single, well-spoken speech is incapable of changing or improving men is (indirectly) shown to be true. The Persian leader believes in careful training and practice - i.e. deeds - rather than words and this rejection of discourse in favour of action is in itself almost a τόπος or commonplace in pre-battle exhortations. In Thucydides, Nicias makes the same point when addressing the Athenians at Syracuse - αὐτῇ γὰρ ἡ παρασκευὴ ἱκανωτέρα μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι θάρσος παρασχεῖν ἢ καλῶς λεχθέντες λόγοι (Thuc. 6.68). Elsewhere at the battle of Mantinea, the Mantineans, Argives and Athenians are all exhorted by their commanders before the fighting commences, but the Spartans think that thorough training is more helpful than last minute speeches - ἔργων ἐκ πολλοῦ μελέτην πλείω σῴζουσαν ἢ λόγων δι' ὀλίγου καλῶς ῥηθεῖσαν παραίνεσιν (5.69).[160] In any event, the Assyrian king's harangue is to no avail when his forces are actually put to the test and perhaps this is another reason why Xenophon allows him, one of the villains of the Cyr., the opportunity to speak in the first place: in order to show how little his forceful words have meant. The most effective

counter-exhortation by Cyrus is, in this case, his silence. The Persian army need not be told, as it were, of the dangers and rewards ahead (although, as we have seen, Cyrus does find it necessary to speak to the rearguard officers and the newly-created homotimoi); they are courageous and well-trained and are victorious in the end, without being harangued or exhorted.

In this conversation with Chrysantas, Cyrus, after denying that a single exhortation can bring about abiding virtues, suggests to his aide how such qualities as courage and honour can be acquired (and retained). If men are to be virtuous, Cyrus says, there must be laws to reward the good and punish the bad, as well as teachers to instruct and accustom their pupils to good behaviour. Only in this fashion will men be able to overcome their fear of the enemy in war, the Persian leader adds, and even then soldiers often forget these lessons of old on the way to battle. Nothing could be more easily learned and taught than courage on the battlefield if an extempore declamation (cf. ἀπορραψῳδήσας 3.3.54) were enough to make men immediately warlike. Delivering a splendid speech on courage to those untaught in ἀρετή is as useful as singing a fine song to the unmusical, Cyrus concludes (3.3.52-55).

The method Cyrus outlines for the teaching of the virtue - a combination of laws and instruction - conforms to the Persian system of education described by Xenophon at the beginning of the Cyr. (1.2.2-14) and is reminiscent of Protagoras' more elaborate depiction of how virtue is taught in Plato's Protagoras (325 C - 326 E). The Persian leader emphasizes the need to re-inforce ideas of right and wrong and accustom men to them until they have become a very part of them (ἔστ' ἂν ἐγγένηται αὐτοῖς 3.3.53). Thus Cyrus is restating the claim he has made when debating with Tigranes (3.1.17; cf. above, p. 135): virtue - be it courage in battle or sophrosyne - cannot be acquired instantly and is the product of instruction, time and practice. The Armenian king was at least taught

and chastened by bitter experience, but here, Cyrus is saying, Chrysantas would like instant results from a speech, a rhapsodical flourish. The word ἀπορραψῳδήσας used here by Cyrus is meant to be scornful, for rhapsodists were generally agreed to be the least intelligent of men - cf. Mem. 4.2.10; Symp. 3.6. Cyrus' rejection of oratory here is no doubt influenced by the negative attitude towards rhetoric held by Socrates (e.g. in the Gorgias) and probably reflects the disapproval in Socratic circles of the way sophists attempted to turn young men into professional orators almost overnight, ignoring the moral qualities of their pupils. It is interesting to note that in one passage of the Mem., Socrates stresses the need for a military commander to learn to speak publicly, contending that all the important lessons of life are communicated through speech (διὰ λόγου Mem. 3.3.11) and this attitude is much closer to Cyrus' usual approach to discourse in the Cyr., for he is, as we have seen, normally far from averse to making speeches.

Cyrus notes that in battle fear of the enemy often drives away or dispells all earlier lessons that have been taught (cf. Thuc. 2.87 φόβος γὰρ μνήμην ἐκπλήσσει) and thus returns again to another theme that has arisen in his discussion with Tigranes, the powerful effects of φόβος (Cyr. 3.1.23-25; cf. above, p. 137). When Xenophon has Cyrus compare a well-spoken oration (λόγος καλῶς ῥηθείς 3.3.55) to a well-sung song (ᾆσμα καλῶς ᾀσθεν), he may be thinking of the Spartan practice of singing and playing the flute on the way to battle;[161] in the Cyr. the Persian forces sing a paean while advancing towards the enemy (cf. 3.3.58). Both the exhortations and the music are meant to bolster the soldiers' confidence before an engagement so that it is only natural to link or associate the two.

Our dialogue, Cyr. 3.3.48-56, can be termed "Socratic" on several counts. The conversation is unequally divided between Cyrus and Chrysantas, with the

Persian leader doing most of the talking and concluding the exchange with a long speech (3.3.51-55), and this is similar to the pattern of many Socratic dialogues in the Mem. It is clear that Cyrus is the "Socrates" here not only from the formal structure of the conversation, but also from the ideas he espouses: his interest in cultivating virtue and disdain for empty rhetoric. Chrysantas, the "pupil", does not counter Cyrus' words in any real way and has little to add to his initial suggestion of a hortatory address by his commander. Many of Socrates' conversational partners in the Mem. have equally minor roles, but it is rare to have a friendly interlocutor initiate a conversation with Socrates, as Chrysantas does with Cyrus here (cf. above, p. 47 ). There is, however, one fairly close parallel to our dialogue in the Mem., the final conversation (Mem. 4.8). There, Hermogenes approaches Socrates with unsolicited advice, only to have the latter reject his counsel, just as Cyrus turns down Chrysantas' suggestion here. The Persian leader is the "Socrates" here, but at a price: his words do not match his usual deeds, so that while he is virtually rejecting rhetoric he is also condemning his own normal behaviour throughout the Cyr. Words are indeed empty.

In this chapter I have first attempted to establish what a Socratic dialogue in Xenophon is like, largely on the basis of Socrates' conversations in the Mem. and then use the characteristic features found - e.g. a leading didactic figure, discussions of moral issues, "question and reply" interrogations, applied analogies, lengthy concluding speeches etc. - to recognize "Socratic" dialogues in the Cyr. These dialogues in the Cyr. often proved upon closer inspection to be freer, more fluid and livelier than their original source of inspiration, Socrates' own conversations in the Mem. In the latter work Xenophon's aim is to defend and glorify Socrates so that he rarely allows any of Socrates' interlocutors to challenge him seriously and never permits another to better him in

argument. The didactic dialogues of the Cyr., on the other hand, are intended to edify (and entertain) Xenophon's readers, not to demonstrate the virtues of any figure, so that Xenophon can give free rein to his imagination and ingenuity. Hence the hero of the Cyr., Cyrus, need not be the teaching figure in every one of these conversations. At times the conflict between two interlocutors is so strong and the debate so lively that it is difficult to decide who is the "teacher" and who the "pupil" (cf. Cyr. 1.3.15-18; 3.1.14-31; 5.5.5-36). Other "Socratic" dialogues of the Cyr. adhere more closely to the pattern found in the Mem. and have a leading didactic figure who talks for most of the conversation, with a more quiescient character as the second interlocutor (cf. 1.4.13; 1.6.1-2.1.1; 3.1.8-13; 3.3.48-56). In our group of Cyr. dialogues, then, Xenophon is freed of some of the constraints of the Mem. and allows himself to construct conversations which are often livelier and more dialectical than Socrates' own. Hence the so-called Socratic dialogues of the Cyr., rewarding and interesting in themselves, also contribute (indirectly) to an appreciation of how Xenophon perceived and understood genuine Socratic dialogue.

# Chapter III

## The Symposium Dialogues of the Cyr.

In this chapter I shall look at the symposia or sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. These are, generally speaking, lengthy semi-serious conversations which take place during or after dinner. My purpose in this chapter is to survey the background, the tradition - both Greek and Persian - within which Xenophon was working, and then to provide a detailed commentary on the symposia of the Cyr. itself.

Only one gathering in the Cyr. (8.4.1-27) is actually termed a symposium ( προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ συμποσίου 8.4.13) but there are several conversations which take place during or after dinner. Three of these dialogues are fairly long, relaxed discussions between a number of participants (1.3.4-12, 2.2.1-2.3.1 and 8.4.1-27) and bear an obvious affinity to other literary symposia, while the two other conversations in this group are more serious dinner-table discussions between only two people (5.2.5-22 and 8.3.35-50).[1] I have already noted above (p. 36 ) some of the more formal features of the sympotic dialogues: they are, in general, somewhat lengthy conversations which take place before a wider audience. In addition, the physical setting of the dialogue and the reactions and thoughts of the participants are described at some length, i.e. the dramatic background is elaborate. Turning to the content of these dialogues it can be seen that they share a number of recurrent themes. A closer look at one of the dialogues, Cyr. 8.4.1-27, is perhaps the easiest way to identify these characteristic topics.

This conversation takes place at a party given by Cyrus to celebrate his victory in the races following his inaugural royal procession. Cyrus' most loyal friends (Chrysantas, Hystaspas etc.) and the leaders of his allies

(Artabazus, Tigranes, Gobryas and the Hyrcanian chief) have been invited. Gadatas is in charge of the arrangements for the party, including the seating plan (8.4.1-2). The guests, we are told, are not seated at random but according to merit, with those most loyal to Cyrus in closest proximity to their host (8.4.3-5), for Cyrus encourages his men to compete for his favour.[2] The theme of rivalry or competition among guests at a symposium (φιλονίκως... ἀγωνιζόμενοι πάντες 8.4.4) introduced here even before the party actually begins, is one that is found in almost all the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. So too the careful attention paid here to the physical setting of the party is not unusual and will be found in the other dialogues of this group.

The conversation proper at this symposium consists of a series of loosely connected exchanges between Cyrus and his guests - rather than one long continuous discussion - and it begins only after dinner. Gobryas opens in a serious vein by admiring Cyrus' generosity in distributing leftovers from the meal to absent friends. Cyrus, says Gobryas, is even more outstanding a philanthropist than he is a general. His host accepts the compliment and explains that he prefers benefitting people to harming them (8.4.6-8). This opening bit is clearly meant to be edifying, for there is a strong didactic strain in all the symposia of the Cyr. and, as will be seen below, Cyrus (along with Gobryas, Xenophon's Socrates and Xenophon himself) believes in the importance of worthy conversations over the dinner table. Cyrus not only has tidbits from his table sent to friends but also gives valuable gifts to his guests at the end of the banquet. A presentation of gifts by the host is found in almost all the dialogues of our group and is, as we shall see, the most Persian feature of these parties.

The drinking continues and Hystaspas is the next one to address Cyrus. He is hurt that Chrysantas has been seated in a more honoured position and so he

cross-examines Cyrus in order to discover why he is considered inferior to Chrysantas. Cyrus explains that while Hystaspas has always discharged his duties with the utmost zeal, Chrysantas has often taken the initiative in furthering Cyrus' aims, besides executing the actual orders he receives from Cyrus. Often, adds Cyrus, Chrysantas rejoices in his leader's good fortune more than Cyrus does himself. Hystaspas accepts this explanation but is puzzled by one thing: How is he meant to demonstrate his great joy at Cyrus' successes? By clapping his hands or laughing? Artabazus suggests that he dance the Persian dance and the party dissolves into laughter (8.4.9-12). While the humour of this last remark is lost upon modern readers, the overall purpose of the joke is not. The guests at this symposium are rivals (if only for a seat close to their host) and Artabazus' closing joke helps to relieve the tension and lighten the party atmosphere. Such alternation between the serious and the light-hearted is found throughout this dialogue and is a key feature of the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. (and literary symposia in general).

The next exchange at the banquet (8.4.13-23) is also semi-serious in tone. Gobryas admits to Cyrus that he is much happier now at the prospect of his daughter marrying one of Cyrus' men than he was when he originally made the offer (cf. Cyr. 5.2.7 ff.), for Cyrus and his men have now shown that they know how to bear good fortune. This is a task even more difficult than their earlier one of bearing hardships cheerfully, Gobryas adds. Cyrus claims to be much impressed with Gobryas' words of wisdom and Hystaspas states that Gobryas' present display of profundity is an even greater incentive towards marrying his daughter than his earlier display of drinking cups (cf. again 5.2.7 ff.) was. Gobryas rejoins that he will gladly make his entire collection

of wise sayings available to Hystaspas if he should decide to marry his daughter, while his drinking cups will go to Hystaspas' rival, Chrysantas. This talk of marriage leads Cyrus to offer his services as an expert matchmaker and he then demonstrates his skill by showing comically what sort of wife would best suit Chrysantas. Their exchange causes the other guests to burst into laughter once again and the interlude ends with Hystaspas complimenting Cyrus on his wit and Cyrus' rejoinder that Hystaspas too would like to be considered urbane, especially by an admiring woman.

Several new themes common to most of the symposia of the Cyr. are introduced in this section. Gobryas' opening words and Hystaspas' preference for wisdom rather than drinking cups are, in essence, a commentary on what constitutes true wealth. Material riches (and their pitfalls) are contrasted to spiritual treasure here; similar discussions of real vs. apparent wealth are found in other sympotic dialogues. Cyrus' matchmaking in fun (and in earnest - see immediately below, 8.4.24-26) is another sympotic pastime that should be noted. Finally both the concluding exchange between Cyrus and Hystaspas and the opening one between Gobryas, Cyrus and Hystaspas, reflect the symposiasts' desire to appear wise and/or witty in the eyes of their fellow guests. Such attempts to outshine table companions in conversation is again a regular feature of symposia, and is, of course, one facet of the competition among party guests already mentioned above.

In the last section of this dialogue (8.4.24-27) Cyrus distributes gifts to his guests: a robe, a golden cup, a horse etc. Cyrus' present to Gobryas is a husband for his daughter - Hystaspas. The latter seems anxious for the match if only to obtain Gobryas' collection of maxims, but has only his friendship with Cyrus to offer in return. This is sufficient for Gobryas and Cyrus has the two shake hands to confirm the betrothal. Hystaspas

immediately receives from Cyrus many gifts to send on to his prospective bride. Chrysantas' gift from Cyrus is a kiss and this arouses the envy of Artabazus, a long-standing admirer of Cyrus (cf. 1.4.27-28). Artabazus too will receive an embrace, promises Cyrus - 30 years from now. Artabazus declares that he will wait and the party ends on this light note.

We have already noted above that the distribution of gifts at a symposium is a Persian, rather than a Greek feature, and the gifts given here seem peculiarly Persian. The allusion to homosexual love at the very end of the party is, on the other hand, much more closely allied to Greek practices. Both themes appear in most of the dialogues of our group.

To sum up, we have found, in addition to a detailed dramatic background, the following themes in the symposium of Cyr. 8.4.1-27: (1) a blending of the serious with the frivolous (σπουδαιογέλοιον); (2) edifying or didactic remarks; (3) competition among the guests; (4) matchmaking (or heterosexual love); (5) presentation of gifts; (6) discussion of poverty vs. wealth and (7) a παιδικὸς λόγος (tale of homosexual love).[3] Not all of these topics are found in all the other symposium dialogues of the Cyr., but several of these themes are found in each dialogue. Perhaps it would be useful now to list the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr., and the themes found in each.

| | DB | σ.γ. | Didactic | Compete | Match | Gifts | Riches | παιδικὸς λόγος |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3.4-12 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | ? |
| 2.2.1-2.3.1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | ? | No | Yes |
| 5.2.5-22 | Yes | Yes | Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| 8.3.35-50 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| 8.4.1-27 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

DB = Dramatic Background  σ.γ.= σπουδαιογέλοιον

The symposium dialogues of the Cyr., then, form a fairly well-defined group.[4] What is their relationship to other literary symposia? More specifically how do they resemble other dinner-party conversations found elsewhere in Xenophon?

A look at Xenophon's Symposium would be, perhaps, the best starting-point for a discussion, for it is the clearest indication of what Xenophon thought should - and should not - be found in a symposium.[5] Furthermore his drinking party is one of the most fully elaborated and realistic[6] depictions of a symposium found in classical literature.

The Symposium tells of a party given by Callias in honour of the young athlete Autolycus. Besides Autolycus, his father Lycon and Niceratus, Callias also invites Socrates and a group of his friends - Critoboulus, Hermogenes, Antisthenes and Charmides - to the celebration (Symp. 1.1-10). During dinner, Philippus, a comedian, appears uninvited (1.11-16) and after dinner, a Syracusan impresario and his troupe provide entertainment (2.1-3.1). This leads to a discussion of the virtues of perfume, women, dance, drink etc. Thereafter the party consists of a series of exchanges between the guests, interrupted at intervals by the performances of the Syracusan band.[7] In the central section of the Symposium Callias and his guests take turns describing the quality or asset they most pride themselves on and then give their reasons for their choice (3.2-4.64). Next comes a mock beauty contest between Socrates and Critoboulos (5.1-10), which is followed by some lively, even raucous exchanges among the other guests (6.1-10). Socrates then asks the Syracusan for a quiet and pleasing entertainment (7.1-5) and while this is being prepared he discourses at length on love, providing an ἐρωτικὸς λόγος (8.1-43). The party breaks up after a moving dance, depicting the love of Dionysus and Ariadne, is performed by two of the Syracusans (9.1-7).

Xenophon provides a full dramatic backdrop in the Symp.: he describes in detail the events leading up to the party (1.2-7), the setting of the symposium, its seating arrangements and the mood of the party (1.8-11), as well as its entertainments (2.1-2, 8, 11, 21-22; 3.1; 9.2-6). So too the reactions (2.11, 17; 3.10, 13; 4.62 etc.), expressions (3.10, 12; 4.2-3; 8.4) and thoughts (1.12; 6.6) of the symposiasts are often mentioned, so that Xenophon takes full advantage of the reported form of this work. All of the themes we have found in the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. are found in the Symp. as well, except for one - the distribution of gifts. We shall now see how these themes appear in the Symp., one by one.

At the very outset Xenophon announces his intention to present a picture of worthy men in a light mood (ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς 1.1) and the combination of serious and frivolous themes, or to be more exact, the presentation of weighty ideas in a playful manner is a key feature of the Symposium.[8] Thus Socrates tells of the virtues of dance and his dancing efforts to a laughing audience (2.16 ff.; cf. in particular ἐγέλασαν ἅπαντες. καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης μάλα ἐσπουδακότι τῷ προσώπῳ 2.17). Similarly Socrates' claim to be an expert μαστροπός (3.10; 4.56-64) is, of course, only semi-serious. Xenophon tells us that Socrates assumes a serious expression (μάλα σεμνῶς ἀνασπάσας τὸ πρόσωπον 3.10) before putting forth his paradoxical boast; nonetheless his listeners immediately laugh (ἐγέλασαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ 3.10). The discussion of Socrates' erotic interest in Critoboulus and the dangers of physical contact (4.27-28) is also half-playful, half-earnest, as Xenophon hastens to remind us (οὕτως ἀναμὶξ ἔσκωψάν τε καὶ ἐσπούδασαν 4.28). Hermogenes notices how Socrates guides Callias on how to behave towards Autolycus in a pleasing manner, and while the beauty contest between Critoboulus and Socrates is pure fun, the teleological or utilitarian arguments used by Socrates are not.

Finally, the closing performance by the Syracusan troupe, the Ariadne-Dionysus dance, is perhaps another instance of σπουδαιογέλοιον, for the two young performers seem to be expressing their real feelings (9.6) and the effect of this light entertainment on its audience is a powerful one.

Straightforward didactic passages (e.g. 2.3-5; 2.24-26; 7.2-5) are also to be found in the Symp., with Socrates as teacher. Turning to the next theme, there is a great deal of competition at Callias' party. The guests vie with one another in presenting and justifying their proudest possession or quality (3.2-4.64), while Antisthenes tries to disprove or minimize some of their claims (3.5-6; 4.1-5). Socrates and Critoboulus compete for kisses in their playful beauty contest (4.18-20; 5.1-10) and the Syracusan impresario feels that Socrates is a serious rival in attracting the guests' attention (6.6-8).

There are several references to matchmaking (cf. Socrates' expertise in μαστροπεία 3.10; 4.56-64) and heterosexual love (e.g. 8.3 - Niceratus, we are told, loves and is loved in return by his wife). The closing scene of the Symp. (9.2-7), where the two young dancers who play Ariadne and Dionysus seem to be in love themselves, is a powerful evocation of marital love and causes most of the symposiasts to think at once of their own (present or intended) wives. Nonetheless the theme of παιδικά or homosexual love is even more prominent. The pairs Autolycus - Callias (1.8-12; 8.7, 11, 37, 42), Cleinias - Critoboulus (4.10-26), Syracusan producer - boy dancer (4.52-54) are all discussed at some length, along with more joking references to Socrates' supposed relationship with Critoboulus (4.27-28) and Antisthenes (8.4-6). So too the bulk of Socrates' ἐρωτικὸς λόγος (8.1-43) is addressed to Callias and is meant to inculcate in him the proper attitude towards Autolycus so that in this speech love is, in essence, homosexual love.

Finally, another topic which appears in many of the Cyr. sympotic dialogues, a discussion of real as opposed to seeming poverty and wealth, is also found in the Symp., for both Antisthenes and Charmides have some paradoxical things to say about the virtues of riches and poverty (3.8-9; 4.29-44). Only one of the Cyr.'s themes is missing in the Symp. since there is no presentation of gifts by Callias - or anyone else - at the party. Gift-giving at a banquet is, as has been noted, more a Persian practice than a Greek one.

All of the features or themes that we have found in the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. (except for the awarding of gifts) are, then, present in Xenophon's full-scale treatment of a banquet as well. Clearly this is not a coincidence and Xenophon seems to have considered these topics or elements peculiarly appropriate for symposia. Nonetheless, there is not a complete correspondence between our group and the Symposium, for the latter includes a number of features which do not appear in any of the Cyr. dinner-parties, such as a variety of entertainments, an uninvited guest, a discourse on love, a round of speeches etc. (see below, pp. 180-184). This partial correspondence leads to two different lines of enquiry: first I shall look at the themes common to the Cyr. group and Xenophon's Symp. in an attempt to see whether these motifs were particularly associated with literary symposia even before Xenophon. Next I shall turn to those themes of the Symp. which are not found in the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. and try to understand why Xenophon chose to leave them out.

The first objective is, then, to see how traditionally sympotic the recurring themes of the Cyr. dialogues are - that is to say, to see which of these features appear in earlier depictions of drinking parties in Greek literature. It should be stated at the outset that my purpose here is not to trace the "shadowy phenomenon" of early sympotic literature[9] or to postulate

the existence of a full-fledged literary genre of symposia prior to Xenophon, but simply to look at the Greek background to, and possible influences on, Xenophon's dinner-parties in the Cyr.

Naturally Plato's Symposium immediately comes to mind as one such possible influence. The question of whether Plato's Symp. came before Xenophon's work of the same name has long been debated[10] but it need not concern us here for it is sufficient for our purposes that Plato's Symp. was, in all likelihood, composed before the Cyr.[11] Plato's Symp., like Xenophon's, contains all of the motifs that we have found in the Cyr. group of dialogues, other than the giving of gifts, but the emphasis placed on several of the themes is noticeably different.

It is not surprising to find that in Plato's narrated-dialogue-within-a-narrated-dialogue there is a great deal of background description. As with many of Plato's earlier dialogues there are lively, dramatic bits such as Aristophanes' hiccups (Pl. Symp. 185 C-E) and Alcibiades' joining Agathon and Socrates on their couch (213 A-B), but Plato also pays special attention to the details related to the symposium per se. Thus we hear of Socrates' careful grooming before the party (174 A), of the seating arrangements at the banquet (175 A-C), the libations after the meal (176 A), the discussion of the amount of wine to be drunk (176 A-E) etc.

The doctor Eryximachus is perhaps the only didactic figure in Plato's work - cf. his words on the dangers of drinking (176 D) and the cure for hiccups (185 D-E) - for the instruction given by Socrates in his central speech (201 D - 212 C) and his questioning of Agathon (199 C - 201 C) is of a different order entirely. It is interesting to note that in Xenophon's Symp. it is Socrates who preaches to his fellow guests (Xen. Symp. 2.3-5, 17-19, 24-26), while in the dinner-party dialogues of the Cyr. this role is

sometimes assigned to Cyrus (cf. Cyr. 1.3.4-6, 10-11; 5.2.9-12) and sometimes given to a different symposiast - e.g. Aglaitidas (2.2.11-16); Gobryas (5.2.15; 8.4.14) and Pheraulas (8.3.40 ff.).

Returning to Plato's Symposium we find several references to σπουδαιογέλοιον the combination or juxtaposition of serious and light elements. Socrates combines the two qualities in his person, as Alcibiades points out (εἰρωνευόμενος δὲ καὶ παίζων... σπουδάσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ 216 E),[12] while Agathon terms his encomium of Eros half-serious, half-playful ( τὰ μὲν παιδιᾶς, τὰ δὲ σπουδῆς μετρίας... μετέχων 197 E).[13] So too the comic poet Aristophanes is warned by Eryximachus that he must speak seriously and not joke too much (189 A-C; cf. 193 B-D). In more general terms Alcibiades' noisy entrance (212 C ff.) which follows immediately upon Socrates' lofty discussion of spiritual love, is the harshest (and most effective) juxtaposition of the frivolous and the serious in Plato's Symp. and Alcibiades' encomium of Socrates (215 A - 222 B) interweaves the two elements closely, both in tone and content. Finally, the very close of the Symp. where Socrates tries to persuade the nodding Agathon and Aristophanes that the same man is capable of writing tragedies and comedies, should be noted in this context.

The round of speeches on love undertaken by the guests is, of course, a form of competition or contest among them (as Socrates' compliment to Eryximachus καλῶς... ἠγώνισαι 194 A shows), but the real rivalry at the party seems to be between Socrates and Agathon. Early on Agathon challenges Socrates to a contest of wisdom ( διαδικασόμεθα ἐγώ τε καὶ σὺ περὶ τῆς σοφίας 175 E) and the latter apparently takes up the challenge with his two cross-examinations of Agathon (194 A-C; 199 C - 201 C). Eventually, Alcibiades crowns Socrates the victor (213 E). As in Xenophon, there are also allusions to sexual rivalry and jealousy, particularly concerning the supposed relationship between Socrates and Alcibiades (213 C-D; 214 C-E; 222 C - 223 A).

This, of course, leads to another central theme, homosexual love. Most of the discourses on ἔρως in the Symp. use love as meaning love between males - cf. in particular Pausanias' speech (180 C - 185 C; note 181 B-C). The presence of the pair Agathon-Pausanias (177 D; 193 B) and the tale of Alcibiades' attempt to seduce Socrates (217 A - 219 D) only underline this motif of παιδικά. Heterosexual love, on the other hand, plays a very small part in Plato's Symp. - see Phaedrus on Alcestis (179 B-D) and Aristophanes' description of the male and female halves of the androgyne searching for one another (191 D-E) - and this is an important difference between Plato and Xenophon.[14]

The last topic (other than the missing one of presentation of gifts) is that of real, as opposed to apparent, wealth. There is, perhaps, a suggestion of this motif in Diotima's depiction of Eros as the son of Πενία (Poverty) and Πόρος (Resource) - but not Πλοῦτος - who has features of both parents and constantly moves from one state to another (203 B-E). Alcibiades also mentions Socrates' total disregard for wealth (216 D-E), but these references do not add up to much.

In sum, Plato's Symp., like the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. and Xenophon's Symp., lays stress on the setting of the symposium, on competition among the guests, on homosexual love and on an alternation between serious and playful topics. Other elements found in Xenophon - didactic maxims, references to heterosexual love and a contrast between poverty and wealth - are far less prominent in Plato.

I turn now to earlier depictions of symposia in Greek literature, and shall examine the presence (or absence) of each of these themes in literary drinking-parties from Homer onwards. As Athenaeus (186 D-E) points out,[15] Homer is careful to supply the time, persons and occasions (χρόνους, πρόσωπα

αἰτίας) i.e. the dramatic setting of his feasts. Thus we are given the list of guests invited to Agamemnon's feast (Il. 2.402 ff.), or a description of the double marriage celebration in Menelaus' house (Od. 4.1 ff.). In addition Homer provides descriptions of the physical setting - that is the food, furnishings, dishes and drinking cups (Od. 1.126 ff.; 4.49 ff.; 7.85 ff. etc.) of these gatherings and their entertainments: singing and dancing (e.g. Od. 1.151-155; 4.17-19; 8.72 ff. etc.). So too Homer notes at times the symposiasts' thoughts or reactions such as Odysseus' tears while listening to Demodocus and Alcinous' reaction (Od. 8.83-95; 521-534), or Telemachus' tears, which arouse Menelaus' sympathy (Od. 4.113-120).

There are several instances of didacticism or moralizing in Homeric symposia - such as Menelaus' words to Telemachus on wealth (Od. 4.78 ff.) or Athena's remarks to Telemachus (Od. 1.224-229). So too Eteoneus (Od. 4.30-36) and Alcinous (Od. 7.155-166) are reproved for not extending hospitality to unexpected guests. Often the symposiasts are concerned that their party should be conducted properly. Telemachus both scolds his mother for trying to dictate to Phemius which songs should be sung (Od. 1.336-360) and calls the unruly suitors to order (Od. 1.365-371). Alcinous is disturbed by Odysseus' tears and would like his guest to enjoy himself (Od. 8.533-545; cf. Od. 9.1-13 for Odysseus' appreciation of his efforts). Similarly Hephaestus is afraid that Hera's quarrel with Zeus will spoil the gods' feasts (Il. 1.575-579) and Peisistratus, Menelaus and Helen all make an effort to dispel the sadness which has overtaken their party by means of drink, potions and story-telling (Od. 4.183 ff.). Such transitions from tears to tales, song and drink remind us, to a certain extent, of the combination of jest and earnest, σπουδαιογέλοιον found in later symposia. Even more noteworthy in this context are those occasions where feasting and drinking serve as a prelude to serious discussions

and war-councils. Both in Il. 2.402 ff. and 7.313 ff. Nestor advises the Achaean leaders after they have sacrificed, eaten and drunk. In Book 9 of the Iliad the embassy to Achilles is sent as a result of post-prandial deliberations. After the Achaean leaders have made their sacrifices, feasted and drunk (Il. 9.89-92) Nestor advises Agamemnon to make peace with Achilles. Agamemnon agrees and a delegation is chosen (Il. 9.93-170). The party then pours libations and drinks together once again (Il. 9.171-177). Here a serious discussion takes place over wine-cups and as Athenaeus (192 C) points out, this is reminiscent of the Persian custom of sympotic councils (see below, p. 197). In the Odyssey, too, weighty matters can be raised in the midst of a banquet, as with Athena's conversation with Telemachus (Od. 1.156 ff.).

Finally, before leaving Homer it should be noted that gifts are sometimes presented in conjunction with a banquet, if not actually at the banquet itself. Menelaus offers Telemachus first horses and then a gold wine-bowl (Od. 4.589-619) the morning after their party together, and Odysseus is presented with clothes, gold, a sword and a cup by Alcinous and the Phaeacians after one festive meal and before the next (Od. 8.389-432). Similarly two other of our themes - competition and matchmaking - also feature in the many banquets held by the suitors at Odysseus' house, for these men are, of course, rivals for Penelope's hand.

In sum, several of our sympotic themes - most notably a wealth of narrative background, didactic pronouncements and an atmosphere both serious and light - are found already in Homeric banquets, even if these features are not necessarily restricted to the symposia in Homer.

Turning to sympotic poetry,[16] we again find, at times, careful elaboration of the setting of the drinking-party: Xenophanes' depiction of the floor,

table, cups, wine, wreaths, perfume, bread, cheese and honey at such a gathering (1.1-12) is particularly noteworthy, but other poets also seem to enjoy dwelling on the symposium's setting, surroundings and entertainments (cf. Theognis 487-491; Ion of Chios 27.3-4; Critias 6.1-7; Dionysius Chalcus 1.1-3 and 3.1-6). Phocylides' 2-line sympotic poem (fr. 14) is almost entirely devoted to painting the backdrop of a drinking party.

It is not surprising that almost all of these poems, which seem to have been written to introduce the rounds of drinking at a party, have a didactic strain[17] and tell the symposiasts what form their celebrations should (and should not) take.Thus, for example, the symposiasts are told that they should drink in moderation, that they should not tell tales of ancient strife but talk of pleasant things etc. χοὔτως συμπόσιον γίνεται οὐκ ἄχαρι (Theognis 496; cf. Anacreon eleg. 2.1-4; Xenophanes 1.13-24; Phocylides 14.1-2; Theognis 211-212 (509-510), 309-312, 467-496; Dionysius Chalcus 2.1-3; Critias 6.8-27). Sometimes the guests are instructed to put their own quarrels aside (Theognis 494; Dionysius Chalcus 2.2) so that it can be understood that strife or rivalry among the participants is found at some symposia. Dionysius Chalcus tells of one mild form of competition among the guests - the capping of one another's verses (1.1-5).[18] Some poets recommend to their fellow symposiasts a blend of frivolity and high-mindedness πίνειν καὶ παίζειν καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν (Ion 26.15-16; cf. 27.5-7 along with Critias 6.14-16; Theognis 491-496 and Anacreon fr. eleg. 2). Others place more stress either on the gaiety (Phocylides 14.1-2) or the solemnity (Xenophanes 1.13-24; Theognis 563-566) of the occasion. Theognis 309-312 is a particularly interesting instance of σπουδαιογέλοιον: the wise symposiast, we are told, while seeming to join in the party fun can unobtrusively observe the other merrymakers and later make use of his observations.[19] One final theme found in several of the sympotic

poems is that of love or the pleasures of Aphrodite ἁγλαὰ δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης (Anacreon eleg. 2.3; cf. Ion 27.9-10 and Critias 6.18-19).

The poetry of banquets, then, is particularly notable for its didactic tendency, i.e. for the instruction given to guests on how a symposium should be conducted, but several other of our motifs - a description of the physical surroundings of the party, rivalry among the guests, σπουδαιογέλοιον and references to sexual pleasure are also present in some of the poems.[20]

The symposia of comedy are generally quite different in tone, and their influence on (or relationship to) the gatherings described in the Cyr. is much less apparent. The outstanding feature of these banquets[21] is, perhaps, the lavish descriptions of the various delicacies that were served - Epicharmus' Ἥβας γάμος frr. 42-74 (Kaibel) is a good example (and see too e.g. Eupolis frr. 150, 161). Gluttony (cf. Eupolis frr. 148, 172-173; Sophocles' satyr play Σύνδειπνοι frr. 138, 139 $N^2$) and heavy drinking (Epicharmus fr. 34, Eupolis fr. 149) are also regularly mentioned. Entertainments too are often described so that we hear of singing (Aristophanes Wasps 1219 ff.; Clouds 1354 ff.; Eupolis fr. 361), dancing (Epicharmus fr.75), riddles (Epicharmus fr. 87; Aristophanes Wasps 20-23; Antiphanes fr.74, 124; cf. Athenaeus 448 B - 459 B) and comparisons and counter-comparisons (Aristophanes Wasps 1308-1314; Epicharmus frr. 87, 90) at comic symposia. Most of these party games were, of course, competitive, with guests taking pains to demonstrate their skill and unsuccessful participants having to pay a forfeit (cf. Antiphanes fr. 74). Thus one of our themes, that of rivalry among the guests at a symposium is frequently found in comedy.

Aristophanes Wasps 1208-1249 and the fragments of Eupolis' Κόλακες (frr. 146-178) are the two bits of comedy which are most interesting for our purposes. In Aristophanes, Bdelycleon is giving his father a detailed lesson on

how to behave at a symposium. He rapidly outlines the normal course of events at a party - reclining on couches, washing, dining, washing again, libations, flute girl, skolia etc. (cf. Plato Comicus fr. 69) - and places particular emphasis on the setting of the symposium. Philocleon, he insists, must pay careful attention to his surroundings and compliment his host on the bronze-ware, ceiling and tapestries (Wasps 1214-1215;cf. in contrast, Diphilus fr. 61). Here we have further evidence that the background or physical setting of drinking parties was an important factor.

Eupolis' play Κόλακες seems to have included a symposium at Callias' house with Protagoras (frr. 146-147), and possibly Alcibiades (fr. 158), the Socratic Chaerephon (fr. 165) and others (frr. 164, 166-167) as guests. As is to be expected, we hear of the flatterers' greedy and lustful behaviour (frr. 148, 155, 158, 161, 162, 172-173), but there are also hints of talk of a somewhat serious nature. Thus Protagoras addresses Callias in pedantic fashion, telling him to drink in order to clear his lung (fr. 147; cf. 146) and an unknown speaker promises to demonstrate how he benefits mankind (fr. 160). It seems, then, that this comic symposium included bits of didactic instruction, if not genuinely serious conversation, so that the party may have included both frivolous and serious interludes. It is also interesting to see that Callias' flatterers are said to have received rewards (τῆς κολακείας τὸ ἆθλον) from their host: wine cups, hetairai and other luxuries (Max. Tyr. 14.7), so that once again the presentation of gifts is found at a Greek symposium.

There are several prose descriptions of symposia which were written earlier than Xenophon's work.While Sophron's mimes may have included some description or representation of a symposium[22] the fragments do not yield any real evidence of anything other than references to food (frr. 14-16;

24-31) and drink (e.g. fr. 99). Ion of Chios, whose sympotic poetry we have already encountered, seems to have included symposia in his prose writings as well.[23] Two descriptions[24] of parties are extant - one of a banquet given by Laomedon in Athens, with Cimon as guest of honour (Plut. Cimon 9.1-6) and the other of a gathering in Chios, in honour of Sophocles (Athenaeus 603 E - 604 D). At the first dinner party, two of our themes appear - competition and didactic instruction. Cimon, we are told, is compared by the other guests to Themistocles, and is found to be the more able of the two. The members of the party then discuss some of Cimon's great exploits, leading him to tell an instructive tale of a clever stratagem he once used when dividing up booty.

Ion's account of the symposium with Sophocles at Chios is especially interesting for, abridged as it is,[25] it contains many of our sympotic motifs. The narrative background is rich, for Ion describes the fire, the cupbearer's blushes, the downcast schoolmaster, Sophocles' laughter etc. Sophocles himself is both playful and in earnest (παιδιώδει παρ'οἶνον καὶ δεξιῷ) when devising his "stratagem" to steal a kiss from the boy and his remarks on Pericles' criticism of him are semi-serious, an excellent example of σπουδαιογέλοιον. The whole of the tale is, of course, a παιδικὸς λόγος used by Athenaeus to illustrate the fact that Sophocles was a φιλομεῖραξ. Finally the pedantic Eretrian schoolmaster, who attempts to correct Sophocles, provides both the didactic and competitive elements we have learned to look for. Although the bulk of Ion's Ἐπιδημίαι is lost, its affinity with Xenophon's literary symposia seems apparent.

Our next author is Herodotus, who describes several dinner-parties in his history. Most of these banquets (5.18-20; 9.15-16; 9.110-111; cf. 1.118-119 and 7.135) involve Persians and will be discussed below (passim). The remaining gathering, a party given by Cleisthenes of Sicyon before announcing

which suitor is to marry his daughter Agariste (Hdt. 6.129-130) is well worth attention. The suitors (who remind us of the Homeric μνηστῆρες) are of course all rivals for Agariste's hand so that two of our themes - competition and matchmaking - are very much in evidence at the party. The suitors also compete, Herodotus tells us, in music-making and talking before the party as a whole (οἱ μνηστῆρες ἔριν εἶχον ἀμφί τε μουσικῇ καὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἐς τὸ μέσον 6.129.2). These speeches may well have contained some edifying pronouncements. The matter at hand is a serious one, the culmination of a year's trial of the suitors, but the atmosphere at the party is generally light - with the guests drinking, singing and dancing, until the carefree Hippocleides dances his prospects away, so that once again we find the serious and the frivolous juxtaposed. In addition, it is worth noting that the host, Cleisthenes, presents all the disappointed suitors with a talent of silver as compensation, at the close of the party. Herodotus' story is clearly a blend of fact and fiction but it is generally agreed that his source here is an Alcmaeonid one,[26] so that certain features of this symposium may have been re-cast in Athenian form.

It seems then that traces of most of the sympotic themes of the Cyr. can be found in Greek literature from Homer onwards. The influence of certain authors (i.e. Homer, several sympotic poets, Ion of Chios), or at least a certain similarity in tone and content between their banquets and those of the Cyr., is apparent. Other pre-Xenophontic symposia, such as those of comedy, are quite different. (It should perhaps be said again that this survey has been an attempt to work backwards from the Cyr. to find earlier hints or seeds of its themes, and not to postulate a series or chain of literary banquets which ultimately led to Xenophon's symposia in the Cyr.) Four of the eight features we have been looking for - emphasis on the setting and

background of the party, competition among the guests, didactic pronouncements, and an alternation between,or blending of, grave and light matters - are fairly prevalent in these earlier symposia, while three others - matchmaking and love (both heterosexual and homosexual) and the presentation of gifts - are less frequent. The theme of real, as opposed to apparent, wealth has not been encountered at all, outside of Xenophon and Plato.

Before leaving the question of possible influences on Xenophon and earlier Greek literary tradition relating to banquets, it is worth taking a brief look at the vestiges of early, lost symposia. Plato himself may refer to one such composition in his own Symp. for we are told that Phoenix son of Philippus, who is otherwise unknown, has given a different version of a banquet which included Socrates, Alcibiades and Agathon (Pl. Symp. 172 B; 173 B),[27] but no trace of any such work is extant. Plutarch (Moralia 823 D) seems to know of a symposium where Alcibiades was host and Socrates the chief guest, and this has been taken by one scholar as referring to Aeschines' dialogue Alcibiades whose setting, he argues, was a symposium.[28] A third candidate for the role of Xenophon's and Plato's precursor is Antisthenes and his (almost entirely lost) Προτρεπτικός , which may have included two symposia: a meeting of sophists at Callias' house and a gathering of the seven wise men at Periander's. Once again there is no real evidence for this.[29] The tradition of some sort of meeting or banquet of the seven wise men at Periander's or Croesus' house is an elusive one and Plutarch's Banquet of the Seven Sages may have been the first literary representation of a discussion or wisdom contest among these sages over wine.[30] Finally, in the pages of Athenaeus (427 F - 428 A) Xenophon himself makes an appearance at a symposium at the court of Dionysius of Sicily and there he justifies his moderate drinking to the tyrant, in didactic fashion. This anecdote too is assigned by some to a lost symposium.[31]

All in all, these bits and pieces of what may have been symposia[32] do not help us much and will be ignored henceforth.

There are several sympotic themes or pastimes which are not found in our group of Cyr. dialogues but are present elsewhere in Xenophon (and in other authors). Perhaps the most outstanding missing item in the Cyr. group is that of entertainments. Although we hear more than once of singing-girls and musicians in the Cyr. (Cyr. 4.6.11;5.1.1;5.5.2; 5.5.39) and singing and dancing are even mentioned in passing in the sympotic dialogues (1.3.10; 8.4.12), there is, in fact, no song, music or dance at any of the Cyr. parties. Only the Medes are described as celebrating in this fashion (1.3.10; 4.5.7). In addition we hear nothing of party games such as riddles or likenesses in these dialogues. We have seen above that music and dance, comedians, comparisons and puzzles were a regular part of most banquets. Xenophon's own Symp. has an abundance of such pastimes (cf. Xen. Symp. 2.1-2, 8, 11, 21-22; 3.1; 9.2-6 and 6.8-10) and in Plato's work of the same name special mention is made of the fact that there is no music (Pl. Symp. 176 E; cf. Prot. 347 C-E). Plato does, however, allow Alcibiades to indulge in the casting of likenesses (εἰκόνες; cf. Pl. Symp. 215 A ff.; 221 D). One of the symposia in the Anab. (6.1.3-13) consists almost entirely of a series of dances, while the other has musical and comic performances, with the host himself joining in the fun (Anab. 7.3.32-33). Thus it seems clear that Xenophon deliberately banned entertainments from the banquets of the Cyr. and I shall try below (pp. 210-212) to see why he did so.

Another related omission is that of organized competition or contests. While the symposiasts of the Cyr. often vie with one another, there are no rounds of speechmaking on a set theme according to turn (as in the Symposiums of Plato and Xenophon[33]), no series of ἐπιδείξεις of any kind - be it σκόλια,

dances, toasts or riddles such as are often found in other symposia.[34]

Two other minor features missing in the Cyr. group but often found in other parties are the appearance of an uninvited guest (ἄκλητος), and a discussion of how much wine should be drunk. Menelaus is the earliest self-invited guest on record (Il. 2.408; cf. Pl. Symp. 174 B-C) and later the parasite who comes of his own accord to banquets seems to have been a regular figure in comedy[35] - Xenophon's Philippus is an example of this stereotype. Plato has two uninvited symposiasts put in an appearance at Agathon's house - Aristodemus and Alcibiades - and writers of later symposia continued with this τόπος,[36] but there are no such figures in the Cyr. So too the banqueters in the Cyr. do not find it necessary to formally regulate or limit their drinking (although the young Cyrus wishes that his Median grandfather would drink less - Cyr. 1.3.9 ff.), even though a decision (taken by the symposiarch) on the amount to be drunk is often found in other parties. The question of ὁ τρόπος τῆς πόσεως frequently leads to talk of the effects of wine - see Theognis 473 ff.; Critias 6; Pl. Symp. 176 A-E; Xen. Symp. 2.23-27.[37] In the Cyr. it seems taken for granted that Cyrus and his companions will drink moderately and once again it is the Medes (Cyr. 1.3.10-11; 4.5.7-8), along with the Babylonians (7.5.15, 25, 27) and later-day Persians (8.8.10) who are intemperate.

Another noteworthy omission in the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. is that of a theoretical discussion of the power and effect of love, an ἐρωτικὸς λόγος. We have seen that the topic of love (both heterosexual and homosexual) often arises in these parties, but there is no general evaluation or description of the nature of love in our group of symposia. Such talk is, however, found elsewhere in the Cyr. (in the two conversations between Araspas and Cyrus concerning Panthea, 5.1.8-18 and 6.1.36-44; cf. below, pp. 285-290 and 294-295), in a non-sympotic setting. Often ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι whether or not they were a

"genre mineur de la prose littéraire",[38] were closely linked with symposia and this is true elsewhere in Xenophon. His Symposium has two long discussions of the effect of love (Xen. Symp. 4.10-28; 8.1-43); Plato's work of the same name consists largely of a series of ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι (cf. Pl. Symp. 172 B and Arist. Pol. 1262b11). In the Mem. there are three main passages that deal with love and may be considered ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι (Mem. 1.3.8-15; 2.6.28-39; 3.11) and all three have close links with symposia.

In the first passage (Mem. 1.3.8-15) Socrates obliquely warns Critoboulus of the dangers of kissing, addressing him indirectly through Xenophon. This dialogue follows immediately upon a description of the way Socrates advised his fellow guests at a party not to over-indulge in eating and drinking (1.3.5-3), speaking in semi-serious fashion ( ἔπαιζεν ἅμα σπουδάζων 1.3.8), i.e. the discussion of eros comes right after a brief depiction of Socrates at a symposium. The Socrates-Xenophon-Critoboulus conversation, which calls for restraint in a third area - sex - has several sympotic motifs, i.e. a semi-jocular tone, didactic pronouncements and a παιδικὸς λόγος and hence seems closely connected to the previous banquet passage. The sympotic flavour or origin of Mem. 1.3.8-15 is even clearer when we look at its close parallel in Symp. 4.10 ff. There Socrates again warns Critoboulus about the powerful effects of a kiss, but the two speak to each other directly, in a bantering tone, and Socrates himself is not insusceptible to the influence of beauty. Our second Mem. passage (2.6.28 ff.) is yet another version of Socrates' lecturing Critoboulus on love, and like its two counterparts, seems to show traces of "eine farbenreiche symposiastische Szene".[39]

The last passage from the Mem. dealing with ἔρως in a general way is Socrates' conversation with the courtesan Theodote (3.11). While their talk is not set in a symposium and takes place at Theodote's house (3.11.1-2) there

is a sympotic "feel" to the conversation. Socrates is at best only semi-serious in the advice he gives the hetaira on how to attract clients and in his claims to have love charms and potions. Theodote, too, is perhaps too wide-eyed and innocent to be taken seriously. The full description of the background scenery - Theodote's posing for an artist when Socrates and his friends arrive, her well-attired mother and servants, the rich furnishings - is very unusual in the Mem. and also reminds us of the dramatic backdrop of a symposium (cf. above, p. 48 ).[40]

In sum, Xenophon does have several ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι outside of the Cyr. and all seem closely connected to, or reminiscent of, symposia. In the Cyr., however, the two are distinct.

Before leaving the question of what is not found in the Cyr. group of banquets, it is worth looking more closely at the two parties described in the Anabasis (Anab. 6.1.3-13; 7.3.15-39). Both banquets are gatherings of military leaders and their allies and thus in the occasion at least, resemble two of the Cyr. symposia (Cyr. 5.2.5-22 and 8.4.1-27). These real-life parties could easily have served as models for the Cyr. ones, but in fact the two groups do not resemble each other in the least. The first symposium of the Anab., in which the generals of the Ten Thousand are hosts to Paphlagonian envoys, turns into a dancing-exhibition by the various Greek contingents, once the formalities of sacrifice, (eating), libations and paeans are over. The dancing is lively, even rowdy and the humour blunt (cf. the Greeks' joking remark that it is their women (dancers) who do the real fighting - Anab. 6.1.13). Of all our sympotic themes only two - an elaborate narrative background and competition among the guests - are to be found.

The second party (Anab. 7.3.15-39) is given by Seuthes, the Thracian king, with the leaders of the Ten Thousand (and others) as guests. On their

way in to dinner certain select guests are stopped by Heracleides, who solicits rich gifts for the king, promising various benefactions in return. The banqueters then dine in a circle and Seuthes distributes meat and bread from his plate to those whom he wishes to favour. After the meal, the important guests toast the king, one by one, and present him with various valuable gifts - a horse, a servant, women's clothing, a silver cup, a carpet etc. Xenophon who is drunk, empty-handed and embarrassed, for he is seated in the position of honour next to Seuthes, offers himself and his men as a present and hopes that they will enable the king to acquire other, more tangible gifts. After a final joint toast by Xenophon and Seuthes, there is entertainment: music, dancing by the host and professional buffoons. The party ends with a practical discussion of military arrangements. Here again, although several of our sympotic motifs can be discerned - a careful description of the surroundings, the presentation of gifts (surprisingly enough by the guests this time[41]) and even one semi-serious speech by the drunken Xenophon - the overall atmosphere of the party is very different from the Cyr. banquets, for in the Anab. the rough-and-tumble of real life dominates, while in the Cyr., as we shall see, Xenophon's urge to educate and edify prevails.

In conclusion, the omissions or restrictions of the Cyr. group, as well as their overall uniformity in tone, must have been intended by Xenophon, for he was clearly acquainted with very different types of symposia, both actual and literary. It is only in his Symposium that the widest possible range of characters, themes and activities is presented: the motifs of the Cyr. group are a deliberate selection, chosen from the grab-bag of the Symposium.

Before turning to a commentary on the individual dialogues of the Cyr. group one further influence on the Cyr. symposia should be borne in mind - Persian party practices.[42] Herodotus 9.15-16, the tale of a banquet at Thebes

where each one of the 50 Greeks shares a couch with a Persian guest and the two nationalities feast, pour libations, drink together and even confide in one another, seems to show that Persian and Greek sympotic practices were not altogether alien. Nonetheless, the Persians did have customs of their own - their habit of holding serious deliberations over wine (see below, p. 197) is perhaps the most famous one - and these play a part in the banquets of the Cyr. These Persian features will be noted as they arise.

Cyr. 1.3.4-12

Our first party in the Cyr. is a banquet given by Astyages for his daughter Mandane and grandson Cyrus, who have recently arrived for a visit in Media (Cyr. 1.3.4-12). Astyages, who wants the young Cyrus to enjoy his stay, offers him an elaborate meal with various side dishes, sauces and meats. Cyrus is used to plain Persian fare (cf. 1.2.8, 11) and does not understand why Astyages takes such a long and circuitous route, through so many dishes, on his way to satiety, instead of simply eating bread and meat the way the Persians do. When his grandfather explains that this roundabout method of dining is a pleasing one, Cyrus retorts that Astyages himself seems disgusted by these rich dishes, for he always wipes his hand after touching one of them, but does not cleanse his hands after handling bread. Astyages does not argue further with Cyrus (although the latter's contention is far from convincing for naturally meat dirties the fingers while bread does not), and merely heaps up his grandson's plate and urges him to eat so that he will grow strong (1.3.4-6).

In this exchange - the first of a series of reproofs delivered didactically by young Cyrus to his grandfather, the Median despot - Persian simplicity is contrasted with Median luxury, a comparison regularly found in the Cyr. (see

e.g. 1.3.2-3; 1.5.1; 1.6.8; 2.4.1, 5-6; 4.5.54 etc.). Elsewhere, of course, it is the Persians who are fond of dainty dishes while the Greeks eat simple repasts (cf. Hdt. 1.133; 9.82; Xen. Ages. 9.3; but compare Hdt. 1.71). Xenophon's heroes often emphasize the importance of eating moderately (e.g. Socrates: Mem. 1.3.5-8; 3.14.5-6; Agesilaus: Ages. 5.1; cf. Hiero 1.17-19), and Cyrus himself returns to this theme many times throughout the Cyr. (e.g. 1.5.12; 4.5.4; 7.5.80). Astyages takes Cyrus' words here to heart, for later when offering his grandson all sorts of treats as an incentive to staying on in Media, Astyages promises him the opportunity to spend much time together with him, companions his own age, horseback riding, hunting and simple meals (ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ μετρίως σοι δοκοῦν ἔχειν ὁποίαν βούλει ὁδὸν πορεύσῃ 1.3.14, continuing the travel metaphor used here).

Cyrus accepts the meats from Astyages and after receiving permission to do with them as he pleases, distributes them to the attendants present at the meal, in return for various services they have rendered him (1.3.6-7). Here we are reminded of the Persian practice of paying subordinates - be they nobles, soldiers or servants - in food or rations, rather than with money. Persian satraps and nobles, as well as the king, all seemed to have an entourage of underlings who shared their table and were dependent on them for the very food they ate (cf. Cyr. 8.2.2-4).[43]

Only Sacas, Astyages' handsome cupbearer, does not receive any meat from Cyrus and Astyages asks why his most honoured servant, who also has the power to decide who shall be admitted to the royal presence, has been passed over. Cyrus (who, as Xenophon points out, is too young to be shy) immediately demands to know why his grandfather is so fond of Sacas. Astyages jokingly (σκώψαντα) replies that it is because his servant pours the wine so gracefully and this leads Cyrus to demonstrate that he too makes a skillful cupbearer.

He performs the service with such a serious expression that he causes his mother and grandfather to laugh ( οὕτω δὲ στήσαντα τὸ πρόσωπον σπουδαίως... ὥστε τῇ μητρὶ καὶ τῷ Ἀστυάγει πολὺν γέλωτα παρασχεῖν 1.3.9). Sacas, Cyrus says, will now be out of a job, for not only does he (Cyrus) pour wine more deftly, he also refrains from drinking any of it.

Cyrus' turn as a cupbearer in particularly interesting for it seems to be a variation on - if not an explanation of - a part of Ctesias' version of Cyrus' rise to power.[44] According to Ctesias,[45] Cyrus, whose father was a brigand and mother a goatherd, attached himself to the Median court in order to earn his living and performed various menial functions there. First he worked outdoors in the palace grounds, and then inside the palace itself. Next he was a lamp carrier and then he served under the chief cupbearer who poured wine for the king himself. Young Cyrus who poured the wine skillfully ( καὶ τὴν φιάλην εὐσχημόνως ἐπιδιδόντα FGrH 90F66 - compare our passage εὐσχημόνως πως προσενεγκεῖν καὶ ἐνδοῦναι τὴν φιάλην Cyr. 1.3.9) caught Astyages' eye and replaced the chief cupbearer upon the latter's death. His influence over the king grew, Ctesias tells us, and he and his family became wealthy and powerful. Finally Cyrus rebelled against the Median despot and captured his kingdom. In the Cyr. Cyrus, of course, comes from royal stock and is on the best possible terms with his Mede relations. By having his young Cyrus only play at pouring wine, Xenophon seems to refer obliquely to this other version and even to demonstrate how such a (false) story could have arisen, i.e. since Cyrus once jestingly poured wine for his grandfather Astyages, he was later thought to be the king's cupbearer. Cyrus' pretending to be a cupbearer also reminds us of Herodotus' version of his childhood, where he plays at being king (Hdt. 1.114-115). In both Herodotus and Xenophon, Cyrus first encounters Astyages as a young boy (he is aged ten in Herodotus, about

twelve in the Cyr.) and in both he addresses the despot freely and without fear. (Compare Hdt. 1.116.1 ἐδόκεε... καὶ ἡ ὑπόκρισις [sc. τοῦ Κύρου] ἐλευθεριωτέρη εἶναι and Cyr. 1.3.8 καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἐπερέσθαι προπετῶς ὡς ἂν παῖς μηδέπω ὑποπτήσσων [46].)

Cyrus, although he carefully imitates Sacas' other movements when pouring wine, does not actually taste the wine and Astyages asks him why he refrains from doing so. Cyrus explains that he is afraid that there is some sort of drug in the wine-bowl, because he is certain that Sacas had placed a drug in the wine he served to the king and his friends at Astyages' birthday celebration. The group of revellers, says Cyrus, were unsteady in mind and body and were more badly-behaved than children. They all spoke at the same time, sang off-tune and could not dance in rhythm either. All the guests seemed to have forgotten that Astyages was their king, and they demonstrated Median freedom of speech (ἰσηγορίᾳ) by never keeping silent. Astyages (who presumably does not appreciate his grandson's ἰσηγορία, although Xenophon does not expressly tell us so) asks Cyrus whether his father ever becomes intoxicated, and Cyrus replies that he drinks moderately for he has no Sacas to pour wine for him (1.3.10-11).

Once again young Cyrus seems to be lecturing his grandfather on a favourite theme of Xenophon's - the ill-effects of excessive drinking. We have already seen that the question of the amount of wine to be drunk often arises in symposia and frequently leads to a discussion of the effects of wine. Here Cyrus does not determine, of course, how much wine will be imbibed at the present banquet, but he does try to discourage Astyages from overdoing it. All Persians seemed to have celebrated their birthdays (Hdt. 1.133) and the king's birthday was naturally an especially important occasion (cf. Hdt. 9.110-111; Plat. Alc. I 121 C); this was probably true of the Medes as well. The phrase

Cyrus uses to describe the revellers' confusion of mind and body ταῖς γνώμαις καὶ τοῖς σώμασι σφαλλομένους (Cyr. 1.3.10) is a favourite one of Xenophon's for describing the effects of drink: Socrates (Symp. 2.26), Lycurgus (Lac. Pol. 5.4) and even the ancient Persians (Cyr. 8.8.10) all think this condition should be avoided. Cyrus mentions the singing and dancing at Astyages' birthday party and we hear of such entertainments at Astyages' court from other Greek sources. The most famous song sung to the Mede despot was an allegorical one, warning him of a beast (i.e. Cyrus) who is about to attack (Deinon FGrH 690F9 and Nicolaus of Damascus FGrH 90F66.26; the former is apparently a variation on the latter), but there are no such overtones here. The party-goers at Astyages' celebration could barely stand up to dance (οὐδ' ὀρθοῦσθαι ἐδύνασθε Cyr. 1.3.10; cf. again Symp. 2.25; Cyr. 8.8.10), that is acted more like beasts than men, for the ability to stand erect is what distinguishes men from animals (cf. Mem. 1.4.11).[47]

Most disturbing of all for Cyrus was the sudden sense of equality between Astyages and his subjects: all alike seemed to have forgotten that he was their king and this led to everyone talking at once. Cyrus ironically terms this free-for-all ἰσηγορία , Median freedom of speech. The remark is a two-edged one, for in the Cyr. Astyages is shown to be a tyrant, subject to no law but his own, and his subjects would not normally speak freely in front of him. In fact, Cyrus often acts as an intermediary in relaying the requests of the Mede nobles (1.4.1-2; cf. too the fear that Cyaxares, Astyages' son, arouses in the Medes - 4.5.18-19). Astyages is unfavourably compared with Cambyses, the Persian "constitutional monarch" (1.3.18), whose regime, while not a democracy, does allow its citizens (8.5.24) some say in the running of its affairs (cf. 1.2.13-15; compare above, pp. 108-110). Thus Cyrus, a Persian, can mock Median ἰσηγορία , saying in effect that Medes can speak freely only when they are drunk.

On the other hand, Cyrus objects to the fact that Astyages was not held in awe by his fellow symposiasts and was treated as an equal, not a king. In the Hiero, the fact that a tyrant can never really enjoy himself with his subjects but must always be on his guard is considered a heavy burden that the ruler must bear (Hiero 6.2-3), so that here one would think that Astyages' relaxed behaviour is a good sign, an indication of how secure he feels amongst his subjects. Does Cyrus disapprove because he thinks Astyages must be more cautious, or simply more dignified? (It is interesting to compare Socrates' reaction to excessive rowdiness at a symposium: he restores order by starting a song - Symp. 7.1).

Young Cyrus may have insulted his grandfather by his blunt criticisms - at any rate his mother Mandane now intervenes, speaking up at the party for the first time, in order to ask why Cyrus dislikes Sacas so much. Her son explains that he is angry at the cupbearer because he frequently does not allow him to see Astyages. Cyrus asks permission to rule over Sacas for just three days and jokingly demonstrates how he would then keep him away from his meals, putting him off with the same kind of excuses that Sacas uses to deny Cyrus access to his grandfather. On this light note ( τοσαύτας... εὐθυμίας 1.3.12) the banquet ends.

The role assigned here to Sacas is an unusual one for he combines two separate functions: cupbearer and chief usher to the king. The latter office of εἰσαγγελεύς (or chiliarch or hazarapatish[48]), controller of the king's audience, was clearly a most important one and Sacas seems to have been the despot's right-hand man (cf. Astyages' description of him ὃν ἐγὼ μάλιστα τιμῶ Cyr. 1.3.8). Cupbearers, who sometimes were eunuchs, generally had a less important role at court.[49] Interesting too is the fact that Sacas' beauty is mentioned (1.3.8); the cupbearer seems a Ganymedes-type figure and perhaps this is why Astyages so favours Sacas.

In conclusion, I shall note in brief which of our sympotic themes appear in Cyr. 1.3.4-12. Cyrus, who unabashedly lectures his grandfather on the need to eat and drink moderately, is the chief didactic figure, but he also amuses the others when he pretends to be a cupbearer and mockingly excludes Sacas from his meals. Cyrus' playful actions alternate with his serious ones so that we have a fairly strict sequence of σπουδαῖον (1.3.4-7), γέλοιον (1.3.8-10), σπουδαῖον (1.3.10-11), γέλοιον (1.3.11-12). Cyrus' distribution of meat to the servants is in a sense a distribution of gifts. The description of overly-rich Median fare versus plain, but satisfying Persian food, is one facet of the poverty vs. riches theme. The narrative background of the party is detailed, in particular the careful depiction of Cyrus mimicking a wine-pourer. Sacas and Cyrus are rivals, at least as far as Cyrus is concerned, and even Astyages and Cyrus seem to compete, with each one claiming that his eating and drinking habits are better. Last of all, the beautiful Sacas just may have played a part in a παιδικὸς λόγος.

In Cyr. 1.3.4-12, then, Xenophon interweaves several different strands: Greek sympotic themes, Median and Persian customs and functions, oblique allusions to Ctesias' story of the young Cyrus and several pet themes of his own.

Cyr. 2.2.1-2.3.1

In this next dialogue (2.2.1-2.3.1) the grown-up Cyrus entertains his officers at dinner in his tent. The Persian forces have arrived in Media at Cyaxares' request and they set up camp there and practise military maneuvers in preparation for their war against Cyaxares' foes. The description of the dinner-party begins somewhat abruptly with a question posed by Cyrus and there is no mention of the guest list or setting of the party, perhaps because

Cyrus' habit of inviting select officers to dinner and serving all those present the same food has just been noted (2.1.30). The dinner is described by Xenophon in order to demonstrate the kind of conversation Cyrus thought appropriate for these meals: talk that is entertaining but conducive to good ( εὐχαριστότατοί τε ἅμα λόγοι... καὶ παρορμῶντες εἰς τἀγαθόν 2.2.1). At the close of the party, Xenophon again stresses this combination of serious and light features τοιαῦτα μὲν δὴ καὶ γελοῖα καὶ σπουδαῖα καὶ ἐλέγετο καὶ ἐπράττετο ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ(2.3.1), i.e. σπουδαιογέλοιον. (We have already seen how this half-playful, half-earnest approach is often found in symposia outside of the Cyr.) Xenophon's introduction to this dialogue is reminiscent of the opening of his Symp.: δοκεῖ τῶν καλῶν κἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔργα οὐ μόνον τὰ μετὰ σπουδῆς πραττόμενα ἀξιομνημονεύματα εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς(Symp. 1.1; cf. too 2.17; 3.10; 4.28; 8.12). In the Mem. too Xenophon points out how Socrates benefited his companions παίζων οὐδὲν ἧττον ἢ σπουδάζων, immediately after bringing a series of anecdotes on Socrates' behaviour at dinners (Mem. 4.1.1; cf. 1.3.8). While there are earlier references to the value of combining or contrasting serious and light matters - the statements by Aristophanes καὶ πολλὰ μὲν γέλοιά μ' εἰπεῖν πολλὰ δὲ σπουδαῖα (Frogs 389-390) and Gorgias δεῖ... τὴν μὲν σπουδὴν διαφθείρειν τῶν ἐναντίων γέλωτι, τὸν δὲ γέλωτα σπουδῇ (fr. 12; cf. too Pl. Leg. 816 D) are especially noteworthy - σπουδαιογέλοιον was particularly associated in ancient times with (Socratic) symposia. Plutarch describes Plato and Xenophon in their Symposiums as μετὰ παιδιᾶς σπουδάζοντες(Hor. 686 D; cf. 708 D, 614 A etc.) and "Hermogenes" describes the two-fold aspect of Socratic symposia thus: Συμποσίου Σωκρατικοῦ πλοκὴ σπουδαῖα καὶ γελοῖα καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ πράγματα ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ξενοφῶντος καὶ ἐν τῷ Πλάτωνος Συμποσίῳ (p.454 Rabe)[50] and immediately afterwards quotes the opening sentence of our dialogue (Cyr. 2.2.1) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Κύρου παιδείᾳ φησὶ Ξενοφῶν ἀεὶ μὲν οὖν

ἐπεμέλετο κ.τ.λ.. Whether or not there was a specific genre of Socratic symposia it is clear from the "Hermogenes" passage that our Cyr. dialogue belongs to this category[51] of half-serious, half-playful dinner-parties (as do all the sympotic dialogues of the Cyr.).

Cyrus opens the conversation by asking his officers how the Persian commoners, who have recently been presented with armour like that of the upper class ὁμότιμοι and invited to fight in their ranks (cf. Cyr. 2.1.11-19), are getting along in both the social and military spheres. Hystaspas responds with the tale of a commoner who is still inferior to the ὁμότιμοι, in social behaviour at any rate. This man protests because he was seated in the middle of a circle of soldiers at mess, and consequently was in a bad position, because portions of meat were distributed to the men first from one end of the circle and then from the other. The third time round Hystaspas arranges for the disgruntled man to help himself first, but because he is overly greedy he ends up with no meat at all and loses the rest of his food as well. Hystaspas could barely control his laughter at the time at the commoner's discomfiture, and the listeners at Cyrus' party naturally (ὥσπερ εἰκός) laugh too (2.2.1-5).

Cyrus' question as to whether the commoners who have now joined their ranks are inferior is not an idle one and was probably designed to let the ὁμότιμοι complain openly about the new soldiers, for the sudden promotion created a great deal of tension among the original ὁμότιμοι (cf. 2.2.21 οἱ ὁμότιμοι ᾤκνουν τὴν τοῦ ὄχλου ἰσομοιρίαν ). In fact only Sambaulas (below, 2.2.28-31) has anything good to say about the new recruits; all the other officers criticize them in some way. The tale of the greedy soldier reminds us of the two other gluttonous party-goers in Xenophon: a nameless dinner companion of Socrates who concentrates almost exclusively on his ὄψον and

is mockingly termed an ὀψοφάγος (Mem. 3.14.2-4), and an Arcadian at Seuthes' party who is so busy eating that he passes the wine along to Xenophon for safekeeping and causes even their host to burst into laughter (Anab. 7.3.25).

An unnamed taxiarch is the next of Cyrus' guests to address himself to the question of the new recruits and he tells of their drill practice. After being reprimanded for advancing in disorderly fashion, the platoon of 50 men follow their leader's orders too punctiliously and end up serving as an armed guard to a... letter. Once again Cyrus and his guests laugh at the tale[52] and Cyrus laughingly praises ( ἅμα γελῶν οὕτως ἐπῄνεσε ) the new recruits' responsiveness and discipline (Cyr. 2.2.6-11).

Perhaps the most curious thing about this anecdote of the overly-obedient soldiers (which has the flavour of real-life experience) is the letter they have all run off to fetch - a letter, presumably about personal matters, sent home to Persia by the taxiarch. There is only one other place in the Cyr. where letter-writing is mentioned and there (4.5.26 ff.) the epistle (from Cyrus to Cyaxares) is reproduced in full.

Another taxiarch, an austere man named Aglaitadas, is not as amused by these tales of the recruits as Cyrus and the others are, and he accuses the two speakers of making up the stories in order to please Cyrus. Cyrus will not, however, have his men called braggarts or dissemblers ( ἀλαζόνες), for they are not pretending to possess a certain quality in order to gain something, but simply are trying to amuse their companions. Aglaitadas, adds the taxiarch who told the second anecdote, would surely criticize them for trying to move him to tears by means of pitiful songs and tales the way writers do, but why reproach them for trying to entertain him? Aglaitadas retorts that while causing others to weep (κλαίοντας καθίζειν) may be a useful way to teach moderation or justice or obedience to laws, there is no benefit to be had from

arousing laughter. Hystaspas suggests that Aglaitadas should nonetheless save tears for their enemies and spend a little of the huge store of laughter he has accumulated over the years on his friends. The latter finally gives in and smiles when he is told that it is easier to rub fire out of him than to make him laugh. Cyrus then mockingly accuses the taxiarch of corrupting his most serious man by laughter, and the exchange ends (2.2.11-16).

This discussion of laughter vs. tears is an interesting one and one wonders whether περὶ γέλωτος was once a regular party theme. Cyrus' definition of an ἀλαζών (2.2.12) is a precise, almost Aristotlean one (cf. EN 1127 a13 ff.), and while it closely resembles Socrates' pronouncements on ἀλαζονεία in the Mem. (1.7.1-5; cf. 2.6.38-39), it includes a further aspect of pretence: the braggart wishes to gain something (λαβεῖν τι ἕνεκα καὶ κερδᾶναι Cyr. 2.2.12) by his posturings. Aglaitadas apears only here in the Cyr. and is, we are told, a stern and humourless man (ἀνὴρ τὸν τρόπον τῶν στρυφνοτέρων ἀνθρώπων 2.2.11; see Demetrius , De Eloc. 134-135 for an appreciation of the charming use Xenophon makes of this grim character). Aglaitadas reminds us of another unsociable symposiast, Hermogenes in Xenophon's Symp., who is criticized by Socrates for being too silent (Symp. 6.1-5) and thus annoying the other guests. Aglaitadas, like Hermogenes,[53] is unrelievedly serious (ἄνδρα... σπουδαιότατον... πολέμιον ὄντα τῷ γέλωτι Cyr. 2.2.16; cf. Symp. 4.50; 6.1; 8.3) and such behaviour is unacceptable at symposia, where seriousness should be blended with fun (cf. Symp. 1.13). Similarly, perhaps, we are meant to reject Aglaitadas' pedagogic theory that the best (or only) way to train and improve people's characters is to cause them to weep. Maybe one should understand instead that an ideal teaching method would be to combine grave threats with more attractive incentives. Philippus the jester of the Symp. who prides himself on his γελωτοποιία is almost the exact antithesis of Aglaitadas and he considers

himself far superior to those who cause others to weep ( πολλοὺς κλαίοντας καθίζειν Symp. 3.11; cf. in contrast Pl. Ion 535 E). His excessive buffoonery, like Hermogenes' and Aglaitadas' excessive gravity, is not appreciated by the other symposiasts (Symp. 1.14; 6.8-10).

The taxiarch's mention of writers of poetry and prose who try to make their audience cry by telling of pitiful things ( ὥσπερ ἔνιοι καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ ἐν λόγοις οἰκτρὰ ἅττα λογοποιοῦντες εἰς δάκρυα πειρῶνται ἄγειν Cyr. 2.2.13) is a particularly Greek intrusion into this gathering of Persians. While the reference is far from being a full-fledged theory of poetics, it does have vague echoes of the words of e.g. Ion the rhapsode (Pl. Ion 535 C), Gorgias (Hel. 9 ff.) and, of course, Aristotle (Poetics 1449 b 24 ff.), and is slightly surprising here.

The next topic of conversation (Cyr. 2.2.17-22) is introduced by Chrysantas,[54] Cyrus' right-hand man, who is worried that the new recruits will think that all soldiers, whether deserving or not, should have an equal share of any booty that the Persians may capture. Nothing, says Chrysantas, is more unequal or unfair (ἀνισώτερον ) than equal awards for good and bad men alike. Cyrus suggests putting the question of an equal division of spoils vs. division according to merit before the army as a whole, and overrules Chrysantas' proposal that Cyrus simply announce his decision on the matter and award prizes as with the contests and competitions the army has held earlier (cf. 2.1.22-23). Chrysantas is skeptical as to whether the commoners will vote for rewards according to merit, but Cyrus thinks that, given the proper encouragement, these men will indeed realize that good men deserve more. Cyrus, Xenophon adds, is aware of the reservations that the ὁμότιμοι have about the new recruits and he wishes for their sake that the vote will be in favour of unequal distribution of booty. The party-goers then agree to submit the question before an assembly

of the army and in fact, the assembly is held the very next day; it is decided there that war-prizes will be awarded according to merit (2.3.1 -16).

Thus, in this dinner-party dialogue, we have an instance of an important proposal which is first discussed over dinner and then re-considered the following day in a more formal way. Here we come fairly close to the Persian custom of holding deliberations over wine and then re-evaluating the result when sober. Herodotus (1.133), Plutarch (Mor. 714 A-C), Strabo (15.3.20), Athenaeus (192 C), and Maximus of Tyre (22.4 C) all tell us of this practice, while in the Book of Esther (3.15; 5.4) we find two actual instances of King Ahauserus considering critical matters in his cups.[55] We have already seen (above, p. 173) that in Homer, too, serious discussions take place over wine and this practice of combining wine and decision-making is perhaps a Persian version - or variation on - Greek σπουδαιογέλοιον, because it is in effect the juxtaposition, or combination, of serious and frivolous matters. When grave affairs are dealt with at the banquets of the Cyr. it is difficult (and perhaps misguided) to determine whether this reflects Greek party practices or Persian ones.

Chrysantas is concerned that all members of the army, whether brave or cowardly, will share equally in the rewards to be had. Such equality, he argues, is unequal or unfair (οὐδὲν ἀνισώτερον... τοῦ τῶν ἴσων τόν τε κακὸν καὶ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀξιοῦσθαι 2.2.18). His conviction that the bulk of the army will naturally favour such an arrangement rather than allowing better men to receive more (πλεονεκτεῖν 2.2.20) reminds us of Callicles' argument in the Gorgias (483 B-C) that laws are the refuge of the weak ἀγαπῶσι... ἂν τὸ ἴσον ἔχωσιν φαυλότεροι ὄντες. Chrysantas favours another kind of equality, that of equal awards for all those whose merit is equal. This is known elsewhere as proportionate or geometrical equality ἡ ἰσότης ἡ γεωμετρική (Pl. Gorg. 508 A),

as opposed to arithmetic equality (or equal shares for all).[56] Geometric equality was often associated with oligarchic, or to be more accurate, aristocratic regimes, while arithmetic equality is the democratic method (when applied to such matters as choosing magistrates). Although Chrysantas does not use this terminology, our passage is Xenophon's contribution to the contemporary discussion of "the two equalities", an issue also touched upon by Isocrates (Aerop. 21-22; cf. Nic. 14-15) and Plato (Laws 757 A - 758 A). All three writers are in favour of awarding prizes according to merit, or geometric equality.[57]

Returning to the Cyr. (2.2.22-28), another taxiarch now laughingly tells of at least one commoner who doesn't believe in sharing everything equally, for he tries to have a larger share of everything except work. Cyrus says that such men must be expelled from the army for the majority of men are readily influenced by strong personalities, whether good or bad. Base men, in fact, are often more persuasive than good ones since they offer immediate pleasures and satisfactions while the path to virtue is an arduous one. Lazy men, continues Cyrus, are like drones and are only harmful inasmuch as others must support them, but men who are both idle and shamelessly intent upon self-aggrandizement are dangerous, for they seem to demonstrate that vice does pay. Such men, then, must be weeded out of the army and replaced by others, who are chosen for the contribution they have to make, rather than because they are fellow-countrymen. A good army, concludes Cyrus, must be composed of good men just as a fast chariot needs fast horses and a well-run house calls for a few good servants rather than many bad ones. Cyrus' guests agree with him and subsequently act upon his advice.

This piece of didacticism from Cyrus strongly resembles in content and tone many of Socrates' pronouncements in the Mem.: it is one of the most Mem.-like speeches in the Cyr. Cyrus' words on the immediate pleasures ( τῶν παραυτίκα

ἡδονῶν ) offered by vice as opposed to the steep uphill (ὄρθιον) path of virtue, at once brings to mind (Socrates' version of) Prodicus' tale of Heracles at the crossroads and its precursor, Hesiod, Works and Days, 287 ff. (cf. Mem. 2.1.20 ff.). The Persian commoners are, it seems, a whole band of Heracleses and must be set on the right path by their officers (who, presumably, play the role of the beautiful and modest Ἀρετή). Cyrus' comparison of the army to a chariot which depends on its horses, and to a household dependent on its slaves, reminds us of many such analogies in the Mem. (cf. e.g. Mem. 2.3.7; 2.4.5; 4.1.3-4; see 4.4.5 for another mention of δίκαιοι i.e. well-matched horses). There are, of course, many animal analogies in the Cyr. too (e.g. 1.6.19; 2.1.28-29; 2.3.9; 4.1.17; 7.5.62; 8.2.4). Cyrus terms lax soldiers drones (κηφῆνες) but considers men who are both idle and grasping much more pernicious. This is perhaps reminiscent of Plato's drones with and without stings in the Republic (Rep. 552 C-D; cf. Oec. 17.14). Elsewhere Cyrus himself is called a "king" bee for all his men wish to be ruled by him ( ὁ ἐν τῷ σμήνει φυόμενος τῶν μελιττῶν ἡγεμών Cyr. 5.1.24; cf., in contrast, Pl. Pol. 301 D-E).

Cyrus' speech also contains a surprising note of cosmopolitanism,[58] since he tells his officers to choose new soldiers according to ability and not because they are fellow-compatriots (ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν... πατριῶται Cyr. 2.2.26), but this generosity of mind is in fact selfish. Cyrus is interested above all in an army which is as large and strong as possible and he is willing to concede that others besides the Persians may fit the bill. In Xenophon's own time, Cyrus the Younger puts this idea into practice when he enlists Greek troops in his campaign against his brother and specifically mentions their superior fighting ability (cf. Anab. 1.7.2-3). Usefulness makes for tolerance, as we shall see immediately below.

In the last exchange of this dinner party (Cyr. 2.2.28-31), Cyrus calls attention to an extremely ugly and hairy man who shares a couch with his commanding officer, Sambaulas. Cyrus teasingly asks if Sambaulas has brought the lad along, in Greek fashion, because of his good looks. When Sambaulas replies that he very much enjoys the sight of his companion, the others laugh and demand to know why Sambaulas favours him. He explains that he admires the recruit's instant obedience to any request and adds that his good example has influenced his whole squad of ten men. One of the symposiasts then suggests that Sambaulas kiss his friend and the ugly companion himself rejoins that that would be a task equivalent to any military drill (compare Critoboulus at Mem. 2.6.32-33). On this note of rough humour the party ends, after prayers and libations are offered to the gods (2.3.1).

Sambaulas presents us with a rather pallid παιδικὸς λόγος or homosexual love interest. His relationship with the ugly recruit is presented as the Persian answer to Greek homosexuality, for while Sambaulas is much pleased with the young soldier and appears to go about everywhere with him, their relationship is not a sexual one, but simply Sambaulas' way of rewarding his most loyal and useful soldier. In both Plato's and Xenophon's Symposiums it is argued that true love, i.e. the right kind of ἔρως between men inspires them to excell, and, more specifically, to be courageous in battle (Pl. Symp. 178 D - 179 B (Phaedrus speaking), 184 C - 185 C (Pausanias); Xen. Symp. 8.26 ff.); this argument is, in all likelihood, found in Aeschines' Aspasia as well.[59] Here the recruit's excellence in military matters has led to his being loved or admired, and not vice versa. Furthermore, while in Xenophon's Symp. (8.9 ff.) Socrates distinguishes between love of the soul and love of the body Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία τε καὶ Πάνδημος and tries to show the advantages

the former has over the latter, here the dichotomy between the two kinds of love seems complete, since the relationship between Sambaulas and his soldier is not at all physical. The relations between Artabazus and Cyrus, the only other male "pair" in the Cyr., are equally chaste. While Artabazus does seem interested in physical contact with Cyrus (cf. Cyr. 1.4.27-28; 8.4.26-27), Cyrus playfully rejects these advances. Nonetheless he manages to put Artabazus' feelings towards him to good use, for the Mede plays an important role in enlisting Median support for Cyrus and his plans, in times of crisis (cf. 4.1.22-24; 5.1.24-26; 6.1.9-10). Homosexual relationships in the Cyr. are, then, mainly utilitarian. While there are playful references to sexual contact, such contact is in fact minimal and the main emphasis is on the benefits one (or both) of the partners derive from their intimacy. If the ugliness of Plato's Socrates only emphasizes his inner, spiritual beauty, the displeasing looks of Sambaulas' recruit serve as a foil to his practical usefulness in military matters.

Before leaving Cyr. 2.2.1-2.3.1, it remains to note briefly which of our sympotic themes are found in the dialogue. There is next to no description of the physical setting of the party, but other background, such as the participants' appearance (e.g. Sambaulas' ugly friend), or thoughts (e.g. Cyrus' concern for the ὁμότιμοι) is provided. We are specifically told of the important role σπουδαιογέλοιον plays at the party, and as with Cyr. 1.3.8-15, there is an almost strict alternation between serious and light topics of conversation (with the two elements combined at times). Both Cyrus and Aglaitadas are didactic figures, while Aglaitadas also underlines the competition among the symposiasts (to make Cyrus laugh). There is no trace of matchmaking or heterosexual love, and the themes of poverty vs. riches and presentation of gifts

arise only indirectly, in the discussion of the new recruits vis-à-vis the ὁμότιμοι , and of the booty to be awarded.

Cyr. 5.2.5-22

Our next symposium, Cyr. 5.2.5-22, is slightly different from the other sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. Most of the symposium proper (5.2.16-19) takes place out of doors and is reported only indirectly, through Gobryas' eyes, while part of the conversation between Cyrus and Gobryas is held indoors, before the two actually sit down to their meal (5.2.7-13; Cyrus' men are already seated outside). Nonetheless, Cyr. 5.2.5-22 is best taken as one unit, i.e. a sympotic dialogue.

Cyrus and his soldiers have come to Gobryas' estate for a first visit, in order to evaluate their new ally, his forces and his land. Gobryas empties his fortress of his men and allows Cyrus and a small company to enter for a tour of inspection. Gobryas' men bring out wine, barley, flour and various meats in order to feed the whole of Cyrus' army, while inside the fortress, the Assyrian presents Cyrus with gold goblets, pitchers and vases, various ornaments and a countless number of darics:[60] all of this comes from a storehouse which includes enough supplies for a generation of men (cf. 5.2.4). Lastly Gobryas brings out his daughter - a girl of exceptional beauty and stature (δεινόν τι κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος) but of sad countenance, since she grieves for her dead brother (who was killed by the young Assyrian king, cf. 4.6.2-5). Cyrus is to do with her (and the gifts) as he likes (τὴν δὲ θυγατέρα ταύτην ἐπιτρέπω διαθέσθαι ὅπως ἂν σὺ βούλῃ ): all Gobryas and his daughter ask in return is the Persian's help in exacting revenge from the young Assyrian king (5.2.5-7).

Gobryas' presentation of wine, barley, flour and meat to all of Cyrus' entourage is, in all likelihood, simply the hospitality offered by a host to

his many guests, but the additional gifts he offers to Cyrus - the gold dishes, ornaments and coins - are more noteworthy. We have already seen (above,pp. 162-163 on Cyr. 8.4.15) how this display of Gobryas' wealth - particularly the drinking cups - left an impression upon Cyrus' companions, perhaps because Persians were notoriously fond of goblets (cf. Cyr. 8.8.18). (Ctesias tells us that having dishonoured men drink from earthenware cups was a punishment used by the Persian king - FGrH 688 F 40 .)

The Assyrian's beautiful, sad daughter reminds us of two other women in the Cyr.: Panthea, who has just been introduced in the previous chapter, and Cyaxares' daughter. The affinities with Panthea are obvious: both are unusually beautiful and tall (5.2.7; 5.1.5, 7), both are distressed (4.6.9 and 5.2.7; 5.1.6), both have been harmed by the young Assyrian king (4.6.9 and 5.2.7; 6.1.45) and both are intended for Cyrus (4.6.9 and 5.2.7; 5.1.6),only to be gently rejected by him (5.2.8, 12; 5.1.8). Panthea, of course, plays a fairly active role in the Cyr. (cf. 6.1.45-49; 6.4.2-11; 7.3.2-16), while Gobryas' daughter is seen (but not actually heard) only in this dialogue. She has been mentioned by her father earlier (4.6.9) and is referred to once more in the Cyr., at another symposium, where Hystaspas offers himself (and is accepted) as a husband (8.4.13-16, 24-26). In her brief appearance here, Gobryas' daughter reminds us of Cyaxares' daughter because of their similar situation: both are presented to Cyrus by their fathers along with valuable gifts, in the hope that a marriage will cement the alliance between Cyrus and the prospective father-in-law (cf. 4.6.9; 5.2.7; 8.5.18-20); compare Anab. 7.2.38 where Seuthes offers his daughter to Xenophon - and would be glad to accept a (non-existent) daughter of Xenophon's in return - in order to strengthen their alliance. Neither Gobryas' daughter nor Cyaxares' is portrayed at any length or given any real character of her own.[61]

Cyrus responds to Gobryas' plea for vengeance by affirming his promise to do his utmost to punish the young Assyrian king, since Gobryas has proved true to his word (by placing his fortress and men in Cyrus' hands - cf. 4.6.1-10). The Persian will keep the presents he has received from Gobryas in order to hand them over to the man who will wed Gobryas' daughter. Cyrus himself wishes for only one gift from his new ally - a gift worth more than all the wealth of Babylon. Gobryas, Xenophon tells us, suspects that Cyrus means his daughter, but in fact the Persian prince is more concerned with his good reputation. Many men, explains Cyrus, do not wish to do wrong, but since they are never tempted by great wealth or power, they die before they can demonstrate their true character. Gobryas, by placing his fortress, wealth, forces and daughter at Cyrus' disposal, has put Cyrus to the test, and hence Cyrus is anxious to show that he will not lie, cheat or renege on his promise to Gobryas. Cyrus wishes both to be just and to seem just (ἕως ἂν ἀνὴρ δίκαιος ὦ καὶ δοκῶν εἶναι τοιοῦτος 5.2.11) and will do his best to repay his new ally's kindness. Gobryas need not worry about a husband for his daughter, adds Cyrus, for he has many noble friends. His men are not as rich as the Assyrian, but they value loyalty to one's friends (and steadfastness in the face of one's enemies) more highly than wealth. Cyrus' men, like the Persian leader himself, are interested both in being virtuous and having a good reputation ἀρετῆς καὶ δόξης ἀγαθῆς (5.2.12). When Gobryas laughingly asks Cyrus to show him such a man, Cyrus replies that if the Assyrian accompanies the army he will soon be able to point out such men by himself.

We have already seen how a suitable husband - Cyrus' close friend Hystaspas - is eventually found for Gobryas' daughter. Hyastaspas is drawn to the Assyrian (if not to his daughter) because of Gobryas' wisdom, which he values

far more than his wealth (8.4.15-16, 24-26; cf. pp. 162-163 above); i.e. Cyrus' prediction about Gobryas' future son-in-law is fulfilled. Since Gobryas considers his daughter the most valuable gift being offered to Cyrus, one wonders how he views the Persian's rejection of the girl, by way of a diatribe on the importance of virtue. Gobryas laughs when Cyrus describes his men as being exceedingly virtuous (and hence suitable sons-in-law) and his laughter seems to reflect disbelief rather than amusement, for he later (8.4.13-14) admits that he was not all that happy about a match between his daughter and one of Cyrus' men: he prefers to see them managing wealth prudently rather than doing without it.

Cyrus' dismissal of those men who wish to be just but are never really given the opportunity to (mis)use wealth and power is reminiscent of his rejection of men who practice and develop a talent for its own sake but do not reap the fruits of their labours (1.5.9-10): he believes that men should realize their potential and has little respect for latent qualities. Cyrus and his followers try both to be virtuous and to seem so, i.e. to enjoy a good reputation. Early on, the Persian prince has been taught by his father that the quickest path to seeming wise or well-versed in any area is to become so (1.6.22-23). A good reputation must be well-founded for impostors are soon unmasked, Cambyses adds (cf. Mem. 1.7.2 and 2.6.38 where Socrates speaks in a very similar vein[62]). In this way there is no dichotomy between actual and apparent goodness. Elsewhere the distinction between seeming and being or character and reputation, is often a problematical one and Aeschylus' line οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν ἄριστος ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλει (Sept. 592) is perhaps the most famous statement of the problem.[63] For Cyrus, good behaviour and a good name go hand-in-hand and both are important. Cambyses has taught him that a reputation with no sound basis in fact is worthless and it would seem that for Cyrus, who is

proud of being praised (ἐπαινῶμαι ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων 5.2.11) and emulated ( ἐμὲ δὲ ζηλοῦσι 5.2.12), the converse is also true: the possession of virtue without the accompanying appreciation and esteem of others is worth very little.

Cyrus now shakes Gobryas' hand and rises to leave, together with his men. He turns down an invitation to dine in the fortress and invites Gobryas to join him for a meal outside instead. They eat their meal outdoors reclining on straw mats and this leads Cyrus to ask Gobryas who, in his opinion, has more coverings (στρώματα) - Gobryas or each one of Cyrus' men? The Assyrian replies that the Persians have more coverlets and couches, as well as a bigger house than his, since they use the earth and heavens for a dwelling. Cyrus and his men have as many couches as there are places to sleep on the ground, and their covers come not from sheep but from the mountains and plains (5.2.15).

This exchange between the two new allies is a surprising one. Costly carpets, coverings and couches were a regular feature, almost a symbol of Persian or Oriental luxurious living. In the Cyr. Xenophon condemns the Persians of his day for over-indulging in these trappings (8.8.16), while Cyrus especially provides Median carpets for the spoiled Cyaxares to sit on, when trying to appease him (5.5.7). When Cyrus' forces organize the equipment to be taken along on a long and arduous march, blankets are jettisoned in favour of provisions, for, as Cyrus reassuringly explains, the men will be able to sleep well even without them (6.2.30). Elsewhere in Xenophon, we find Pharnabazus ashamed to make use of the soft rugs spread out for him when he finds Agesilaus and his men sitting on the ground (Hell. 4.1.30). Agesilaus, in contrast to the Persian king, falls asleep easily, on the simplest kind of bedding (Ages. 5.2; 9.3). Hercules at the crossroads is warned by Arete about the soft blankets and mattresses that are part of Kakia's corrupting life-style

(Mem. 2.1.30).[64] Thus the point made here that plain mats are more than adequate is a favourite one of Xenophon's, a part of his general recommendation that men should eat, drink, sleep and enjoy themselves as simply and modestly as possible. What is unusual is the fact that Gobryas, rather than Cyrus, is Xenophon's spokesman here, with Cyrus' question only a "feed". Gobryas is, as we have seen, exceedingly wealthy and is used to rich trappings and furnishings. It is only natural for him to look down upon poor people with few possessions, as he does (at first) almost immediately afterwards: ὁρῶν τὴν φαυλότητα τῶν παρατιθεμένων βρωμάτων πολὺ σφᾶς ἐνόμιζεν ἐλευθεριωτέρους εἶναι αὐτῶν (5.2.16; cf. 5.3.3). One would expect Cyrus to be the one to demonstrate how heaven and earth, the mountains and plains are enough to satisfy his needs, with Gobryas, perhaps, insisting upon supplying the Persians with carpets, bedding etc. Nonetheless, with the exception of Cyrus' words on the importance of being true to one's promise (5.2.8 ff.), Gobryas is the didactic figure at this gathering and continues in this vein down to the close of the dinner party; he plays a similar role at the symposium held after the capture of Babylon, with his clever ῥῆμα which is one of a large collection of written sayings (8.4.14-16). It is interesting to note that Gobryas' almost pantheistic perception of heaven and earth as serving as a huge dwelling-place is the outdoors counterpart of Antisthenes' description of the inside of his house in the Symp. (4.38). The walls of his home, Antisthenes says, are like a warm tunic and the roof - a thick cloak, so that he has little need of other clothes; he too is more than satisfied with his (presumably non-existent) bed-covers στρωμνὴν... ἀρκοῦσαν ἔχω (Symp. 4.38).

The rest of the symposium held outdoors in front of Gobryas' castle is not presented to us in direct dramatic form, but only indirectly through Gobryas' view of the proceedings: this holds true until the closing exchange

between the Assyrian and Cyrus (Cyr. 5.2.16-22). Gobryas, who at first thinks poorly of Cyrus' men because of their simple fare, quickly learns to appreciate the educated Persians' table manners. They do not become overly-engrossed in their food and drink, for they consider such behaviour bestial (ὑικὸν καὶ θηριῶδες 5.2.17), and are moderate, sensible and attentive to their surroundings. They remind Gobryas (or, in all likelihood, the author of περὶ ἱππικῆς and Ἱππαρχικός) of horsemen who can both ride their mounts and carry on other activities, such as looking, listening and talking, at the same time. Their conversation, the Assyrian notes, is playful, but not at all offensive, and the questions and repartee are of a kind that is more pleasant to hear than not. Gobryas is particularly struck by the fact that all men alike, no matter what their military capacity, are served the same portions of food. When he rises to leave, the Assyrian expresses his admiration of the Persians to Cyrus, saying that although he possesses more cups, clothing and gold, Cyrus and his men are worth more. Gobryas and his associates concentrate on accumulating possessions, while the Persians devote their time to bettering themselves. Cyrus does not respond directly to his new ally's observation, but simply requests that the Assyrian have his cavalry ready early in the morning, in order to guide the Persian forces through his territory. On this pragmatic note the dinner party ends (ἀπῆλθον ἑκάτερος ἐπὶ τὰ προσήκοντα 5.2.22).

Most of our symposium is, then, presented only indirectly and in summary form through Gobryas' reactions at the occasion. In the Cyr. Xenophon describes the thoughts of his characters (other than Cyrus) only rarely and hardly ever at the length allotted here to Gobryas. The Assyrian's reflections simply serve,of course, to present Xenophon's views on what a convivial gathering of educated, well-bred men should be like. In the other sympotic dialogues of the

Cyr. Xenophon brings actual instances of the lively, pleasant conversation he considers desirable and then, at times, underlines or explains what he is doing - e.g. τοιαῦτα μὲν δὴ καὶ γελοῖα καὶ σπουδαῖα καὶ ἐλέγετο καὶ ἐπράττετο (2.3.1). Here he uses the much less successful device of presenting general observations on what the symposium was like, with no enlivening examples to interest the reader, so that his didactic aims are all too apparent. Thus, for instance, rather than seeing a greedy eater reprimanded (as in 2.2.2-5), we are simply told that the Persians were not overly interested in their food and drink. We are not provided with any illustrations of the type of questions which are more pleasant to hear than not and Plutarch, in fact, devotes a section of his Quaestiones Conviviales to demonstrate the kind of conversation Gobryas is probably referring to (Mor. 629 E - 635 A). The choice of Gobryas as a mouthpiece for Xenophon's ideas must be deliberate, for an appreciation of good manners and playful, but cultured conversation is more significant when it comes from a wealthy man who is used to concentrating on the physical side of symposia - i.e. costly furnishings and dishes, rich food (cf. 5.3.3) - and this is, of course, the point of Gobryas' closing remarks to Cyrus.

The description here of educated Persians (τῶν πεπαιδευμένων i.e. the ὁμότιμοι - cf. 2.3.13; 3.3.59, 70) at dinner is very similar to the depictions of Spartans at their communal meals. The Persians here, with their Spartan fare, are in fact more like the Spartans at Hdt. 9.82 - where Pausanias sets the two types of meals, Persian and Spartan, side by side - than their fellow compatriots there. Xenophon tells us how the Spartans eat and drink with restraint at their sussitia, and usually speak of important political deeds so that there is little room for insolence, drunkeness, unseemly conduct or talk (ὥστ' ἐκεῖ ἥκιστα μὲν ὕβριν, ἥκιστα δὲ παροινίαν, ἥκιστα δὲ αἰσχουργίαν καὶ αἰσχρολογίαν ἐγγίγνεσθαι Lac. Pol. 5.6; cf. our passage ὡς πολὺ μὲν ὕβρεως

ἀπῆν, πολὺ δὲ τοῦ αἰσχρόν τι ποιεῖν, πολὺ δὲ τοῦ χαλεπαίνεσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους Cyr. 5.2.18). Plutarch (Lyc. 12.4) and Critias (6.14-16) also mention the Spartans' gentle, harmless joking at their gatherings.

Gobryas' description of the Persian sympotic talk also brings to mind Socrates' contrast between the sympotic pastimes of common and ignorant men, and those of well-bred, educated symposiasts (καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ συμπόται καὶ πεπαιδευμένοι ) in the Protagoras (347 C-E). The former type of party-goers are unable to entertain themselves and feel obliged to introduce foreign voices (i.e. of singers and musical instruments), while the latter group are sufficient unto themselves, taking turns at speaking and listening in orderly fashion (κοσμίως). Indeed, perhaps it is this feeling that men of real culture have no need of flautists, dancers etc. at their gatherings (cf. Theaet. 173 D) which causes Xenophon to forgo all such entertainments at the symposia of the Cyr. In Xenophon's Symp. even though the Syracusan troupe performs several times during the course of the evening, the question of the proper way for gentlemen to amuse themselves at a party also arises. Socrates thinks that it would be a disgrace (αἰσχρόν) if he and his fellow-banqueters, who consider themselves superior to the band of entertainers, were not to prove capable of improving or amusing one another (Symp. 3.2).[65] Later (7.2-5) Socrates advises the Syracusan impresario that daredevil exhibitions by his group would be inappropriate and suggests that they dance to the flute instead. Entertainments, then, are found at Xenophon's Symp. but even there they are only of a certain kind and do not serve as a substitute for the guests diverting one another by means of their own conversation. In the Cyr. Gobryas sees almost at once (as, of course, Xenophon's readers are meant to see) that the Persians try to appear sensible and temperate at their meals (ἐν τῷ σίτῳ οἴονται δεῖν φρόνιμοι καὶ μέτριοι φαίνεσθαι Cyr. 5.2.17) and

one can understand how musical entertainments might be thought (by Xenophon) to detract from this high-minded atmosphere. At 8.1.33 there is a similar depiction of the Persians as gentlemen who avoid angry shouts and boisterous laughter and live nobly (εὖς κάλλος). We have seen (above, p. 180) that in the Cyr. it is only the Medes who indulge in music and dancing at their parties; elsewhere (Athen. 10.434 E-F; FGrH 689 F 2 ) however, such sympotic pastimes are attributed to the Persians as well.

In the Cyr. entertainments go hand-in-hand with (excessive) drinking (cf. Cyr. 1.3.10; 4.5.7 and compare Athen. 10.434 E-F) and in Plato's Symp. too the type of entertainment to be provided seems to be related to the amount of wine to be imbibed, for Eryximachus' suggestion that the flute-girl be dismissed and the guests entertain one another by speaking on Eros, comes immediately after all have agreed to drink only in moderation (Pl. Symp. 176 E). While both Plato and Xenophon allow moderate drinking in their symposia (Pl. Symp. 176 A-E; Xen. Symp. 2.23-27) and Socrates hints that even well-bred symposiasts may be overly-bibulous at times (κἂν πάνυ πολὺν οἶνον πίωσιν Prot. 347 D; Socrates himself is capable of drinking a great deal with no ill effect - cf. Pl. Symp. 176 C; 220 A; 223 C-D), there is next to no mention of any wine-drinking in the symposia of the Cyr. - see only Cyr. 1.3.9 and 8.4.9.[66] Xenophon was, of course, well-aware that banqueters often became intoxicated and in the Anabasis he refers gracefully to his own inebriated state at Seuthes' party (Anab. 7.3.29 ff.), so that his representation in the Cyr. of Medes, Babylonians and later-day Persians - but not Cyrus' men - as drinking at celebrations (cf. above, p. 181 ) is significant. Persians were considered fond of wine - cf. Hdt. 1.133; 5.18-19; Esther 1.7 and FGrH 689 F 2 etc. - and this means that the symposia of the Cyr. with their sober symposiasts and lack of musical entertainments are particularly - and deliberately -

puritanical. This sobriety is probably due to Xenophon's giving free rein to his didactic impulses and allowing his urge to instruct his readers in what a model symposium of sensible and temperate men should be like to prevail over a more realistic depiction of men relaxing over their cups. Nowhere is this desire to use these fictitious symposia to edify and instruct more apparent than in the portrayal here of Cyrus' sober men, with their plain fare on simple dishes, and their playful, if somewhat bland conversation. (It has already been noted that the fact that our symposium is filtered through Gobryas' eyes and not presented directly makes this gathering especially edifying, but otherwise rather lifeless.) Xenophon's didactic aim here so dominates that he is led to an inconsistency. Earlier (5.2.5) we have been told that Gobryas' servants have brought out a variety of food - wine, flour, barley and various animals to be slaughtered - to feed Cyrus' army. Nonetheless the Persians then supposedly eat such simple food that Gobryas looks down upon them (at first). The other symposia of the Cyr., despite the absence of music and dance and spirits, are lively, colourful parties and as such, are, in fact, more successful models of gentlemanly celebrations. If it is true that Xenophon does not include outside entertainments because he wishes to demonstrate that men of culture can easily manage without them, it is perhaps surprising that he makes this point only indirectly. One would have expected a comment akin to Prot. 347 C-E or Xen. Symp. 3.2 at one of the Cyr.'s banquets, i.e. that a guest would, for instance, suggest bringing in a singer or dancer and that Cyrus would then advise the diners that they, as man of culture, amuse one another by conversing instead.[67]

Gobryas is especially impressed by the Persians' rationing system: all of Cyrus' men (i.e. officers, regular soldiers and probably camp-followers as well) receive equal portions of food (cf. 2.1.25, 30), for they think that

the best feast is to make their fellow-soldiers as strong as possible (cf. 4.2.38 where Cyrus expresses the same sentiment). From the Assyrian's reaction it would seem that this system of equal rations for all is an innovative one and was not the usual practice in Xenophon's (and his readers') own time, but the evidence for this is not clear-cut.[68]

The Assyrian's final acknowledgement at the end of dinner that the Persians, who are bent on self-improvement, are indeed superior to his men who strive only after wealth, echoes Cyrus' earlier words to him (5.2.12). Then Gobryas laughed at Cyrus' description of the Persians but now he has been converted, as it were. Cyrus responds somewhat ungraciously with practical instructions and plans for the next day, reminding us of the close of Seuthes' party in the Anabasis (7.3.34-39). Here, however, the transition from polite dinner-party conversation to everyday military matters is even more abrupt.

In sum, Cyr. 5.2.5-22 is the least life-like and most didactic of our symposia. In addition to the didacticism, almost all of our other sympotic themes appear here. There is a presentation of gifts (by Gobryas to Cyrus), an attempt at matchmaking (between Gobryas' daughter and Cyrus), reflections on the true value of riches (both by Cyrus and Gobryas) and an elaborate mise-en-scène: e.g. Gobryas' servants bearing food, a display of Gobryas' wealth and a depiction of the Assyrian's mournful, but beautiful daughter, along with a picture of Cyrus and Gobryas reclining outdoors on straw mats. The description of the Persians' gentle joking with one another at their meal and Gobryas' laughter at Cyrus' claims about the moral worth of his men provide a certain element of σπουδαιογέλοιον while Cyrus' words on the way his men strive to emulate him and prove his equal (5.2.12) hint, perhaps, at the competition among Cyrus' companions. The only sympotic theme which does not appear here at all is that of homosexual love.

Cyr. 8.3.35-50

Our next sympotic dialogue, Cyr. 8.3.35-50, is a conversation between the Persian commoner Pheraulas and an unnamed Sacian, one of the most curious pairs in the Cyr. Pheraulas, an old friend of Cyrus', is a most gentleman-like commoner (Cyr. 2.3.7) who has just helped Cyrus arrange the inaugural royal procession in Babylon to be as impressive as possible (8.3.5 ff.). The Sacian is a rank-and-file member (ἰδιώτης ἀνήρ 8.3.25) of his tribe's forces who has met Pheraulas thanks to his swift horse. Immediately after the royal procession and sacrifices, Cyrus organizes a series of horse races, with each nationality competing separately. Cyrus wins the Persians' race, Artabazus is the first of the Medes (riding a horse that Cyrus has given him), Tigranes is the best Armenian rider etc.; i.e. as is to be expected, the leaders of each national group win their respective races. The only exception to this rule[69] is the young, ordinary Sacian who comes out far ahead of the rest of his compatriots, presumably because of the quality of his steed. Cyrus is then reported to have asked him whether he would accept a kingdom for his horse, and the Sacian replies that he is not interested in a kingdom, but would like to earn the gratitude of a good man (i.e. would give the horse to a good man in the hope of reaping some benefit in return). Cyrus then tells the Sacian that there are so many good men surrounding him, he is bound to hit one, even with his eyes shut, if he throws a clod of mud in a certain direction. The Sacian closes his eyes, throws the lump of mud and hits Pheraulas, who continues to ride on as if nothing has happened because he is in the midst of performing some errand for Cyrus. The Sacian is puzzled by Pheraulas' behaviour and Cyrus does not help him much, suggesting that Pheraulas may be mad (μαινόμενος γάρ τίς ἐστιν, ὡς ἔοικεν 8.3.30). The Sacian then rides up to the Persian commoner, who is bleeding from the blow he has received, gives

him the horse and explains what has happened. Pheraulas accepts the horse, giving his own mount to the Sacian in return, and prays that his new friend will not regret the gift, even though, he adds, the Sacian would have been wiser to choose a richer man (8.3.25-32). This, then, is how Pheraulas and the Sacian become acquainted; the dinner party at the Persian's quarters is their second meeting.

This story of the first encounter between the two is puzzling, even intriguing. Horses played an important part in the Persians' life, as Darius' inscriptions telling of his "kingdom great possessed of good horses, possessed of good men" (DSf 11.8-12 = DSm 11.3-5; cf. too DSp and DSs[70]) indicate. So too in the Avestan hymns to deities, or Yashts, various heroes pray for swift horses and for victory on the race course, for horse and chariot races seemed to have been a regular test of bravery among the ancient Iranians (cf. Hdt. 7.196[71]). On the Greek side, in the Anabasis, the Ten Thousand, after arriving at Trapezus, first perform sacrifices and then organize various games, including horse-races (Anab. 4.8.25 ff.; cf. too 5.5.5). Thus it is quite natural to find Cyrus, who likes to have his men compete (cf.e.g. 2.1.22), organizing a series of horse races; natural too is his desire to obtain the Sacian's remarkably swift horse. What is odd is Cyrus' abrupt "kingdom for a horse" question: what does Cyrus mean by the offer? There are certain Indo-European traditions which indicate that there were strong links between a ruler and his horse(s). The king in India, as well as Iran, carried out a great ritual horse-sacrifice, and in India a new king was allotted the amount of territory that a special horse covered, when allowed to roam freely. In Achaemenid Persia we know of at least one ruler who owed his kingdom to his horse - Darius I (Hdt. 3.84-86; cf. Ctesias FGrH 688 F 13.17).[72] Nonetheless these links between a kingdom and a horse do not suffice to prepare us for Cyrus' question which

is introduced both suddenly and indirectly (ἔνθα δὴ λέγεται ὁ Κῦρος ἐρέσθαι τὸν νεανίσκον... 8.3.26). Such oblique narration of the framework of a dialogue is extremely rare in the Cyr. (see above, p. 35 ) and may possibly hint that Xenophon is recalling here a tale he has read or heard elsewhere.

Puzzling too is Cyrus' suggestion that the Sacian choose the man who is to receive his steed by throwing a clod of earth with his eyes closed. Clearly the random method of selection is meant to show that good men in Cyrus' company are thick and fast and can be found almost everywhere - elsewhere Xenophon uses the same "can't be missed" idiom to describe the enemy (cf. Anab. 3.4.15; Hell. 2.4.16) - but blindly throwing clumps of earth does seem an extravagant way to demonstrate this point. Similarly, the fact that Pheraulas carries on with his duties and ignores the blow is meant to display the Persian's worth, but why does Cyrus mislead the Sacian and imply that Pheraulas is unbalanced, instead of praising his friend? Again it is tempting to conjecture that Xenophon is re-working and possibly compressing another, somewhat longer tale in which these points are clearer, but this is mere speculation.

Finally it should be noted that Pheraulas and the Sacian exchange horses οὐ μὲν δὴ οὕτω διηλλάξαντο (8.3.32). It is perhaps not too fanciful to be reminded of two exchanges of gifts in the Iliad.[73] In their exchange of armour, Glaucus presents Diomedes with a far more valuable present (Il. 6.230-236), just as here the Sacian's horse is far better than Pheraulas' mount. So too the exchange of presents between Hector and Ajax (Il. 7.299-305) leads to grave, even fatal consequences for each, at least according to post-Homeric tradition (cf. S. Aj. 1028-1035). Here too the exchange has far-reaching, but not tragic, results for both parties.

I turn now to the symposium Pheraulas arranges for the Sacian at his quarters. The two dine together and after dinner Pheraulas fills their wine

cups, toasts his guest and presents him with the goblets. The Sacian, who is impressed by the rich furnishings and many servants at Pheraulas' disposal, asks his host if he was a rich man back in Persia. Pheraulas explains that he comes from a poor family and so was forced to forgo his education and help his father farm from an early age. He worked the small family plot by himself and the land was very just, giving back only slightly more than it received. All the Sacian sees is, in fact, a gift from Cyrus (Cyr. 8.3.35-38).

Pheraulas' gift to the Sacian, the drinking-cups, were originally a gift from Cyrus. (The Persian leader has received them as a prize for his victory in the horse races (cf. 8.3.33), so that the Sacian, another victor in the race, now has two sets of these cups.) Xenophon thus shows at the very outset how all of Pheraulas' wealth can be traced back to Cyrus. The Sacian's curiosity about the source of Pheraulas' riches reminds us of Socrates' opening questions to the courtesan Theodote in the Mem. (3.11.4). Both visitors are impressed and perhaps surprised by the luxuriousness of their surroundings and both immediately try to find out where the affluence comes from. Socrates' questions are, of course, more roundabout and only semi-serious; Pheraulas and the Sacian do not joust in the same way.

We have already learned something of Pheraulas' background earlier in the Cyr.: he is a Persian commoner (Πέρσης τῶν δημοτῶν 2.3.7). The commoners are, apparently, precisely those Persian citizens who cannot afford to attend the life-long educational curriculum sponsored by the state (cf. Cyr. 1.2.3-15, esp. 15), but must work for their living, just as Pheraulas describes himself here (8.3.37; cf. 2.1.15).[74] Although a commoner, Pheraulas is very much like a gentleman in body and spirit ( καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν οὐκ ἀγεννεῖ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικώς 2.3.7) and is an old acquaintance of Cyrus . At the assembly convened to discuss whether booty should be distributed according to merit or equally

to all, Pheraulas speaks out in favour of rewarding men according to their deserts and urges his fellow-commoners to compete with the ὁμότιμοι on equal terms (2.3.8-15). In this earlier speech Pheraulas touches upon the arduous and unhonoured (ἐπίπονον μέν, ἄτιμον δέ 2.3.11) life of the commoners and points out that the commoners, like the homotimoi, have been rigorously trained to withstand hunger, thirst and cold, and to bear heavy burdens, but theirs was the best teacher of all - necessity (2.3.13-14). The same ironic, almost grim tone is used by Pheraulas in two other passages. When some of Cyrus' officers who resent Pheraulas being put in charge of them sarcastically term the commoner a great man (μέγας δὴ σύγε, ὦ Φεραύλα 8.3.7), he replies, "not only that, I also serve as a porter" (οὐ μόνον γε... ἀλλὰ καὶ συσκευοφορήσω ) for he is carrying with him robes - gifts that are meant to soothe their ruffled feathers. In our dialogue Pheraulas ironically praises his "very just" (δικαιότατον) plot of land which in strict fairness gives back produce more or less equal to the amount of seed it takes in, with little interest. Occasionally, Pheraulas adds, the land returns double the amount it receives, out of "nobility" (ὑπὸ γενναιότητος 8.3.38).

It is interesting to compare Pheraulas' sarcastic remarks here about his land with two passages in the Oec. praising the earth and agriculture; the same two qualities - justice and nobility - are mentioned there as well. In the Oec. Socrates tells Critoboulus that the earth teaches justice (δικαιοσύνην διδάσκει ), for those who tend her best receive the most in return (Oec. 5.12). Ischomachus praises the art of farming as being philanthropic and noble (γενναῖον ) for it is fine, great, beneficial and gentle toward people (Oec. 15.4). Later Ischomachus reveals the secret of his success at farming, a secret he has learned from his father: he diligently cultivates fallow, unplanted land which he has bought cheaply, until it becomes fertile (Oec. 20.22 ff.).

Pheraulas has not learned these tricks of lucrative farming and his appreciation of the earth's finer qualities differs radically from that of Ischomachus and Socrates; it is much more akin to the slave's praise of his master's field in Menander's Γεωργός (35-39). The field, says the slave, is most pious for it produces myrtle, ivy and flowers. If one sows anything else, the land gives only a just and fair return, no surplus.[75]

The two symposiasts now turn to a discussion of the pleasures (and pains) of wealth (Cyr. 8.3.39-48). The Sacian begins by congratulating Pheraulas on his newly-acquired riches and adds that the Persian's pleasure in his affluence must be all the greater for his having been poor once. Pheraulas replies that on the contrary, he finds wealth more worrisome than poverty, since he eats, drinks and sleeps with no greater pleasure than before, but now has many more responsibilities. He must feed, clothe and care for many servants, and is often troubled by mishaps involving his sheep, oxen and cattle. The Sacian is unconvinced and thinks that nonetheless Pheraulas is many times happier than he himself is, when all goes well. The Persian commoner retorts that the joy of possessing wealth is not equal to the pain of losing it, and demonstrates this by pointing out that while rich people do not stay awake at night from happiness, those who lose their property do lose sleep from sorrow (see Cyr. 7.5.82 and Anab. 7.7.28 for similar statements and cf. Hdt. 3.39.4). Nonetheless, the Sacian rejoins, people who have acquired something do stay awake because of their happiness. Pheraulas concedes this point but stresses that possessing wealth is much less enjoyable than acquiring it, for the rich man must expend great amounts on the gods, on friends and on guests. He who is overjoyed with his riches, will be equally sorry to spend them. The Sacian claims that he would be happy both having and spending large sums of money and this leads Pheraulas to suggest that the Sacian take over his fortune and

do with it as he likes, treating Pheraulas as a mere guest. The Sacian thinks that Pheraulas is joking (παίζεις) but the Persian is in earnest (σπουδῇ 8.3.47) and even offers to ask Cyrus to release the Sacian from his military and court duties, so that he can stay at home and tend to Pheraulas' wealth. In that way Pheraulas will be able to devote himself wholeheartedly to Cyrus and any further wealth he may acquire will be handed over to his new steward. The two agree to the arrangement and each one considers himself happy (ὁ μὲν... εὐδαίμων... ὁ δ' αὖ... μακαριώτατος 8.3.48): the Sacian because he controls great amounts of money and Pheraulas because he is free to do what he enjoys most (8.3.39-48).

Pheraulas' exchange with the Sacian, in which he criticizes wealth without praising poverty (i.e. his words are a ψόγος πλούτου without being an ἐγκώμιον πενίας)[76] is one of several discussions of the relative value of wealth that are found in Xenophon. The three most interesting passages for our purposes are Symp. 4.29-44, Oec. 2.2-9 and Cyr. 8.2.15-23, and I shall look briefly at each.[77] Symp. 4.29-44 is a pair of speeches by Charmides and Antisthenes: Charmides explains why he is proud of his poverty (Symp. 4.29-33), while Antisthenes gives his reasons for priding himself on his (spiritual) riches (4.34-44). Charmides favourably contrasts his present life of poverty with his former wealthy state. As a rich man he had to worry about losing some of his fortune to thieves, and appease sycophants for fear of the harm they could do him. So too while he was often called upon to spend money on civic projects, his loyalty was frequently questioned and his movements restricted. Now that he is a poor man, Charmides is able to come and go as he pleases, associate with whomever he likes, and he is considered a threat by rich men, even while receiving financial support from the state. Thus the poverty-stricken Charmides now sleeps content and relaxed (ἡδέως μὲν καθεύδω ἐκτεταμένος

4.31). The affinities between Peraulas and Charmides are clear: both find the possession of wealth a heavy burden, entailing great worries (Cyr. 8.3.40-41; Symp. 4.30, 32) and expenses (Cyr. 8.3.44; Symp. 4.30, 32). So too the Persian and the Greek feel freer to pursue their own interests and inclinations when unencumbered by wealth (Cyr. 8.3.47-48, 50; Symp. 4.31-32) and both find it easier to sleep well when poor (Cyr. 8.3.40, 42; Symp. 4.31). The mention of sleep in both our passages is interesting and in Cyr. 3.1.24 we find a similar argument in which the ability to sleep well is an indication of peace of mind and contentment. Aristotle (cf. Stob. IV 31.91) tells of Anacreon rejecting the gold talent offered to him by Polycrates the tyrant, because of his dislike of presents that keep one awake (μισῶ δωρεὰν ἥτις ἀναγκάζει ἀγρυπνεῖν).[78] Returning to Peraulas and Charmides, we find that both are more troubled by wealth than poverty (Cyr. 8.3.41; Symp. 4.29, 32). Under these circumstances, Peraulas' move to divest himself of the responsibility of his wealth is a logical one and Callias is perhaps right to wonder why Charmides does not turn his back on every opportunity to acquire money (Symp. 4.33).

Although Antisthenes is poor he prides himself on his fortune, for he thinks that poverty and wealth are related to spiritual rather than physical acquisitions ( οὐκ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ... ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς Symp. 4.34). In his speech, Antisthenes points out that the same income can be more than enough for one person but insufficient for another, and notes that some men (such as tyrants) are so hungry for wealth, they will do anything to obtain it. He, on the other hand, is easily able to satisfy his modest needs and considers himself as well taken care of as Callias. The luxuries he desires are those of the mind and he enjoys the greatest delicacy of all (τὸ ἁβρότατόν γε κτῆμα ) - leisure to spend his time as he likes, i.e. in the company of Socrates (Symp.

4.34-44). Unlike Pheraulas, Antisthenes seems to positively embrace poverty; nonetheless the two do have certain attitudes in common. Pheraulas, like Antisthenes, does not think that being rich causes one to eat, drink, or sleep better (ἐσθίω μὲν καὶ πίνω καὶ καθεύδω οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν νῦν ἥδιον ἢ τότε ὅτε πένης ἦν Cyr. 8.3.40; cf. Symp. 4.37), even if he is not the ascetic that Antisthenes is. Antisthenes' ability to make do with very little is, of course, a quality he shares with Socrates, as will be seen immediately below. Hiero is another character in Xenophon who contends that the rich do not enjoy their food and drink more than the poor (Hiero 1.17-25). Both Antisthenes and Pheraulas are interested in the leisure which the rich cannot seem to afford, but they use their time in very different ways. Antisthenes devotes himself to Socrates and the pursuit of philosophy (as Charmides does to a certain extent), while Pheraulas intends to spend his time with Cyrus, helping him to consolidate his rule over an empire. Thus Antisthenes' rejection of wealth in favour of the pursuit of wisdom - a favourite protreptic theme (cf. e.g. Pl. Euthyd. 278 E ff.) - becomes something very different in the Cyr. and one wonders if Pheraulas' goals are equally worthy in Xenophon's eyes.

In our next passage, Oec. 2.2-9, Socrates paradoxically claims that Critoboulus is to be pitied for his poverty, although the latter has a fortune a hundred times the size of his own. Socrates manages satisfactorily with the little that he has, while Critoboulus would still be short of funds with three times the amount of his present fortune, because he has a reputation to maintain. Critoboulus must sacrifice lavishly to the gods, entertain many foreigners and fellow-citizens on a grand scale, and expend great sums on civic enterprises or else he will incur the wrath of his compatriots. Nonetheless, if in need, Critoboulus would not be helped by his supposed friends, unlike Socrates who can always rely on financial support from others. In addition,

says Socrates, because Critoboulus need not concern himself with earning money, he wastes his time on childish pursuits. All of these considerations lead Socrates to feel sorry for Critoboulus.

Socrates' evaluation of Critoboulus' wealth is both similar and dissimilar to Pheraulas' views on his fortune. Both the Greek and the Persian consider the private expenditures expected of the rich man - a kind of "richesse oblige" - burdensome (Oec. 2.5; Cyr. 8.3.40-41, 44), but Pheraulas, who is not an Athenian citizen like Charmides and Critoboulus, does not seem to be bothered by demands for funds for any wider civic activities. So too while both Socrates and Pheraulas agree that a rich man does not find it easier to satisfy his physical wants than a poor man does (Oec. 2.4,8; Cyr. 8.3.40; cf. Mem. 1.6.4-6), Pheraulas does not, perhaps, favour the minimal, almost bare standard of living that Socrates and Antisthenes (cf. e.g. Mem. 1.3.5; Symp. 4.40-42) prefer. Although Pheraulas tells the Sacian that he is to be treated more sparingly ( ἔτι εὐτελέστερον Cyr. 8.3.46) than a guest, his description of the life of a poor farmer is not a glowing one, and even after he turns over his household to the Sacian, the Persian commoner continues to bring in additional revenues. A substantial difference between Socrates' and Pheraulas' outlooks is their perception of the amount of leisure available to a rich man. Critoboulus, according to Socrates, does have time for his own interests, even if they are idle ones, for in the Oec. lack of free time is a characteristic of the banausic class (cf. Oec. 4.3), while Pheraulas (along with Antisthenes and Charmides in the Symp.) feels that a wealthy man has no time to call his own.

In our third passage, Cyr. 8.2.15-23, it is Cyrus who speaks out against wealth or, to be more precise, against accumulating riches. When Croesus chides Cyrus for distributing much of his fortune to his friends and allies,

instead of storing it up in treasuries, Cyrus shows the Lydian king how his friends act as his treasurers and are always willing to put their funds at his disposal, by demonstrating their speedy and positive response to a request of his for money. Cyrus then points out to Croesus that by giving great sums to his friends, he acquires trusty, willing guardians of his wealth, live "treasure houses" as it were, whereas hoarding his riches would only lead to friends' jealousy and the need to hire paid watchmen. (In Hiero 11.13, Simonides advises Hiero in very similar fashion.) Cyrus himself, is as he admits, as avaricious as the next man, but after satisfying his needs (and there is a limit to how much one can eat, drink or wear) he does not choose to bury his money (cf. 3.3.3 where Cyrus again denounces burying treasure) or constantly count, measure or guard his hoard. Instead he distributes his wealth to friends and thus acquires security and a good reputation - qualities that do not wear out and cannot be found in excess. He who acquires the most money by honest means and uses it well should be considered happiest (εὐδαιμονέστατον) Cyrus concludes, and not the person who possesses and guards the most money.

Pheraulas may well have heard Cyrus' strictures to Croesus, for he seems to have been influenced by them. The Persian commoner has found in the Sacian a loyal, trustworthy treasurer of the kind Cyrus acquires by means of his generous gifts. In essence, neither Cyrus nor Pheraulas actually parts with his wealth: they simply hand it over to reliable caretakers for safekeeping, but not for ownership. Although we are specifically told that gratitude and acknowledgement of favours are qualities that Pheraulas values highly (8.3.49), he does not seem to expect anything in return from the Sacian other than leisure to devote himself to his own concerns. Cyrus, on the other hand, expects (and receives) good will and friendship, security and a good name

( εὔνοιαν... καὶ φιλίαν... ἀσφάλειαν καὶ εὔκλειαν 8.2.22) in return for his contributions. Throughout the Cyr. we hear of Cyrus' gift-giving - interestingly Pheraulas describes him early on as someone who is more pleased to give than to have (2.3.12) - but the mention of Cyrus' benefactions is almost always coupled with a description of the advantages he obtains through these gifts (cf. 1.3.6-7; 1.4.10, 26; 1.6.3-4; 2.4.9-11; 5.1.1, 28-29; 5.3.2; 8.2.7 ff. and compare 5.4.32; 5.5.26). Thus while both parties to transfers of these type seem to benefit, it is perhaps the original owner who derives the greater advantage from the arrangement. In the Mem. there are two depictions of relationships akin to that of owner and caretaker. One, that between Crito and his "watchdog" Archedemus (Mem. 2.9.1-8), seems to be of equal satisfaction to both sides, as with Pheraulas and the Sacian, but the other (Mem. 2.3.1-6) presents a more negative view of the caretaker's role. Eutherus, when urged by Socrates to earn his living by acting as a steward to another man's estate, objects to the bondage (δουλείαν 2.8.4) and accountability to another ( τὸ ὑπαίτιον εἶναι 2.8.5) that go with the job.

In our dialogue, Xenophon emphasizes that both partners are happy with the arrangement and uses many (apparently interchangeable) expressions meaning happiness, joy or good fortune in this conversation - cf. ὦ μακάριε σύ (Cyr. 8.3.39), εὐφραίνῃ (8.3.42); εὐδαιμονία (8.3.44, 45) and εὐδαίμων (8.3.46, 48); μακαριώτατος (8.3.48); ὑπερήδετο (8.3.50). Nonetheless Pheraulas' point of view is given greater prominence here for he speaks at much greater length and allows us a glimpse of his thoughts at the close of the dialogue. It is perhaps not insignificant that as a result of their agreement the Sacian is termed εὐδαίμων, but Pheraulas is μακαριώτατος (8.3.48) - the more (or most) fortunate. The Sacian, who is freed from other duties and stays at home tending Pheraulas' fortune, is somewhat like Croesus' wife, who, as her envious husband notes,

leads a most blissful life (μακαριωτάτην βιοτήν), sharing in all of Croesus' wealth and luxuries with no part in the wars, battles and efforts to acquire further riches (7.2.27-28). The Sacian's role is, however, more challenging than that of the Lydian queen for, besides the passive, woman-like function of waiting for Pheraulas to bring home more wealth, it includes the more active task of managing the Persian's estate.

It should be noted that the fact that Pheraulas already has in Babylon a great household including a richly-furnished home, many servants and great herds of livestock - all of which must be carefully tended and managed - is perhaps slightly premature. Babylon has only recently been captured, Cyrus has just been inaugurated as king and although we hear of Cyrus distributing houses and servants to his friends (cf. 7.5.35-36, 56; 8.3.34), there has scarcely been enough time for Pheraulas to turn into a harrassed estate-owner. In other words, Pheraulas' burdens as a rich man are, at this stage at least, contrived, probably because Xenophon was eager to include a full-fledged discussion of poverty and wealth in the Cyr. This is the longest conversation in the Cyr. in which Cyrus has no part (and there are very few such dialogues) and this again may be an indication of Xenophon's interest in the subject of our dialogue. Clearly Cyrus could not take over Pheraulas' role here, for although, as we have seen, the Persian leader is firmly opposed to hoarding wealth and frequently shares out his good fortune, having Cyrus actually reject riches in the straightforward way Pheraulas does would be unconvincing. Pheraulas, a Persian commoner who has tasted both poverty and wealth, is Xenophon's choice of spokesman and the passage concludes with a description of his character and thoughts.

Pheraulas has, Xenophon tells us, a friendly, loyal nature (ὁ τρόπος φιλέταιρος) and likes nothing better than being useful to his fellow-men. He

finds men far superior to other creatures for man is most gracious (εὐχαριστότατον) and is eager to return any praise, favours or affection he receives. Human beings' superiority to animals is especially apparent in their loving devotion to their parents; other creatures are more thankless and unfeeling. Hence, concludes Xenophon, Pheraulas is thrilled with the opportunity the Sacian now gives him to attend to his friends and ignore his possessions, while the Sacian delights in managing the Persian's ever-increasing fortune. The two continue so for the rest of their days, in mutual contentment (Cyr. 8.3.49-50).

Pheraulas seems to practise what he preaches for he possesses many of the qualities he admires most in men. We already know for example of the commoner's filial devotion, for he tells the Sacian how after being cared for by his father as a child, he supported him in return (ἐμὲ γάρ τοι ὁ πατὴρ... τρέφων ἐπαίδευεν... ἔνθα δὴ ἐγὼ ἀντέτρεφον ἐκεῖνον 8.3.37-38; contrast the behaviour of Lamprocles , Socrates' son in Mem. 2.2). From his very first appearance Pheraulas is described as pleasing (ἀρεστὸς ἀνήρ 2.3.7) and Cyrus chooses him to organize the inaugural procession partly because he knows that the commoner is anxious to gratify him ( τοῦ χαρίζεσθαι αὐτῷ οὐκ ἀμελῆ 8.3.5). This theme of gratitude - a favourite one of Xenophon's (cf. Cyr. 1.4.26; 4.1.20; 4.5.32 etc.; Mem. 2.1.28; 2.2.1 ff. etc.) - comes up elsewhere in conjunction with Pheraulas. When Cyrus appoints him stage-manager of the inaugural procession Pheraulas must give orders even to the leading Persian officers and this, naturally enough, arouses their resentment. Pheraulas (who perhaps is following Cyrus' advice here - cf. the ambiguous οὕτω διαδοὺς ἢ ἐτάχθη Cyr. 8.3.8), cleverly overcomes this obstacle by seemingly doing each of the officers a favour: when distributing new mantles for the procession, he allows each leading Persian to choose the "better" of two garments, and

thus incurs his gratitude (8.3.6-8). The Persians of the Cyr. are instructed from their earliest youth to reciprocate favours and beware ingratitude (cf. 1.2.7)[79] and this is a lesson that Pheraulas, who only attended school as a boy, has absorbed well. We have already seen (above, p. 218) that a certain gruff irony is characteristic of Pheraulas and comes to play in all three of his appearances in the Cyr. (cf. 2.3.13; 8.3.7, 38), and his likening of carrying weapons to bearing wings (2.3.14) along with his brief reply to the Sacian's question as to whether he was wounded (8.3.31) should also be noted in this context. Another habit the commoner has is comparing men to animals - either to point out the difference in their natures (8.3.49) or the similarity (2.3.9). In other words, Pheraulas is given a certain voice and character of his own in the Cyr. and is not a wooden figure introduced by Xenophon to illustrate a certain viewpoint or type; the same cannot be said of his new partner, the unnamed Sacian.

Before leaving Cyr. 8.3.35-50, it remains to be seen how symposium-like the dialogue is. Unlike the other symposia in the Cyr., this party has only two participants[80] and their conversation is in many ways a "Socratic" one. Nonetheless many of our sympotic themes are found in this after-dinner conversation. The setting of the party, Pheraulas' well-furnished house, is described, providing a physical backdrop and the thoughts of the symposiasts are also narrated so that there is a dramatic background. Pheraulas first presents the Sacian with drinking-cups and then with the control of his entire estate, so that gifts are presented on a grand scale. Almost the whole of the conversation between the Sacian and the Persian is concerned with one of our sympotic motifs - poverty and riches - and Pheraulas is very much the didactic figure here. There are some traces of σπουδαιογέλοιον in Pheraulas' mock praise of his"just" land and in the Sacian's initial, incredulous reaction to

his host's perfectly serious offer (παίζεις, ἔφη ὁ Σάκας. καὶ ὁ Φεραύλας ὀμόσας εἶπεν ἢ μὴν σπουδῇ λέγειν 8.3.47). The other three themes - competition, matchmaking and homosexual love - are not found in this dialogue, for although we are told that the two partners regard one another with great affection (ἐφίλει δὲ ὁ μὲν Σάκας τὸν Φεραύλαν... ὁ δὲ τὸν Σάκαν 8.3.50), clearly theirs is not a homosexual relationship. The dialogue is, then, a sympotic one; the relationship between the Persian commoner and the Sacian is an unusual and somewhat puzzling one.

Cyr. 8.4.1-27

We return now to Cyr. 8.4.1-27, the sympotic dialogue with which this chapter began. The discussion held at Cyrus' party celebrating his victory in the horse-races, has already been summarized and we have seen how all eight of the characteristic sympotic motifs appear there (above, pp. 160-164); it remains now to comment on several interesting features of the conversation.

When Gobryas tells Cyrus (à propos his distribution of food to friends, both present and absent) that he now thinks that the Persian's outstanding characteristic is his generosity and not his military expertise, and Cyrus responds that indeed he prefers the good deeds of philanthropy to the harmful acts of a military commander (8.4.6-8), both seem to be speaking out of character or inconsistently. We have already seen (above, p. 186) that the distribution of foodstuffs from the leader's table was, in fact, the normal Persian method of feeding (and paying) subordinates, so that Cyrus is not really being generous here. Gobryas has, in the past, admired Cyrus' character, his attempts (along with his Persian followers) to be as good as possible (ὡς βέλτιστοι ἔσεσθε 5.2.20) rather than to acquire as much as possible, and it is clear from the context of his remarks (5.2.16 ff.; cf. 5.3.3) that Cyrus' "goodness"

is in the moral sphere as much as the military one. In other words, Gobryas has from the very start admired Cyrus' nobility of character and does not begin to do so now. Cyrus, on the other hand, has not objected to the deeds of war in the past and has often emphasized that victory over the enemy is the greatest good, the chief source of happiness in life (τὸ δὲ πάντων μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον 5.5.24; cf. 4.2.26; 6.1.55; 7.1.10, 13; 7.3.11; 7.5.79 etc.) and his remarks here (reminiscent of Agesilaus' words at Hell. 4.1.10) are something of an about-face. φιλανθρωπία is a quality often associated with Cyrus in the Cyr. (cf. 1.2.1; 1.4.1; 4.2.10; 8.2.1) but his preference of φιλανθρωπία over στρατηγία is new and not altogether convincing: earlier he has told his allies that it is far from wrong (οὔκουν ἀδικίᾳ ) to conquer and plunder hostile forces, while allowing the enemy to possess anything at all is an act of generosity (φιλανθρωπίᾳ 7.5.73).

Hystaspas' interrogation of Cyrus as to why Chrysantas has been seated in a more honoured position (8.4.9-12) is reminiscent at first of a Socratic or forensic cross-examination, with its series of short, sharp "yes or no" questions, but it is Cyrus who has the last word and Hystaspas who is put in his place. Hysataspas prefaces his questions with a request for permission to speak his mind freely and Cyrus replies that he will be displeased only if Hystaspas keeps silent when he has something he would like to say. Later, when Cyrus explains to Hystaspas why Chrysantas is considered the worthier of the two, he, in turn, is afraid that the truth may hurt Hystaspas' feelings ( σὺ αὖ οὐκ ἀχθέσῃ μοι ἀκούων τἀληθῆ; 8.4.10). This issue of speaking freely and truthfully arises yet a third time soon afterwards (8.4.13) when the hesitant Gobryas is urged by Cyrus to reply honestly to a question of his. It is, of course, natural for a speaker to hesitate before saying something that is not likely to please his listener (cf. e.g. Pharnabazus and

Agesilaus at Hell. 4.1.37 and Demaratus and Xerxes at Hdt. 7.101.3), but of the three reluctant speakers here, it is only Cyrus who says anything which could be considered painful or disagreeable to his audience. Perhaps Hystaspas and Gobryas now hesitate to speak openly in front of Cyrus because of his new position as master of a great empire: the old free-and-easy relationship between Cyrus and his allies has changed. Truth in the end does prevail at Cyrus' party (ψεύδους γε οὐδεμία ἐρώτησις δεῖται 8.4.13), perhaps because it is, as we have seen, a quality much appreciated by the Persians.

Cyrus tells Hystaspas that he values Chrysantas because he not only obeys every order but actually anticipates Cyrus' wishes and is more concerned for Cyrus' welfare than his own. Often Chrysantas serves as an enthusiastic "seconder" of new proposals put forward by Cyrus - e.g. to establish a Persian cavalry (4.3.3-21), to divide booty according to merit (2.3.2-6) and to live in Babylon in accordance with the customs and practices established in Persia (7.5.71 ff.) - but he also initiates several moves on his own. Thus he suggests that Cyrus move into the royal Babylonian palace (7.5.55-56), recommmends that the Persian nobles attend Cyrus at his court in Babylon (8.1.1-5)and raises the question of distribution of spoils in the first place (2.2.17-21). In his most machiavellian address (6.2.21-22), spoken to an assembly badly frightened by reports of enemy strength before the final offensive against Babylon, Chrysantas, under the guise of explaining to Cyrus the soldiers' true feelings, makes pointed references to the rich and varied plunder to be had and thus calms the soldiers by appealing to their sense of greed. In our dialogue Cyrus points out to Hystaspas that Chrysantas sometimes puts forward Cyrus' views and proposals as if they were his own, when it is inconvenient for the Persian leader to express himself directly (8.4.11). This admission casts an interesting, almost sinister light on Chrysantas' acts of initiative. Who originally thought

of having Cyrus move into the Babylonian royal palace? Whose idea was it to have the Persian nobles attend Cyrus' court? Chrysantas may have been no more than Cyrus' agent, generating "spontaneous" enthusiasm for plans conceived by the Persian leader. If that is the case, the two men clearly must work in close collusion and Hystaspas, an outsider to plots of this kind, does not stand a chance of replacing Chrysantas in Cyrus' affections; neither does Artabazus, as we shall see below.

Hystaspas professes himself delighted with the results of his questioning, but the oath he uses (νὴ τὴν Ἥραν 8.4.12) can be ironic and sometimes serves to express feigned admiration (cf. e.g. Mem. 3.11.5; 4.2.9; 4.4.8; Symp. 4.54; versus Symp. 8.12; 9.1; Mem. 3.10.9 etc.).[81] So too his question on the best way to express his joy at Cyrus' successes sounds sarcastic: Hystaspas does not seem firmly convinced that Chrysantas is indeed the better man and not simply the better flatterer.

When Cyrus now reminds Gobryas of his earlier attempt to find a husband for his daughter (at another symposium - 5.2.7 ff.; cf. above, pp. 202-205 ), the Assyrian admits that he is happier now at the thought of having one of Cyrus' men as a son-in-law. At the earlier gathering, Gobryas admired the Persians' efforts to excell and thought them superior to the acquisitive Assyrians (5.2.20). Now, according to Gobryas, the Persians surpass even their old, austere selves for after having cheerfully borne adversity, they now succeed in an even more rigourous test of character - living with success and prosperity. Gobryas' final maxim (ῥῆμα) - τὰ μὲν [sc.ἀγαθὰ ] γὰρ ὕβριν τοῖς πολλοῖς, τὰ δὲ [sc. κακὰ ] σωφροσύνην τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐμποιεῖ (8.4.14) - impresses Cyrus and Hystaspas a great deal but the idea is far from novel. We have already encountered the claim that punishment or hardship brings a person to his

senses and causes him to be σώφρων several times in the Cyr. (cf. Aglaitadas at 2.2.14 and Tigranes at 3.1.16 ff.), while the view that hybris is the besetting sin of the rich is a commonplace (cf. e.g. Solon fr. 6 (West); Theognis 153-154 etc.).[82] Gobryas perhaps hints that the thought is not his own when he refers to a written collection of such statements that he has (πολλά γέ μοί ἐστι τοιαῦτα συγγεγραμμένα 8.4.16). This collection will be part of his daughter's dowry, and is a great attraction, in Hystaspas' eyes at any rate, since he now considers becoming a suitor of Gobryas' daughter (τῆς θυγατρὸς μνηστῆρα 8.4.15).[83] Presumably Gobryas has gathered together an anthology of the sayings of wise men, something akin to the collections of Socrates (τοὺς θησαυροὺς τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν, οὓς ἐκεῖνοι κατέλιπον ἐν βιβλίοις γράψαντες Mem. 1.6.14; cf. 1.2.56) and Euthydemus (γράμματα πολλὰ... ποιητῶν τε καὶ σοφιστῶν τῶν εὐδοκιμωτάτων Mem. 4.2.1; cf. 4.2.8-9). Such ἐκλογαί may well have been popular in Xenophon's day (cf. Isoc. ad Nic. 44), but it is unexpected, even incongruous to find the Assyrian, wise though he may be, sifting through others' writings and carefully writing down their maxims. Hystaspas' eagerness to acquire these writings, rather than Gobryas' gold cups, does him credit and reminds us of Euthydemus, who is praised by Socrates for choosing wisdom over treasures of silver and gold (Mem. 4.2.9). Despite his extensive collection of γνῶμαι Euthydemus still has much to learn; perhaps the same is true of Hystaspas (and Gobryas). Socrates of the Mem., at any rate, has an ambivalent attitude towards such collections - on the one hand, he has, as we just have seen, his own selection of the writings of wise men (Mem. 1.6.14), but he seems to view Euthydemus' pride in his collection as a challenge and added incentive to show the youngster how little he really knows (Mem. 4.2.1, 8-9). Are we meant to think that Gobryas' treasure-trove of writings is as valuable as Hystaspas finds it?

Cyrus now offers his services as a matchmaker; he professes to be an expert in the art (δεινός εἰμι ταύτην τὴν τέχνην Cyr. 8.4.18) and knows what kind of match would suit each of his friends (ὁποῖος ἂν γάμος ἑκάστῳ συναρμόσειε 8.4.19). He first playfully demonstrates what sort of wife Chrysantas needs and then actually arranges a match between Hystaspas and Gobryas' daughter. This is the first we hear of Cyrus' somewhat unexpected talent and he reminds us of several other expert matchmakers and alliance-arrangers in Xenophon. Agesilaus in the Hellenica (4.1.4-15) arranges a marriage between the daughter of Spithridates, a noble but poor Persian exile, and Otys, king of the Paphlagonians, using his considerable powers of persuasion and deviousness.[84] While Cyrus' dealings with Hystaspas and Gobryas are more straightforward than Agesilaus' handling of Spithridates and Otys, both the Persian ruler and the Spartan one arrange an unequal alliance between a rich man and a poor one - an alliance which should have its uses for they themselves - and have the two men pledge the betrothal in their presence.

Cyrus' espousal of the art of matchmaking at a symposium also calls to mind Socrates' surprising claim in Xenophon's Symp. that the skill he most prides himself on is that of procurer (ἐπὶ μαστροπείᾳ Symp. 3.10; cf. 4.56-64). A procurer, Socrates explains to his fellow-symposiasts, must try to make his clients as pleasing as possible in looks, dress, expression, voice and speech. A good procurer will be able to make his client agreeable to a great many people and the best procurer of all (παντελῶς... ἀγαθὸς μαστροπός Symp. 4.60) is capable of attracting an entire city to his protégé. Socrates then goes on to say that his fellow guest Antisthenes is such a μαστροπός (thus unexpectedly transferring his own speciality, as it were, to another) and adds that Antisthenes has also perfected the art that follows upon procuring - pandering (τὴν προαγωγείαν). He hastens to explain to the indignant Antisthenes that a

good pander is someone who matches people who can benefit one another and causes them to desire one another's company. So, for example, Antisthenes has brought together the needy sophist Prodicus and the rich, wisdom-seeking Callias and has also introduced Socrates to various visitors to Athens, after arousing his interest in them (Symp. 4.56-64). There is a certain similarity between Antisthenes' pairing of Prodicus and Callias, who have complementary needs and qualities and Cyrus' joking suggestion that Chrysantas, who has a hooked nose and convex stomach would be well-matched (ἄριστ' ἂν προσαρμόσειε Cyr. 8.4.21) to a wife with a snub nose and concave stomach; both the Athenian and the Persian believe in pairing people who complement one another in various ways. Antisthenes' προαγωγεία includes, of course, a much wider field than Cyrus' matchmaking, but Socrates specifically includes the arrangement of suitable marriages (γάμους ἐπιτηδείους συνάγειν Symp. 4.64) as one of the good pander's activities.[85]

In the Symp. Socrates claims rather suddenly, that it is Antisthenes, rather than he himself, who is a good μαστροπός;[86] in the Mem. where the question of developing and encouraging relationships between people arises again, he tells Critoboulus that he has learned about matchmaking from Aspasia (Mem. 2.6.28-39; see especially 36). Socrates has offered to help Critoboulus attract potential friends, for he is not without experience in these matters (2.6.29). He will praise Critoboulus to those he wishes to become friendly with, saying that Critoboulus is a loyal, affectionate and caring friend, but only if this is indeed true. Aspasia (cf. Oec. 3.14) has taught Socrates that good matchmakers (τὰς ἀγαθὰς προμνηστρίδας) are able to arrange successful marriages by giving true reports of people's good qualities, but they refuse to praise people falsely, for this leads to the couples hating one another, as well as the matchmaker. Hence Socrates will not praise Critoboulus falsely

to acquaintances, but will help him by persuading him to become good and truly praiseworthy. In other words, according to Socrates, Critoboulus' desire for love (or friendship) should lead to an effort on his part to become better (πειρᾶσθαί σε ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα γενέσθαι 2.6.37). This passage of the Mem., in which Aspasia, matchmaking, ways to please another and a call to ἀρετή are all featured closely together, brings to mind the story of Aspasia's attempt to reconcile Xenophon[87] and his wife, found in Aeschines' Aspasia (fr. 31 D. = Cicero, de Inv. 1.31.51-52). There, Aspasia uses (as Cicero notes) the very Socratic method of having her interlocutors first respond to questions about simple, but analogous cases and then applying their answers to their own situation. She demonstrates to Xenophon and his wife that if their marriage is to be a happy one and they are to satisfy one another, each must try to be the best spouse possible. In his dialogue Aspasia, then, Aeschines apparently showed, using the example of Aspasia, how ἔρως could (and should) lead to (political) ἀρετή (cf. above, p. 200 ) and this may well have influenced Socrates' words to Critoboulus at Mem. 2.6.28 ff.[88] In his talk of pairing, procuring and pandering in the Symp. Socrates again touches upon this point. We have already noted Socrates' claim that the most successful procurer can make his client beloved of an entire city (Symp. 4.60), i.e. turn him into a political leader by improving him. Later, after hearing the ἐρωτικὸς λόγος addressed to him, Callias understands that this is precisely what Socrates is trying to do to him with his talk of love - "seduce" Callias into political activity (οὐκοῦν σύ με, ὦ Σώκρατες, μαστροπεύσεις πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὅπως πράττω τὰ πολιτικά Symp. 8.42) after he cultivates virtue because of his desire to win Autolycus' love (cf. 8.27).

In sum, Socrates' disreputable calling (ἀδόξῳ οὔσῃ τέχνῃ Symp. 4.56) of pairing various interested parties stems from his desire to improve those he

matches together. (It is worth noting in this context the semi-serious advice Socrates gives to the courtesan Theodote at Mem. 3.11.9 ff.) Socrates wants to surprise, even shock his fellow symposiasts with his profession of μαστροπεία but he also wishes to educate them. Love and sexual union are mentioned by Socrates only to lead to a discussion of beneficial relationships, ἀρετή etc.; this is true, of course, to an even greater extent in Plato's Symp. (and in all likelihood in Aeschines' Aspasia). Cyrus' matchmaking, on the other hand, is down-to-earth and practical. In his comical attempts to find Chrysantas a suitable wife, Cyrus concentrates solely on the latter's physical appearance, while in the match he arranges between Hystaspas and Gobryas' daughter (Cyr. 8.4.24-26), he is chiefly concerned with the property settlement (and the potentially useful political alliance). Thus in our symposium in the Cyr., Cyrus' matchmaking has, no doubt, Socrates' expertise as a procurer as its literary forbearer, but the theme of matchmaking and love is "lowered" here, so that what follows is not an elevated discussion of the spiritual effects of love, but a joking attempt to find a woman who complements Chrysantas physically and the arrangement of a pragmatic and convenient marriage: Cyrus as a matchmaker betrays the influence of both Socrates and Agesilaus.

When Cyrus demonstrates what kind of woman is a suitable female counterpart to Chrysantas his reasoning, while playful, is also practical, even functional. Chrysantas, being short, needs a short wife or else he will have to jump up to kiss her and since his nose is hooked (γρυπός) and his stomach curves out, his spouse should have a concave stomach and a snub nose (σιμή) if they are to be well-paired. Such a functional approach towards a person's physical appearance, concentrating on utility rather than esthetics, is reminiscent of Socrates' attitude in his light-hearted "beauty contest" with Critoboulus in the Symp. (5.1-10). There Socrates points out, feature by

feature, how his prominent eyes, flat nose (cf. the discussion of noses in the Cyr.) and thick lips are better adapted to their natural function of seeing, smelling etc. than Critoboulus' classical, handsome features. Beauty, Critoboulus readily agrees, is found in anything that is well constructed or well-endowed to serve its function, and by these standards Socrates is, he concedes, more beautiful. The competition between Critoboulus and Socrates, like Cyrus' attempt to find Chrysantas a suitable wife, is, of course, frivolous but both make use of a serious yardstick - utilitarianism. In the Mem. Socrates again discusses beauty in terms of fitness for function (Mem. 3.8.4-7; 4.6.9; cf. the "teleological" argument at 1.4.6), and there he is in earnest.

Chrysantas' joking question about the most suitable wife for a frigid king ( ψυχρῷ...βασιλεῖ ) is, apparently, a play upon the literal and figurative meanings of the word ψυχρός: Cyrus' humourous attempts at matchmaking are, Chrysantas implies, somewhat insipid and feeble; as a frigid or physically cold ( ψυχρός ) king, he then needs according to Cyrus' own idea of matching opposites, a θερμή i.e. warm (or perhaps warm-blooded) wife.[89] The comment by Hystaspas that he envies Cyrus' ability to arouse laughter despite his coolness, continues this word play, but in fact it is his rival Chrysantas whose witticism has just made everyone laugh. Hystaspas too at any rate, would like to be considered urbane ( ἀστεῖος 8.4.23; cf. 2.2.12 and see Aristotle, Rhet. 1410 b 6-7 for a similar link between εὐδοκιμεῖν and ἀστεῖος ).

At the close of his party, Cyrus distributes presents to his guests. Persian rulers were well known for their lavish gift-giving or πολυδωρία (cf. e.g. Cyr. 8.2.7) and favourite presents were robes, gold necklaces and bracelets, horses with golden bridles, drinking cups and swords,[90] or the kind of gifts we find here. (It is quite likely that the γυναικεῖον κόσμον given to Tigranes as a present for his steadfast wife is, as one scholar suggests,[91]

the gold bracelets and necklaces normally presented to Persian men, which are transformed here by Xenophon into a woman's gift because he finds such ornaments effeminate.) We have already seen several instances of gift-giving at symposia (e.g. at Hdt. 6.130; Anab. 7.3.26 ff.) and it is worth looking at other two Persian parties in connection with such presentations. Herodotus (9.110-111) tells us that at his βασιλήιον δεῖπνον Xerxes gives gifts to the Persians. In addition, reluctant though he is, he hands over Masistes' wife to Amestris, because he was compelled to do so by the law (ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἐξεργόμενος 9.111) that no one may be refused a request at the king's royal feast. In the Hellenica (1.5.4-7) we once again find a host granting a petition at a feast, against his better judgement. At first Cyrus the Younger turns down the Spartans' request that he raise the sailors' pay, but he changes his mind over dinner with Lysander. When Cyrus toasts Lysander and asks what he can do to please him ( μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον, ἐπεὶ αὐτῷ προπιὼν ὁ Κῦρος ἤρετο τί ἂν μάλιστα χαρίζοιτο ποιῶν Hell. 1.5.6), the Spartan again asks for a raise in pay and this time Cyrus agrees. A Persian host, it seems, regularly gives presents and fulfills requests at his parties. Perhaps this is why Cyrus does not refuse Artabazus' playful plea for a kiss (Cyr. 8.4.27) but merely puts him off for 30 years.

The short closing scene of our symposium in which Artabazus, a longtime admirer of Cyrus (1.4.27-28; see above, p. 201), is jealous of the kiss Chrysantas has received, and has his advances teasingly rejected by Cyrus, is again reminiscent of a scene in the Symp.: Socrates' playful rejection of his admirer, Antisthenes (Symp. 8.4-6). The exchange in Xenophon's Symp. in which Antisthenes claims to be in love with Socrates, only to have Socrates coyly ( ὡς δὴ θρυπτόμενος 8.4) put him off, may have, in turn, been influenced by Socrates' mock complaints about Alcibiades' jealousy in Plato's Symp. (213 C-D;

note in particular how Socrates' admirer in each case can barely restrain himself from physical violence μόνον μὴ συγκόψῃς με Xen. Symp. 8.6; τῶ χεῖρε μόγις ἀπέχεται Pl. Symp. 213 D).[92] Such brief scenes involving an admirer's semi-serious jealousy combine, in fact, three of our sympotic themes: σπουδαιογέλοιον, competition among the symposiasts and a homosexual love interest. In Socrates' symposium-like dialogue with the courtesan Theodote, there is yet another variation on this type of exchange, when Socrates lightly turns down Theodote's advances, claiming that he is too busy and has many other friends ( φίλαι) too (Mem. 3.11.15-18). Our symposium ends on this light note and Artabazus promises to stay alive for the next 30 years, if only to collect the kiss Cyrus has promised him. The guests then rise and depart.

Cyr. 8.4.1-27, the last of our sympotic dialogues, is the only one of the group to include all eight sympotic themes and it is, in many ways, the most symposium-like. Cyrus' victory party seems closest in feeling to Xenophon's full-fledged Symposium and two specific scenes (i.e. Cyrus' matchmaking efforts and Artabazus' jealousy) seem to have been adapted from that work. So too the ill-humoured Aglaitadas (of Cyr. 2.2.11-16) appears to have been influenced by the silent and sanctimonious Hermogenes (Symp. 6.1-5; see above, p. 195). Thus our group of dialogues in the Cyr. not only share many of the themes and motifs found in Xenophon's Symp. (along with other literary symposia), but also include what seem to be reworkings of, or variations on, specific scenes in the work. While it is notoriously difficult to date Xenophon's works or even arrange them in chronological order, partly because Xenophon often reworks his material, it does seem likely that the Symp. scenes and not the Cyr. ones came first. The three scenes in the Symp. (Socrates' disapproval of Hermogenes' silence, the beauty contest between Socrates and Critoboulus, and Antisthenes' jealous passion for Socrates) are, by and large, well motivated, fully elaborated

and skilfully integrated into the work as a whole. So too the episodes in the Symp. are based on the characters of the party's participants, and their personalities are an important feature of the work. The analogous scenes found in the Cyr. are, on the other hand, more compressed and (especially in the case of the otherwise unknown Aglaitadas) less closely related to the symposiasts' qualities and character.

Summing up the group of sympotic dialogues of the Cyr. as a whole, it can be seen that, as with the Socratic dialogues discussed in Chapter II, they are not pure examples of the genre. All, to be sure, take place over dinner and all contain several themes that we have come to recognize as characteristic of symposia, but they incorporate other influences as well. Thus Persian customs and practices (at parties and elsewhere) are featured prominently in these dialogues, and other topics, having little to do with banquets, also arise. Xenophon, while casting these conversations in a sympotic mould, uses their framework flexibly and introduces extra, non-sympotic material to suit his purposes.

# Chapter IV

## The Novelle of the Cyr.: Croesus, Panthea, Gobryas and Gadatas

The colourful, romantic episodes of the Cyr. - the stories of Croesus, Panthea, Gobryas and Gadatas - are the subject of this chapter. These dramatic tales, often referred to as the novelle of the Cyr.,[1] are presented by Xenophon to the reader largely, but not exclusively, by means of dialogues. Each one of these four tales is related in a series of episodes, rather than as one continuous tale, and each includes several conversations. It is difficult to single out any one specific dialogue as a "typically" novellistic one, and so, in order to characterize this group of dialogues, I shall summarize each one of the four stories. After noting some common features of the group as a whole I shall attempt to trace earlier works which may have influenced Xenophon in the telling of these tales. The final part of the chapter will be a commentary on the individual "novellistic" dialogues of the Cyr.

Three of the four novelle of the Cyr. centre around "Assyrians", i.e. Babylonians,[2] who for one reason or another have joined Cyrus in his military campaign against their former king. (Croesus, the subject of the fourth tale, is of course a Lydian and an ally of the Assyrian king.) Panthea, the fairest woman in Asia, is the key figure in the longest and most famous story of the Cyr. We first hear of her when we are told that the lady of Susa (τὴν Σουσίδα γυναῖκα) is included in the booty set aside for Cyrus, after his first victory over the Assyrians (Cyr. 4.6.11). A fuller description of Panthea's background, circumstances and appearance comes almost immediately afterwards, when Cyrus asks Araspas, his childhood friend from Media, to guard Panthea for him (5.1.2 ff.). Part of this background information is provided by Xenophon in his introduction to the dialogue between Cyrus and Araspas (5.1.2-3) and the rest is found in their actual conversation, when the excited Mede dwells upon Panthea's

loveliness (5.1.4-7). Araspas' enthusiastic report only convinces Cyrus that it would be better for him to avoid seeing the lovely Panthea, for he is afraid of being ensnared by her charms to the detriment of his duties. Cyrus' fears lead to a debate between the two on whether or not a good man can fall in love against his will (5.1.8-17). Subsequently, Araspas, who is firmly convinced that such a thing could never happen to him, becomes enamoured of Panthea. We next hear of Panthea and her admirer in Book 6. Araspas, Xenophon tells us, has tried to win Panthea over with words and when these fail, he then threatens to use force. The alarmed Panthea sends her eunuch to tell Cyrus of Araspas' threats and Cyrus, who is amused by Araspas' downfall, has Artabazus instruct the young Mede that Panthea is only to be persuaded by words and is not to be forced to act against her wishes. Artabazus, we are told, reproaches Araspas harshly and the latter is ashamed and afraid of Cyrus' reaction (6.1.31-35). Araspas' predicament leads Cyrus to think that the Mede would make an excellent candidate to spy on the enemy. He invites Araspas to a private tête-à-tête and reassures the Mede that he forgives him for his all-too-human indiscretions. Cyrus asks Araspas to pretend to defect to the enemy, using his supposed fear of Cyrus' wrath as an excuse and the Mede readily agrees. After further discussions of the pitfalls of love and the best way to confound the enemy, the two part (6.1.36-44).

After Araspas departs, Panthea sends word to Cyrus, offering to ask her husband Abradatas to join Cyrus with his forces. Cyrus agrees and Abradatas is summoned (6.1.45-46). Upon his arrival Abradatas is immediately re-united with Panthea. After an initial embrace the two turn at once to a discussion of Cyrus' kindness (6.1.46-47). Abradatas then meets Cyrus, pledges his allegiance to the Persian (6.1.48-49) and readies his chariots and cavalry for the forthcoming battle (6.1.50-51). As both sides finish their preparations for the fight and plan their tactics, Araspas returns with a first-hand report of the enemy's

numbers and their battle plan. Cyrus embraces the Mede upon his return and explains to the surprised onlookers that Araspas did not depart in disgrace but was sent by him secretly to spy on the enemy. He then questions Araspas closely about the enemy's arrangements (6.3.14-21). Cyrus subsequently arranges his own forces in accordance with what he has learned of the enemy's tactics and Abradatas, Panthea's husband, is allotted the most dangerous battle position after volunteering for it (6.3.35-37).

We next encounter Panthea and Abradatas as the latter is dressing for battle. Panthea presents Abradatas with gold armour that she has secretly fashioned from her own jewellery. She bids Abradatas to be brave and reminds him of her love for him and of Cyrus' kindness to them both. Abradatas prays to be worthy both of Panthea and Cyrus and then enters his chariot. Panthea, reluctant to be parted from her husband, follows the chariot until Abradatas insists that she turn back. Her servants conduct her to her carriage and it is only after she departs, Xenophon remarks, that the onlookers have eyes for Abradatas, adorned as he is (6.4.2-11).

Abradatas takes up his assigned position in the battle array and is encouraged and exhorted by Cyrus, who is making a final tour of inspection of his forces (7.1.15-18). When the contest with the Assyrians and their allies begins, Abradatas and his men charge the Egyptian phalanx and are killed after fighting valiantly (7.1.29-32). It is only some time after the battle has ended that Cyrus learns of his ally's death. A servant tells him of Abradatas' courageous stand and adds that Panthea and her attendants are now arranging the burial (7.3.2-7). Cyrus rushes to the graveside and finds Panthea seated on the ground, clutching her husband's corpse, which has been badly mutilated. The Persian eulogizes Abradatas and tries to comfort his widow but she reproaches herself for sending her husband to his death. Cyrus presents Panthea with ornaments for

Abradatas (and animals to be sacrificed at the graveside) and promises Panthea that she will be escorted to wherever she chooses (7.3.8-13). After his departure, the lady of Susa orders the eunuchs accompanying her to withdraw and instructs her nurse, who has remained at her side, that she is to be wrapped in the same shroud as her husband, after she dies. The nurse tries to dissuade Panthea from suicide, but her mistress stabs herself with a dagger and dies upon her husband's breast. Three eunuchs who have witnessed Panthea's act then kill themselves as well. A horrified Cyrus returns to the scene and arranges for a huge monument to be erected over their grave (7.3.14-16).

This, then, is the story of Panthea - the one bit of Xenophon's writings, which more than any other, led later Greek novelists to adopt the name "Xenophon".[3] Ignoring for the moment the content and sources of this romantic tale, I shall concentrate on several formal aspects of the novella. First of all, it should be noted that the story is presented in several installments, as a series of episodes scattered over Books 5, 6 and 7 of the Cyr. All these episodes are carefully integrated into the main action of the Cyr. (i.e. Cyrus' preparations for the second and decisive confrontation with the Assyrians, the battle itself and its aftermath). Araspas, Panthea's love-stricked guardian who is sent by Cyrus to spy upon the enemy because he makes a most plausible defector, is perhaps the best demonstration of the strong links between the "inner" workings of the novella and the "outer" plot of the Cyr. A second feature worth observing is that the story of Panthea is told by and large through dialogues. Some of the dialogues provide background information (e.g. 5.1.4-7: Araspas' initial description of the beautiful, tearful Panthea) and others are part of the unfolding novella (e.g. 6.4.2-11: Abradatas' farewell to Panthea). While some parts of the story are related by Xenophon outside of the dialogues, these narrated bits are almost always found in the immediate vicinity of one of the

novella's dialogues: they serve as an introduction to a conversation (5.1.2-3; 6.1.31-35), are sandwiched in between two conversations (6.1.46; 7.3.6-7) or appear at the conclusion of a dialogue (5.1.18; 6.1.50-51; 7.3.15-16). The only exception to this rule is the narration of Abradatas' death on the battle-field (7.1.29-32), which is given as part of Xenophon's running description of the fight with the Assyrians at Thymbrara, and it is interesting to note that Abradatas' end is described again, briefly, in a dialogue (7.3.3).

A third characteristic of the Panthea novella is the brevity or economy with which the tale is told. The author of the Cyr. does not overly-embroider or draw out his story even though there are many incidents which could have been more fully elaborated, such as Araspas' efforts to seduce Panthea (6.1.31, 33), Artabazus' reproachful speech to Araspas (6.1.35) or the nurse's attempt to dissuade Panthea from killing herself (7.3.14). In this novella Xenophon does not wring every last drop of pathos from his tale.

A fourth and final point to be noted (and this will be seen in more detail in the running commentary below), is that Xenophon's language here is, at times, poetic or tragic and the diction is grander than the usual style of the Cyr., because of the emotional qualities of the story.

Our next two novelle, the stories of the two Assyrian nobles, Gobryas and Gadatas, who go over to Cyrus' side, are closely related. Both men become allies of Cyrus and play an active role in the conquest and consolidation of Cyrus' empire, and hence both appear fairly frequently in the pages of the Cyr. Here I shall look at the novellistic part of their story, i.e. the account of each one's relationship with the young Assyrian king.

Gobryas, an elderly Assyrian noble, approaches Cyrus after the Assyrians' first defeat at the hands of the Persians and Medes (4.6.1 ff. - cf. above, pp. 202 ff.). Gobryas explains to Cyrus that he was a loyal and highly respected

subject of the Assyrian king, who was killed in the recent clash (cf. 4.1.8). Their children were even to have been married. However, adds Gobryas, the new Assyrian king, the former ruler's son and successor, is his sworn enemy, for he has murdered Gobryas' only son. His motive for killing Gobryas' son was jealousy: when the two young men were hunting together, Gobryas' son twice managed to hit and kill animals that the Assyrian prince had tried to down. Gobryas tells Cyrus that he has lost all interest in life since his son died and consequently will do everthing in his power to aid the Persian in his campaign against the Assyrians, if Cyrus will help him avenge the death of his son. In addition, Gobryas promises Cyrus his daughter, who was originally intended to be the bride of the young Assyrian king. Cyrus accepts Gobryas' offer of an alliance and the two arrange to meet at Gobryas' fortress (4.6.1-10). At his estate Gobryas again refers to his desire to punish the young Assyrian ruler, when presenting his daughter, a tall, beautiful but grief-stricken young woman, to Cyrus (5.2.7; for the symposium held outside of Gobryas' house, see above, pp.202-213). Shortly afterwards Gobryas actually confronts his arch-enemy, speaking to him (through a messenger) on Cyrus' behalf. The elderly Assyrian urges the young king to come out and do battle with Cyrus' forces, but the ruler simply jeers at Gobryas, saying that while he does not regret having cut down Gobryas' son, he is sorry not to have killed the father as well (5.3.5-7). Later, during the conquest of Babylon, the two Assyrians meet face-to-face one final time: Gobryas, together with his fellow-countryman Gadatas and their men, kill the young king inside his palace (7.5.26-30). After the deed the two Assyrians cry for joy and embrace Cyrus in deep gratitude (7.5.32).

The story of Gobryas' dealings with the young Assyrian king is, like the tale of Panthea, presented in several episodes in more than one book of the Cyr. Here too these installments are carefully woven into the main fabric of the

Cyr. for they explain and motivate the appearance of a powerful Assyrian noble at Cyrus' side. Gobryas' brief exchange with the Assyrian ruler (5.3.5-7), in which he both relays a message from Cyrus and comments on his own personal tragedy, is perhaps the best example of the links between the particular details of Gobryas' story and the overall plot of the Cyr. Most of the Gobryas novella is told through dialogues (4.6.1-10; 5.2.7 ff.; 5.3.5-7), but its finale, the execution of the Assyrian despot is narrated in brief fashion (7.5.26-32). As with the Panthea novella, Xenophon's language is at times unusually poetic and high-flown, but the tale is told with considerable restraint. Several scenes could have been elaborated more fully, with for example, the daughter of Gobryas actually lamenting her dead brother, or Gobryas vilifying the Assyrian king before killing him, but Xenophon avoids excessive pathos.

Our third novella is the story of Gadatas, a young Assyrian noble, who joins Cyrus' forces. We first hear of Gadatas from Gobryas. Cyrus has called in Gobryas (and the Hyrcanian leader) to help him recruit more allies in his campaign against the Assyrians (5.2.23 ff.). The Persian asks Gobryas whether the young Assyrian king has behaved badly to anyone besides himself and Gobryas is reminded of the son of an Assyrian noble even more powerful than himself. This young man, a friend and drinking companion of the Assyrian crown prince, was castrated by the latter because the prince's mistress praised his beauty. Gadatas, adds Gobryas, will be difficult to contact for he lives at the very gates of Babylon, but Cyrus is not deterred (5.2.27-30). After Gobryas' parley with the Assyrian king has failed to induce the despot to confront the Persians, Cyrus again questions Gobryas about Gadatas (5.3.8-14). The Persian leader asks Gobryas to meet with the eunuch and recruit him to their cause. If Gadatas agrees to become their ally, he is to enter the Assyrian fortress located on the Sacian-Hyrcanian border on the pretext that he has learned from Persian captives that

Cyrus intends to attack the stronghold. Once inside the fortress Gadates is to do his utmost within to help Cyrus capture the fortification from the outside (5.3.8-14). Following this conversation Gobryas approaches Gadatas, who agrees to Cyrus' proposal and the fortress is captured according to plan (5.3.15-17). The Persian and the eunuch then meet for the first time. Cyrus, thanking Gadatas for his assistance, promises the unfortunate young noble that his new friends will try to be as helpful towards him as his own children would have been (5.3.18-19). Cyrus' offer is quickly put to the test when Gadatas informs him shortly afterwards that the Assyrian king, angry at his part in capturing the fortress, has now attacked his own land. Cyrus speeds Gadatas on his way home and promises to come with his own forces as quickly as possible (5.3.26-29), and indeed the Persian easily persuades his men that it is in their own interest to aid Gadatas (5.3.29-34). While Gadatas is on the road, one of his men betrays the eunuch's position and numbers to the Assyrian ruler, who then launches a full-scale attack. Gadatas is wounded by the traitor and his forces are about to be defeated when Cyrus comes to the rescue. The Assyrians are quickly put to flight and the traitor killed (5.4.1-9). Cyrus and the wounded Gadatas meet near the latter's home and Gadatas thanks the Persian profusely, saying that his own child could scarcely have been as helpful (5.4.10-14). The next meeting between the two takes place when Cyrus is about to depart. Gadatas presents him with many gifts and reminds Cyrus tearfully that he will have no heir to whom to bequeath his possessions. The Assyrian then points out that he is now in a precarious position, since his estate is so close to the Assyrians he has betrayed. Nonetheless, adds Gadatas, his desire for revenge was stronger than any considerations of safety. Cyrus, concerned, invites the eunuch to join him on his campaign, saying that he can be of great use to the Persians and their allies, and the Assyrian readily complies (5.4.29-40). The final mention of Gadatas in relation

to the Assyrian king is at the conquest of Babylon, where, as we have seen, Gadatas and Gobryas kill the cruel despot in his palace (7.5.26-30).

The Gadatas novella, i.e. the story of the eunuch's treatment at the hands of the Assyrian king, ends with the latter's death, but Gadatas, like Gobryas, appears elsewhere in the Cyr. in his capacity as Cyrus' guide, advisor and household manager (5.4.41-50; 8.4.2 ff. etc.). His tale, like those of Panthea and Gobryas, is closely tied to the main action of the Cyr. - with Gadatas' help in capturing the enemy's fortress and his assassination of the Assyrian ruler serving as the two strongest links to the central plot. Here too the novella is told mainly through dialogues, with straightforward narrative passages usually coming before, in between or after the conversations (cf. 5.3.15-17; 5.4.1-9). However, unlike the adventures of Gobryas and Panthea, the eunuch's story is concentrated, in the main, into a relatively small section of the Cyr. (5.2-4; cf. 7.5.24 ff.). So too, although the novella could have been expanded even further - with, for instance, Xenophon including more details of Gobryas' recruitment of Gadatas (reported only indirectly at 5.3.15) or of the meeting between Gadatas' treacherous officer and the Assyrian ruler (5.4.5) - Gadatas' story, as it stands, is not narrated as concisely and economically as the novelle of Panthea and Gobryas. The eunuch refers to his sorry state several times and Xenophon seems less concerned to avoid any hints of pathos in this tale. As is to be expected, Gadatas' diction is at times high-flown and nearly tragic.

The last of our four tales is that centreing around Croesus. As has already been noted, Croesus is the only non-Assyrian to be the hero of a novella and his story differs from the other three in other respects as well. In the Cyr., Croesus, king of Lydia, is an ally of the Assyrians in their campaign against the Medes from the very start (1.5.3; 2.1.5; 3.3.29) and after the first defeat

of their forces and the death of the old Assyrian king, he is chosen commander-in-chief of all the enemy's soldiers (6.2.9; 6.3.11). Croesus flees after the first Assyrian rout (4.1.8; 4.2.29; cf. 6.2.19) and in the second confrontation between the two armies he is again defeated by Cyrus. Croesus escapes to Sardis, but is soon followed by the Persians and their allies, who take the city by storm. The Lydian king is trapped in his palace and calls for Cyrus but the Persian keeps him waiting, while he first arranges for Chaldean looters to return the plunder they have taken, and then settles his men in their quarters (7.2.5-8). Only then does Cyrus summon Croesus and the Lydian monarch appears on stage, so to speak, for the first time in the Cyr. (7.2.9-29). The conversation between the two, in which Croesus relates much of his past, is the core of the Croesus novella. The downcast king greets Cyrus very humbly but is soon put at his ease by the Persian, who almost immediately asks the Lydian's advice. Cyrus wishes to present his soldiers with some of the riches of Sardis, but to avoid destroying the city by looting. Croesus offers to act as an intermediary and arrange for the Lydians to surrender their wealth peaceably. Cyrus then questions the Lydian about his delegations to Apollo and the Delphic oracle. Croesus relates to Cyrus the history of his dealings with the oracle, beginning with his first presumptuous approach, in which he tested the oracle's veracity. The next response from the oracle, namely that Croesus would indeed have sons, proved a misleading one, for while the Lydian ruler did beget sons, both were treated harshly by fate. Croesus' third question to the oracle also leads to unhappy results, for he was told that he could spend the rest of his life most happily by knowing himself (σαυτὸν γιγνώσκων 7.2.20). The Lydian king tells Cyrus that he did not, in fact, learn to recognize his own capabilities or limitations, for he foolishly considered himself the Persian's equal and twice tried to challenge him on the battlefield. Only now, adds Croesus, has he gained

self-knowledge and he consults Cyrus as to whether happiness is bound to follow. Cyrus does not reply to the question at once, but offers to restore to the captive monarch his wife, daughters, friends, servants and former luxuries, while forbidding him to engage in further military activities. Croesus considers the Persian's offer a guarantee of future happpiness, for he now will be able to live as his wife does, enjoying all the trappings of wealth with no share of the tensions involved in acquiring it. Cyrus, Xenophon tells us, is surprised by Croesus' attitude and arranges to have him as a constant companion either because he considers him too useful or else too dangerous to be left behind.

The next two episodes relating to the Lydian monarch are discussions between Cyrus and Croesus on guarding treasure; these dialogues are not really "novellistic". (As we have seen, the question of the proper disposal of wealth has already arisen in their first conversation.) When Cyrus leaves Sardis for Babylonia and takes many wagon-loads of booty with him, Croesus gives him a written inventory of the contents of each wagon so that the Persian can check that the conveyors deliver all that they carry. Cyrus explains to the Lydian that the goods borne by the men belong to them as well as to himself, so that by stealing they would, in fact, be stealing from themselves. Nonetheless Cyrus does make use of the Lydian's list (7.4.12-13). In the final dialogue between the two (8.2.15-23; see the discussion above, pp.223-225), Croesus suggests to Cyrus that he store his wealth in a treasury, rather than squandering it by distributing so much to his friends. Cyrus then demonstrates to the Lydian that friends make the best and safest treasure-houses. The Persian ruler sends Hystaspas (who is accompanied by a trusted servant of Croesus) round to his friends with a request for funds. Each friend writes down the amount he is willing to contribute, and the sum total, checked by Croesus, proves to be much larger than the amount that the Lydian thought that Cyrus could amass on his own. The

conversation ends with the Persian leader pointing out at length that those who acquire money justly and use it well are happier than those who store up vast amounts of wealth.

In sum, the tale of Croesus, unlike our other three stories, is essentially contained in one dialogue (7.2.9-29), while the other two episodes concerning the Lydian (7.4.12-13; 8.2.15-23) are more didactic than novellistic. The novella itself, i.e. the account of Croesus' activities up to the time of his capture by Cyrus, is presented very succinctly (almost to the point of being unintelligible without reference to Herodotus, cf. below p. 344) and all of the Lydian's past history is narrated in his opening conversation with Cyrus. As with the other novelle, Croesus' story could have been more fully elaborated and here, in fact, Xenophon could have broken up the tale into several dramatic episodes, with e.g. a direct account of Croesus' election as commander-in-chief of the enemy's forces or a discussion between Croesus and a confidante on the meaning of the third oracle etc. Nonetheless, perhaps because in the Cyr. we are never given a glimpse of scenes behind enemy lines (other than at 3.3.43-45), Croesus is not presented to us in the flesh, as it were, until he comes under Cyrus' control. Only then is his story told in fairly restrained and unemotional language. Neither the account of Croesus' earlier history, nor the story of his relationship with Cyrus after the conquest of Sardis, advances the plot of the Cyr. in any real way and Xenophon may have included the Lydian's tale simply because the story of Croesus and his downfall was so well-known in the Greek world that any narrative of Cyrus' conquests would be incomplete without it.

Two other episodes in the Cyr. should be mentioned here, although both are too slight to qualify as full-fledged novelle.[4] The first is the Cyr.'s παιδικὸς λόγος, the story of the Mede Artabazus who becomes enamoured of the young Cyrus who is visiting in Media. When Cyrus, about to return to Persia, kisses his Mede

relatives goodbye, Artabazus too manages to steal several kisses, pretending to be another relative. Artabazus tells Cyrus that he begrudges even the time spent blinking, when he cannot see the handsome Persian (1.4.27-28). This playful incident has more serious consequences for Cyrus later on, for his admirer Artabazus plays a key role in convincing Cyaxares' officers to continue with the campaign against the Assyrians (4.1.19-24), and the Mede is an important ally of Cyrus throughout.

The second story is also a romantic one, involving, in this instance newlyweds. Cyrus has just pardoned the Armenians for transgressing the terms of their treaty with the Medes and all are discussing his beauty, wisdom, kindness etc. Tigranes asks his wife if she too thought Cyrus handsome, and the Armenian woman replies that she had eyes only for the man who promised to give his very soul to save her from servitude, i.e. for Tigranes (3.1.41; cf. 3.1.36). Although we hear of Tigranes' wife, who accompanies her husband throughout the campaign (cf. 3.1.43), only one more time towards the end of the Cyr., when Cyrus presents Tigranes with a gift for her (8.4.24), the depiction of their marital devotion has left its mark upon many readers of the Cyr., both ancient and modern.[5]

These, then, are the novellistic dialogues of the Cyr. Before looking at Xenophon's predecessors in an attempt to see which writers may have influenced him here, it may prove useful to summarize the main characteristics, both of form and content, of our group of dialogues. Beginning with the structure of these tales we find the following features: (1) In general, each novella is composed of several dialogues which are interspersed into wider sections of the Cyr.; the novelle are not self-contained units. (2) The novelle (and their conversations) are an integral part of the overall plot of the Cyr. and often directly contribute to the main action. In other words, the novellistic tales

are not digressions and their heroes may appear elsewhere in the Cyr. in a non-novellistic role. (3) The dialogues form the core of each tale, with related narrative passages generally coming before, in-between or after the conversations, i.e. in close proximity to the dialogues. There is not a single novella in the Cyr. without dialogue. (4) The conversations themselves are of two types: (a) "dramatic" conversations, in which a part of the tale is acted out for the reader (e.g. Abradatas' reunion with Panthea 6.1.47) and (b) "narrative" dialogues, in which a portion of the story is simply related (e.g. the story of Gadatas' misfortune, which is related by Gobryas to Cyrus 5.2.27 ff.). Some dialogues (e.g. Araspas' discussion with Cyrus after his first meeting with Panthea 5.1.2-18) are a combination of the two. (5) The dialogues, though generally written with considerable brevity and restraint, contain several emotional passages, written in poetic language that is more grandiloquent than the usual style of the Cyr.

Turning now to the content of these tales, I shall summarize the main characteristics of each of the more colourful characters[6] involved in these novelle. (The summary will be done in penny thriller or sensational style in order to stress the kind of exotic themes to be traced elsewhere.) We have encountered the following figures:

(1) Panthea - A beautiful and noble woman, taken prisoner of war, who resists her guard's advances and remains loyal to her husband. Once reunited with him, she sends him off to fight at Cyrus' side. He dies bravely on the battlefield and Panthea commits suicide, hugging his mutilated corpse.

(2) Araspas - An impetuous Mede who falls in love with the lovely Panthea against his will and is consequently sent to spy on the enemy.

(3) Gobryas - An elderly Assyrian noble, bent on avenging the death of his only son, who was killed by a prince jealous of his prowess in hunting.

(4) Gadatas - A eunuch who murders the Assyrian ruler who castrated him and becomes Cyrus' loyal attendant.

(5) The young Assyrian king - A cruel, willful despot who kills, maims and harasses his subjects out of jealousy and arrogance.

(6) Croesus - A proud and pampered monarch who, after he is defeated in the battlefield, turns to an effeminate life of ease.

This somewhat sensational summing up of the novellistic characters and themes of the Cyr. is meant to stress just how unusual and colourful these bits of the Cyr. are. This observation naturally leads to the question of Xenophon's sources for these stories. Where does the lovely Panthea, so different from that Athenian paragon of virtue, Ischomachus' wife, come from? Are she and the other novellistic characters pure invention on Xenophon's part or was he influenced by others in the writing of these stories? One possibility is, of course, that Xenophon makes use of Persian material in these novelle. We know very little of the Persian traditions available to the author of the Cyr. and the vexed question of possible Persian influence will be dealt with separately (cf. below, Appendix II,pp. 402-414). Turning to Greek authors who may have influenced or inspired Xenophon when writing these colourful episodes - these stories of vengeful eunuchs, beautiful women, bloodthirsty monarchs, mutilated corpses etc., set in the East in a (pseudo-)historical framework - the first writer who comes to mind is Xenophon's contemporary, Ctesias.[7]

Ctesias, the physician from Cnidus, who spent the years 404-398/7 B.C. at the court of Artaxerxes II, wrote a 23 volume Persica or history of Persia. This work, which begins with the reign of Ninus in Assyria and ends with the final events of Ctesias' own stay in Persia (i.e. 398/7 B.C.), first appeared in the 390's.[8] We know from the Anabasis (1.8.26, 27 = FGrH 688 F 21; cf. T 15) that Xenophon was acquainted with the Persica and since (as has been argued

above, p. 17) the Cyr. was written after the Anabasis it is not unreasonable to postulate Ctesias' influence on the Cyr. The Persica did not, of course, survive in direct transmission, but enough has been preserved indirectly, particularly in the epitomes of Diodorus (a summary of Books 1-6, the history of the Assyrian and Median Empires down to Astyages) and Photius (an even briefer précis of Books 7-23, the history of the Persian Empire from Cyrus the Great to Artaxerxes II), to give us a fairly good notion of the original form and contents of Ctesias' work.

The history was a picturesque and sensational one, filled with dramatic, incredible tales as the ancients testify (cf. FGrH 688 T 11, T 13, T 19) and as the fragments themselves indicate. My purpose here is not to summarize the whole of the Persica but to single out characters, themes and incidents in Ctesias which are reminiscent of our novelle and may have influenced Xenophon to a certain extent. I begin with the women in Ctesias in an attempt to see how they and their adventures are like (and unlike) that of Panthea. In general there are two kinds of women to be found in the pages of Ctesias. The first type, best exemplified by Semiramis (688 F 1 passim), are brave, beautiful and strong-minded queens, who govern and even do battle alongside their husbands, and then rule independently after their husbands are gone. Other members of this group are Zarinaea (90 F 5; 688 F 1b 34.1-5, F 7, 8a, 8b),[9] Sparetra (688 F 9.3) and possibly Roxane (688 F 15.55). The second group of women, of whom Parysatis (688 F 15 & 16 passim; F 17, 24-29) is perhaps the most outstanding example, are also wives (or daughters) of kings, but they themselves play a more passive role. These women scheme at home behind the scenes and persuade their consorts, often unreasonably, either to punish their enemies or pardon their friends. These powers behind the throne frequently torture their opponents in horrible fashion. Amytis, daughter of Astyages (688 F 9.1, 6; F 13.12, 13), Neitatis

(F 13a), Amestris (F 14.39, 42-45) and Amytis, wife of Megabyzus (F 13.32, F 14.34, 42-44) all belong to this category. Almost all of the females in Ctesias have strong personalities and most are quite cruel as well. In many ways, Panthea is like the women of the second group, for her role in the Cyr. is a passive or at least non-combatant one, but her power and influence, like theirs, is considerable, even if exercised in private. Nonetheless in her noble character and behaviour Panthea does not resemble the vengeful, plotting Parysatis and company in the least.

Turning to the first group of Ctesian heroines, we find that Panthea has certain features in common with them as well. These women, as we have seen, actually take to the battlefield (with and without their husbands); while Panthea does not engage in military combat the way they do, she is nonetheless closely involved in the battles of the Cyr., first as a captive taken in war, and then later, when she fashions battle armour for Abradatas and urges him to fight courageously. Panthea's place is not at home (as with Ischomachus' wife), nor in the harem (as with Parysatis, Amytis etc.), but in close proximity to the battlefield. Two of the women in this group, Semiramis and Zarinaea, are not only outstandingly brave, they are also exceptionally beautiful and hence, like Panthea, find themselves at the centre of a romantic conflict, which ends tragically.[10] According to Ctesias (688 F 1b 6.4-10), Semiramis first meets Ninus when she joins her husband Onnes at Bactra, which is being besieged by Ninus' army. Semiramis ascends to the citadel of the city, captures it and thus brings about the surrender of Bactra. Ninus rewards her for her courage and then, swayed by her beauty, falls in love with her. The Assyrian king tries to persuade Onnes to relinquish Semiramis and marry his daughter instead, and when the latter refuses, threatens to blind him. The miserable Onnes, frightened and in love, kills himself. Thus Semiramis becomes Ninus' queen, bears him a child

and later succeeds him to the throne. The Abradatas-Panthea-Araspas triangle does not of course correspond to the Onnes-Semiramis-Ninus one, for in Ctesias it is the husband and not the importuning lover who is rejected, but the two tales do have a certain theme in common - the suicide of a loyal spouse.

Zarinaea (FGrH 90 F 5; 688 F 1b 34.1-5, F 7, F 8a-b),[11] our second beautiful warrior, is a Sacian queen. She encounters the Mede Stryangaeus in battle and he first unseats her from her horse and then spares her because she is so lovely. Later Zarinaea's husband takes the Mede prisoner and intends to execute him. Instead he is killed himself by Stryangaeus and his men, who have been set free by Zarinaea. Stryangaeus falls in love with the Sacian queen and, encouraged by his eunuch, declares his love to her. She, despite her love for him, rejects his advances gently, pointing out that he is married to an even more beautiful woman and asking him to be as manly in love as he is in war. Stryangaeus composes a farewell letter to Zarinaea, in which he reflects on the workings of love, and then commits suicide. The affinities between Panthea and Zarinaea are apparent: both lovely women refuse would-be lovers because involvement with them would lead to a breach of marital fidelity. So too both stories include lovers who commit suicide because they cannot bear living without their beloved. Zarinaea, however, seems to have colluded in the death of her own husband (688 F 7; cf. 90 F 5) and is in love with Stryangaeus (90 F 5) so that her behaviour is less impeccable than Panthea's and her rejection of the Mede is somewhat puzzling. It should be noted that Ctesias' account of Zarinaea and Stryangaeus seems to have included reflections on the power of eros (cf. Stryangaeus' letter 688 F 8b) and the need for restraint in love (cf. the words of Zarinaea 90 F 5), just as we find in the discussions between Araspas and Cyrus in the Panthea novella (Cyr. 5.1.8-17; 6.1.36, 41).

Panthea, then, bears a certain resemblance to the kind of women found in

Ctesias' Persica. She is beautiful, strong-minded and closely involved (if not an actual participant) in scenes of military conflict. Her loveliness brings about a romantic entanglement and her own strong passion leads ultimately to suicide. So too Panthea is instrumental in bringing about both an alliance (between Abradatas and Cyrus) and a (feigned) break between two former allies (Araspas and Cyrus). All of these are features or qualities shared by one or both types of women described by Ctesias. Nonetheless we cannot "explain" Panthea of the Cyr. by reference to Ctesias, nor can we trace all of the elements of her story back to the Persica. In particular, Panthea is a noble wife, loyal and chaste, and no such positive figure appears in the surviving fragments of Ctesias. Hence other literary forerunners of the lady of Susa should be sought elsewhere.

The next feature of the novelle of the Cyr. which can be attributed with some assurance to the influence of Ctesias is the prominence of eunuchs.[12] One eunuch, the young Assyrian noble Gadatas, is the hero of one of our novelle and in another, the story of Panthea, eunuchs play an important role: delivering messages (Cyr. 6.1.33-34), escorting their mistress (6.4.11), preparing Abradatas' grave (7.3.5) and finally, committing suicide upon their master and mistress' fresh grave (7.3.15). Eunuchs are key figures throughout Ctesias' Persica.[13] Often when a new king comes to power we are told at once (in Photius' summary at any rate) who his chief eunuchs were, almost in formulaic fashion (μέγα παρ' αὐτῷ δυνάμενος - cf. FGrH 688 F 9.6, F 13.9, F 13.24, F 13.33, F 15.51; compare F.15.49, F 15.54)[14] and the prominent position given to the eunuchs reflects their importance in Ctesias' history. Over two dozen individual eunuchs appear in the Persica[15] and they perform a variety of functions. Some eunuchs deliver messages or plead their master's cause in front of another. Such are the two eunuchs sent to influence Artaeus in the Nanarus - Parsondes affair (90 F 4) and Artoxares,

who helps reconcile Megabyzus and Artaxerxes (688 F 14.42, 43; see other examples at 90 F 5 and 688 F 8b, 90 F 66.23). Other eunuchs perform more complex services, both good - e.g. escorting a dead master home for burial (688 F 13.9, F 13.23, F 15.47) - and bad, such as Petasacas starving Astyages to death at Oebares' bidding (F 9.6) or Matacas plundering Delphi under orders from Xerxes (F. 13.31). The eunuchs' most frequent activity in Ctesias seems to be plotting and conspiring against their masters. Thus we find eunuchs conniving against Sermiramis (F 1b 20.1), Sardanapallus (F 1b 24.4, F 1p), the Magus pretender to the throne (F 13.13, 15, 16), Amyrtaeus king of Egypt (F 13.10), Xerxes I (F 13.33), Artaxerxes I (F 14.34), Xerxes II (F 15.48, 52) and Darius II (F 15.54). (In the last instance Darius' eunuch Artoxares plots to become king himself and is caught ordering a false beard and moustache for the occasion!) As a result of their conspiratorial activities these eunuchs often die horribly, after cruel tortures (F 9.6, F 13.15, F 14.34, F 15.52, F 15.54; cf. F 16.66 and F 26). Thus Gadatas of the Cyr., who together with Gobryas kills the Assyrian king within the palace walls (Cyr. 7.5.29-30), follows the Ctesian pattern to a certain extent, and the brief description of the assassination in the Cyr. seems to have fairly close parallels in the Persica (FGrH 688 F 13.16, F 15.48; cf. below, pp. 337-338). Nonetheless Gadatas is not altogether like the eunuchs in Ctesias for he is an Assyrian noble, a member of an important family (Cyr. 5.2.28), who has been castrated by his ruler, and he was not meant to be a servant or court eunuch to start with. There are no stories of a noble castrated by a king in the surviving fragments of Ctesias[16] but as will be seen below (p. 327) the Persica did include a speech by a eunuch who refers to his childless state and "adopts" Cyrus so to speak, just as Gadatas does (FGrH 90 F 66; cf. Cyr. 5.4.30). Gadatas, while a sworn enemy of the Assyrian king, transfers his loyalty to Cyrus, whom he serves faithfully, and thus he demonstrates another, diametrically

opposed characteristic of eunuchs: their loyalty to their masters. Panthea's eunuchs, of course, provide an extreme example of this kind of loyal devotion when they kill themselves immediately after their mistress' suicide. In Ctesias too there are several tales of faithful eunuchs, such as Artoxares who is exiled by Artaxerxes for speaking too freely on Megabyzus' behalf (F 14.43), Bagapatas who lives by, and guards, Darius' tomb (F 13.23) and Parsicas who grieves for Cyrus the Younger (F 20.12.1-2). So too the eunuchs of the Persica sometimes die with their masters (e.g. Sardanapallus' eunuchs join him on the funeral pyre F 1b 27.2) or in their stead (as with Parysatis' eunuchs who are killed by Artaxerxes as a punishment for his mother's misdeeds F 27.70), so that while there is no tale in Ctesias of eunuchs stabbing themselves to death in the wake of their master's demise, such a scene is not far removed from the world of the Persica.

The young Assyrian king of the Cyr. is, as we have seen, the villain of the work and is a harsh, arrogant and envious despot. None of the leading men in Ctesias seem quite as unrelievedly cruel and vindictive as the Assyrian, but several perform deeds similar to his. Ninus, for example, drives Onnes to suicide when he threatens to blind him for refusing to part with his wife Semiramis (688 F 1b 6.9-10). Oebares, Cyrus' right-hand man and another ruthless figure, not only kills the Babylonian seer who predicts Cyrus' rise to power in order to guarantee his silence (90 F 66.18-19), but also has Astyages starved to death long after the Median king has been subdued (688 F 9.6). Darius I chops off the heads of 40 bearers after his parents have been killed due to their negligence (F 13.19). Artaxerxes I condemns Megabyzus to death and then exiles him instead, as a punishment for anticipating him in a hunt and successfully shooting down a lion (F 14.43); the parallel with Gobryas' son and the young Assyrian king (Cyr. 4.6.3-4) is apparent. Several women in Ctesias, in particular

Amestris and Parysatis, are perhaps better examples of cruel and vengeful figures. Amestris convinces Artaxerxes to betray his word and hand over Inarus, her son's killer, to her for punishment (FGrH 688 F 14.39). So too she tortures her grandson's killer (F 14.45) and Apollonides, the Greek doctor who seduced her daughter (F 14.44). Parysatis' list of victims is even longer and includes a pretender to the throne (F 15.54), the entire family of her treacherous son-in-law Teritouchmes (F 15.56, F 16.61), including eventually Artaxerxes' wife Stateira (F 27.70, F 29b), and finally, all those involved in the death of Cyrus the Younger at Cunaxa (F 16.66-67, F 26). In short, the young Assyrian king of the Cyr. could easily slip into the pages of the Persica. It should be added that while Gadatas and Gobryas are presented as positive figures in the Cyr., they too are motivated by a desire for revenge and so deserve to be mentioned in this context.

The story of Croesus in the Cyr. is, as we shall see below, closely linked to Herodotus' presentation of the Lydian king and bears little resemblance to Ctesias' version (688 F 9.4-5, F 9b-c). Nonetheless one particular aspect of Xenophon's account - Croesus' desire to be like his wife and lead the happiest of lives, enjoying luxuries with no cares about providing them (Cyr. 7.2.26-28) - is reminiscent of a favourite theme in the Persica: the pampered, effeminate monarch. In Ctesias' work we meet several such rulers who prefer to spend their time in the harem leading a life of ease, such as Ninyas, son of Ninus and Semiramis (688 F 1b 21.1-2, F 1n),"eat, drink and be merry" Sardanapallus (F 1b 23.1-3, 24.4, F 1p) and Nanarus, the effete Babylonian satrap who turns his opponent Parsondes into a music girl (688 F 6, 90 F 4). Croesus of the Cyr. is anxious to join their ranks. It is curious that these indolent, effete kings are found alongside the ruthless warrior queens of the Persica. Semiramis and her son Ninyas (688 F 1b passim) are perhaps the best instance of this stark

contrast. In the Cyr. the courageous Panthea is perhaps meant to be such a counter-figure to the spoiled Lydian monarch, even if no direct comparison is drawn between the two.[17] Cyaxares is, of course, another such effeminate ruler in the Cyr.

In sum, many of the novellistic themes and characters of the Cyr. are not unlike those found in Ctesias. We have seen that some correspondences between the Cyr. and the Persica are very close, while in other instances we have found only a more general resemblance. At the same time Xenophon does not always follow Ctesias' lead so that e.g. Panthea does not take to the battlefield and Cyrus and the Assyrian king do not engage in a face-to-face duel as they would if they were simply carbon copies of figures in Ctesias. It seems safe to conclude that Ctesias influenced Xenophon in the writing of the novellistic episodes of the Cyr., but these tales are not simply re-workings of, or variations on, stories of the Persica.

I have looked so far only at the content of the Persica but not its form. Our interest is in novellistic dialogues so I shall now try to see what can be learned of Ctesias' use of conversations in his work. The two epitomes of Diodorus and Photius which comprise the bulk of the fragments of the Persica contain next to no direct speech (cf. only 688 F 13.13, F 15.52), but there are several clear indications that "speeches and dialogues... were without doubt an important (and effective) ingredient" in the original work.[18] Our first bit of evidence concerning dialogue in the Persica comes from Demetrius (De eloc. 216 = 688 F 24), who quotes with approval the way Ctesias has a messenger gently break the news of Cyrus' death to Parysatis. In the exchange between the two, the queen mother asks a series of questions and the messenger replies little by little, step by step (κατὰ μικρὸν καὶ κατὰ βραχύ ) with the evil tidings. In this passage then, as Demetrius notes, Ctesias makes effective dramatic use of

the dialogue form. A second piece of evidence comes from a recently discovered papyrus (P.Oxy. 2330 = 688 F 8b) generally believed to contain Ctesias' ipsissima verba.[19] The bulk of the fragment contains Stryangaeus' farewell letter to Zarinaea, but more interesting for our purposes is the beginning of the papyrus (ll. 1-5) which contains an exchange between the Mede Stryangaeus and his eunuch (apparently; cf. the version of Nicolaus of Damascus 90 F 5). While the opening of the conversation is obscure, Stryangaeus' prosaic final sentence ("come,first I'll write to Zarinaea φέρε τὸ γοῦν πρῶτον γράμματα γράψω πρὸς Ζαρεινα῎αν) would seem to indicate that Ctesias, like Xenophon, used dialogue in more commonplace situations as well, i.e. fairly regularly.[20]

Photius, as we have seen, uses direct speech very rarely and there is only one exchange in oratio recta in all of his summary (688 F 13.13; cf. F 15.52). Nonetheless there are several places in his very succinct summary which seem to hint at speeches or conversations that appeared in the original, full-scale Persica (cf. F 9.8, F 13.32, F 14.44, F 16.63, F 16.67). In those passages of Plutarch which come from Ctesias and supplement Photius' brief account of the battle of Cunaxa and its aftermath,[21] there is a great deal of direct speech (see 688 F 18, F 19, F 20 [11.4; 12.1; 12.6]; F 26 [14.5, 6, 9; 15.2, 3, 4, 6, 7; 17.8] and compare F 16). Thus we find conversations between e.g. Cyrus and Clearchus, Artaxerxes' "eye" Artasuras and the dead Cyrus' eunuchs, Artaxerxes and Parysatis etc. and these probably appeared (if in slightly different form) originally in Ctesias. Perhaps the best example of how a fully elaborated dialogue which appeared in the Persica and is preserved in Plutarch was compressed by Photius in his summary is the story of Mithradatas, who is egged on by Parysatis' eunuch to boast that he was the one to fatally wound Cyrus (F 26 = Plut. Artax. 15.1-7). In Plutarch we meet the two at a dinner party and their

talk takes the form of a lively, dramatic dialogue which includes a description of the participants' thoughts and reactions. In the parallel passage in Photius (which closely corresponds to Plutarch's account) we are simply told that Mithradatas was handed over to Parysatis for punishment after he bragged at dinner of having killed Cyrus ἐπὶ τραπέζης μεγαλαυχήσαντα ἀποκτεῖναι Κῦρον (F 16.67).

In Diodorus' summary of the Persica (688 F 1b) there is not a single instance of direct speech but there are several places in the narrative where it seems more than likely that the original did include either speeches or dialogues. Thus Ninus' confrontation with Onnes over Semiramis (688 F 1b 6.9-10), the exchange of messages between Semiramis and the Indian king before their battle (F 1b 18.1-2), the council of war held by Arbaces, Belosus and their allies (F 1b 25.4-5) and Arbaces' magnaminous attitude towards Belosus at his trial (F 1b 28.5) all seem well-suited to, almost to require, oratio recta. Fortunately, using a fragment of Nicolaus of Damascus which comes from the Persica and supplements the epitome of Diodorus (90 F 3),[22] we are in the position to recover one such lost dialogue. Diodorus (688 F 1b 24.2-3) tells us briefly of the friendship between the Mede Arbaces and the Babylonian seer Belosus, who meet at Babylon. Belosus, Diodorus relates, predicts that Arbaces will take over Sardanapallus' empire and the Mede promises him the satrapy of Babylonia in return. In Nicolaus' account (90 F 3), we are first told of the vision the Babylonian seer has concerning Arbaces' rise to power (including a conversation between two horses) and then are shown how Belosus slowly and gently informs Arbaces that he will become ruler of the Assyrian empire. Belosus, by asking a series of questions ("What will you give me if I tell you that you will rule over x?"), gradually brings Arbaces to the realization that he will indeed become king. The technique used here is very similar to that found in

the passage of Ctesias praised by Demetrius, where a messenger informs Parysatis of Cyrus' death (688 F 24) and must be Ctesian.[23]

The other Ctesian fragments of Nicolaus (90 F 2, F 4, F 5, F 66) also contain several dialogues and speeches (cf. in particular F 4 and F 66), which were, in all likelihood, simply lifted or excerpted from the Persica.[24] We can conclude, then, that Ctesias made frequent use of dialogues in his history and hence he may have influenced Xenophon in matters of form as well as content in the novellistic dialogues of the Cyr., i.e. in the use of conversations as a means of presenting a novella. Ctesias' dialogues also seem to have been of two types, i.e. both dramatic and narrated (cf. e.g. the confrontation between Nanarus and Parsondes, and the eunuch's message to King Artaeus on Parsondes' captivity [90 F 4] respectively for examples of both types),as with the novellistic dialogues of the Cyr.

We have seen that the novelle of the Cyr. are an integral part of the work and do not appear as digressions. Ctesias too seems to have avoided digressions - cf. 688 T 13 οὐδὲ πρὸς ἐκτροπὰς δέ τινας ἀκαίρους, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος [sc. Herodotus] ἀπάγει τὸν λόγον - and in fact the Persica was, to a certain extent, composed of a chain of novelle, arranged in chronological order and interspersed into descriptions of lands, customs, battles and the concrete accomplishments of each noteworthy monarch. There is no evidence that the novelle of the Persica were not narrated continuously and were broken up into several scattered episodes, as were the colourful tales of the Cyr., but the nature of our sources for most of the fragments - epitomes by Diodorus and Photius - make this point difficult to judge. It is worth noting, perhaps, that Parysatis' continuing vendetta against the family of her son-in-law Terituchmes is presented in several stages (cf. 688 F 15.55-56, F 16.58, 61) and that there are several scattered episodes centreing upon Megabyzus, but this may well be Photius, and not Ctesias, at work.[25]

Finally, the last structural characteristic we have noted in relation to the tales of the Cyr. (above, p.255) is the restraint and economy with which these stories are told, even if Xenophon's characters do use rather poetic diction during their most emotional moments. It can safely be said that such brevity and restraint are not due to the influence of the Persica, for Ctesias was considered by the ancients to be long-winded, repetitive and diffuse (cf. 688 T 13, T 14a-b). These qualities are not always apparent in the straightforward summaries of Diodorus and Photius, but fragments such as those describing the long, complicated and drawn-out affair of Cyrus' death at Cunaxa (688 F 16.63-64, F 19 - F 21) in which, as Plutarch aptly remarks, Ctesias finishes off the Persian prince "as if with a blunt sword"( καθάπερ ἀμβλεῖ ξιφιδίῳ 688 T 14b), do reflect the Cnidian's prolixity. Furthermore, Ctesias was not especially well-known for his low-key presentation: sensationalism, pathos, surprises and incredible tales were his trademarks as a writer (cf. 688 T 11, T 13, T 19).

We can conclude, then, that Xenophon was influenced by the Persica when writing the novelle of the Cyr. His characters and their stories belong to the Oriental world of court intrigues, eunuchs, harsh despots and strong-minded women so beloved of Ctesias, and there are several specific correspondences between the two works. In addition, Ctesias' history seems to have contained many speeches and conversations, and this may have influenced Xenophon in the presentation of his spicy tales largely through dialogues. However it is clear that Ctesias was not Xenophon's sole source of inspiration for these stories and the Cyr., even at its most novellistic, is without a doubt less sensational and melodramatic than the Persica was.

Having noted the affinity between Ctesias and the novellistic dialogues of the Cyr. it is perhaps necessary to point out how little the Cnidian influenced

Xenophon elsewhere.[26] Xenophon's version of the life of Cyrus the Great, the main thread of the Cyr., differs in almost every respect from the account found in Ctesias (90 F 66; 688 F 9). In the Persica Cyrus is the son of a Persian brigand and works his way up from a lowly position at the Median court to Astyages' chief adviser. Cyrus manages to wrest control of the Median empire away from Astyages with the aid of a Babylonian seer and Oebares, and then marries Astyages' daughter. Ctesias' Cyrus then expands his empire, warring with the Bactrians, the Sacians and the Lydians (but not the Babylonians). The Persian leader is fatally wounded in a conflict with a Scythian tribe and dies only after delivering his last will and testament to his two sons, Cambyses and Tanyoxarees. The only detail of Cyrus' life in Ctesias which Xenophon seems to have made use of in the Cyr. is the name of Cyrus' younger son - Tanaoxares in the Cyr. (8.7.11); Xenophon may have been influenced by Cyrus' farewell speech in the Persica as well.[27] Ctesias' Cyrus does not seem to have been the up-standing didactic figure that our Cyrus is - see for instance his instructions to torture Astyages' family (688 F 9.1). In general there are very few good or moral characters in Ctesias' work: only Memnon, a participant in the Trojan War (688 F 1b 22.3), Sardanapallus' supplanter Arbaces (90 F 2-3; 688 F 1b 24-28; cf. in particular 24.1, 28.5-6) and Amorges, Cyrus' Sacian enemy who becomes his ally (688 F 9.3, 7, 8) would seem to qualify. Ctesias' influence on the Cyr. is, in short, noticeable only in relation to the novelle.[28]

The Anabasis also betrays very little of the Cnidian's influence, even though Xenophon refers to the Persica there (Anab. 1.8.26-27; cf. above, p. 256 ). Since the two works cover some of the same ground, i.e. the preparations leading up to the battle of Cunaxa, the battle itself and its aftermath, it may be useful to compare their different versions of the same events. It is apparent at once that the two compositions are very dissimilar, not only in their factual

accounts of the battle at Cunaxa[29] but in their literary presentation of the conflict between Cyrus and his brother Artaxerxes II. Thus in his much more detailed account of the original feud between the two brothers (688 F 16.59, F 17 vs. Anab. 1.1.3-5), Ctesias presents such melodramatic scenes as Parysatis wrapping her arms and tresses of hair around Cyrus, clinging to his neck and begging Artaxerxes to spare him (688 F 17.6); Xenophon's description of the same occurrence is ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ἐξαιτησαμένη αὐτὸν ἀποπέμπει πάλιν... (Anab. 1.1.3),[30] and this low-key, brief and unemotional approach is characteristic of his narrative throughout. Both writers include a description of the face-to-face confrontation between Cyrus and Artaxerxes on the battlefield, with Cyrus wounding his brother (Anab. 1.8.26-27; 688 F 16.64, F 20.1-2), but in Xenophon, Cyrus is then quickly despatched to his demise, while Ctesias relates a complicated and protracted sequence of events which seems overly-long even in Plutarch's apocopated version (F 20), so that the reader greets Cyrus' death with considerable relief. The Cnidian then goes on to describe Artaxerxes' exultation - and the eunuchs' and Parysatis' grief - over Cyrus' corpse (688 F 16.64, 66, F 20, F 24, F 25) but Xenophon includes no such emotional outbursts, lingering only over a description of Artapates, Cyrus' most loyal (eunuch) sceptre-bearer, who is killed near his dead master (Anab. 1.8.28-29).[31] (Xenophon does, of course, eulogize Cyrus in the following chapter of the Anab., 1.9.) So too Ctesias seems to have dwelt on the mutilation of Cyrus' body in long and loving detail (F 16.64, 66, F 20), while Xenophon handles the matter in a few words (Anab. 1.10.1). The only episode found both in Ctesias and Xenophon which seems to have been presented in more sensational detail by the Athenian is the account of Meno and his final fate. Ctesias, as far as we can glean from Photius (F 27.69) and Plutarch (F 28.5), simply tells us that Meno was not killed along with Clearchus and the other captured Greek generals (cf. Diod. 14.27.2).

Xenophon, after a defamatory description of Meno's character and sexual misdemeanours, goes on to say that Meno died slowly and painfully a year after the other Greek generals (Anab. 2.6.28-29). Thus Xenophon could be as melodramatic and sensational as the Cnidian if he so chose (see too Anab. 2.5.33; 4.7.13-14; cf. 5.4.12-17, 32-34). His style and presentation in the Anabasis is, however, rarely reminiscent of Ctesias and it is difficult to detect the latter's influence upon him when he recounts the events surrounding Cunaxa.

I have argued that while Xenophon did not follow Ctesias' version of the life of Cyrus the Great, he was influenced by the Persica when writing the novelle of the Cyr. What can we say of the novelle of the Anabasis? For a start, there are next to no novelle in the Anabasis, although there are many places where Xenophon hints at colourful tales that could have been further elaborated. Thus our interest is aroused by Cyrus the Younger's relationship with Epyaxa, wife of Syennesis, king of Cilicia. We know that she supported Cyrus and convinced her husband to meet with him (Anab. 1.2.12, 14-18, 26; cf. 688 F 16.63); Xenophon then discreetly adds ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ συγγενέσθαι Κῦρον τῇ Κιλίσσῃ (Anab. 1.2.12). Similarly, Cyrus' Ionian mistress, captured by Artaxerxes' forces, is simply dismissed as τὴν σοφὴν καὶ καλὴν λεγομένην εἶναι (Anab. 1.10.2; cf. her half-clad Milesian colleague 1.10.3) and we must turn to other writers (Plut. Artax. 26.3-5; Peric. 24.7; Athen. 13.576D) for further details of this "Aspasia". In all likelihood Xenophon could have (and Ctesias would have) told us more about these women.[32] There are other stories in the Anabasis which contain brief, somewhat tantalizing references to colourful episodes and characters, but these are not developed into full-fledged novelle of the kind we find in the Cyr. We hear, for instance, of the family of the headman of an occupied village in Armenia (Anab. 4.5.24 - 4.6.3), including a newly-married daughter, a son-in-law away hunting and a handsome son who catches a Greek

soldier's fancy, but these figures are sketched only in outline.[33] The Spartan Dracontius who was exiled for accidentally killing a boy in his youth (4.8.25) and Dexippus, a troublemaker who eventually received his just deserts (5.1.15; 6.6.5-7, 9, 15) are other characters in the Anabasis whose background stories are alluded to, but not supplied. Two other passages in the Anabasis are more novella-like: Seuthes' story of his father's exile and his own life as an orphan at another king's court (7.2.32-34) and a charming παιδικὸς λόγος in which Xenophon convinces Seuthes to allow Episthenes, a παιδεραστής who once recruited a company of soldiers solely on the basis of their good looks, to spare the life of a handsome Thracian lad (7.4.7-11). It is interesting to note that these tales are narrated largely through dialogue, but they are too brief to be considered full-scale novelle. On the whole, Xenophon does not include romantic or melodramatic tales like those of the Cyr. in the Anabasis and his account of the Ten Thousand is (perhaps deliberately) very unlike Ctesias' Persica. In conclusion, the only place where we can point to the (probable) influence of Ctesias upon Xenophon is in relation to the novelle of the Cyr.

Another author who must be considered a likely influence upon, or inspiration for, the colourful tales of the Cyr. is Herodotus, "the classic representative of the Greek novella".[34] As we shall see in detail below (pp. 338-339) one of the novelle of the Cyr. - the story of Croesus - is clearly dependent upon Herodotus and there is little doubt that Xenophon was well acquainted with Herodotus' work.[35] Herodotus' History contains a large number of novelle and these are presented in a variety of ways, unlike Xenophon's dramatic stories which all have a similar form (above, p. 254). In Herodotus some novelle are narrated as one continuous tale - e.g. the stories of Polycrates' ring (Hdt. 3.40-43), Masistes' wife (9.108-113), Cyrus' youth (1.108-122) etc. - while others, such as the tales of Periander (3.50-53; 5.92), Pythius (7.27-29, 38-39),

Demaratus' birth (6.61-63, 68-69) etc. are presented in more than one episode. Several novelle are directly related to the main narrative thread of the History - see e.g. the story of Syloson's flame-coloured cloak (3.139-140) or Zopyrus at Babylon (3.150-160) - while others are digressions, plain and simple, as with the tale of Rhampsinitus and the thief (2.121) or Cleisthenes and the suitors (6.126-130). So too some characters appear in Herodotus' History both in and out of novelle (e.g. Croesus, Harpagus, Demaratus, Polycrates etc.; cf. Gobryas and Gadatas in the Cyr.), while others (such as Gyges, Masistes' wife, Arion, Perdiccas etc.) feature only in a single novella and then disappear. In other words the novelle in Herodotus (unlike those of the Cyr.) are not necessarily episodic in structure, nor are they always woven into the main fabric of the story. In addition, the tales of Herodotus are not always presented chiefly through conversations. Some novelle are composed almost entirely of dialogue (e.g. the story of Pythius 7.27-29, 38-39), others are narrated through-out in oratio obliqua (cf. Arion 1.23-24 and Rhampsinitus and the thief 2.121), but most are a blend of narrative and dialogue - e.g. Gyges and Candaules (1.8-12), Alexander and the partying Persians (5.18-21) etc.[36] Yet other tales are told within a speech - cf. the chain of stories concerning Labda, Cypselus, Periander, Thrasybulus and Melissa (5.92) and the tale of Glaucus and the deposit (6.86) - so that we find in Herodotus both "dramatic" and "narrated" novelle, just as we have seen both types of novellistic dialogues in the Cyr. (above, p. 255).

It is evident then that Xenophon did not adopt several of the more formal characteristics of his novelle (i.e. the presentation of the tales in stages, the strong links between the stories and the main plot of the Cyr. and the predominately conversational form of the tales) from Herodotus, because the tales

in the History are much freer and varied in their form. Xenophon may have, however, been influenced by the sheer quantity and diversity of tales in Herodotus, and have learned from the work how such dramatic stories could enliven and break up long narrative stretches. In other words, the example of Herodotus' History may have led Xenophon to introduce novelle into the Cyr. in the first place, even though he devised his own means of presenting these tales. So too Xenophon's generally brief and restrained narration (interrupted at times by highly emotional moments) may have been inspired by Herodotus.

It is difficult to demonstrate Herodotus' influence on the form of the Cyr.'s dramatic stories; what of their content? I begin with the women in Herodotus, in an attempt to find traces or forerunners of the heroine of the Cyr., Panthea. The two types of women we have found in Ctesias - bold and intelligent warrior queens[37] and cruel, strong-minded females who plot behind the scenes - are also present in the pages of Herodotus. (We have seen above, pp.258-260, that Panthea has several traits in common with both these types of women.) Women of the first type include Semiramis (1.184), Nitocris, the Babylonian queen (1.185-187), Nitocris, the Egyptian queen (2.100) and the Amazons (4.110-117). Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, who defeats Cyrus on the battlefield and mutilates his body (1.205-214) and Artemisia, ruler of Halicarnassus and the only "man" among Xerxes' advisers (7.99; 8.68, 87-88, 93, 101-102) are the most outstanding examples. Among the domestic, but scheming figures we find Candaules' wife (1.8-12), Cassandane, mother of Cambyses (3.2-3), Eryxo, wife of Arcesilaus II (4.160) and Pheretime, mother of Arcesilaus III (4.162, 165, 202, 205). Atossa, with her famous bedroom discussion with Darius (3.133-134; cf. 7.2-3) and Xerxes' cruel wife Amestris (7.114; 9.110-112) are the two most notable women in this group. As in Ctesias (and Xenophon too, of course) there are several women who arouse strong passions in men; such are Ariston's third wife (6.61-63), Perkalos (6.65)

and Cambyses' sister-wife (3.31-32) and these emotions lead at times to fatal consequences, as with Candaules' wife (1.8-12) and the wife (and daughter) of Masistes (9.108-113). Women in Herodotus are, then, objects of desire, but there is no romantic love story in the History along the lines of Panthea and Abradatas (or Tigranes and his wife, or Ctesias' more sensational pairs Onnes and Semiramis, and Zarinaea and Stryangaeus).[38]

In addition to the kinds of women we have already seen in Ctesias, Herodotus has a wide range of female characters.[39] In fact we find several positive figures or good women - such as Gorgo, daughter of Cleomenes and wife of Leonidas, who is both moral and clever (5.51; 7.239) or Polycrates' daughter who prefers spinsterhood to losing her father (3.124). Other women, while not quite as noble, serve as their husbands' companions (Harpagus' wife 1.109; Ladice, wife of Amasis 2.181) and advisers (Cyrus' foster mother 1.111-112; cf. Sesostris' wife 2.107). Others reprove (Cambyses' sister-wife 3.32), pacify (Periander's daughter 3.53), assist (Phaidine, Otanes' daughter 3.68-69) or save the very lives of (Intaphrenes' wife 3.119; Labda, mother of Cypselus 5.92) their menfolk. In short, there are many different kinds of women in Herodotus and several have one or more characteristic in common with Panthea - i.e. there are women who are beautiful, noble women, women of strong character, and wives who serve as their husbands' companions and advisers in the History. So too Herodotus portrays women who are sought after by more than one man and females who are closely involved in martial conflict. Nonetheless Panthea remains unique among them and there is no one woman in Herodotus who is overly like our heroine, for none of his wives are as devoted and loving as Panthea. One woman, the anonymous daughter of Hegetorides of Cos, who is the unwilling mistress of a Persian noble, does remind us somewhat of Panthea, at least in her situation as a fugitive from the battlefield. At the battle of Plataea this woman flees from the Persian side and

pleads with Pausanias to spare her (9.76). Her position as a beautiful prisoner of war who is surrounded by a retinue of maids and is in great distress, is reminiscent in many ways of the fair lady of Susa as we first meet her in the Cyr. (5.1.4-7). In sum, while several women in the History may have contributed to the fashioning of Panthea, it is clear that she is not simply borrowed from Herodotus' heroines.

We have seen that eunuchs feature in two of the Cyr.'s novelle and that they are almost omnipresent in Ctesias, but such men are rarely found in Herodotus. Eunuchs are mentioned several times in an offhand way, when they perform errands or act as escorts or bodyguards (Hdt. 1.117; 3.4; 3.77, 78; cf. 7.187); one eunuch steals his master's fortune (4.43). The only eunuch who is allotted any real role is Hermotimus, Xerxes' chief eunuch, who like Gadatas has his revenge upon the man who castrated him (8.104-106; cf. below, p. 330 ). Nonetheless eunuchs are, at best, minor figures in Herodotus and it seems unlikely that Gadatas and the eunuchs of Panthea were inspired chiefly by the History.

On the other hand, Gobryas, the Assyrian noble whose son dies tragically at the hands of the young Assyrian king, does have several counterparts in Herodotus. Astyages arranges a terrible end for Harpagus' son, punishing father and son alike (1.118-119), while Prexaspes, a leading Persian noble, watches his son being shot through the heart by the mad Cambyses and is made to applaud the despot's marksmanship (3.34-35). The Lydian Pythius who infuriates Xerxes by his request to have his eldest son released from the army, sees his child cut in half (7.38-39) and Darius deals with a similar petition in equally cruel fashion and kills all three of Oeobazus' sons (4.84). So too Psammenitus, king of Egypt is forced by Cambyses to witness the spectacle of his bridled and trussed son being led to his death (3.14-15; a reprieve comes too late to save the boy) and Croesus is another bereaved father whose son dies tragically, even if not at the

hands of a tyrant (1.34-45); this also seems to be the case with Croesus' son in the Cyr. (7.2.20). It is interesting to note that Herodotus tells of several bereaved wives, mothers and sisters and these female figures - Tomyris (Hdt. 1.213-214), Nitocris the Egyptian queen (2.100), Eryxo (4.160) and Pheretime (4.162-167, 200, 202) - are generally much more vengeful than their male counterparts, and manage to punish the assassins. In any event, Gobryas, who lost his son due to the whims of a despot, is reminiscent of several figures in Herodotus.

Cruel, capricious despots along the lines of the young Assyrian king in the Cyr., are not of course lacking in the pages of Herodotus. Mad Cambyses, who tortures the embalmed body of Amasis (3.16), wounds the Apis calf (3.27-29), murders his brother Smerdis (3.30), marries two of his sisters and then kills one (3.31-32), kills Prexaspes' son in order to demonstrate his sobriety (3.34-35), tries to kill Croesus (3.36) and burns temple images (3.37) is the outstanding example. Cambyses is like the young Assyrian ruler in that he is unrelievedly bad (except for his final, penitent speech 3.65-66). Xerxes is more of a mixed character but he too can be unaccountably harsh (as with Pythius 7.38-39) and he rather arbitrarily cuts off a great many heads (of the dead Leonidas 7.238; of the slandering Phoenicians 8.90; of a ship's captain who brought him safely to shore at the cost of others' lives 8.118). The Persian ruler seems at his most unbridled in his passion, first for his brother's wife and then for her daughter, and in his subsequent arrogant behaviour towards Masistes (9.108-113). Astyages is another ruler who can be cruel and vindictive, as his original intention to kill his grandson Cyrus (1.108) and in particular his revenge upon the disobedient Harpagus (1.117-119) shows. There are several other harsh tyrants in the History (e.g. Periander, Polycrates etc.) and Xenophon's young Assyrian king would not feel out of place among them. Such figures

were not, of course, "invented" by Herodotus, and Xenophon need not have turned to the Halicarnassian (or to Ctesias for that matter) for inspiration when drawing the portrait of his arrogant Assyrian, but it is worth noting that his cruel king is a well-established type.

In summing up the possible influence of Herodotus on the novelle of the Cyr. we can single out one novella - the story of Croesus - which seems to have been written with Herodotus in mind. Other tales have certain characters or themes in common with the History (i.e. cruel despots, influential women, bereaved fathers, a vengeful eunuch) but Xenophon's stories are more than variations on these tales and include other (original) elements. The means used by Xenophon to present his novelle in the Cyr. - their episodic structure, the large number of dialogues, their links to the main plot etc. - seem to be his own and do not stem from Herodotus, who narrates his novelle in a variety of ways. Perhaps the chief influence of Herodotus on the stories of the Cyr. is their very inclusion in the work: Xenophon could have decided to introduce novelle into the Cyr. in the wake of Herodotus' novella-filled History.

Xanthus, another predecessor of Xenophon who apparently included novelle in his semi-historical work, should also be mentioned in this context.[40] In his Lydiaca Xanthus seems to have included many sensational and improbable stories, telling for example of a gluttonous king who ate his own wife (FGrH 765 F 18; cf. 90 F 22), of Amazons who blinded their male children (765 F 22), of female eunuchs (F 4a-b) etc. So too he narrates tales of love and intrigue (cf. F 8 and F 20, his version of Niobe's misfortunes) but his two most romantic tales have survived only indirectly as fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus' universal history (FGrH 90 F 44, F 47). Scholars are divided in their views as to how faithfully Nicolaus reproduces the original Xanthus, but it is generally agreed that the core of these two stories comes from the Lydiaca.[41] While we do

not know if Xenophon in fact read or made use of Xanthus' original work, it is nonetheless interesting to observe that the two tales, although they are much more sensational than the novelle in the Cyr. (see e.g. the plethora of amputated heads, real and wooden in 90 F 44), have several story lines in common with them. Thus Adyattes, the young Lydian prince, kills Dascylus (the grandfather of Gyges) because he is jealous of his father's high regard for him (90 F 44.11), reminding us of the Assyrian prince in the Cyr. So too Gyges of the Lydiaca is reminiscent of the Mede Araspas, for he too falls in love with the woman he is meant to be guarding for another; in this case, she is the king's bride (90 F 47.6-7, 11). In these two fragments Xanthus tells of several other romantic involvements, including Damonno and Spermus (F 44.2-3), Kerses and Ardys' daughter (F 44.5) and the king's chambermaid and Gyges (F 47.8), and all these entanglements have political implications or consequences, as with Araspas and Panthea (and Abradatas) in the Cyr. It is impossible of course to demonstrate Xanthus' direct influence on Xenophon, since we do not have a clear picture of what his Lydiaca was like. We do not even know, for example, if the passages of direct speech and dialogues found in the Nicolaus fragments (cf. F 44.6, 9, F 47.13, 14; there is no direct speech in Xanthus' own Lydiaca fragments, 765 F 1-30) were in the original work.[42] All we can say with any certitude is that Xanthus wrote colourful stories which were set against an Oriental background, and linked to a historical narrative, before Xenophon wrote the Cyr.[43]

Before turning to a commentary on the novellistic dialogues of the Cyr. I shall take a brief look at the novelle of another work of Xenophon, the Hellenica. In this (more or less) straightforward historical composition there are several colourful, dramatic stories which are told largely through dialogues. Such are the tales of Agesilaus' slightly devious matchmaking between Otys and the daughter of Spithridates (Hell. 4.1.4-15), the acquittal of Sphodrias because

of the love affair between his son and Archidamus, son of Agesilaus (5.4.25-33) and the peace negotiations on the grass between Pharnabazus and Agesilaus, with the charming exchange between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus' son at their end (4.1.29-40).[44] Conversations are not, however, the only means Xenophon uses to present novelle in the Hellenica and two of the most dramatic tales in the work - Phillidas' nearly single-handed liberation of Thebes (5.4.2-9) and the murder of Alexander, ruler of Thessaly, instigated by his wife and executed by her brothers (6.4.35-37) - are told without any use of direct speech. In both these instances Xenophon's account is lively and includes vivid background details such as Phillidas finding the unsuspecting Leonidas lying down after dinner, with his wife working wool at his side (5.4.7) or Alexander's wife holding the door tightly shut while her husband is being murdered (6.4.36). Yet another novella in the Hellenica, the story of Mania, her treacherous son-in-law Meidias and his subsequent downfall at the hands of Dercylidas (3.1.10-28) falls into two parts: (1) Mania's rise to power, her friendly relations with Pharnabazus and her murder (3.1.10-15) and (2) Dercylidas' negotiations with Meidias, ending in the latter's total submission (3.1.16-28), and it is only in the second, less novellistic or sensational part that Xenophon includes several passages in direct speech. In short, unlike his practice in the Cyr., Xenophon does not always use dialogues in the Hellenica when narrating novelle. The tales in the Hellenica are often digressions, or at least not an essential part of the main stream of events, and they are always presented as one continuous unit, rather than a series of episodes. Xenophon's technique for narrating novelle in the Hellenica is, then, generally different from his method in the Cyr., but in both works Xenophon relates his tales briefly and economically.

Looking at the content of these stories, perhaps the most interesting feature is the important role allotted to love affairs between men. While there

are a few key women in the novelle - cf. Mania who takes over her husband's satrapy and is a close friend and adviser of Pharnabazus (3.1.10-15), Alexander's wife who arranges for her husband's assassination (6.4.35-37) and the more passive daughter of Spithridates, the beneficiary of Agesilaus' matchmaking (4.1.4-15), not to mention Melon and his men who are disguised as partying women (5.4.4-6) - men, or to be more exact, romantic relations between men are the prime factor in many of these stories. The outstanding example is the pair Cleonymus and Archidamus whose intimacy, Xenophon implies, is responsible for Sphodrias' surprising acquittal (5.4.25-33). In addition, Alcetas' παιδικά causes him to lose the acropolis of Oreus (5.4.57), Anaxibius' beloved dies fighting at his side (4.8.39) and Alexander's mistreatment of his boyfriend leads to his own death (6.4.37). The son of Pharnabazus charms Agesilaus (4.1.39-40) and two other handsome young men, the sons of Mania (3.1.14) and of Spithridates (4.1.6) are also mentioned, if only briefly.[45] In general the colourful stories of the Hellenica are not overly like those of the Cyr. and Artabazus, the Mede who is enamoured of Cyrus and supports the Persian throughout, is the figure who would feel most at home in the pages of the Hellenica.

To sum up,this brief survey of novelle in historians who preceded Xenophon shows that Xenophon was following in the wake of others when he included picturesque and dramatic tales, set in an Oriental background, in the allegedly historical narrative of the Cyr. His dramatic stories and characters are often like those found in Herodotus and Ctesias, but contain many original elements which are more than variations on, or re-workings of extant novelle. Xenophon is perhaps even more original in the way he presents these tales, for their episodic structure, numerous dialogues and strong links with the main story line, make them unique (even in relation to other works by Xenophon himself).

The Panthea Novella

I turn now to a detailed commentary on the Panthea novella (summarized above, pp. 242-245), beginning with the first introduction to the fair lady of Susa (Cyr. 5.1.2-18; cf. 4.6.11), when Cyrus summons Araspas and asks him to guard Panthea for him. Araspas is, Xenophon tells us, Cyrus' childhood friend from Media to whom Cyrus presented his Median robe when he returned to Persia (5.1.2; cf. 1.4.26). Xenophon perhaps reminds us of this incident not only in order to identify Araspas (who is named here for the first time), but to contrast subtly Cyrus' behaviour with that of his Mede friend. Astyages, the Mede tyrant, takes away the gifts that his grandson has presented to his friends and forwards them all (including presumably Araspas' cloak) to Cyrus in Persia. Young Cyrus reprimands his grandfather and insists that the presents be returned to their recipients. Cyrus, then, proves himself, even as a child, a zealous guardian of the property of others, but Araspas, as we shall see, has not absorbed the lesson to be learned from this incident.

Xenophon immediately tells us that Panthea's husband, Abradatas of Susa, was away on a diplomatic mission to Bactria when the Assyrian camp was captured (5.1.3). His departure reminds us of Tigranes' absence during Cyrus' military confrontation with the Armenians (3.1.7): both Abradatas and Tigranes are noble and brave men who later join the Persian side. Since Xenophon cannot allow them at first to fight courageously on behalf of their fellow countrymen against Cyrus, he simply removes them from the scene.

When Cyrus puts his request to Araspas, the Mede learns that he has not actually seen the beautiful prisoner of war. Hence Araspas tells Cyrus of his first meeting with Panthea, describing the carefully-staged scene in an exceptionally vivid way (5.1.4-7). Throughout this first meeting Panthea is surrounded by her maids. These loyal women first sit round her on the ground ( περὶ

αὐτήν) and when she is ordered to stand, they too rise (συνανέστησαν). When Panthea wails they immediately join in her cries (συνανεβόησαν). It seems as if Panthea tries to lose herself among her servants, for not only is she encircled by them, but she also dresses in clothing like theirs - perhaps because she, a captive of war, is about to become the subject of another for the first time herself.

Panthea does not speak in this scene, but her every movement is described: her downcast expression while sitting on the ground, the tears trickling down her dress and to her feet (poetically described as τὰ δάκρυα στάζοντα 5.1.5), the tearing of her clothing, her cries and the sudden exposure of her face, arms and neck - and her actions are more eloquent than any words could be. The whole of this description leads up to Araspas' final impression of her incomparable beauty μήπω φῦναι μηδὲ γενέσθαι γυνῇ ἀπὸ θνητῶν τοιαύτη ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ (5.1.7).

Panthea, although she is dressed like her maids, is conspicuous because of her stature, nobility and elegance (τῷ μεγέθει... τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ εὐσχημοσύνῃ 5.1.5), and she reminds us in certain ways of Penelope. Indeed the very word δμωαί used here with θεράπαιναι and δούλαις to describe Panthea's female attendants seems to have Homeric overtones.[46] (We shall see below that Panthea has a large retinue of servants, including eunuchs, male and female attendants and a nurse, and in each episode of her novella Xenophon mentions those servants who best suit the occasion.) Penelope, another loyal wife who is separated from her husband, is like Panthea tall and beautiful (cf. e.g. Od. 18.248-251).[47] She too has no desire to beautify herself in front of others when her husband is away (Od. 18.171-181) and she too can be found sitting low on the ground, in tears and surrounded by loyal maids (Od. 4.716-720). This resemblance to Penelope is the first of several Homeric echoes we shall find in the Panthea story.

Panthea's modest dress, stature and simple elegance also remind us a bit of the chaste appearance and demeanour of another woman in Xenophon - Arete who meets Heracles at the crossroads (Mem. 2.1.22). In addition, we have already seen above, pp. 275-276) the similarities between Panthea and another beautiful but tearful prisoner of war, the daughter of Hegetorides of Cos (Hdt. 9.76). It is interesting to note that this woman (who was but recently the mistress of a leading Persian noble) dresses herself and her attendants carefully for her supplication scene with Pausanias κοσμησαμένη χρυσῷ πολλῷ καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ ἀμφίπολοι καὶ ἐσθῆτι τῇ καλλίστῃ τῶν παρεουσέων (Hdt. 9.76.1) in contrast to the modestly clad Panthea (ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα... ἐν ταπεινῷ σχήματι ἐστηκυῖα Cyr. 5.1.4-5). Both women receive the same encouragement from the men who now hold their lives in the balance: γύναι θάρσει (Hdt. 9.76.3); θάρρει ὦ γύναι (Cyr. 5.1.6). The daughter of Hegetorides is permitted to go where she likes, but Panthea is told that she is to belong to Cyrus, a man equal to her husband in appearance and ability. This announcement causes Panthea to weep and rend her clothes (cf. Cyr. 3.1.13 and 3.3.67 for similar female reactions to bad tidings), thus revealing, as Araspas points out to Cyrus, her lovely face, neck and arms for the first time. Araspas is perhaps slightly insensitive here, appreciating Panthea's beauty rather than her distress, and one wonders if Xenophon means him to be so.[48]

Our first introduction to the fair lady of Susa resembles in many ways, even foreshadows, our last sight of her, at Abradatas' grave (7.3.2-16). In both instances we find her sitting in mourning on the ground (χαμαί... ἐκάθητο 5.1.4; χαμαὶ καθημένην 7.3.8; cf. κάθηται χαμαί 7.3.5). She is surrounded by faithful servants in both scenes (5.1.4-6; 7.3.5, 14), but her husband is unavailable and she is in great distress, crying and wailing (cf. ἀνωδύρατο 5.1.6 and 7.3.9). In our episode Panthea is, at first, veiled (κεκαλυμμένη 5.1.4)

and in her final appearance she is, in the end, covered once again - wrapped in the same shroud as her husband (cf. περικαλύψαι... ἑνὶ ἱματίῳ 7.3.14). There are, of course, differences between the two scenes, for in the first Panthea is silent while in the second she addresses Cyrus, speaking with much bitterness. So too in the final episode Panthea is the one to encourage Cyrus (with great irony), telling him ἀλλὰ θάρρει... ὦ Κῦρε (7.3.13), rather than being reassured herself. Nonetheless, in many ways Panthea's first appearance in the Cyr. hints at or mirrors her final one.

Araspas invites Cyrus to go see the fairest woman in all Asia for himself and is very surprised by the Persian's refusal. Cyrus explains that he is afraid that after viewing Panthea once he will be unable to resist returning again and again, and thus will be led to neglect his duties. Araspas and Cyrus now turn to a discussion of the workings of love and their ἐρωτικὸς λόγος (which is continued at their next meeting 6.1.36 ff.) is slightly unusual: not in terms of its content but because it is occasioned by a woman. In the Mem. Socrates is also told by a friend of a woman who is beautiful beyond words - Theodote. Unlike Cyrus, he rushes off to see her at once, even though he too is aware of the danger of being enticed to visit again and again (Mem. 3.11.1-3). Socrates is, however, well able to withstand the charms of Theodote (cf. Mem. 3.11.15-18) and seems to take the hazards of passion seriously only when it comes to relations between men. Hence elsewhere in the Mem. Socrates warns Xenophon of the pitfalls of love after he learns that Critoboulus has kissed Alcibiades' handsome son (1.3.8-13), he reprimands Critias for his unseemly pursuit of Euthydemus (1.2.29-30) and warns Critoboulus that he must be discriminating in his advances towards young men (2.6.28 ff.). In the Symposium Critoboulus is roused by Cleinias' beauty to speak of the effects of love (Symp. 4.10-22; cf. 23-28) and Socrates' long ἐρωτικὸς λόγος (8.1 ff.) is, in essence,

meant to guide Callias in his relationship with young Autolycus. (We have already seen [above, p. 183] that such discussions of love are often found in a symposiastic setting, but this is not true in the Cyr.) Elsewhere too talk of eros usually centres round male relationships as with the speakers in Plato's Symposium and the speech by "Lysias" in the Phaedrus.[49] Xenophon, by having the lovely Panthea spark off an ἐρωτικὸς λόγος changes the usual sex of the object of the speaker's devotions and this deviation seems to have been a deliberate one. Artabazus, Cyrus' would-be wooer (Cyr. 1.4.27-28; cf. 8.4.26-27 etc.), could easily have fulfilled the same function, i.e. bring about a discussion of the hazards of love, if Xenophon so chose. Xenophon is not, perhaps, altogether innovative here, for he seems to be following in the footsteps of Aeschines' Aspasia. In Aeschines' work a discussion of Aspasia's talents and abilities causes Socrates to reflect upon the whys and wherefores of love.[50] Aeschines' dialogue may have had an even stronger influence on our passage, for he included in the Aspasia the tales of two beautiful and influential Oriental women: Thargelia and Rhodogyne.

Rhodogyne is a brave and lovely warrior queen of the Persians, i.e. is one of the Semiramis-type rulers we have already encountered in Ctesias and Herodotus. When she is informed suddenly of a rebellion in her empire, she goes off to conquer the Armenians with her hair only half-braided; later a gold statue, portraying her with her hair partially arranged is made in her honour. Beautiful as Rhodogyne is, she has no interest in love and disdains men. Thargelia of Miletus, on the other hand, actively pursues men in order to win them over to the Persian cause. She succeeds her husband as ruler of the Thessalians and is treated by the Persian king as an equal.[51] We cannot be sure what role the stories of these women (which apparently were narrated by Socrates)

played in the Aspasia and we do not know what Aeschines' sources for these novelle were, but it seems likely that the Socratic was influenced by Ctesias' depictions of outstanding Eastern women.[52] In other words Aeschines included the novellistic tales of two Ctesian-like heroines in an undoubtedly didactic work - a Socratic dialogue - in which ἔρως was discussed, several years before the writing of the Cyr.[53] Hence, although we have already seen that Xenophon was in all likelihood directly influenced by Ctesias in the novelle of the Cyr., he may have been indirectly affected as well, via Aeschines. Panthea does not resemble either of the two women appearing in the Aspasia, although she is a bit like the less militant Thargelia. Nonetheless the fact that almost immediately after the lovely Panthea is introduced, a (very Socratic) discussion of ἔρως arises, seems to point to Aeschines' Aspasia as a likely source of inspiration, for at least part of the Panthea novella.

In the course of Araspas' debate with Cyrus on love, Xenophon repeatedly refers to the Mede as ὁ νεανίσκος (5.1.8, 9, 13, 18), even though he is, as we have seen, Cyrus' childhood friend and presumably the same age as the Persian leader. The word is meant to characterize Araspas and perhaps take the sting out of his future actions. Araspas is impetuous and inexperienced, Xenophon seems to say, and will (understandably) yield to temptation. Araspas, in any event, argues that beauty is not an irresistible force since it does not affect everyone equally, the way that fire does. Araspas is, of course, playing with fire and a bit later, Cyrus takes up the Mede's analogy and contends that gazing upon beautiful people is as fraught with danger as touching fire. The effects may not be felt immediately, but one is bound to be burned in the end (αἴθεσθαι τῷ ἔρωτι 5.1.16). We find similar comparisons between being in love and coming in contact with fire (upholding Cyrus', and not Araspas', view of the matter) in two other discussions of love in Xenophon that we have already

encountered. Socrates thinks that Critoboulus, by kissing a handsome lad, is being more daring than if he were to jump into fire (κἂν εἰς πῦρ ἅλοιτο Mem. 1.3.9), while Critoboulus himself - whom Socrates describes as burning with passion (Symp. 4.23 ἰσχυρῶς προσεκαύθη; cf. the description of a kiss as ὑπέκκαυμα at 4.25) - is ready to walk through fire with his beloved Cleinias (Symp. 4.16). In Plato, Socrates caught fire ( ἐφλεγόμην Charm. 155D) when he glanced inside Charmides' cloak and he is reminded of a poet's warning to beware of beautiful boys.

Araspas goes on to argue that love is a matter of choice ( ἐθελούσιον 5.1.10; cf. 11) as the avoidance of matches between brothers and sisters, or fathers and daughters shows. One cannot pass a law against feeling hunger and thirst or heat and cold, but fear and law ( φόβος καὶ νόμος 5.1.10) are sufficient to prevent incest. Here the young Mede Araspas is, of course, using very Greek arguments, not only bringing in the familiar νόμος - φύσις antithesis (cf. πέφυκε 5.1.10; πεφύκασι 5.1.11 and νόμος 5.1.10, 11), but also using the outlawing of incest as an illustration of his point. While Greeks may have abhorred incest (see Eur. And. 173-176; Pl. Leg. 838A-B; cf. Mem. 4.4.19-23), Persians apparently did not - see Hdt. 3.31 (vs. 1.135); FGrH 765 F 31 (Xanthus); FGrH 688 F 44 (Ctesias); Διασοὶ Λόγοι 2.15; Antisthenes fr.29 (Caizzi)[54] - and Xenophon seems to have forgotten for the moment that his interlocutors are not two Athenians, but a Mede and a Persian.

Cyrus replies that if love were indeed a matter of volition then people should be able to stop loving at will. Instead his observation is that lovers are bound to those whom they love in chains stronger than iron and are virtually enslaved. Although they often cry out in pain, they are unable to free themselves from the sickness, and, in fact, do not wish to escape (Cyr. 5.1.12). Cyrus' analysis of the behaviour of ensnared lovers is very like two passages dealing

with ἔρως in the Mem. At Mem. 1.2.22-23, Xenophon (speaking in his own persona) also compares the actions of lovers before they fall in love (πρὶν ἐρᾶν Mem. 1.2.22; cf. Cyr. 5.1.12) to their profligate ways afterwards, while at Mem. 1.3.11 Socrates (addressing Xenophon) terms lovers slaves, and mentions their spending vast sums on their favourites, just as Cyrus does here. The Persian leader compares love to a sickness (εὐχομένους ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλης τινὸς νόσου ἀπαλλαγῆναι 5.1.12) and this analogy is regularly found in ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι : cf. Gorgias, Helen 19; Pl. Phaedr. 231D; Symp. 207A, Antisthenes fr.109 (Caizzi) etc.[55]

Araspas counters Cyrus' arguments by roundly condemning such lovers as wretched creatures (μοχθηροί Cyr. 5.1.13; cf. the even more contemptuous τὰ μοχθηρὰ ἀνθρώπια 5.1.14). These lovers, who could solve their difficulties by committing suicide, turn to stealing and do not respect the property of others. Cyrus, the Mede adds, would be the first to condemn and punish such thieves. Good people, while they may hanker after gold, good horses and beautiful women, do not touch these things out of turn, and Araspas himself is, he claims, living proof of this. Although he has seen Panthea and certainly appreciates her beauty, he nonetheless continues with his life as usual. It seems that the whole point of Araspas' speech here is to build up to his subsequent fall. The transition from besotted lovers to those who take the belongings of others is most intelligible if it refers to Araspas himself, who later is both obsessed with love and wishes to have a woman who belongs to another man - or actually two: Cyrus and Abradatas. Araspas, when faced with his moral dilemma, does not choose to kill himself either and his statement that Cyrus would be the first to chastise a thief is equally misguided as the Mede himself subsequently acknowledges - compare Araspas' initial assumption οὐ συγγιγνώσκεις ἀλλὰ κολάζεις (5.1.13) to Cyrus' actual attitude when put to the test σὺ μὲν... εἶ.. πρᾷός τε καὶ

συγγνώμων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων (6.1.37). Young Araspas is made to condemn his own later behaviour here while rashly boasting of his invulnerability and this makes his subsequent downfall all the more dramatic and sensational.

Cyrus, as we have seen, advises Araspas to avoid Panthea as he would a fire, and he particularly warns him against gazing upon the lovely woman of Susa for too long (ἐᾶν τὴν ὄψιν ἐνδιατρίβειν 5.1.16). In the passage of the Mem. where Socrates warns Xenophon of the dangers of love (Mem. 1.3.8 ff.), he compares handsome people to scorpions, for both sting people and can induce madness. Scorpions must actually touch their victims in order to do harm, adds Socrates, while good-looking people can inflict damage from afar (πάνυ πρόσωθεν 1.3.13; cf. τοὺς ἄπωθεν θεωμένους Cyr. 5.1.16) just by being looked upon. Both Cyrus and Socrates hint at the power of ὄψις - mere looking - to induce love but do not go into detail. The Greeks seem to have believed that emanations - sometimes thought of as shafts or missiles of love - went from a (beautiful) person and entered the observer's heart through his eyes; see e.g. Aes. Aeg. 742; Eur. Hipp. 525-526; Gorgias Hel. 15-19; Pl. Phaedr. 251 B and compare Hesychius s.v. ὀμμάτειος πόθος : διὰ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὁρᾶν ἁλίσκεσθαι ἔρωτι .[56] This seems to be the reason that both Cyrus and Socrates so strongly advise against looking at beautiful people for long periods of time - love is bound to follow. (Perhaps this is also the reason why Critoboulus so prefers seeing Cleinias in person to gazing at the image of him he carries in his heart - cf. Xen. Symp. 4.21-22).

Araspas reassures Cyrus that he will not do anything wrong even if he will look at Panthea without pause, and the Persian compliments him, perhaps ironically, on his good intentions κάλλιστα... λέγεις (Cyr. 5.1.17). He asks Araspas to take good care of the lady of Susa for she may come in handy (ἐν καιρῷ ) later on. Cyrus' final (and, it seems, chief) interest in Panthea is the possible

benefit or use that can be derived from her capture, and this is typical of the hero of the Cyr. His circumspect behaviour towards Panthea is not only the result of the Socratic or even Agesilaus-like (cf. Ages. 5.4 ff.) moderation in sexual matters that is only to be expected from one of Xenophon's didactic figures, but also stems from calculations of military or political advantage. Araspas has grouped beautiful women together with money and fine horses (5.1.14; the women are in third place), i.e. classified them as useful, as well as desirable, possessions, and this is indeed Cyrus' view of Panthea: she is to be used - not sexually, but for other purposes. As we have already seen in relation to Sambaulas and his ugly friend (2.2.28-31) and Cyrus and Artabazus (above, pp. 200-201), in the Cyr. beauty and physical attractions take second place to utility.

Cyrus' request that Araspas guard Panthea carefully concludes their conversation for the time being (τότε μέν 5.1.17 - hinting at future discussion to come). Immediately after the debate between Araspas and Cyrus, Xenophon tells us how the Mede nonetheless fell in love, describing the process in one very long sentence, where the various factors at work (ἅμα μὲν... ἅμα δὲ... ἅμα δὲ... ἅμα δὲ... )[57] are shown to lead up to an end result (ἐκ πάντων τούτων ἡλίσκετο ἔρωτι ) which is not all that surprising, as Xenophon himself notes (καὶ ἴσως οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν ἔπασχε 5.1.18).[58] Araspas becomes enamoured of Panthea not only because of her superior looks and character, but also because of her friendly, concerned attitude towards him: she appreciates his kindness and has her servants attend to his needs, showing particular attention to him when he is ill. The lady of Susa seems to be following some of the advice Socrates has given the courtesan Theodote on the best way to attract suitors (Mem. 3.11.10-12). Socrates recommends to Theodote to welcome a dedicated admirer warmly, to attend to sick friends carefully and to repay kindness. In short, Theodote is to behave towards suitors just as Panthea treats Araspas. It is no

wonder then that the young Mede falls in love with her, and Socrates' expertise and understanding in matters of love is indirectly demonstrated here.

Xenophon tells us no more of the love-stricken Araspas until Book 6, when Cyrus is looking round for a suitable spy (6.1.31 ff.). Cyrus is aware of the Mede's plight, for Panthea has found it necessary to inform him of Araspas' threats, and sent her eunuch with a message to the Persian leader. The eunuch is mentioned here (6.1.33) for the first time, and he does seem a more suitable servant than the maids we have encountered so far to perform such a Ctesian-like errand, telling tales of intrigue and lust. Cyrus' first reaction to the news is laughter (ἀναγελάσας 6.1.34) and he is perhaps paying Araspas back, for the Mede has earlier laughed at him, when he refused to see Panthea (καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος ἀναγελάσας εἶπεν... 5.1.9). Cyrus sends Artabazus to instruct Araspas that no force is to be used against Panthea, and Artabazus takes the young Mede to task severely, reprimanding him for his impiety, sinfulness and lack of control ἀσέβειάν τε... ἀδικίαν τε καὶ ἀκράτειαν (6.1.35). Cyrus' choice of representative is a bit puzzling for Artabazus, who once pretended to be Cyrus' relative in order to steal several kisses from him (1.4.27-28) is hardly a paragon of sexual rectitude himself. Perhaps he was sent because he is a fellow Mede, or maybe it is because Araspas' chief sin is not sexual indiscretion, but failing to guard properly what was entrusted to him by Cyrus. Panthea is a deposit of a kind (cf. παρακαταθήκην 6.1.35) and perhaps Artabazus spoke to Araspas in the same fashion as Leutychides did when addressing the Athenians, telling them of Glaucus and the deposit (Hdt. 6.86). In any event, this exchange between the two Medes is probably one of the most interesting unrecorded conversations in the Cyr. At its end Araspas is reduced to tears and feels ashamed and afraid of Cyrus' reaction. His pain (ὥστε... πολλὰ μὲν δακρύειν ὑπὸ λύπης 6.1.35) shows how correct Cyrus' earlier observation on the behaviour of lovers was (cf. κλαίοντες ὑπὸ λύπης 5.1.12).

Cyrus invites Araspas for a private talk (μόνος μόνῳ ἔλεξεν 6.1.36) and this confidentiality is probably arranged not only out of consideration for the shamefaced Mede's feeling, but also because of the need to keep the espionage plan secret. The conversation between Cyrus and Araspas is, in fact, a curious blend of the two topics: reflections on love and a detailed plan of how Araspas is to spy on the enemy. The Persian ruler first comforts Araspas, telling him that he has heard that the gods themselves have been worsted by love (ἔρωτος ἡττῆσθαι 6.1.36), not to mention prudent men. The excuse (or argument) that even the gods are unable to resist the power of love and consequently men certainly should not be blamed for their amorous involvements is a familiar one: cf. Gorgias, Helen 19;[59] Aristoph. Clouds 1079-1082 (where the language is similar to our passage - Zeus is ἥττων ἔρωτος ); Eur. Tro. 948 ff. etc.[60] Love is irresistible (cf.τῷ ἀμάχῳ πράγματι 6.1.36 and compare S. Ant. 781 ff.; Eur. fr.430 N²) and that is why Cyrus himself has kept away from Panthea, following, as it were, Socrates' advice in the Mem. that one should avoid passionate involvements if one wishes to behave prudently (σωφρονεῖν Mem. 1.3.8). The Persian leader blames himself for exposing Araspas to temptation, and indeed their earlier discussion should have made it clear to Cyrus just how susceptible to Panthea's attractions the Mede was. Araspas is very grateful to Cyrus for his kind, forgiving attitude towards his all too-human failings (σὺ μὲν... εἶ... πρᾷός τε καὶ συγγνώμων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων 6.1.37) and this is reminiscent of Cyrus' advice to Tigranes to forgive his father the Armenian king for having killed "Socrates": cf. 3.1.40 where Cyrus first addresses the king ἀνθρώπινά μοι δοκεῖς ἁμαρτεῖν and then turns to Tigranes συγγίγνωσκε τῷ πατρί (cf. 5.4.19 and see above, p. 130 ). Here Cyrus is practising what he preached to his friend, i.e. forgiving human waywardness, but he also benefits from the pardon he grants Araspas by being able to send him off as a spy; Tigranes does not, apparently, derive any similar advantage from forgiving his father.

Araspas tells Cyrus how all have made him feel like sinking in shame (καταδύουσι τῷ ἄχει 6.1.37; cf. καταδύεσθαι δ' ὑπὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης 6.1.35): his enemies have been well pleased at word of his misfortune, while even his friends have advised him to keep well out of Cyrus' way. It is interesting to note that Araspas has, along with friends, a stock of enemies within the Persian camp. While enemies are often referred to in the Cyr., usually the Assyrians are meant. Cyrus now explains to Araspas how his sorry reputation can be put to good use (see ἐν καιρῷ 6.1.38 and compare 5.1.17), for if he pretends to defect to the enemy, seemingly afraid that the Persian leader will take action against him because of Panthea, he will be readily accepted by the Assyrians and their allies. It is likely that Araspas will be made privy to their deliberations and councils, adds Cyrus, and thus he will be able to report back in full detail on the enemy's plans. This ploy of sending a supposed defector - a man who seemingly has good cause to change sides - to spy upon the enemy, is similar to Zopyrus' action against the Babylonians on behalf of Darius in Herodotus (3.153-160). There Zopyrus, not Darius, is the one to conceive the plan, and he mutilates himself terribly in order to claim that Darius had injured him and thus provide a reason for his going over to the Babylonians. While Zopyrus arranges with Darius an even more complicated scheme than the one found here, a scheme involving the use of Persian forces as cannon fodder (cf. below on Gadatas, p. 324), the basic idea is the same. Both Zopyrus and Araspas depart from the Persian side under a (supposed) cloud in order to be accepted by the "Assyrians" and spy on them. Both succeed as espionage agents (Hdt. 3.156, 158; Cyr. 6.3.14-20), allegedly giving away their own sides' secrets (Hdt. 3.157; Cyr. 6.1.42) and both are handsomely rewarded and honoured by their leaders (Hdt. 3.160; Cyr. 6.3.16-17).

Araspas readily agrees to spy upon the Assyrians and Cyrus teasingly asks him if he will be able to leave the fair Panthea behind. In his reply, the Mede theorizes once more on the character of love. Araspas explains that he has two

souls, a good one and a bad one, rather than one soul which is capable of being both bad and good. He has learned this from his recent encounter with that unjust sophist, love (νῦν τοῦτο πεφιλοσόφηκα μετὰ τοῦ ἀδίκου σοφιστοῦ τοῦ Ἔρωτος 6.1.41), but with Cyrus as an ally, he is confident that his good soul will dominate. This passage of the Cyr. seems to have certain Platonic overtones. In Plato's Symp., at any rate, Socrates (quoting Diotime) describes Eros as φιλοσοφῶν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου δεινὸς γόης καὶ φαρμακεὺς καὶ σοφιστής 203 D).[61] Araspas terms love, his teacher for this bit of philosophy about the dual nature of the soul, an unjust or crooked ( ἄδικος ) sophist, referring perhaps not so much to the content of his teaching, as to the means by which the lesson has been taught.[62] The doctrine of two souls found here reminds commentators of several passages in Plato - Phaedr. 237 D; Rep. 439 D; Leg. 896 E (cf. Arist. Pol. 1334 b17 ff.) - although in Plato, the soul is usually described as tripartite. Phaedr. 237 D, part of Socrates' first ἐρωτικὸς λόγος , where he serves as a mouthpiece for a wily lover, is perhaps closest in tenor and context to our passage. Socrates, while trying to define love, contrasts the two ruling or guiding principles within people - the desire for pleasure ( ἐπιθυμία ἡδονῶν ) and an acquired judgement which has what is best as its goal ( ἐπίκτητος δόξα ἐφιεμένη τοῦ ἀρίστου Phaedr. 237 D) and these two principles correspond, more or less, to Araspas' two souls, ἡ πονηρά and ἡ ἀγαθή (Cyr. 6.1.41). The doctrine presented here by the Mede, like that of the wily lover in Socrates' speech, is more popular than philosophical.[63]

Cyrus does not respond to Araspas' remarks with any philosophical musings of his own, but turns to some practical advice on how the Mede is to proceed as an espionage agent. Araspas should supply the enemy with misleading information on Persian plans, advise them on military formations and then return as close as possible to the actual battle with up-to-date information on their battle

strategy (6.1.42-43). The conversation between Cyrus and Araspas ends on this pragmatic note and the Mede sets out for the Assyrian camp according to plan, after leaving a false trail behind him: εἰπὼν πρός τινας ἃ ᾤετο συμφέρειν τῷ πράγματι (6.1.44) is Xenophon's gentle way of describing this deceit.

When Panthea hears that Araspas has gone[64] she sends word to Cyrus, offering to summon her husband, who will be, she promises, a far more loyal friend than Araspas was. Abradatas, who will bring with him as large a force as possible, will be glad to change sides, Panthea adds, for he too has a score to settle with the young Assyrian king. While Abradatas was on excellent terms with the old Assyrian king, the new ruler had once tried to separate forcibly (διασπάσαι 6.1.45) Panthea and her husband. The lady of Susa does not explain why the wanton (cf. ὑβριστήν 6.1.45) young man tried to keep them apart, but presumably he had designs on the fair Panthea. While the readers of the Cyr. may be disappointed at not hearing all the details of another scandal which, like the story of Gadatas, deals with sexual jealousy, the fact that Panthea does not elaborate is in keeping with her delicate and circumspect behaviour. In any event, Abradatas, like Gobryas and Gadatas, will transfer his allegiance to Cyrus because he has been mistreated by the brash Assyrian despot; like his two fellow Assyrians, he had been a loyal subject of the young king's father. Cyrus, apparently also addressing Panthea via messenger - the two do not seem to meet face-to-face until after Abradatas' death (7.3.8) - asks her to send for her husband: his idea that the lady of Susa could prove useful (cf. 5.1.17) has borne fruit.

Abradatas, receiving Panthea's summons and recognizing his wife's σύμβολα gladly (ἄσμενος 6.1.46; cf. Panthea's prediction to Cyrus ἄσμενος ἂν... ἀπαλλαγείη 6.1.45) sets off with some 1,000 cavalrymen to join Cyrus. This is the first we hear of any σύμβολα, which were, perhaps, tokens serving as proof

of Panthea's identity, like those of Menelaus and Helen (Eur. Hel. 291) or the σήματα of Penelope and Odysseus (Od. 23.108-110). It is, at any rate, another small gap or bare allusion, like the reference to the provocative behaviour of the young Assyrian king towards Panthea, which Xenophon leaves to the imagination of his reader to fill in. Abradatas, when he reaches the Persian camp, sends word of his arrival to Cyrus, and the Persian leader has him brought at once to his wife. Panthea and Abradatas, re-united, embrace one another, naturally (ὡς εἰκός 6.1.47; see 3.1.41 for a like remark by Xenophon on a similar reunion between Tigranes and his wife and cf. 2.1.2) and then turn to talk of... Cyrus. Panthea praises the Persian's attitude towards her and Abradatas wonder how he can repay him. His wife's reply is that he should try to act towards Cyrus as the latter has behaved towards him (6.1.47).

While Xenophon clearly intends the reunion between husband and wife to be a touching scene, as his description of their embrace after they scarcely hoped to meet again (ἐκ δυσελπίστων 6.1.47) shows, he is, it seems, even more anxious to extol the virtues of his hero Cyrus. No sooner does Panthea meet with her husband again than she begins to list the Persian leader's virtues - his piety, self-restraint and compassion towards her (τὴν ὁσιότητα καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν κατοίκτισιν 6.1.47) and Abradatas' first thought too is, apparently, one of gratitude towards Cyrus, rather than, for instance, interest in his wife. In the next (and final) glimpse of the married pair that Xenophon give us (6.4.2-11) we learn a bit more about the relationship between the two. Cyrus is again a topic of their conversation, but he is not the sole subject. Here, the exclusive concentration on the Persian jars: Xenophon emphasizes the didactic (and not the romantic) aspect of his tale.

Abradatas leaves Panthea in order to present himself before Cyrus. Taking the Persian's right hand, Abradatas offers himself as friend, servant and ally

( φίλον σοι ἐμαυτὸν δίδωμι καὶ θεράποντα καὶ σύμμαχον 6.1.48) and says that he will try to co-operate with Cyrus in any enterprise the latter undertakes ὅσα ἂν ὁρῶ σε σπουδάζοντα συνεργὸς πειράσομαι γίγνεσθαι 6.1.48 (cf. immediately below ὁρῶν ὁ Ἀβραδάτας σπουδάζοντα τὸν Κῦρον... ἐπειρᾶτο συντελεῖν αὐτῷ 6.1.50). Abradatas displays a certain dignity or awareness of his own worth in his approach to Cyrus. When his compatriot Gobryas meets Cyrus for the first time in very similar circumstances, i.e. upon his defection, he is more humble, addressing the Persian leader as ὦ δέσποτα(4.6.2; cf. 5.4.42) rather than Abradatas' ὦ Κῦρε(6.1.48). So too Gobryas presents himself as a suppliant (ἱκέτης προσπίπτω), a vassal and ally (καὶ δίδωμί σοι ἐμαυτὸν δοῦλον καὶ σύμμαχον 4.6.2) rather than the man of Susa's more dignified friend, servant and ally. Gadatas, the third Assyrian who changes sides, bows down before the Persian leader (προσκυνήσας 5.3.18) the first time they meet and later addresses Cyrus as ὦ δέσποτα(5.3.28). Abradatas has been described earlier as καλὸν... κἀγαθόν and compared to Cyrus with respect to his appearance, judgement and power (5.1.6), so that his attitude towards Cyrus as a grateful, but equal, ally is probably a reflection of his nobility and high standing. Cyrus accepts Abradatas' offer and sends him off to dine with Panthea. We next encounter Abradatas fulfilling his promise to aid Cyrus in his affairs and readying 100 chariots for the forthcoming battle (6.1.50-51).

In the meantime, Araspas' plan to infiltrate the enemy's command has apparently succeeded, for Cyrus learns from interrogating enemy prisoners that there are three men in charge of drilling the Assyrian forces - Croesus, a Greek[65] and a Mede, said to be a deserter from the Persian side (6.3.11), i.e. Araspas. Cyrus, upon hearing of the Mede, exclaims, "may I get hold of him as I like" ἀλλὰ... λαβεῖν μοι γένοιτο αὐτὸν ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι (6.3.11) - a two-edged remark, which Cyrus' men understand properly only shortly thereafter, when

Araspas returns to the Persian camp (6.3.14). Cyrus greets Araspas warmly, explains to the others that the Mede has not departed in disgrace, but has been sent to spy on the Assyrians, and then questions Araspas about the enemy's numbers and tactical procedures (6.3.14-21). The Egyptians, Araspas reports, appear to be the most dangerous opponents and it is against them that Abradatas volunteers to fight when Cyrus assigns the battle positions (6.3.35). Cyrus recommends casting lots for this dangerous post facing the enemy's phalanx, and Abradatas then wins the position by lot; he is fated, it seems, to undertake this hazardous task (and Cyrus utters words to that effect at 7.1.15).

Cyrus' forces ready themselves for the contest with the Assyrians and we find Abradatas putting on his armour for the forthcoming battle, with Panthea at his side (6.4.2 ff.). She presents him with new, golden armour that she has secretly had made for him and her husband guesses that the gold has come from her own jewellery. Panthea explains that he is her most precious ornament (μέγιστος κόσμος 6.4.3), especially when he appears to others as he seems to her. In using her own jewellery to ensure that Abradatas is well-turned out, and thus (only) indirectly adorning herself, the lady of Susa is following in the footsteps of Cyrus the Younger, who according to Xenophon, passed along finery given to him to his friends, thinking φίλους δὲ καλῶς κεκοσμημένους μέγιστον κόσμον ἀνδρί (Anab. 1.9.23); our Cyrus shares this sentiment (Cyr. 8.3.4; cf. Cyaxares' words at 2.4.5). Panthea is anxious for Abradatas to impress others and this desire for public recognition and honour, a typical attitude in the Cyr., is something that she will return to immediately below. Panthea, while helping her husband put on his new armour tries to hide the tears falling down her cheeks: λανθάνειν μὲν ἐπειρᾶτο, ἐλείβετο δὲ αὐτῇ τὰ δάκρυα κατὰ τῶν παρειῶν (6.4.3) is Xenophon's poetic description.[66] The language used here is somewhat like a passage in the Odyssey where Odysseus is trying to hide

his tears and Homer compares him to a widow mourning her fallen husband - cf. ... δάκρυ δ' ἔδευεν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι παρείας... πάντας ἐλάνθανε δάκρυα λείβων... (Od. 8.521-532). In her two actions here - supplying Abradatas with armour and crying at her husband's departure - Panthea brings to mind two different females in Homer: Thetis bringing Achilles the new armour she has had Hephaestus make for him (Il. 19.10 ff.; cf. 18.136 ff.) and Andromache bidding farewell to Hector (Il. 6.394 ff.);[67] the resemblances (and differences) between Panthea and Andromache are, as we shall see, particularly interesting.

Abradatas, Xenophon tells us, who is already attractive to begin with, looks handsome and noble in his golden armour (Cyr. 6.4.4). A lengthy and complimentary description of a character other than Cyrus is unusual in the Cyr. - Xenophon lingers less over Cyrus' own costume for the battle (7.1.2). So too in the course of the engagement itself, Abradatas' actions - his exhortations to his companions, his swift assault upon the enemy and his courageous death - are described in full (7.1.29-32) and come close to rivalling the amount of narrative devoted to the deeds of the Cyr.'s hero on the battlefield. Thus here, as in Homer,[68] a detailed arming scene serves as an indication that the hero will play an important role in the forthcoming fighting. It should be noted that Abradatas, in addition to his role as Panthea's husband, is the only one of Cyrus' close friends or allies to be killed in battle and therefore considerable attention is devoted to his aristeia (7.1.29-32; cf. 7.3.3).

When Abradatas is about to mount his chariot, Panthea, asking those surrounding them to withdraw, addresses her spouse (6.4.5 ff.). She begins by declaring that she loves Abradatas more than her own life ( μεῖζον τῆς... ψυχῆς 6.4.5), thus reminding us of another devoted pair in the Cyr. - Tigranes and his wife, for the Armenian prince was ready to give his life ( κἂν τῆς ψυχῆς πριαίμην (3.1.36; cf. 41) to keep his wife from servitude. The lady of Susa does not wish

to go into a point-by-point ( καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον 6.4.5) proof of her loyalty, for her actions are stronger testimony than any words; loving and faithful as she is, her overwhelming concern is, nonetheless, that Abradatas should distinguish himself in the coming battle. Panthea states that she would rather be buried ( γῆν ἐπιέσασθαι is her poetic phrase; cf. P. Nem. 11.16) with a brave Abradatas ( μετὰ σοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ γενομένου ) than live in shame with an ashamed man ( ζῆν μετ' αἰσχυνομένου αἰσχυνομένη 6.4.6). Abradatas and Panthea must demonstrate their gratitude to Cyrus who has treated the lady of Susa as if she were his brother's wife, not a slave or a mistress ( ὡς ἐλευθέραν ἐν ἀτίμῳ ὀνόματι 6.4.7 is the euphemism used by the delicate Panthea). So too Panthea has promised the Persian leader that Abradatas will prove a far better and more loyal man than Araspas was (6.4.8; cf. 6.1.45).

Panthea, then, in this farewell scene with her husband, exhorts Abradatas to be courageous and fight bravely. She has asked the others present to depart not so as to exchange a few last intimacies with her husband (cf. Andromache's regrets at Il. 24.744-745), but in order to rouse Abradatas to valiant action on the battlefield. If Panthea's situation - that of a tearful wife parting from her husband, who is going to die in the fighting - is similar to Andromache's in Book 6 of the Iliad, her words and outlook are not at all like that of the Homeric heroine. Andromache tries to dissuade Hector from returning to the fighting and thinks only of the disastrous personal consequences for herself and their son Astyanax, if he should be killed (Il. 6.405 ff.). It is Hector who is, like Panthea, concerned with the opinion of others and he is anxious to avoid seeming a coward ( κακός Il. 6.443; compare Panthea's fear about living in shame μετ' αἰσχυνομένου αἰσχυνομένη Cyr. 6.4.6), while Andromache concentrates on her own personal situation. Her wish that she may die too ( χθόνα δύμεναι) if Hector is killed (Il. 6.410-411; cf. Hector's similar

petition at 464-465) stems from despair and sorrow and is not at all like Panthea's vision of sharing in Abradatas' heroic end as the greatest good (τῶν καλλίστων Cyr. 6.4.6). Panthea's words here foreshadow, of course, her own death at Abradatas' side, but at the time of her suicide, she views her husband's death in an entirely different light (below, p.307 ). The lady of Susa may shed tears in this farewell scene, just as Andromache does (Cyr. 6.4.3; Il. 6.405, 484, 496), but in spirit she is closer to Herodotus' Atossa, who in the seclusion of their bedroom urges Darius to enter into a war in order to demonstrate to the Persians that their ruler is a man (Hdt. 3.134);[69] it is perhaps not a coincidence that both Atossa and Panthea, when urging their husbands to fight, are influenced by their feeling of obligation to another man, i.e. Democedes and Cyrus respectively. Both in this scene and in her previous appearance where she suggested to Cyrus that her husband join the Persian's forces, Panthea seems closest to the scheming Oriental women of Ctesias and Herodotus (cf. above, pp.259-260). She is, of course, far more refined and delicate and is not at all cruel, but her strong character and ambition are well in evidence.

Abradatas is not in the least wounded that Panthea finds it necessary to remind him to fight valiantly, even after he has volunteered for - and been allotted - one of the most dangerous battle positions (Cyr. 6.3.35-36); he is, in fact, pleased by her words ἀγασθεὶς τοῖς λόγοις (6.4.9). Placing his hand on Panthea's head and looking upward to heaven, he prays to Zeus to prove a worthy husband to Panthea and a worthy friend to Cyrus. Returning for a moment to the Hector-Andromache parting, we find that Hector too offers a prayer to Zeus (and the other gods) but his concerns his son Astyanax (Il. 6.475-481). The child Astyanax, a (practically) silent presence at his parents' farewell, is ever uppermost in their thoughts (cf. Il. 6.407-408, 432, 466 ff.) and to a

certain extent, Cyrus plays the same important third-party role at the final meeting between Abradatas and Panthea: the pair from Susa have Cyrus in mind during much of their conversation and he is almost a silent, third presence at their discussion.

Abradatas mounts his chariot and closes the door and, with her husband out of reach, Panthea embraces the chariot-box and secretly follows the chariot as it drives away. Abradatas, turning round, bids Panthea farewell once again and asks her (somewhat brusquely) to leave θάρρει, Πάνθεια, καὶ χαῖρε καὶ ἄπιθι ἤδη (Cyr. 6.4.10). Panthea's eunuchs and maidservants lead her to her carriage, have her lie down and hide her from view: Panthea is, presumably, overcome by grief and perhaps while the eunuchs handle the physical side of her carriage's departure, the women servants comfort her. In her reluctance to be parted from her husband, the lady of Susa reminds us once again of Andromache who also has to be dismissed by her husband (ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε Il. 6.490), and is then surrounded by maidservants who share in her grief (497-499). Abradatas, who is understandably reluctant to have his wife follow him to the battlefield, speaks more impatiently to Panthea than Hector does to his wife, and in the Iliad it is Hector who lingers and delays the final parting (Il. 6.515-516; cf. 496 where Andromache is said to frequently turn round ἐντροπαλιζομένη ). In any event, the ruler of Susa is far more gentle in dismissing Panthea than, for example, Ajax is to Tecmessa (S. Aj. 578 ff.), in yet another reminiscence of the Hector-Andromache scene.

Only after the beautiful lady of Susa is out of sight, Xenophon adds, do onlookers turn to gaze at Abradatas, decked out in his armour (Cyr. 6.4.11) and this is a final narrative touch in a dialogue full of vivid background detail. The conversation here between Panthea and Abradatas is accompanied by a great deal of movement and many gestures and props, and here too, as with

Araspas' depiction of his initial meeting with Panthea (5.1.4 ff.), the description seems close to stage directions. So too, the setting of their talk moves from indoors (probably inside a tent), where Panthea tearfully helps Abradatas don his armour, to outdoors, where the ruler of Susa departs in his chariot. The audience present at their conversation also changes: at first the couple are, it seems, surrounded by attendants whom Panthea then dismisses in order to converse with Abradatas privately, and later, at their final separation outside, eunuchs, maids and bystanders are again to be found. All the dialogues of the Cyr. are, of course, narrated by Xenophon, and in many he includes some kind of dramatic background, but rarely are the setting and actions accompanying conversations more prominent than in the Panthea novella; this is true of the final dialogue of the novella as well.

Once Abradatas takes up his allotted spot in the battle line-up, he converses briefly with Cyrus who encourages him and advises him to go and exhort his men (7.1.15-18). Abradatas' role in the actual battle - his valiant attack upon the Egyptian phalanx, his mutilation and death together with the loyal few who fought at his side - is narrated in its proper chronological place, i.e. as part of Xenophon's running description of the course of the fighting (7.1.29-32). This is, as we have seen, the only essential element in the plot of the Panthea novella which does not appear in a conversational context and the main details of Abradatas' death are later recapitulated in a dialogue. After the capture of Sardis, Cyrus innocently enquires after Abradatas and learns from one of his servants that the ruler of Susa has been killed (7.3.2 ff.). The servant tells of Abradatas' demise in language very similar to Xenophon's original description (compare 7.1.30 and 7.3.3). In addition, he informs the Persian ruler that Panthea has taken up Abradatas' body for burial and brought it near the River Pactolus, where a grave is being dug. Panthea, having decked her husband out

for burial, is sitting on the ground, clutching her husband's head to her knees (7.3.4-6). The information relayed by the servant to Cyrus, in an address somewhat like a messenger speech in tragedy, could have simply been narrated by Xenophon, and indeed both the beginning and end of his speech - the description of Abradatas' death and of Panthea sitting on the ground with her husband's corpse - are narrated again separately (cf. 7.1.30; 7.3.8). By having a servant inform Cyrus of Abradatas' death, Xenophon makes his reader concentrate on the Persian's reaction and builds up tension and interest in the forthcoming encounter between Cyrus and Panthea.

Cyrus reacts by hitting his thigh - a gesture indicating vexation and grief (cf. Il. 15.113) - and rushing to the scene of the burial, after leaving instructions for ornaments and animals for sacrifice to be brought to the graveside (7.3.6-7).

The burial given here to Abradatas seems more Greek than Persian. The corpse was apparently bathed in the River Pactolus and such pollution of a river is not in accordance with Persian custom, at least according to Herodotus (Hdt. 1.138). Abradatas is to be buried (cf. ὀρύττειν... θήκην Cyr. 7.3.5), without being embalmed in wax (cf. Hdt. 1.140) or exposed to the elements, according to the Zoroastrian practice.[70] The sacrifice of animals at the burial site in Abradatas' honour, which Cyrus wishes to organize (Cyr. 7.3.7, 11) is, apparently, in line with Persian customs (cf. Arr. Anab. 6.29.7), but Xenophon is also influenced, perhaps, by the slaughter of sheep and cattle to be found at the funeral rites of Homeric heroes, such as Patrocles (Il. 23.166-167) and Achilles (Od. 24.65-66).

Cyrus finds Panthea sitting on the ground, holding Abradatas' head on her lap (Cyr. 7.3.8; cf. 7.3.5), and this is the customary gesture of the chief mourner at a funeral (cf. e.g. Il. 24.724 where Andromache mourns Hector in the

same way).[71] Although Xenophon does not mention the fact, this is, it seems, the first time that Cyrus actually sets eyes on Panthea; in any event, this is the first direct exchange between the two in the Cyr. Perhaps Cyrus does not permit himself to see the fair lady of Susa until she no longer belongs to another man. Cyrus first sheds tears for the dead Abradatas and then addresses his spirit - ὦ ἀγαθὴ καὶ πιστὴ ψυχή (Cyr. 7.3.8) and perhaps his choice of adjectives is meant to echo Panthea's promise to him that her husband will prove ἄνδρα καὶ πιστότερον καὶ ἀμείνονα , a better and more loyal man (than Araspas 6.4.8; cf. 6.1.45). Cyrus then clasps Abradatas' hand in a gesture of farewell (cf. 3.2.14; 8.7.28), only to have the dead man's hand come away with his own, for Abradatas has been badly mangled by the Egyptians ( ἀπεκέκοπτο 7.3.8; cf. κατεκόπησαν 7.1.32). Panthea, weeping, takes the hand from Cyrus and fits it back in place.

This somewhat gruesome incident of Abradatas' severed hand is compared by commentators to the tale of the clever thief in Herodotus, whose detachable arm is seized by Rhampsinitus' daughter (Hdt. 2.121); several scholars consider this bit an incongruous or inappropriate touch.[72] A more relevant parallel seems to be the mutilation of Cyrus the Younger at Cunaxa, for he had his head and right arm cut off by Artaxerxes' men (Anab. 1.10.1; cf. Ctesias' more detailed version, FGrH 688 F 16.64, 66; F 20). In fact, the circumstances of Abradatas' death resemble in many ways Cyrus' end. Both men launch an attack on the enemy's closely-formed ranks ( τὸ στῖφος Anab. 1.8.26; πολλῷ στίφει Cyr. 7.1.30; cf. 7.3.3) with the aid of only a few close friends ( οἱ ὁμοτράπεζοι Anab. 1.8.25; cf. οἱ... φίλοι καὶ συντράπεζοι Anab. 1.9.31; οἱ... ἑταῖροί τε... καὶ ὁμοτράπεζοι Cyr. 7.1.30), for the rest of their forces have rushed off to pursue the enemy (Anab. 1.8.25; Cyr. 7.1.30; cf. 7.3.3). Abradatas and Cyrus the Younger both fight valiantly but are killed, together with their close companions

(Anab. 1.8.27; Cyr. 7.1.32) and their corpses, as we have seen, are mutilated. It may not be a coincidence, then, that Abradatas, the only one of the Cyr.'s heroes to be killed in battle, dies in a fashion similar to that of a real-life hero in another work of Xenophon's, the Anabasis.[73] The mangling of Abradatas' corpse, while perhaps an unsavoury occurrence, is not, in fact, far removed from the exerience of Xenophon himself. In addition, it is possible that Ctesias' full-scale depiction of the death of Cyrus the Younger and its aftermath has influenced Xenophon here. Ctesias seems to have included a scene showing Parysatis mourning Cyrus (FGrH 688 F 24, F 25; cf. F 41), which apparently included a description of how she gathered her son's scattered limbs for burial - ὡς Παρύσατις... πενθοῦσα Κῦρον καὶ μόλις ἐκομίσατο τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν χεῖρα is Photius' brief summary (688 F 16.66) - just as the weeping Panthea tends Abradatas' pitiful remains in our episode.

The widowed Panthea has done a complete turnabout in her attitude towards the glory of war (cf. Cyr. 6.4.6-8). She blames herself - and Cyrus too (ὅσως δὲ καὶ διὰ σέ, ὦ Κῦρε 7.3.10) - for her husband's death because she has foolishly (ἐγὼ... ἡ μώρα 7.3.10) exhorted him to prove himself a loyal friend to Cyrus on the battlefield, with no thought of the consequences for himself. The lady of Susa, who had told her husband that she much preferred a glorious, shared death to a life together in disgrace, is now bitter and repentant: she will indeed shortly join Abradatas in death, but clearly derives little comfort from his heroic end. One wonders if, given another opportunity to address her husband for the last time, her choice of glory over life would be repeated. This sad and reproachful Panthea is perhaps a more convincing and human figure than the earlier exhorting one, but she is a surprising creation of the author of the Cyr. It is Cyrus' viewpoint, i.e. that Abradatas who has died victorious has been granted the fairest end of all (τὸ κάλλιστον τέλος 7.3.11), which is the

usual attitude in the Cyr. (cf. 5.5.24; 6.1.55; 7.1.10 etc.), and Panthea herself has expressed just this sentiment to Abradatas before he set out for the battlefield - cf. οὕτως (i.e. by dying after valiant action against the enemy) ἐγὼ καὶ σὲ τῶν καλλίστων καὶ ἐμαυτὴν ἠξίωκα (6.4.6). The Persian leader utters his words of comfort to Panthea after a few additional tears over her plight (see Cyr. 5.5.10 and Anab. 1.3.2 for other such tactful displays of crying), and he continues to demonstrate his appreciation of the glories attached to victory by pressing on Panthea all the outer trappings - fine burial clothing and decorations, animals for sacrifice at the grave and an impressive monument - used to honour a fallen hero. Cyrus is also concerned about Panthea's future and promises to arrange an escort for her to the place of her choice, because he respects her fine character and self-restraint (σωφροσύνη; cf. 6.1.47 where it is Panthea who praises Cyrus' σωφροσύνη). All Panthea need do, says the Persian, is reveal to him to whom she wishes to be conveyed. The lady of Susa replies in terrible irony tht Cyrus need have no fear about her concealing the identity of the person whom she wishes to join ἀλλὰ θάρρει... ὦ Κῦρε, οὐ μή σε κρύψω πρὸς ὅντινα βούλομαι ἀφικέσθαι (7.3.13). Cyrus does not understand the ambiguity of her remark, even though the style is akin to his own two-edged wish earlier to get hold of Araspas (6.3.11). He takes his leave of Panthea, pitying her for having lost such a husband and pitying Abradatas for never being able to see his wife again (κατοικτίρων... τὸν ἄνδρα οἷαν γυναῖκα καταλιπὼν οὐκετ' ὄψοιτο 7.3.14). In these last words, where Cyrus refers to seeing Panthea, there is perhaps an allusion to the lady's great beauty, but a more open reference would be inappropriate at this scene of mourning. So too the Persian's reassurance that Panthea will not be left friendless (ἔρημος 7.3.12) and his delicate probing as to where she would like to go may not only serve as a "feed" to her final ironic statement, but is possibly also meant to show that he is ready to

arrange a match for her with the man of her choice. Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to suggest that the Persian leader considers himself a suitable candidate for the role of protector and future spouse. Cyrus' offer makes it clear that Panthea 's suicide stems solely from her love for her husband; unlike Andromache, for example, she need not worry how she will fare without her husband's protection, so that her grief is perhaps less selfish than that of the Homeric heroine. Had Panthea not killed herself, it seems likely that she would eventually have married one of Cyrus' chief lieutenants (as Gobryas' daughter does, for example), if not the Persian leader himself. The only sure way to preserve the lady of Susa's image as a faithful wife untarnished is the method Xenophon has chosen, i.e. to have Panthea join her husband in death.

After Cyrus' departure, Panthea bids her eunuchs to withdraw so that she can mourn Abradatas as she likes (ὡς βούλομαι 7.3.14 - another ambiguous phrase that is not understood correctly by those who surround her). Eunuchs are often involved in the burial of their masters in Ctesias (cf. FGrH 688 F 13.9; F 13.23; F 15.47) and this may have been one of their regular functions; in any event, their attendance here at Abradatas' grave is not surprising. More unexpected is the presence of Panthea's nurse, to whom the lady of Susa now turns with the request that she be covered with the same shroud as Abradatas, after she dies. This is the first we hear of any τροφός she is presumably Panthea's childhood nurse who now serves as her mistress' confidante. Xenophon introduces her here only minutes before Panthea's death, in a role very like that of the nurses in tragedy, for she now tries to dissuade her mistress from suicide - cf. e.g. Hermione's nurse in the Andromache (Eur. And. 811 ff.) and Deianira's τροφός in the Trachiniae (S. Tr. 874 ff.).[74] In Ctesias, Parysatis has a trusted maid and confidante, called Γύγγη or Γύγις, who is privy to her plot to poison her daughter-in-law Stateira, but she is not described as a τροφός in the extant fragments

(FGrH 688 F 27.70; F 29). Panthea is, in any event, deaf to her servant's entreaties and the nurse withdraws, allowing the lady of Susa to unsheath a dagger long held in readiness (πάλαι παρεσκευασμένον 7.3.14) and stab herself to death. Panthea dies with her head on her husband's breast and the nurse, fulfilling her last wish, wraps the pair in a joint shroud.

It has already been noted that Xenophon does not spin out the novelle of the Cyr. and nowhere is this economy more apparent than in the presentation of Panthea's suicide. Xenophon does not show us the over-wrought nurse actually pleading with Panthea, nor does he have the lady of Susa indulge in a long, emotional speech before her death, the way a tragic heroine (such as Phaedra, Alcestis, Deianira or Evadne of the Supplices) would. In her death scene, Panthea is dignified and restrained. She clearly has planned her suicide carefully in advance, as her hidden dagger indicates, and she puts an end to herself quickly and quietly.

The lady of Susa kills herself because she has no desire to live without her husband Abradatas. Grief-stricken widows who voluntarily join their husbands in death are found in two plays of Euripides: Laodameia in the Protesilaus (frr.647-657 $N^2$; cf. especially fr.656) and Evadne in the Supplices (980 ff.) and Xenophon may have been acquainted with these tragic heroines. More generally, in Plato, Socrates speaks of the many people who voluntarily descend to Hades in the hope of being united with their loved ones (Phaedo 68 A) and Xenophon probably knew of several instances of people who willingly died together with (συνθανεῖν ) or in the wake of another ( ἐπαποθανεῖν), both in fiction (e.g. Jocaste in Eur. Phoen. 1455 ff.) and in fact (cf. e.g. Hell. 4.8.39, where a παιδικά fights to the very end by his lover's side).[75] Indeed, we have just seen that the close friends and companions of both Abradatas and Cyrus the Younger (cf. too Oec. 4.19) chose to die with their leader. Turning to the East,

Herodotus (5.5) tells of the way certain Thracian wives customarily join their husbands in death. Each male Thracian has several wives and when a husband dies there is a contest among his wives as to which was his favourite and is to be granted the honour of being killed and buried alongside her husband. Ctesias (FGrH 688 F 1q) tells us that Sardanapallus' wife joins her husband (and his mistresses) on the huge funeral pyre that the king erected after his defeat by the Medes, but it is unclear whether this was on her own initiative. Diodorus Siculus (19.33-34) describes the Indian custom of suttee which, according to his account, arose not from wives' passionate devotion to their husbands, but in order to prevent women from poisoning unsatisfactory spouses. Nonetheless, Diodorus includes the story of a man's two wives who vie for the privilege of being buried with him and his tale probably comes, in part, from the much earlier Alexander-historian Onesicritus;[76] possibly Xenophon was also acquainted with this Indian practice. Panthea's suicide, her wish to die because her husband is dead, is not, then, without precedent both in Greek literature and Oriental practice.

Panthea's three eunuchs, when they see what their mistress has done, quickly follow suit, pulling out their daggers and stabbing themselves to death on the spot (Cyr. 7.3.15). What is perhaps the closest parallel to their act of self-sacrifice is again to be found on the battlefield of Cunaxa, where, according to one of the two versions Xenophon brings, the eunuch Artapates, Cyrus' most loyal sceptre-bearer[77] draws out his dagger and kills himself, when he sees that his master has died (φασι... ἑαυτὸν ἐπισφάξασθαι σπασάμενον τὸν ἀκινάκην Anab. 1.8.29; compare our passage σπασάμενοι... τοὺς ἀκινάκας ἀποσφάττονται Cyr. 7.3.15). In Ctesias, the eunuchs of Sardanapallus also die with their master on the funeral pyre (FGrH 688 F 1b 27.2), but as with the ruler's wife, we do not know if they volunteered to do so. Herodotus (7.107) tells of Borges'

great funeral pyre, including, besides himself, his wife, children, mistresses and servants.

When he learns of Panthea's suicide, Cyrus, stunned, rushes back to the scene to see if he can assist in any way. All that remains for him to do is arrange a fitting funeral for the pair and erect a huge monument (μνῆμα ὑπερμέγεθες 7.3.16) over their grave. While the description of the tomb of Abradatas and Panthea here is quite brief,[78] it is the only such description to be found in the Cyr. There is nothing, for example, about the monuments or tombs of Astyages, Cambyses or Mandane although we do hear of Cyrus' thoughts on his own burial and tomb (8.7.25, 27). In Ctesias the details of a leading figure's burial and tombstone seem to have been a regular feature in the original Persica - so that we hear of the tombs of Ninus (FGrH 688 F 1b 7.1), Zarinaea (F 5.34.5), Astyages (F 9.6) and Darius (F 13.19).

Although Cyrus mourns Panthea's death he also admires her action (ἀγασθεὶς τε τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ κατολοφυράμενος Cyr. 7.3.16): his reaction is esteem mingled with sadness, rather than horror; this is probably the feeling Xenophon wishes to arouse in his readers as well. The lady of Susa's devotion and loyalty to her husband are so total as to lead - almost inevitably - to her suicide and her act is considered an exemplary one.

The colourful, romantic tale of the lady of Susa ends with her death and neither Panthea, Abradatas or Araspas are mentioned again in the Cyr. One last question remains: what is the source of this dramatic story? The fact that the novella serves Xenophon's literary aims so well - since it enlivens what would otherwise be long, battle-ridden stretches of narrative and yet is firmly linked to the main plot of the Cyr. - is perhaps the strongest argument for Xenophon's authorship of the tale or at least for considerable revision of an existing account by him. It is hard to imagine that a story developed in its entirety by

another would fit into the Cyr. so neatly and successfully. The novella seems to be neither wholly Greek (despite the heroine's very Greek name) nor wholly Oriental and the three kinds of attendants found in the tale - maidservants, eunuchs and a τροφός point respectively to the three most recognizable influences at work: Homer, Ctesias and other stories of the Persian court, and Greek tragedy. It seems reasonable to conclude that it is Xenophon who has blended and mixed these various elements; it is much less likely that he simply lifted the story whole from an unknown source, either Greek or Persian.

Gobryas and Gadatas

The leading figure in our next novella is the Assyrian noble Gobryas, whose story has been summarized above (pp. 246-247). Xenophon introduces him into the Cyr. simply by telling us that after Cyrus' first victory over the Assyrians, Gobryas, an elderly Assyrian Ἀσσύριος πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ (4.6.1) arrives at the Persian camp, accompanied by a cavalry guard. We learn of his background and the reason for his appearance only when Cyrus does: the whole of his story is unfolded in the course of his conversation with the Persian leader. When asked by the guards to surrender his arms, the Assyrian first requests that he be granted an interview with Cyrus and he is conducted to him (4.6.1). Gobryas, addressing Cyrus most humbly - cf. ὦ δέσποτα... ἱκέτης προσπίπτω... δίδωμί σοι ἐμαυτὸν δοῦλον (4.6.2; cf. above, p. 298 on Abradatas) - first introduces himself, explaining that he is an Assyrian noble with a stronghold, a considerable estate and one thousand cavalry-men at his disposal. He was a loyal friend and ally of the old Assyrian king who has just died in the battle with the Persians, but now wishes to transfer his allegiance to Cyrus because of his hatred for the old king' son and successor (4.6.2).

While neither Herodotus nor Ctesias make any mention of an Assyrian (i.e.

Babylonian) named Gobryas who defects to Cyrus, we know from Babylonian sources that there was indeed such a historical personage. The cuneiform Nabonidus Chronicle, when relating the events of the 17th year, i.e. 539 B.C., the year of Cyrus' conquest of Babylon, tells of how "Ugbaru (= Gobryas) the governor of Gutium and the army of Cyrus entered Babylon".[79] According to the chronicle, Cyrus himself entered Babylon only later, and Gobryas died shortly thereafter. In broad outline, then, Xenophon's account of Gobryas in the Cyr. corresponds to the cuneiform source: both tell of an important Babylonian who is on Cyrus' side, facilitates the capture of Babylon and enters that city ahead of the Persian ruler.[80] The Cyr.'s "Assyrian" Gobryas should be distinguished from the Persian of the same name who appears in Herodotus as one of Darius' fellow-conspirators; the latter is also the father of Mardonius (Hdt. 3.70 ff.; 6.43 etc.) and he probably was the satrap of Babylonia under both Cyrus and Cambyses.[81] In any event, it seems that our Gobryas is not a figure invented by Xenophon: he is based on an authentic Babylonian ally of Cyrus. We do not know, however, which elements of the Assyrian's tale come from Xenophon's (unknown) source and which are the product of his own imagination. It would be especially interesting to know whether the reason for Gobryas' defection, the senseless killing of his son, was one such element added by Xenophon.

Gobryas now relates to Cyrus the circumstances of his son's death (Cyr. 4.6.2-7). He is deeply agitated by the tragedy and Xenophon indicates this not by describing Gobryas' gestures or expressions or emotional state, but by the language he has the Assyrian use to tell his tale. Gobryas' speech contains what is perhaps the highest concentration of tragic or poetic words in the Cyr. - cf. γαμέτην (4.6.3), αἰχμήν (4.6.4), τάλας (4.6.5), γοωμένη (4.6.9) etc.[82] - probably because the vocabulary of tragedy is best suited to convey his misery. In

addition, the Assyrian uses, at first, long, convoluted sentences, with various clauses left dangling (cf. in particular 4.6.3) - apparently, as we are meant to see, because he is too overcome by grief to present the story in an orderly and coherent way.

The Assyrian had only one son, a loving and devoted child, who was invited by the old Assyrian king to court in order to marry the king's daughter. The crown prince invites the son of Gobryas to go hunting with him and they ride together as friends, with the Assyrian prince allowing his companion a free hand (ἀνεὶς αὐτῷ θηρᾶν ἀνὰ κράτος 4.6.3), since he considered himself a far better horseman. Gobryas' son killed a bear and a lion in quick succession, but only after the prince had aimed at each in turn and missed them both. When Gobryas' son exclaimed in delight at his own skill, the prince could contain his jealousy no longer - he snatched a spear and stabbed his companion to death (4.6.3-4).

The Assyrian prince kills Gobryas' son out of jealousy, which he first tries to hide (κατέσχεν ὑπὸ σκότου τὸν φθόνον 4.6.4) but then is unable to control. It has already been seen above (p. 262) that Ctesias tells a similar tale of a monarch's furor at another's prowess in hunting, in relation to Artaxerxes I and Megabyzus (FGrH 688 F 14.43; cf. Plut. Mor. 173 D) and Curtius Rufus reports a parallel incident concerning Alexander and a young man from his royal guard (Exp.Alex. 8.6.7). The prince is, apparently, unused to hunting and competing freely with others, in friendly fashion. In this respect he presents a contrast to Cyrus, who as a youth in Media resisted Astyages' suggestion that he take advantage of royal prerogative and have his fill of hunting ahead of his companions: Cyrus enjoyed the friendly rivalry and praised his successful friends without the least bit of jealousy (οὐδ' ὀπωστιοῦν φθονερῶς 1.4.15). During Cyrus' stay in Media he came close to actually meeting the Assyrian prince when the latter set out on another ill-fated hunting expedition. The Assyrian, about

to be married, travels to the Assyrian-Median border to hunt for game for his wedding. He is accompanied by a large military force and consequently decides to make a foray into Media itself so that his expedition will prove even more productive and impressive (1.4.16-17). Astyages and Cyaxares, hearing of the invasion, rush to the frontier with their cavalry and the teen-aged Cyrus joins them. The Medes attack, following a plan suggested by Cyrus, and the Assyrians are forced to retreat (1.4.18-24). Thus early on in the Cyr. there is a near confrontation between the Persian and the Assyrian in which both behave in characteristic fashion: Cyrus is bold and ingenious and the Assyrian prince is proud and overly ambitious. So too the failure of the small Assyrian force at Media foreshadows their later large-scale defeat at the hands of Cyrus.

Gobryas mourns his son deeply, stressing the fact that the youth was a beloved, only son (τὸν μόνον μοι καὶ φίλον παῖδα 4.6.4; cf. μόνος καὶ καλὸς κἀγαθός 4.6.3) and that he no longer has a male child (ἄπαις δ' εἰμὶ ἀρρένων παίδων 4.6.2). The Assyrian noble contrasts his present sorrowful old age (ἔρημος ὢν καὶ διὰ πένθους τὸ γῆρας διάγων 4.6.6) with his former cheerful existence and touchingly describes the sorrow of an old man burying a beloved young one (κἀγὼ μὲν ὁ τάλας... ἔθαψα τηλικοῦτος ὢν ἄρτι γενειάσκοντα τὸν ἄριστον παῖδα τὸν ἀγαπητόν 4.6.5). This theme of bereaved fathers and missing sons, one which appears fairly frequently in Herodotus (see above, pp. 276-277) is also found in our two remaining novelle. Gadatas refers to his childless state, to the sons he will never have (5.4.12, 30; cf. 5.3.19) and Croesus briefly mentions his son who perished in the prime of life (7.2.20). The circumstances surrounding the killing of Gobryas' son - his death during a hunting party at the hands of a supposed friend and by means of a spear - are, in fact, somewhat like the fatal end of Croesus' son Atys in Herodotus' version of the story (Hdt. 1.34-45). Xenophon presents the bereaved Gobryas with great sympathy and delicacy

and this has led one scholar to suggest that our passage was written after Xenophon's own son Gryllus was killed at Mantinea in 362.[83]

Gobryas goes on to say that the Assyrian prince never expressed any remorse over his evil deed, although his father, the king, did show his sorrow and sympathy. Gobryas, who would never have turned against his friend, the old king, cannot possibly live under the rule of his son's murderer; the latter is, in any event, aware of the bereaved father's animosity towards him. Gobryas insists upon his faithfulness to his former master, the old Assyrian king, because the loyalty of a defector is normally suspect. All three of Cyrus' Assyrian allies join his side because they are innocent victims of their cruel ruler: in the black-and-white world of the Cyr. all those identified with the Persian side must be of unblemished character and cannot simply betray their own country. The hope of revenge, concludes the elderly Assyrian noble, is his sole source of comfort (Cyr. 4.6.6-7). Cyrus, in reply, agrees to help Gobryas avenge the murder of his son and the two discuss the terms of the proposed alliance (4.6. 8-10). Gobryas, besides offering to make his estate and soldiers available to Cyrus and to pay tribute to the Persians, also mentions his marriageable daughter, who was originally intended for the young Assyrian king. We have seen (above, p. 234) how Cyrus eventually arranges a match for her with Hystaspas.

In both the Herodotean and Ctesian versions of Cyrus' rise to power, the Persian has a close ally and adviser who helps him in the earlier stages of his conquests (i.e. Harpagus and Oebares respectively) and Gobryas comes closest to filling this role in the Cyr., even if Xenophon's Cyrus only rarely follows his advice. Gobryas, in fact, bears more than a superficial resemblance to Harpagus in Herodotus, for each joins forces with Cyrus because his own ruler has wantonly murdered his only son (cf. Hdt. 1.118-119). Harpagus, of course, plays a much more active part in establishing Cyrus' rule than the Assyrian does, for he

actually encourages or incites the Persian to rebel, while Gobryas (like almost everyone else in the Cyr.) is more of a tool in Cyrus' hands. Gobryas turns against the Assyrian ruler partly because he realizes that the young king is aware of his hostility towards him and this is much more realistic than the situation in Herodotus where Astyages simply forgets that he has wronged Harpagus (Hdt. 1.127) and appoints him commander of the Median forces. Finally, both Gobryas and Harpagus ultimately achieve their aim and avenge their sons' deaths.

Cyrus goes to visit Gobryas' estate soon afterwards in order to become better acquainted with his new ally and their meeting there, in particular their symposium, has already been discussed (above, pp. 202-213 ). The next scene in our novella is a conversation between Gobryas and the impious Assyrian ruler, conducted through messengers (Cyr. 5.3.5-7). Gobryas approaches the king on Cyrus' behalf, for while the Persians are ready to do battle, the Assyrians do not march out to meet them. The Assyrian noble tells his former ruler that if he will come to to defend his country, Gobryas himself will join him; if not, Gobryas will be compelled to submit to the (Persian) victors. Gobryas' words, which have been dictated to him by Cyrus and are relayed by messenger to the Assyrian king - i.e. which are a message conveyed through several intermediaries - are reported by Xenophon only in indirect speech (5.3.4), but the despot's reply, a sharp and pointed blast, is reproduced directly, even though he too uses an emissary. The young ruler, reminding Gobryas that he is still his king, says that while he does not regret killing Gobryas' son, he is now sorry that he has not killed the father as well. He is not ready to begin fighting and recommends that Gobryas return with his men in 30 days, i.e. at some future indefinite date (cf. 8.4.27 where Cyrus promises to kiss Artabazus 30 years hence). Gobryas replies - and his words too are reported in direct speech - that he hopes to continue to vex the young king (5.3.7).

This exchange between Gobryas and the young king is the only passage in the Cyr. where we actually see the arrogant ruler in the flesh. Elsewhere his actions are always reported - either by Xenophon as narrator or by one of the characters of the Cyr. Similarly, his father, the old Assyrian king, is shown only once, exhorting his soldiers to bravery before their battle with the Persian forces (3.3.43-45). In his brief "live" appearance the young Assyrian ruler lives up to his bad reputation and behaves in cruel and arrogant fashion. His opening words δεσπότης ὁ σὸς λέγει (5.3.6) are meant to put Gobryas in his place as a rebellious upstart and establish the young king's authority; his father would surely never have addressed the elderly Assyrian in that way. Oriental rulers are often addressed as ὦ δέσποτα (see e.g. Hdt. 1.90; 7.38; 8.102 etc.) and in the Cyr. too Gobryas, Gadatas and Croesus all use ὦ δέσποτα at times when speaking to Cyrus (Cyr. 4.6.2; 5.4.42; 5.3.28; 7.2.9; cf. 7.3.3 and 4.5.11), but here it is the king who finds it necessary to use the term δεσπότης of himself. In Herodotus there are three kings who refer to themselves as δεσπότης - Darius addressing the Scythian ruler (Hdt. 4.126; cf. 127), Cambyses speaking to Psammenitus (3.14) and Xerxes lashing the Hellespont (7.35) - and in all three instances it is because their authority over the person (or object) they address is new or not fully acknowledged, as is the case with the Assyrian king here. The king's unwillingness to fight, expressed by his scornful invitation to Gobryas to return some other time, is a bit like the Scythians' rejection of Darius' efforts to engage them in battle in Herodotus (4.125 ff.), although here the Assyrian ruler does eventually take up the challenge and is, of course, defeated.

An exchange of messages between enemies before they clash, such as we have here, is found fairly regularly both in Ctesias and in Herodotus. In the Persica, the Indian king sends Semiramis a threatening letter before she launches her

attack upon him, but she dismisses his words contemptuously (FGrH 683 F 1b 18.1-2). So too Astyages threatens an unperturbed Cyrus before their clash (90 F 66.33) and Darius and the Scythian king exchange nasty letters before they go to war (688 F 13.20). In Herodotus, too, Astyages and Cyrus communicate briefly before they meet in battle (Hdt. 1.127) and Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, sends messages to Cyrus before each of their two confrontations (Hdt. 1.206, 208, 212). Darius and the Scythian king exchange messages, and the Persian king later receives gifts which are meant to serve as a warning, as preliminaries to a fight that never actually takes place (Hdt. 4.126 ff.), while Alexander, sent as an ambassador by Mardonius, attempts to negotiate with the Athenians before the battle of Plataea (8.140 ff.). The conversation between Gobryas and the young Assyrian king fits in well with this tradition of pre-battle exchanges in which the two enemies regularly vilify one another, although generally it is the leaders of the two opposing sides who address one another. Xenophon seems to avoid a direct confrontation between Cyrus and the young Assyrian king: the two do not meet face-to-face on the battlefield as young men in Media (Cyr. 1.4.16 ff.; cf. above, pp. 315-316) or at the final Persian-Assyrian conflict at Thymbrara, and they do not even speak to each other indirectly, through messengers, before the battle. Gobryas is Cyrus' emissary here in his dealings with the Assyrian despot, as he is, in a certain sense, later on, when he actually kills the enemy king.

When Gobryas returns to the Persian camp with the Assyrian's reply, Cyrus recalls that Gobryas has told him of another Assyrian, the eunuch Gadatas, who would probably be willing to defect to the Persian side and the two discuss the best way to recruit Gadatas and make use of his services (5.3.8 ff.). Gobryas mentioned Gadatas to Cyrus when the latter enquired after other victims of the Assyrian prince's insolence ( ὑπερηφανίαν 5.2.27), in the hope of having them

join the Persians and their allies. Gadatas, another so-called friend of the Assyrian prince, attracted the attention of the prince's mistress at a drinking-party, Gobryas tells Cyrus. The Assyrian prince then had his friend seized and castrated because his mistress praised Gadatas' beauty and congratulated the woman who would become his wife. The prince himself put out a different version of the incident, claiming that his friend had attempted to seduce his mistress (5.2.27-28).

There are at least two other stories where the sexual jealousy of a royal barbarian comes to a head at a drinking-party: Ahauserus has Haman executed for coming too close to Queen Esther when pleading for his life at the party she has arranged (Esther 7.7-10) and Amestris insists at the king's birthday dinner that Xerxes hand over Masistes' wife to her because of the monarch's relations with mother and daughter (Hdt. 9.110-112). More generally, Ctesias has several tales of royal figures behaving harshly and cruelly towards others because of their sexual involvements. Such are the stories of Ninus' threat to blind Onnes if he does not relinquish Semiramis (FGrH 688 F 1b 6.9-10), Amestris' torturing of the Greek doctor Apollonides because of his affair with her daughter Amytis (F 14.44) and Parysatis' vengeful actions against the entire family of Teri-touchmes, her disloyal son-in-law who is in love with another woman (F 15.56; F 16.61). Amytis, Megabyzus' wife and the daughter of Xerxes, gets off very lightly for her sexual misdemeanours and is merely scolded by her father (F 13.32; cf. 14.34), while Parysatis' alleged lover is killed by her son Artaxerxes (F 16.60). Herodotus too tells of strong reactions by royal Orientals to sexual offences: Candaules' wife insists that Gyges assassinate her husband because he has exposed her to view (Hdt. 1.8-12) and Xerxes has Sataspes impaled (after he fails to circumnavigate Libya) because he has raped Zopyrus' daughter (4.43). We have already seen how afraid Araspas was to face Cyrus even after an unsuc-

cessful attempt to seduce Panthea, and all these stories point to the fact that Eastern rulers took sexual matters very much to heart (cf. Plut. Artax. 27.1). Thus the Assyrian prince's sexual jealousy is not without precedent, but the punishment he inflicts - castration - is far from usual. It is interesting to see that, according to Gobryas, the young ruler found it necessary to present his own account of Gadatas' supposed misdeed. While the crown prince has never expressed any misgivings over the killing of Gobryas' son, he does feel obliged to justify (somewhat) his behaviour towards Gadatas, who is, it should be recalled, the son of an Assyrian noble even more powerful than Gobryas (Cyr. 5.2.28).

The incident at the party involves the mistress of the Assyrian prince and not his wife. We have seen (above, pp.315-316) that the prince was about to be married long ago, when he set out on his hunting escapade in Media (1.4.16 ff.) so that presumably he is now married (and Gobryas' daughter - cf. 4.6.9 - was intended to be an additional wife). Perhaps the prince's mistress is present at the party with Gadatas because the Eastern (or at least Persian) custom may have been to have mistresses and concubines, but not wives, present at such affairs (see Plut. Mor. 613 A; Artax. 26 and compare Hdt. 5.18, 9.110; Athen. 145 D). Another possible reason is that Xenophon wishes to show how little real cause for jealousy the Assyrian prince has, for it is only his mistress, who is probably one of many, who praised Gadatas' looks and not his wife, whose actions are to be taken much more seriously.

Gobryas adds that while he is certain that Gadatas, who has now inherited his father's estate, would be glad to ally himself with the Persians, it will be difficult to get in touch with him since it would mean openly marching up to the very walls of Babylon. Cyrus proclaims to Gobryas - in a long didactic speech which seems deliberately cut off from the preceding exchange by the unusually

lengthy assignment of speaker ὁ Κῦρος ἀκούσας τοῦ Γωβρύα τοιαῦτα τοιάδε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλεξε (5.2.31) - that there is no reason to hide from the Assyrians even though their numbers are much greater (5.2.31-37). The end result of their discussion is that Cyrus and his forces do march up to Babylon, where, as we have seen, Gobryas is unable to convince his former ruler to come out and do battle, so that Gobryas and Cyrus are led to talk again of recruiting Gadatas (5.3.8 ff.).[84]

The elderly Assyrian tells Cyrus that he is confident that Gadatas will join their side for he and the eunuch have often spoken freely to each other (ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους 5.3.8) - obviously against the Assyrian prince - in the past. The Persian leader asks Gobryas to approach Gadatas at an opportune time (and thus the difficulties involved in slipping through enemy lines are glossed over) and to sound him out. If Gadatas wishes to join them, Gobryas should keep the matter secret, Cyrus suggests, since there is no greater advantage in war than having a friend pose as an enemy (5.3.9). Cyrus has learned about the desirability of deceiving one's foes from his father Cambyses, before he began his long campaign (cf. 1.6.27-37) and spies are, of course, one popular means used to fool the enemy. Gadatas is the first espionage agent that the Persian recruits and Araspas is the second; later Cyrus also sends members of a delegation from the Indian king and several of his own men disguised as slaves to spy upon the Assyrians (6.2.2-3, 9-11).

The Persian and Assyrian now consider how they can make use of the eunuch. They work out a plan with Cyrus putting forward his suggestions in a series of questions and Gobryas approving, or sometimes adding to, the Persian's ideas - cf. λέγε δή μοι... οἶει... ; σαφῶς γε... 5.3.11; οὐκοῦν... ; σαφῶς... 5.3. 12-13; οὐκοῦν... ; εἰκὸς γοῦν ... 5.3.13-14. Even though Babylon is the Assyrian's home territory and it is he who is acquainted with Gadatas, Cyrus, as usual,

comes up with their next moves. The plan is for the Persians to pretend to attack Gadatas' territory and allow him to capture some of their forces. These captives will reveal that they intend to assault the Assyrian fortress which is used to direct operations against the Hyrcanians and Sacians, and Gadatas will use this "information" as a pretext to enter the fortress without arousing suspicion. Cyrus will then attack the stronghold and with the eunuch's assistance from within, the fortress should fall into Persian hands (5.3.11-14). Gobryas contacts Gadatas who readily agrees to co-operate and all goes as planned (5.3.15-17). We have already seen (above, p. 250 ) that Xenophon simply summarizes the secret meeting between Gobryas and Gadatas and does not actually show us the re-union of the two Assyrians. It can be assumed that the two commiserated over their injuries at the hands of the cruel young king and that Gobryas praised Cyrus in glowing terms, encouraging the eunuch to join his side. Their situation is somewhat like the re-union of Panthea and Abradatas (6.1.47) without, of course, the romantic element.

The story of Zopyrus' self-mutilation and infiltration of Babylon on behalf of Darius found in Herodotus (Hdt. 3.153 ff.) has already been mentioned in relation to Araspas' espionage mission (above, p. 294 ). Gadatas' entry into the Assyrian fortress also seems closely related to Zopyrus' exploit, particularly in the deliberate despatch of Persian military forces that are to be captured by a supposed ally of the enemy in order to enhance his credibility. In the case of Zopyrus, several thousand of Darius' men are actually killed as part of his plan (Hdt. 3.155, 157), while with Gadatas, Cyrus' men are only cross-examined (and presumably tortured) in public (βασανίζων ἐναντίον πολλῶν 5.3.16); later these men help the eunuch secure the inside of the fortress (5.3.17). Gadatas is also somewhat like another figure in Herodotus, Cyrus' ally Harpagus (cf. above, pp. 317-318), for he too is considered above suspicion (ἀνύποπτος Cyr.

5.3.11, 12) by his compatriots and allowed to command forces opposed to Cyrus, even though he has been treated so cruelly by his own king.

It is perhaps not insignificant that the eunuch Gadatas' chief role takes place inside the fortress, rather than together with Cyrus out on the battle-field. The Persian leader takes up Gobryas' suggestion τὰ μὲν ἔνδον ἐκείνου [sc. Gadatas] συμπαρασκευάζοντος, τὰ δ' ἔξωθεν σοῦ [sc. Cyrus] ἰσχυρότερα προσάγοντος (5.3.14; compare ὁ εὐνοῦχος τὰ ἔνδον καταστήσας 5.3.18). The eunuch's place is generally within an establishment or at its gates and this is true of the noble Gadatas later on as well, when as a member of Cyrus' court in Babylon he is both chief sceptre-bearer and in charge of running the Persian's household - ἡ πᾶσα ἔνδον δίαιτα (8.4.2). In addition, eunuchs were customarily the keepers of the keys - cf. Ctesias' description of Bagapatas ὃς τὰς κλεῖς πάσας τῶν βασιλείων εἶχε (FGrH 688 F 13.16) - and in the Persica we find several eunuchs who are called upon to admit, in secret, people who conspire against the head of their household (cf. 688 F 1p and F 1b 24.4; F 13.16 and (probably) F 15.48), and thus play a role similar to that of Gadatas here.

After the fortress is captured, Gadatas hurries out to meet Cyrus for the first time (Cyr. 5.3.18 ff.). The eunuch bows down to the Persian, according to the custom (τῷ νόμῳ προσκυνήσας 5.3.18), Xenophon adds, probably referring to the Assyrian habit, although neither Gobryas nor Abradatas, for example, has greeted Cyrus in this fashion. Thus far in the Cyr. only Assyrian captives have bowed down to Cyrus (4.4.13) and it is only much later, at the royal procession in Babylon, that Persians do obeisance to him for the first time (8.3.14). While Gadatas' bow may be no more than the physical equivalent of Gobryas' first greeting to Cyrus ὦ δέσποτα (4.6.2), the eunuch seems quite submissive and meek in all his dealings with Cyrus, despite his noble lineage. Gadatas simply greets Cyrus, saying χαῖρε Κῦρε(5.3.18) and the Persian, playing upon the meaning of

the word, tells the eunuch that he is obliged to feel joyous, for Gadatas has enabled him to turn the fortress over to his allies. The Persian leader, referring at once to the eunuch's unfortunate situation, says that while the Assyrian king has deprived him of the ability to have children, he has not taken away Gadatas' capacity to acquire friends and his new allies will try to be no less helpful than any offspring would have been (5.3.19). Gadatas has no chance to reply to this somewhat tactless pronouncement (although later he does compare Cyrus to a son 5.4.12) for the Hyrcanian leader rushes in to express his gratitude to Cyrus for the capture of the stronghold. Cyrus points out to him that Gadatas should be thanked as well (5.3.20-21).

The next conversation between Gadatas and Cyrus is a brisk, business-like one, since the eunuch must return home quickly in order to ward off an attack on his own land by the Assyrian king. Cyrus arranges to follow him with an army as quickly as possible (5.3.26-29). As we have seen (above, p. 249), the Assyrian king, aided by a treacherous member of Gadatas' cavalry, comes close to defeating Gadatas and the eunuch himself is wounded by the traitor. Cyrus and his men then arrive opportunely on the scene and drive the Assyrians away (5.4.1-9). The Persian leader sets out to visit the injured Gadatas but meets the eunuch, already bandaged, on the way. The encounter between the two (5.4.10 ff.) is a happy one: Cyrus is glad to see his new friend up and about and Gadatas is delighted to greet his rescuer. In this conversation, the first in which Gadatas speaks at any length, the eunuch is effusive and emotional and this is also true of his later appearances in the Cyr. (e.g. 5.4.29-40; 6.1.1-5). Gadatas is very grateful to Cyrus for his intervention, saying he has done little to deserve such aid and pointing out, in surprisingly Gorgianic style, that all would have been lost for him without the Persian ὡς νῦν τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οὔχομαι, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ σοὶ σέσωμαι (5.4.11). Referring back, apparently, to Cyrus' promise that

the eunuch's new friends will try to prove as devoted as any children would have been (5.3.19), Gadatas states that even if he had been able to father children, he is uncertain whether his own sons would have been as loyal to him as Cyrus is. Fathers are often pained by their children, Gadatas explains, as the example of the Assyrian king and the crown prince shows; once again the theme of father and sons (noted above, p. 316) appears in a novella.

Gadatas is a fairly young man, a contemporary of Gobryas' son and the young Assyrian ruler (5.2.28), so that the comparison of his relationship with Cyrus to father and son is inappropriate; brothers would be a more fitting designation. Elsewhere, for instance, Panthea says that the Persian leader has treated her as he would a brother's wife (6.4.7), while the elderly Gobryas looks upon Cyrus as a substitute son (4.6.2) and both these supposed relationships are chronologically tenable. Clearly the question of children arises in relation to Gadatas because he is a eunuch, but his comparison of Cyrus to a son (cf. too below 5.4.30) may have also been influenced by the story of Artembares, Astyages' chief eunuch who takes young Cyrus under his wing, which appears in (Nicolaus of Damascus' re-working of) Ctesias (FGrH 90 F 66.5-7). Artembares serves as Astyages' wine-pourer and trains young Cyrus to serve wine at the king's table. The eunuch becomes very fond of the Persian lad ( φιλοφρονησάμενος ὡς ἂν υἱῷ F 66.6) and receives permission from the Mede king to adopt Cyrus as a son and have him inherit his own position as cup-bearer. Just as Xenophon has his Cyrus pour wine just once, in what seems to be a sideways glance at Ctesias (Cyr. 1.3.8 ff.; see above, p. 187), so too Gadatas' paternal attitude towards Cyrus may be another variation on the story of Cyrus' youth in the Persica.

Cyrus points out to the eunuch that it is not he alone who has come to the rescue, but an entire army of Persians, Medes, Hyrcanians, Armenians, Sacians and Cadusians, just as he has earlier reminded the grateful Hyrcanian leader

that Gadatas played an important part in gaining control of the frontier fortress (5.3.20-21). At this stage, i.e. before the conquest of Babylon - but not later (cf. 8.2.26-28) - the Persian leader does his utmost to unite all his various friends and allies into one cohesive unit and he is willing to forgo the adulation of others in order to foster such unity. Gadatas responds to Cyrus' hint and provides gifts and food for the entire army (5.4.13-14).

The Persian and Assyrian next speak to each other when Cyrus' army is about to depart from the eunuch's territory (5.4.29 ff.); this is the most novellistic of their dialogues. Gadatas comes to Cyrus bearing many gifts, including horses confiscated from his disloyal cavalry (cf. 5.4.1). The eunuch presents the gifts to the Persian leader, saying that all of his property is at Cyrus' disposal νόμιζε δὲ... καὶ τἆλλα πάντα τἀμὰ σὰ εἶναι (5.4.30) for he will never have a child of his own to inherit his estate. When he dies, Gadatas continues emotionally, his race and name will be extinguished ( πᾶν ἀποσβῆναι τὸ ἡμέτερον γένος καὶ ὄνομα 5.4.30). Gadatas swears by the gods who see and hear all οἳ καὶ ὁρῶσι πάντα καὶ ἀκούουσι πάντα (5.4.31; cf. Cyr. 8.7.22 and Mem. 1.4.18 for similar descriptions of the gods by Cyrus and Socrates respectively) - that he has said and done nothing to deserve the injury that he has suffered. His denial is an emphatic one with 5 of the 12 words he uses in his oath meaning "no" - καὶ ταῦτα... οὔτε ἄδικον οὔτε αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲν οὔτε εἰπὼν οὔτε ποιήσας ἔπαθον (5.4.31). The eunuch, overcome by his sad fate, then bursts into tears and is unable to continue speaking. While all four of the main characters of the Cyr.'s novelle - Panthea, Gobryas, Gadatas and Croesus - find themselves in tragic situations, only two, Panthea and Gadatas are reduced to tears by their fate and Panthea is, of course, a woman (cf. above, p. 142). Here, as in the preceding dialogue, Gadatas is quite emotional and perhaps Xenophon portrays him as an effeminate, somewhat maudlin creature because he is a eunuch.

Cyrus pities Gadatas, Xenophon tells us, but he offers no words of comfort and turns to the practical matter at hand - the gifts offered by the Assyrian. The Persian leader is glad to accept the horses, in order to build up his cavalry, but refuses the other presents since he is unable to reciprocate Gadatas' generosity. He asks the Assyrian to safeguard the gifts for him, but the eunuch replies that he is hardly in the position to do so. As long as he was on good terms with the Assyrian ruler he considered his father's estate ideal, since it was near enough to Babylon to allow him all the advantages of urban living and yet quiet and removed from the bustle of a big city; now he is situated dangerously close to powerful enemies (5.4.32-34). This description of Gadatas' estate in days of old is unexpected: the Assyrian sounds a bit like Ischomachus, weighing the advantages of urban vs. rural living (cf.e.g. Oec. 11.14-18). It should be recalled, perhaps, that Xenophon himself spent many years on a rural estate at Scillus, close by to Olympia (cf. Anab. 5.3.7 ff.).

The eunuch realizes that he should have thought of the consequences of having an angry enemy at his doorstep before he transferred his allegiance to Cyrus: he raises this point in the form of a question put to him by a hypothetical interlocutor: τάχ' οὖν εἴποι τις αὖ· καὶ τί δῆτα οὐχ οὕτως ἐνενοοῦ πρὶν ἀποστῆναι (Cyr. 5.4.35). This device of putting an objection into the mouth of an imaginary listener, using a phrase like ἴσως εἴποι τις ἄν... is normally used by a speaker in Xenophon only in the course of a long speech or monologue (cf. Cyr. 7.5.46, 80; Mem. 1.2.17, 19; Anab. 7.6.16, 21; Hell. 7.3.10). In a dialogue the natural turn of events is for the speaker's partner to raise any problems or objections (but see Hiero's words to Simonides εἴποις οὖν ἂν ἴσως σύ Hiero 1.13). Here Xenophon does not want Cyrus to put this question to Gadatas for that would seem sheer ingratitude on the Persian's part, and so an imaginary interlocutor is used instead. The Assyrian noble explains that he

acted as he did because his soul, injured and outraged, was indifferent to questions of safety and was filled - or pregnant (κυοῦσα 5.4.35), a peculiar word for the eunuch to use - only with thoughts of revenge. The new Assyrian ruler is hated by the gods and men alike (τὸν καὶ θεοῖς ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἀνθρώποις 5.4.35), continues Gadatas, and he despises people not when they do him some harm, but if he suspects that they are superior to him.

In this dialogue Gadatas roundly condemns the Assyrian ruler and stresses his desire for revenge upon the man who has had him castrated, thus reminding us of another vengeful eunuch - Hermotimus, the chief eunuch of Xerxes, who appears in Herodotus (8.105-106). Hermotimus was taken as a prisoner of war to Sardis and sold to Panionius of Chios who made a profession of castrating good-looking youths. Years later, when Hermotimus, who had risen to become Xerxes' favourite eunuch, met Panionius, he managed to get the Chian and his family into his power by pretending to be a grateful friend. Hermotimus then has his revenge, forcing Panionius to castrate his four sons and the sons - their father. Before this terrible act is performed, the furious eunuch addresses Panionius and his speech is similar in many ways to Gadatas' words to Cyrus here. Hermotimus, like Gadatas, bemoans his fate as a eunuch ( με ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς ἐποίησας τὸ μηδὲν εἶναι Hdt. 8.106.3), also saying that he has done nothing to deserve such treatment and similarly reviling the man who has turned him into a eunuch ( ποιήσαντα ἀνόσια Hdt. 8.106.3; Gobryas and Gadatas term the Assyrian king τὸν ἀνόσιον βασιλέα Cyr. 7.5.32 and cf. 4.6.4). Both Hermotimus and Gadatas succeed in their quest for vengeance, but in Herodotus, Hermotimus confronts the man who has injured him and condemns him face-to-face. In the Cyr. there is no direct exchange between Gadatas and the young Assyrian ruler, not even when the eunuch enters the royal palace and assassinates the king (Cyr. 7.5.27-30).

Gadatas claims that the Assyrian ruler injures those who seem superior to

him and this was certainly the case with Gobryas' son, who was killed because he proved a better marksman than the prince. Gadatas presumably was punished for being more handsome than the cruel ruler since the latter could not bear to hear his friend's beauty praised. The Assyrian despot's jealousy leads him to surround himself with scoundrels as allies so that, Gadatas adds sarcastically, Cyrus need not worry about fighting any brave Assyrians for their ruler will handle them by himself (Cyr. 5.4.36). The eunuch's description of his ruler's attitude towards good men is similar to what Xenophon's Hiero has to say about the way a tyrant must act towards outstanding compatriots. Hiero complains to Simonides that a tyrant must fear brave, wise and just men, since they may object to his regime and hence he must resort to unworthy men as allies (Hiero 5.1-4; cf. 2.17-18). Similarly, in the Persians' constitutional debate in Herodotus, Otanes contends that a tyrant is jealous of the best of his subjects and takes pleasure in the worst (Hdt. 3.80.4; cf. Pl. Rep. 567 B-C). The Assyrian despot is behaving, it would seem, in typically tyrannical fashion.

Gadatas concludes (Cyr. 5.4.36) by saying that unworthy as the Assyrian ruler's allies are, they are still capable of harassing him. Cyrus takes his new partner's worries to heart and suggests that Gadatas fortify his estate and then join the Persians in their campaign. Cyrus' invitation is not an altruistic one since he thinks that Gadatas will prove a useful companion, and indeed the eunuch does supply information on roads, water supplies and provisions in the area (cf. 5.4.40): the best interests of Gadatas and Cyrus conveniently coincide.

The eunuch breathes a sigh of relief (ἀνέπνευσε 5.4.38) at the Persian's invitation and adds that he would like to take his mother along. The mention of Gadatas' mother, who is presumably an elderly widow dependent on her none-too-powerful son, is another touch by Xenophon which makes the eunuch seem a weak

and somewhat pathetic figure; we hear nothing, for instance, of any elderly dependents of Gobryas, Panthea or Abradatas. Gadatas readies his household for the departure, leaving behind garrisons to guard his forts, and taking along both friends and untrustworthy associates with him on the campaign (5.4.39).

Before turning to the final episode in the stories of Gobryas and Gadatas, their entry into Babylon and the assassination of the king, it is worth taking a brief look at one further dialogue in which Gadatas features - Cyr. 6.1.1-5 - even if the conversation is not directly related to his novella. Cyrus and his allies have gathered in front of Cyaxares' tent, waiting for the Mede leader to join them in a council of war on whether or not to continue their campaign against the Assyrians. Cyrus' men bring forth many of their new allies, who naturally beg the Persian leader to remain. Among these allies is Gadatas, who is accompanied by Hystaspas (6.1.1). Cyrus, as Xenophon tells us, knows that Gadatas is consumed by fear that the allied forces will disband and he teases the eunuch (ἐπιγελάσας 6.1.2), saying that Gadatas does not really want him to stay, but is just parroting Hystaspas' words. Gadatas does not realize that Cyrus is joking and raises his hands to heaven, swearing that he has not been persuaded by Hystaspas but has approached Cyrus on his own initiative since without the Persian army all will be lost for him (ἔρρει τἀμὰ παντελῶς 6.1.3). Cyrus then turns to banter with Hystaspas, who teases him in return (6.1.4-5) and the conversation ends with Hystaspas asserting that he will continue with the military campaign until he makes the eunuch master of the Assyrian king. In this semi-serious conversation - cf. οἱ μὲν δὴ τοιαῦτ' ἔπαιζον σπουδῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους 6.1.6[85] - much of the rough humour is directed against Gadatas, who, unlike Hystaspas, is unable to respond in kind to Cyrus' teasing. The eunuch cannot forget his vulnerable position for even a moment, as his solemn and somewhat emotional oath shows. Once again Gadatas cuts a sorry and pathetic figure

and again, one suspects that he is presented in this way because he is a eunuch. Hence while Gobryas and the Hyrcanian leader, for instance, also have a great deal to lose if Cyrus' army withdraws, we do not see them being teased in front of Cyaxares' tent, but find them inside, presenting their case with great dignity at the council of war itself (6.1.7, 11).

Having noted that Gadatas is often portrayed as a fairly weak and emotional character, it should be added that he also performs various notable military deeds, i.e. at times we see that he is a noble, rather than a eunuch. Such exploits are his original "battle" with Cyrus and infiltration of the frontier fortress (5.3.15-18), his winning over of an Assyrian garrison by persuasion (5.4.51)[86] and his victory over the other Assyrian defectors in the horse races (8.3.25). In addition, Gadatas contributes military equipment to the allied forces (6.1.19, 21) and is in command of 10,000 horsemen at the royal procession (8.3.17). His most outstanding deed is, of course, his part in the conquest of Babylon (7.5.24 ff.).

In his attempt to take Babylon, Cyrus first surveys the city's massive high walls and concludes that an assault on the walls is virtually impossible; he then seems to plan on organizing a siege and starving the Babylonians into submission instead.[87] After Chrysantas suggests fording the Euphrates, the Persian leader arranges for ditches to be dug, thus making the city accessible by draining the river (7.5.1-14). Cyrus decides to attack the night of a Babylonian festival in which the enemy will be occupied in drinking and carousing. He calls his forces together, exhorts and advises them (7.5.15-24) and then asks Gobryas and Gadatas to lead the way into the city and the royal palace. Gobryas warns that a guard is always posted in front of the palace gates and after one final exhortation by Cyrus, the Persians and their allies enter the city (7.5.25-26). Some of the enemy are killed, others flee, shouting aloud and Gobryas and his

men join in the shouting, pretending to be fellow-revelers. The Assyrian defectors head straight for the palace gates and fall upon the sentries there, as they drink by the fire. The clamour reaches the palace and the king sends out messengers to see what is wrong. Gobryas and Gadatas rush through the open gates up to the king himself, who awaits them, dagger in hand. Gadatas, Gobryas and their men kill the king and his attendants: Babylon has been captured (7.5. 26-31). The two Assyrian defectors bow down and thank the gods for allowing them their vengeance upon the wicked king; next they kiss Cyrus' hands and feet, crying for joy (7.5.32), for their dream has been fulfilled.

Xenophon's description of Cyrus' conquest of Babylon resembles in many ways the account found in Herodotus (1.189-191). Both writers agree that the city was hostile to the Persian leader (Hdt. 1.190; Cyr. 7.5.2, 13, 14; cf. 58) and consequently had to be captured by force (Hdt. 1.190-191; Cyr. 7.5.20-31). In both versions Cyrus originally intends to besiege the city (Hdt. 1.190; Cyr. 7.5.7) but is daunted by the fact that the Babylonians have a huge store of provisions (enough for many years - Hdt. 1.190.2; 20 years worth - Cyr. 7.5.13). The Persian leader, in both accounts, then diverts the Euphrates in order to gain entrance into the city (Hdt. 1.191.1-5; Cyr. 7.5.15-16) and his attack takes place at the time of a festival (τυχεῖν γάρ σφι ἑοῦσαν ὀρτήν Hdt. 1.191.6; ἑορτὴν... ἤκουσεν εἶναι Cyr. 7.5.15) when many of the Babylonians are drinking and making merry (χορεύειν τε... καὶ ἐν εὐπαθείῃσι εἶναι Hdt. 1.191.6; πάντες Βαβυλώνιοι... πίνουσι καὶ κωμάζουσιν Cyr. 7.5.15; cf. 21, 25, 26, 27). The Book of Daniel (5.1 ff.) also tells of Babylon being captured by "Darius the Mede" at the time of a great feast, when the king and his court drink a great deal. This stratagem of taking advantage of an intoxicated enemy is found elsewhere as well: in Herodotus, Cyrus kills and captures many of the Massagetae after they wine and dine on Persian fare (1.211) and the clever

thief puts Rhampsinites' guards to sleep by sharing with them the wine he has "accidentally" spilled and thus is able to recover his brother's body (2.121 δ ). Charon of Lampsacus has another such tale of getting the enemy drunk (FGrH 262 F 17).

Unlike Xenophon, Herodotus does not refer to the fate of the king of Babylon (whom he calls Labynetus, son of Nitocris - Hdt. 1.188) and he makes no mention, of course, of the part played by the Assyrian defectors, Gobryas and Gadatas. In any event, neither Herodotus' version nor that of Xenophon matches the account of Babylon's capture found in the cuneiform evidence, the most authentic historical record.[88] According to the Nabonidus Chronicle (col. iii), "Gobryas... and the army of Cyrus entered Babylon without battle" and Nabonidus himself was arrested. Some ten days later, Cyrus entered the city and he was greeted with palm twigs, i.e. as a victor and liberator. There is no mention of the fact that Persian rule began in Babylon during a festival, although according to some translations of the Chronicle, reference is made to the drinking of wine at the beginning of the description of the fall of Babylon.[89] The less historical and more biased or propagandist Cyrus Cylinder[90] also tells of how Marduk had Cyrus enter Babylon without any battle and delivered Nabonidus into the Persian's hands; the people of Babylon were jubilant. In actual fact, then, Cyrus did not have to take the city of Babylon by force. He captured Nabonidus, the ruler of Babylon, but scholarly opinion varies as to whether Nabonidus was executed.[91]

This brings us to the question of the identity of the nameless Assyrian rulers - father and son - found in the Cyr. Who is Xenophon referring to in his depiction of a kindly, elderly Assyrian king and his son, the wicked young ruler? One possibility is that the father in Xenophon - the original Assyrian king - is Nabonidus, and the crown prince is his son Belshazzar. Since Nabonidus spent several years in self-imposed exile in Tema, returning to the capital only

the year before the city's capture, and his son Beshazzar reigned in his stead, as co-regent, in Babylon, Xenophon (or his source) may have assumed that Belshazzar was the actual ruler of Assyria (i.e. Babylon) at the time of Nabonidus' exile and that his father had died.[92] In the Cyr., however, the elderly Assyrian king is a fairly positive figure: his former subjects all speak highly of him (cf. Cyr. 4.6.2, 5, 6; 5.4.12, 34; 6.1.45) and his only crime is his desire to add Media to his empire (1.5.2-3). His son, on the other hand, is unabashedly evil, known above all for his impiety (ἀνόσιος cf. 4.6.4; 7.5.32). This picture of a wicked, impious king fits in well with the very black portrait of Nabonidus found in the (Persian-inspired) Babylonian sources - especially in the Cyrus Cylinder and the "Verse Account of Nabonidus".[93] In these cuneiform sources Nabonidus is a wicked man and a heretic who prefers the cult of the moon-god Sin over the traditional worship of Marduk. He moves the images of the gods about, neglects various temples and fails to celebrate the New Year's festival; in addition, he mistreats his subjects ("Verse Account", col. i). Nabonidus is unfavourably contrasted with Cyrus, who is seen as a saviour chosen by Marduk. While opposition to Nabonidus' rule may not have been solely, or even chiefly, on religious grounds,[94] it is clear that he was quite unpopular in Babylon and that he was attacked by Persian propagandists for his unrighteous behaviour. Thus word of Nabonidus' bad reputation may even have reached Xenophon through Persian sources, and Nabonidus seems a much more likely candidate than Belshazzar for the role of the villainous young Assyrian king in the Cyr. If Nabonidus is the younger Assyrian of the Cyr., we are left with the problem of identifying his father, the elderly king, for Nabonidus was not the son of Labashi-Mardak, the previous ruler, but ascended to the throne after conspiring against his king. There is, in sum, no simply way to identify the two Assyrian rulers of the Cyr. with any pair of historical Babylonian kings.[95]

It has already been noted (above, p. 248 ) that the assassination of the young Assyrian king, the final scene in the Gobryas-Gadatas novella, contains no dialogue; it is the only important novellistic episode that does not include any conversation. Gadatas, Gobryas and their forces (οἱ σὺν Γαδάτᾳ καὶ Γωβρύᾳ Cyr. 7.5.30 - Xenophon is careful here to mention both Assyrian defectors, while in the earlier part of the narrative they are sometimes referred to jointly and sometimes separately) are simply shown making their way into the palace and killing the king, who awaits them with his dagger held in his hand. It is perhaps surprising that Xenophon does not dramatize the actual assassination more, including, for example, speeches by Gobryas and Gadatas, vilifying the king one last time before killing him, or a plea by the king that he be spared. In both Herodotus and Ctesias there are similar stories involving the murder of a reigning king within the palace walls, and their accounts seem much livelier. Herodotus, when telling of the assassination of the Magi pretenders to the throne by the seven Persian conspirators (Hdt. 3.77-79), has a full description of the event. He tells of the conspirators' entry into the palace, the Magi taking up their weapons and the actual struggle between the Magi and the Seven. Herodotus even includes an exchange between Gobryas and Darius in the midst of the fight, in which the former urges the latter to kill the Magus at all cost (Hdt. 3.78. 4-5). Ctesias' parallel description of the same event (FGrH 688 F 13.16) is, typically, even more colourful. The seven Persians, who have the eunuchs Artasuras and Bagapates, the keeper of the keys, join their plot, come upon the Magus ruler in bed with a Babylonian concubine. The Magus, having no other weapon at hand, fights them off with a couch leg, but is eventually overpowered. In another assassination scene (F 15.48), Secundianus aided by the eunuch Pharnacyas, kills his half-brother Xerxes, only a short time after the latter ascends to the throne. The killing takes place during a festival, when Xerxes is asleep

in the palace after drinking his fill. This story, in the abridged version that Photius gives us, clearly resembles our scene, for both killings take place during a festival when the victims are fairly drunk, and both involve two conspirators - a noble and a eunuch. Eunuchs also participate in the assassination of the Magus in Ctesias' version of the event and Xenophon may possibly have been influenced by this involvement of eunuchs in the killing of kings in the Persica, when fashioning Gadatas' role in the Cyr.

Why does Xenophon describe the assassination of the Assyrian so briefly? One reason may be that, as with Abradatas' death in the course of the Battle of Thymbrara (Cyr. 7.1.29-32), he does not wish to interrupt the swift narrative of events - the conquest of Babylon - in order to linger over a diverting, novellistic episode: such a pause would break up the continuity of his tale. Another possibility is that Xenophon did not consider a drawn-out death scene especially edifying or entertaining. In any event, with the death of the wicked Assyrian king, the novelle of the two Assyrian defectors come to an end. Both Gobryas and Gadatas can be encountered later in the Cyr. (see e.g. 8.4.1 ff.), but no further reference is made to their tribulations at the hands of the young Assyrian ruler.

Croesus

Croesus is the leading figure in the last of our four novelle. The part the Lydian monarch plays in the Cyr. up to the conquest of Sardis has already been sketched above (pp.250-253): his novella proper begins with his conversation with Cyrus, following his capture (7.2.9 ff.). It should be stated at the outset that this dialogue was undoubtedly written by Xenophon with Herodotus' account of Croesus in mind.[96] Herodotus' story of Croesus' meeting with Solon, the tale of the Lydian's two sons, his frequent consultations of the oracle at Delphi, his first encounter with Cyrus after the capture of Sardis - all seem to have

left their mark on our dialogue. This influence expresses itself in different ways: at times Xenophon seems to assume his reader's acquaintance with Herodotus' History, alluding very briefly to stories found there, and taking them for granted, as it were, while elsewhere in the dialogue he deliberately strays from his predecessor's account.

Cyrus enters Sardis the morning following the capture of the city, and the Lydian monarch, who has shut himself up in his palace, immediately calls for him (Κῦρον ἐβόα 7.2.5), presumably in order to ask for protection for himself and his men.[97] Cyrus leaves a guard to watch Croesus, but has no time for the defeated king himself. The Persian leader has discovered that the Chaldaean contingent, who have entered and captured the city together with the Persians the night before, have left their posts in order to loot the rich capital. An enraged Cyrus summons the Chaldaean leaders and dismisses them from his army, warning them that they will now be exposed to danger. The penitent Chaldaeans offer to return the booty at once and Cyrus has them turn it over to the obedient Persians who have stayed at their posts, for he thinks that well-disciplined soldiers should have the advantage over the rest (πλεονεκτοῦσιν οἱ εὔτακτοι 7.2.7). Only after dealing with this reckless plundering of Sardis is Cyrus able to pay attention to his defeated enemy Croesus, and in this fashion Xenophon sets the stage for the discussion concerning the guarding of treasure which takes place between the Persian and Lydian rulers at their first meeting. This topic - which also arises, of course, at the first encounter between Croesus and Cyrus in Herodotus (1.88-90) - recurs in their two other conversations in the Cyr.

Croesus is brought before Cyrus and greets him submissively - χαῖρε ὦ δέσποτα (Cyr. 7.2.9) - saying that fate has decreed that Cyrus will be called his master henceforth. The Persian, rather unexpectedly, wishes Croesus well in

return καὶ σύ γε [sc. χαῖρε ], reminding him that they are both (only) human ( ἐπείπερ ἄνθρωποί γέ ἐσμεν ἀμφότεροι 7.2.10). Cyrus' greeting is exceptionally benevolent and mild, considering that Croesus was the leader of the enemy forces allied against him and, as such, has caused him a great deal of trouble. In a similar situation - i.e. a first meeting with a defeated enemy immediately after his capture - Cyrus behaves much more sternly towards the Armenian king (cf. 3.1.5 ff., especially 31-37 and see below, pp.350-351). The key to the Persian's humane attitude here seems to be Herodotus and his version of the first meeting, at the funeral pyre, between Croesus and Cyrus. There the Persian leader appreciates the fact that he and the Lydian are equally mortal - cf. Hdt. 1.86.6 καὶ τὸν Κῦρον... μεταγνόντα τε καὶ ἐννώσαντα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον... ζῶντα πυρὶ διδοίη - after hearing of Croesus' discussion with Solon (cf. Hdt. 1.29-33). In the Cyr. Cyrus comes to this first meeting already equipped with an awareness of his - and Croesus' - mortality and he brings it up at the very start of the conversation, without having been enlightened by Croesus. The Lydian, in turn, has never been taught by Solon, as far as we hear. Thus Cyrus, in Xenophon's version, fills to a certain extent the role given to Solon in Herodotus, or at least he possesses a part of Solon's wisdom.[98]

Cyrus' next words to Croesus are again somewhat abrupt and surprising: the Persian would like to ask the Lydian's advice. Cyrus only rarely asks the advice of others in the Cyr. and Croesus, an enemy and rival who has just been subdued, is an unlikely adviser, so that once again it seems likely that Herodotus' influence is at work. Croesus is eager to oblige ( καὶ βουλοίμην γ' ἂν... ἀγαθόν τί σοι εὑρεῖν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἂν οἶμαι ἀγαθὸν κἀμοὶ γενέσθαι Cyr. 7.2.10), reminding us of Herodotus' Croesus who, in fact, volunteers his counsel without being asked (cf. Hdt. 1.89.1 ἐπείτε με θεοὶ ἔδωκαν δοῦλόν σοι, δικαιῶ, εἴ τι ἐνορῶ

πλέον σημαίνειν σοι; see too 1.207.1). The question discussed is the same in both Xenophon and Herodotus: the looting of Sardis. In the Cyr. this problem, as we have seen, troubles Cyrus even before his meeting with Croesus and although the Persian has resolved the Chaldaean affair by himself, he is concerned with the ramifications of the incident. He would like to reward his deserving soldiers but is afraid that if he allows them to loot Sardis indiscriminately, the city will be destroyed and the worst men will end up with the largest share of the booty. In Herodotus, it should be recalled, Croesus points out to the Persian leader that the victorious Persian soldiers are pillaging what is now Cyrus' - and not his own - city (οὔτε πόλιν τὴν ἐμὴν οὔτε χρήματα τὰ ἐμὰ διαρπάζει... ἀλλὰ φέρουσί τε καὶ ἄγουσι τὰ σά Hdt. 1.88.3). According to Herodotus, the Lydian warns Cyrus that the Persians, who are both undisciplined and unused to money, will be spoiled by their new wealth, with the one who takes the most bound to rebel against Cyrus. Croesus then suggests to Cyrus a way to confiscate all the spoils taken without arousing the anger of his men (Hdt. 1.89). Thus one of Cyrus' two worries in the Cyr. - that his worst soldiers will be most acquisitive - is discussed already by the Herodotean Croesus, but his other concern, that the city of Sardis will be ruined, is, interestingly, not taken into consideration by the Lydian monarch there. In Herodotus, Croesus thinks only of how to keep Cyrus' newly-acquired wealth safe for him and prevent the Persian soldiers from behaving badly towards their leader, while in Xenophon, the Lydian (more convincingly) worries about his own city and subjects. Croesus' advice in our dialogue, in fact, relates only to the best way to have the Lydians turn over their wealth and preserve the city intact; he does not suggest how Cyrus is to distribute this booty among his soldiers or restrain the more avaricious among them. (Cyrus later successfully handles this problem by himself - cf. 8.4.29-36.) Croesus offers to approach his compatriots,[99] saying that if

Cyrus guarantees that there will be no sacking of the city or selling of women and children into slavery, the Lydians will voluntarily hand over all the wealth of Sardis to him. In this way, Croesus adds, the city will be filled afresh, next year, with many good things, while pillaging Sardis would mean destroying its handicrafts (τέχναι - for this meaning cf. 5.3.47 and 6.2.37), which are the source of affluence. Cyrus can always reconsider the questions of spoils later, concludes the Lydian monarch, but in the meantime the Persian can begin his take-over of the riches of Sardis by emptying out Croesus' own treasuries (Cyr. 7.2.10-14).

In this opening section of their dialogue, it is fairly clear that Croesus is the teacher or adviser, while Cyrus is the pupil or advisee,[100] an unusual role for him in the Cyr. After Cyrus' long conversation with his father (1.6.1-2.1.1), in which the Persian king instructs his son on how to behave in the forthcoming military expedition, it is very rare to find Cyrus following the advice of others. He often rejects the counsel - both solicited and unsolicited - of his followers, friends and allies (cf. e.g. 2.1.8; 3.3.29-33, 46-47, 48-56; 4.1.10-11; 5.2.29-37; 5.4.41-50 etc.). Here the Persian leader consults with Croesus, listens to his recommendations and adopts them all: ταῦτα μὲν δὴ πάντα οὕτω συνήνεσε ποιεῖν ὁ Κῦρος ὥσπερ ἔλεξεν ὁ Κροῖσος (7.2.14). Croesus not only offers immediate, specific advice, but explains his reasoning, speaking in a more general fashion on the economic foundations of a city: his remark αἱ τέχναι... ἃς πηγάς φασι τῶν καλῶν εἶναι (7.2.13) is especially noteworthy. Here, then, Croesus is a wise counsellor and a repository of general wisdom. He continues in the role of adviser to Cyrus in his two later appearances in the Cyr. (7.4.12-13; 8.2.15-23), just as the Herodotean Croesus counsels Cyrus (and Cambyses) several times (Hdt. 1.155-156, 207; 3.34, 36).[101] On these later occasions in the Cyr., the Lydian volunteers his suggestions unasked and Cyrus

does not accept them as whole-heartedly as he does here: Croesus is no longer quite so wise. Even in the course of this first dialogue Cyrus, too, has his share of sagacity, such as his words ἄνθρωποί γέ ἐσμεν ἀμφότεροι (Cyr. 7.2.10), already discussed above. So too, towards the close of this conversation, it is Croesus who would like the Persian's opinion on an important matter - his future (7.2.25-26; see below, p. 350). Thus Xenophon when portraying the relationship between Cyrus and Croesus, plays about with the roles of adviser and advisee, oscillating between the characterization of Croesus as counsellor and Cyrus as advisee found in Herodotus and his own idealized portrait of Cyrus as a wise leader who rarely needs to consult others.

Having resolved the immediate problem of the pillaging of Sardis, Cyrus now questions Croesus about his past, allowing us a further, more novellistic glimpse into the Lydian leader's background. Cyrus begins by asking Croesus about his relationship with Apollo and the Delphic oracle (7.2.15). In Herodotus' version of the first meeting between the two rulers, a puzzled and angry Croesus requests permission from Cyrus to send messengers to Delphi, in order to discover why has has been so dangerously misled by the oracle. It is only after he receives an explanation from the Pythian priestess that Croesus is willing to acknowledge his own share in his downfall (Hdt. 1.90-91). Here, Cyrus is already aware of the Lydian's connection with the oracle and he wonders about the responses from Delphi, i.e. wonders how Croesus, an obedient and generous follower of Apollo, has ended up in his present unfortunate situation. Croesus, in Xenophon, is not surprised by his defeat at the hands of the Persians and at once, immediately after his downfall, realizes that he is entirely to blame.[102] The lessons which both Cyrus and Croesus learn slowly and at some cost in Herodotus - on mortal limitations and on personal culpability - are quickly absorbed, even taken for granted, in the Cyr.

The Lydian king has, he tells Cyrus, behaved badly towards Apollo from the very start, testing the oracle's credibility, rather than approaching it with a specific request. Even gentlemen, to say nothing of the gods, do not like being mistrusted, continues Croesus. Nonetheless, the oracle responded to Croesus' test and knew the strange things the Lydian was doing (καὶ μάλ' ἄτοπα ἐμοῦ ποιοῦντος Cyr. 7.2.18) far away from Delphi. Croesus' account here of his testing of the oracle is brief to the point of obscurity and can only really be understood with reference to Herodotus' story (Hdt. 1.46-48), according to which exactly 100 days after he sent messengers off to various oracles, Croesus boiled a tortoise and a lamb together in a bronze cauldron. In other words, here Xenophon seems to assume that his readers are familiar with Herodotus' version and consequently quickly glosses over this section of the Lydian's tale. In Herodotus no one actually says that the Lydian ruler was wrong to put the oracle to a test. Croesus is not reprimanded for his impiety, not even in the last response he receives from Delphi in which the Pythian priestess explains how he has consistently misconstrued the oracle's words (Hdt. 1.91). This action of his is, nonetheless, surely meant to contribute to the picture of an arrogant and hybristic man who is bound to fall, found in Herodotus. Elsewhere in the History such attempts to tamper with the divine, or test it, often end in disaster. Amasis' warning to Polycrates (3.40-43) and Artabanus' attempts to conjure up Xerxes' dream by sleeping in the king's bed (7.15-18) are two such examples. (The case of Aristodicus, who successfully tests the truth of an oracle given at Branchidae in connection with the suppliant Pactyes (1.157-159) is perhaps a counter example.)

Returning to our dialogue, Croesus now tells Cyrus of his second consultation of the Delphic oracle, when he asks what he should do in order to have children. This question does not have any parallel in Herodotus and we must

simply understand that Xenophon's Croesus did not have any children - or perhaps sons (cf. Cyr. 7.2.26) - for many years. The Lydian king does not receive a reply at first, presumably because Apollo was angered by his initial approach, and he then appeases the god with rich offerings and sacrifices, until he is told that he will have children (ἔσοιντο Cyr. 7.2.19). Here Croesus uses the treasures he sends to Delphi as a kind of bribe or incentive to prompt a reply, rather than as a thank-you offering after an oracle has been given, as in Herodotus. Croesus subsequently had two sons but they were of no avail (οὐδὲν ὤνησαν 7.2.20) for one is permanently mute while the other was killed in the prime of life. Once again Xenophon is apparently looking back at Herodotus, for Croesus' description of his two sons in our dialogue ὁ μὲν γὰρ κωφὸς ὢν διετέλει, ὁ δὲ ἄριστος γενόμενος ἐν ἀκμῇ τοῦ βίου ἀπώλετο (Cyr. 7.2.20) closely parallels Herodotus' initial description of the two ἦσαν δὲ τῷ Κροίσῳ δύο παῖδες, τῶν οὗτερος μὲν διέφθαρτο, ἦν γὰρ δὴ κωφός, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος τῶν ἡλίκων μακρῷ τὰ πάντα πρῶτος... (Hdt. 1.34.2). Herodotus then gives the full details of the tragic death of Atys at the hands of Adrastus (Hdt. 1.34-45) and later (1.85) tells of how Croesus' other son miraculously regained his power of speech and saved his father's life, when Sardis was captured. Xenophon's brief mention of Croesus' dead son seems to allude to the Atys-Adrastus tale in Herodotus, but he pointedly rejects the second story, stressing that Croesus' second son remained ( διετέλει ) mute. Here, again, Xenophon takes his reader's acquaintance with Herodotus for granted, alluding briefly to one incident and taking issue with another.

The Lydian monarch's next approach to the oracle comes, he tells Cyrus, because he is overcome by the misfortunes concerning his children. He asks Apollo what he should do in order to pass the remainder of his life most happily - τί ἂν ποιῶν τὸν λοιπὸν βίον εὐδαιμονέστατα διατελέσαιμι; (7.2.20). This question

is perhaps best understood against the background of Solon's conversation with the Lydian king in Herodotus (1.29-33), since there too Croesus is concerned with the question of happiness.[103] When he is asked by Croesus to name men who are happy, Solon repeatedly stresses that men can be judged fortunate only after their lives are over - πρὶν δ' ἂν τελευτήσῃ, ἐπισχεῖν μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὄλβιον (Hdt. 1.32.7; cf. 1.30.4; 1.31.3; 1.32.5, 9; 1.33) - i.e. only if their good fortune continues to the very end of their days. Our Croesus seems to take this warning of Solon into account when he frames his question to the oracle, since he asks, in the wake of his family misfortunes, how he is to be happy for the rest of his days ( τὸν λοιπὸν βίον Cyr. 7.2.20), rather than asking, for instance, what he should do to change his luck or how he can become happy.

The oracle's response to Croesus - quoted verbatim, so to speak, in verse form - is Σαυτὸν γιγνώσκων εὐδαίμων, Κροῖσε, περάσεις (Cyr. 7.2.20). This is, of course, the famous Delphic maxim γνῶθι σαυτόν - Croesus must know himself and in this way he will go through life happy. The oracle quoted here, like the question which prompts it, does not appear in other extant accounts of Croesus and it seems likely that it was invented by Xenophon himself.[104] Croesus' earlier consultation of the Delphic oracle - on having children - also appears only in the Cyr. and again was probably made up by Xenophon, but there he simply summarizes Apollo's reply "ἔσοιντο" and does not produce a full-fledged metrical oracular response. This second oracle conforms to the general pattern of oracular responses: it is in dactylic hexameter, Croesus, the petitioner, is addressed in the second person, and his name is mentioned in the vocative. Only the type of dactylic hexameter used - spondees in all four first feet - is rather rare.[105] The lesson that Xenophon has Apollo teach Croesus here, "know thyself", is a traditionally pious one but it is nonetheless disconcerting to find him, a petitioner of the Delphic oracle on his own behalf (Anab. 3.1.5-8;

cf. 5.3.5; 6.1.22), concocting, even "forging" an oracle for literary purposes.

Upon receiving this reply from Delphi, Croesus was, he tells Cyrus, pleased, thinking that the oracle had prescribed a very easy task, since everyone knows who he himself is (ἑαυτὸν δὲ ὅστις ἐστὶ πάντα τινὰ ἐνόμιζον ἄνθρωπον εἰδέναι Cyr. 7.2.21). Initially, then, Croesus takes the famous injunction γνῶθι σαυτόν - which was inscribed over the entrance to Apollo's sanctuary at Delphi and ascribed to various wise men such as Thales, Chilon etc.[106] - at its face value. The Lydian thinks that he already knows who he is, i.e. knows that he is (named) Croesus. In his superficial approach to the maxim Croesus reminds us of another figure in Xenophon - Euthydemus of the Mem. (4.2.24 ff.). Young Euthydemus, who has been to Delphi twice, has to be taught by Socrates that "know thyself" does not simply mean knowing one's name (cf. ὅστις τοὔνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον οἶδεν Mem. 4.2.25), but knowing one's capabilities (cf. ἔγνωκε τὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν Mem. 4.2.25). This - the recognition of his capabilities (or in-capabilities) - is precisely the lesson Croesus learns through his encounters with Cyrus. When the Lydian king stays peaceably at home, all goes well for him, but after joining the Assyrian's campaign against Cyrus, his troubles begin afresh, since the Assyrians and their allies, including Croesus, are defeated in their first clash with the Persians (cf. Cyr. 3.3.65 ff.). Only when the Lydian recognizes his inferiority to the Persians (ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔγνων ἐμαυτὸν μὴ ἱκανὸν ὑμῖν μάχεσθαι 7.2.22) and withdraws from battle (cf. 4.1.8; 4.2.29), is his safety (and consequently well-being) guaranteed. In other words, by means of their first engagement in battle Cyrus teaches Croesus to know himself - as an inferior rival. When Socrates explains to Euthydemus the meaning of γνῶθι σαυτόν and the advantages of such knowledge, he uses just such an example: cities that do not know their own capabilities and fight against stronger ones lose either their territory or their freedom (Mem. 4.2.29). Thus Socrates'

interpretation of the maxim in the Mem. is very similar to Croesus' approach in the Cyr. even though the precept can be understood in several different ways.[107] In the Mem. Euthydemus is taught the meaning of γνῶθι σαυτόν by Socrates, but Croesus learns the lesson by himself, with Cyrus only an indirect instrument or agent. The relationship between the Lydian and the Persian is not like that of Euthydemus and Socrates - Croesus and Cyrus are not disciple and master here.

Croesus' newly-acquired knowledge of himself, his recognition of his own limitations in the military sphere, is short-lived and soon afterwards he allows himself to be chosen commander-in-chief of the Assyrians and their allies. The life of luxury he leads, the gifts he receives, the flattery and entreaties of others and the prospect of becoming the greatest of men - all these factors puff Croesus up (ἀναφυσώμενος Cyr. 7.2.23), he explains to Cyrus, and cause him to accept the leadership of the army. It is interesting to note that the means used to persuade Croesus here - gifts and soft words - are precisely those he himself used to coax an answer from the Delphic oracle (cf. 7.2.19). In this way Croesus once again does not know himself ( ἀγνοῶν ἄρα ἐμαυτόν 7.2.24), i.e. does not acknowledge his own limitations. Croesus now compares himself to the Persian leader, pointing out that Cyrus is descended from the gods, comes from a line of kings and has practised virtue from childhood onwards, whereas he himself is descended from a man who gained both his kingdom and his freedom on the same day.

This last statement by the Lydian monarch is interesting for several reasons. The founder of Croesus' royal house who was a servant before becoming king is, of course, Gyges, who was, according to Herodotus, one of Candaules' bodyguards ( τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Hdt. 1.8.1; cf. δορυφόρος 1.91.1 and see Pl. Rep. 359 D where Gyges is called a shepherd). Here Croesus mentions his famous ancestor very

briefly so that once again Xenophon seems to be referring his reader to Herodotus' History, where the story of Gyges' rise to power appears in full (Hdt. 1.8-13).[108] According to Herodotus, the oracle at Delphi had given notice that in the fifth generation after Gyges, i.e. in Croesus' time, Gyges' crime would have to be paid for, but Croesus ignored the prediction (1.13,91). Perhaps, then, by this oblique allusion to Gyges in our dialogue, Croesus hints at something else he should have known about himself: he is the descendant of Gyges and is fated to be punished for his forefather's impious acts. Croesus mentions his ignoble ancestry chiefly in order to draw a contrast between himself and Cyrus, the scion of gods and kings. Croesus' description of Cyrus here πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ θεῶν γεγονότι, ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ βασιλέων πεφυκότι, ἔπειτα δ' ἐκ παιδὸς ἀρετὴν ἀσκοῦντι (7.2.24) - is reminiscent of Xenophon's introduction to the Cyr. where he announces his intention to tell the reader what he has learned about Cyrus the Great ἐσκεψάμεθα τίς ποτ' ὢν γενεὰν καὶ ποίαν τινὰ φύσιν ἔχων καὶ ποίᾳ τινὶ παιδευθεὶς παιδείᾳ 1.1.6. He then (1.2.1 ff.) proceeds to describe Cyrus' ancestry (γενεά), appearance and character (φύσις) and education (παιδεία). Here Croesus (who is surprisingly well-acquainted with the Persian leader's background) appears to define φύσις differently, using it as a synonym of γενεά The Lydian ascribes to Cyrus an even more illustrious background than Xenophon does, calling him a descendant of the gods; Xenophon, when discussing Cyrus' origins, simply notes that his clan, the Persidae, take their name from the hero Perseus (οἱ δὲ Περσεῖδαι ἀπὸ Περσέως καλῆζονται 1.2.1; cf. Hdt. 7.61). The only other figure in the Cyr. who refers to Cyrus' supposed descent from the gods is Artabazus, Cyrus' long-time Mede suitor (Cyr. 4.1.24) and it seems that the Lydian has turned, overnight, into an equally enthusiastic admirer of Cyrus.

Croesus readily admits his culpability ( δικαίως... ἔχω τὴν δίκην 7.2.24) for his present unfortunate situation, but he now feels that he does know himself

(ἀλλᾶ νῦν δῆ... γιγνώσκων μὲν ἐμαυτόν 7.2.25); defeat has been a swift teacher. The Lydian ends his speech with a question: does Cyrus think that his new self-knowledge will, in fact, guarantee his happiness, as Apollo has promised? Cyrus is, Croesus explains, in the best position to know since he now controls the Lydian king's welfare (καὶ γὰρ δύνασαι ποιῆσαι 7.2.25). Croesus' doubts about Apollo's veracity - cf. ἔτι δοκεῖς ἀληθεύειν τὸν Ἀπόλλω (7.2.25) - would seem to indicate that he has not entirely changed his old ways. His question is, in essence, a plea for Cyrus to treat him kindly and the Persian so understands it. Cyrus replies to the Lydian's question only indirectly by offering to restore to Croesus his wife, daughters, friends, attendants and customary pleasures of the table (τράπεζαν σὺν οἵπερ ἔζητε 7.2.26), but not his weapons - Croesus will not be allowed to wage wars. Cyrus makes these concessions to Croesus, he says, because he pities him the loss of his former happiness ἐγὼ γάρ σοῦ ἐννοῶν τὴν πρόσθεν εὐδαιμονίαν οἰκτίρω... σε (7.2.26). This statement by Cyrus reminds us of his opening words in the dialogue ἄνθρωποί γέ ἐσμεν ἀμφότεροι and also of the compassionate attitude displayed by Herodotus' Cyrus (Hdt. 1.86.6; see above, p. 340).

It is interesting once again to compare Cyrus' attitude towards Croesus here to his earlier stance towards another vanquished opponent - the Armenian king (Cyr. 3.1.1 ff.). Cyrus in unwilling, at first, to pardon the Armenian king because he is suspicious of the ruler's instant contrition and change of heart - cf. παραχρῆμα ἐξ ἄφρονος σώφρων (3.1.17) - following his defeat, and thinks that it is only temporary. Often, the Persian leader tells Tigranes, a proud man can be humbled by defeat, only to recover and behave arrogantly once again (3.1.26) and in fact this is just the pattern that Croesus has followed - attacking Cyrus, withdrawing after he recognizes his inferiority, only to be puffed up with pride and attack once more. Cyrus allows himself to be persuaded by Tigranes

to forgive the Armenian king in the end, because such a course of action best serves his own interests (cf. above, pp. 138-139); he is not motivated by humanitarian fellow-feeling towards his vanquished foe, as he is here. Even after pardoning the Armenian, Cyrus negotiates with him over the release of his family (3.1. 31-37). In our dialogue Cyrus is magnanimous from the start, restoring Croesus' family and luxurious life-style to him at once, but he does forbid him all military initiative and keeps a close eye on him henceforth. The Persian's words to Croesus may be gentler than those he addressed to the Armenian king, but his actions are similarly pragmatic.

Croesus is delighted by the terms Cyrus offers him, saying that he now knows that his life will indeed be a most happy one (μακαριωτάτην... βιοτήν 7.2.27). Cyrus will be treating the Lydian as Croesus does the person he loves the best - his wife - allowing him all the riches and luxuries of life, with no part in the military actions undertaken to acquire them. Apollo's oracle is being fulfilled and Croesus feels that he should send the god thank-offerings. Cyrus is surprised by Croesus' reaction and arranges to take him along as a companion wherever he goes, either - Xenophon is careful to add - because he thinks that the Lydian will prove useful or because he considers matters safer that way (7.2.29).

The life Cyrus now arranges for Croesus - luxuries, ease and no martial activities - is the very one Croesus suggests for the rebellious Lydians, as a means to tame them, in Herodotus (1.155). By stripping the Lydians of their arms, dressing them in flowing garments and teaching them to engage in music and trade, the Herodotean Croesus tells Cyrus, the Persian leader will turn the Lydian men into women (γυναῖκας ἀντ' ἀνδρῶν ὄψεαι γεγονότας Hdt. 1.155.4). Here in the Cyr., Cyrus thinks of disarming Croesus while allowing him luxuries, but it is the Lydian who (gladly) foresees that he will now lead a woman's life; once again the roles of teacher and pupil, or adviser and advisee, are not clearly demarcated

in our dialogue. Croesus embraces his new effeminate life whole-heartedly, reminding us of several woman-like rulers in Ctesias, such as Semiramis' son Ninyas, Sardanapallus and Nanarus the Babylonian (cf. above, p. 263 ). Our Croesus does not, however, go to the extremes that these rulers do, for we do not hear of him wearing women's clothing or carding wool together with his mistresses. We have seen that these effete rulers are countered or complemented by various bold Oriental women who take upon themselves the tasks of men (see above, pp. 257-260 and pp. 274-275) so that often male and female roles seem to be shifted about. In Herodotus, Xerxes exclaims that his men have turned into women and his women into men ( οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες Hdt. 8.88), in the wake of Artemisia's (seemingly) courageous actions in battle, and this blurring of masculine and feminine functions is best exemplified, perhaps even symbolized, by Semiramis' cloak which is especially designed to disguise whether its wearer is male or female οὐκ ἦν διαγνῶναι τὸν περιβεβλημένον πότερος ἀνήρ ἐστιν ἢ γυνή (FGrH 688 F 1b 6.6). Semiramis wears this garment on her way to assisting her husband and Ninus in the very masculine mission of conquering Bactria. The theme of effete men (and vigourous women) is a popular one in novelle, but it should be remembered that the effeminate leaders in these tales can suddenly demonstrate their virile qualities, if the need arises. The pair Nanarus and Parsondes, the pampered Babylonian satrap and his captive enemy who is forced to become a music girl (FGrH 90 F 4), is probably the best illustration of such transformations. The womanish satrap is quite ruthless when it comes to dealing with his foe, while the manly Parsondes turns from courageous hunter and fighter to effeminate flute player and then back to dangerous enemy in the course of the tale. Similarly, the effete Sardanapallus leaves the harem behind him and fights boldly for the control of his empire when put to the test; his courageous suicide is admired by many (FGrH 688 F 1b 25-27; F 1q). Perhaps Cyrus,

who wonders at Croesus' good-humoured acceptance of his new status ( ἐθαύμασε... τὴν εὐθυμίαν Cyr. 7.2.29) suspects that the Lydian too may undergo another change of heart and that is why he considers it safer to keep him at his side.

While keeping an eye on Croesus may be one reason why Cyrus has the Lydian accompany him henceforth, his potential usefulness ( χρήσιμόν τι νομίζων αὐτὸν εἶναι 7.2.29) is another and it is this side of Croesus that we see in his next conversation with the Persian leader (7.4.12-13). Cyrus is about to depart from Sardis, taking many wagon-loads of booty with him. Croesus, who presumably has kept his word and facilitated the smooth transfer of wealth from the defeated Lydians to their conquerors (cf. 7.2.12-13), presents Cyrus with an exact written list of the contents of each wagon. The Lydian explains to Cyrus that this inventory will enable him to check which of his men faithfully deliver the goods entrusted to them and which do not. The Persian thanks Croesus for taking the trouble, but reminds him that the men conveying these valuables are entitled to them (i.e. are to receive a share of this booty), so that stealing would, in effect, only mean stealing from themselves ( ὥστε ἤν τι καὶ κλέψωσι, τῶν ἑαυτῶν κλέψονται 7.4.13). Despite his words to Croesus, Cyrus makes use of the Lydian's lists, handing them over to his lieutenants so that they can in fact check up on the men responsible for delivering the wagon-loads.

In this brief exchange, Croesus gives Cyrus advice which the Persian seemingly rejects, but actually makes use of. The Lydian is, as in his first appearance in the Cyr., again concerned with the preservation and orderly transfer of wealth but here Cyrus - in word, if not in deed - does not share his views. The Persian, while proclaiming his faith in his men, does arrange to keep them under surveillance - that is, manages to have his cake and eat it too. The argument that Cyrus uses here - that his men would only be robbing themselves - seems a variation on Croesus' words to Cyrus in Herodotus, where he points out that the Persians are

looting what is now Cyrus' city and not his own - οὔτε πόλιν τὴν ἐμὴν οὔτε χρήματα τὰ ἐμὰ διαρπάζει... ἀλλὰ... τὰ σά (Hdt. 1.88).[109] Once again Xenophon seems to be writing with one eye on the Herodotean Croesus and Cyrus, and their roles there. It should perhaps be added that even in Herodotus, Croesus is not always the wise adviser, nor is Cyrus simply the advisee. In the History, the Lydian is at first in need of sage advice himself and he is counselled by Bias/ Pittacus (Hdt. 1.27), Sandanis (1.71) and, of course, by Solon (1.29-33). After the Lydian's defeat he is transformed into an adviser, guiding both Cyrus and Cambyses, and he retains that role to the end of his days. His suggestions do not, however, always prove valuable, as Cambyses points out (3.36). Herodotus' Cyrus though generally the recipient of advice (from Harpagus, Croesus etc.), is capable of devising his own schemes when the need arises (cf. 1.125-126). At the very end of the History, the Persian ruler himself appears as a wise adviser, warning of the dangerous effects of a soft climate (9.122). Thus Herodotus too allows a certain fluidity or flexibility in the roles of adviser and advisee,[110] but it is true that when Croesus and Cyrus converse in his work, the Lydian is always the teacher and the Persian his pupil. Xenophon has the two virtually exchange parts in the Cyr., proceeding by stages. At their first meeting Cyrus requests Croesus' advice and does as the Lydian suggests (Cyr. 7.2. 10-14), but is asked, in turn, by the Lydian for his opinion on a different matter (7.2.25). When the two next converse, Cyrus again accepts the Lydian's advice, which is unsolicited this time, but does so reluctantly, contributing his own words of wisdom (7.4.12-13). Finally, at their third and last discussion (8.2.15-23), the Persian leader rejects Croesus' unasked for counsel outright, and Cyrus is clearly meant to be the wiser of the two.

The third dialogue between Croesus and Cyrus, in which the Persian demonstrates with the help of Hystaspas that friends, rather than treasuries, are the

best place to deposit one's riches, has already been discussed above (pp.223-224; cf. pp. 252-253), and only a few further points remain to be seen. This final conversation between Croesus and Cyrus is introduced by Xenophon in a chapter which is devoted to demonstrating how Cyrus does his utmost to be liked by his subjects (ἐπὶ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι 8.1.49). Xenophon praises Cyrus here in a fashion very similar to that he uses for Socrates in the Mem. He describes the Persian's actions and sayings - note in particular καὶ λόγος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπομνημονεύεται (8.2.14) - and then quotes the conversation between the Persian and the Lydian in order to show how Cyrus neatly demonstrated to Croesus (καλὸν δ' ἐπίδειγμα... λέγεται Κῦρος ἐπιδεῖξαι Κροίσῳ) that the best policy is to enrich one's friends and to attend to them in general. Croesus, who clearly plays second fiddle to Cyrus here, once again brings up the problem of preserving Cyrus' wealth, but afterwards has very little to say; all of his share of the conversation is reported only indirectly, in oratio obliqua. Cyrus proves that his method of sharing wealth is a better one by sending Hystaspas round to his friends, along with a trusted servant of Croesus, with a request for funds and the dialogue here falls into two parts - the discussion before and after Hystaspas' errand, with a break during the Persian's absence. There are several such two-part dialogues in the Mem., which contain a pause during which Socrates' instructions are carried out (cf. Mem. 2.7; 2.9; 3.1 and see above, pp. 48-49 ); there too, as here, a third person is introduced once in order to carry out a plan (Mem. 2.9.4 ff.). Another Mem.-like feature of our dialogue is Cyrus' fairly lengthy speech at the end of the conversation (Cyr. 8.2.19-23): Socrates often ends his conversations with others in the Mem. by addressing or exhorting them at length (cf. above, p. 50 and pp. 56-57). Thus, in his third exchange with Croesus in the Cyr., Cyrus is so much the teacher that he is made to bear a strong resemblance to Xenophon's favourite didactic figure of all - Socrates; Herodotus'

Croesus has been left far behind. This is Croesus' last appearance in the Cyr.: with Cyrus resuming his usual role of wise leader, the Lydian can no longer serve as a counsellor and he has, in a sense, outlived his usefulness. We hear no more of Croesus and the last of the four novelle of the Cyr. comes to a close.

I close this chapter with some final comments on the question of Xenophon's sources for the novelle of the Cyr. Throughout the chapter I have attempted to show the similarities between these stories in the Cyr. and other tales set against a Persian or Oriental background written by Greek writers such as Herodotus and Ctesias. The resemblance is most obvious in the case of the Croesus novella, which clearly was written by Xenophon with Herodotus close at hand, but many other features in the three other novelle of the Cyr. have fairly close parallels in Herodotus, Ctesias etc. The stories that Xenophon tells, while more than pallid variations on, or imitations of, tales in other Greek writers, are sufficiently like them to eliminate the necessity of assuming that the Cyr. novelle stem from more remote Persian material (cf. Appendix II, below, pp. 402-414). Nonetheless, the inclusion of an apparently historical figure such as Gobryas, who does not appear in other Greek sources, would seem to indicate that Xenophon had access to Persian-based material of some kind. One can either credit Xenophon with enough imagination to have invented many details of these lively stories of the Cyr. on his own, or else attribute the more colourful bits to his unknown source(s). In either case, Xenophon is manifestly well in control of his novellistic material. He uses these tales to enliven his work, but ensures that they are firmly linked to the main plot and action of the Cyr. So too Xenophon presents these stories in a vivid and dramatic way, chiefly by his skilful use of narrated dialogues. Whatever their source, the novelle of the Cyr. are, on the whole, Xenophon's own creation.

# Chapter V

## A Survey of the Remaining Dialogues

In this chapter I shall look briefly at each one of the remaining four categories of dialogues in the Cyr.: short, information, negotiation and planning dialogues.

### Short Dialogues

The short dialogues of the Cyr.[1] are, as we have seen above (p. 25), brief conversations which do not contribute to the plot of the Cyr. in any real way, but are part of the background of the work, often serving to characterize or describe their participants. Several of these short dialogues are anecdotal conversations, something like the χρεῖαι μικταί discussed by ancient rhetoricians[2] for they combine action with pointed (or educational) speech.

Cyr. 2.4.5-6 is a good example of such an anecdotal dialogue: when Cyaxares summons Cyrus to a meeting with an Indian delegation, sending along a decorative robe for his nephew to wear, Cyrus comes forward quickly with his men, wearing his usual plain costume. He is adorned, he tells his disappointed uncle, with sweat and haste (ἱδρῶτι καὶ σπουδῇ... κεκοσμημένος 2.4.6; see below, pp.394-395). Here, then, Cyrus not only acts in exemplary fashion, hastening to obey his uncle's summons, but also points out didactically, in his brief exchange with Cyaxares, the virtues of his behaviour. (In Xenophon the working up of a sweat (ἐκπονεῖν) is often considered a virtue - cf. Cyr. 1.2.16; 1.6.17; Mem. 2.1.28; Oec. 11.12; Symp. 2.18 etc.) It is interesting to compare our dialogue with the story of Lysander's visit to the garden or παράδεισος of Cyrus the Younger found in the Oec. (4.20-25). This Cyrus also believes in the value of sweat-filled exercise (cf. μηπώποτε δειπνῆσαι πρὶν ἱδρῶσαι Oec. 4.24), but his elaborate costume, jewellery, scents etc. give Lysander no hint of the fact

(cf. too Anab. 1.5.8). Cyrus the Younger manages to care for both his health and his appearance: he would have pleased both Cyaxares and his nephew.

Cyr. 5.1.1 is another dialogue which combines a positive action with an explanation. After booty has been distributed among the Persians and their allies by the Medes, Cyrus declares that all should feel free to make use of his share of the plunder whenever they like. An unnamed Mede, who is fond of music, immediately takes up Cyrus' offer and requests that the Persian leader give him one of the music-girls he has just received. Cyrus does so gladly, adding that he is grateful for the opportunity to do a favour. The point of this conversation is, of course, Cyrus' generosity and his desire to gratify others. Xenophon could have shown these qualities of the Persian leader indirectly, simply telling of (the Mede's request and) Cyrus' gift. Instead, he dramatizes the incident and uses dialogue - with the Mede actually putting forward his request and Cyrus granting it - in an attempt to make these characteristics of his hero more tangible and memorable. The recipient of Cyrus' gift, the music-loving Mede is nonetheless an anonymous, unknown character, for the emphasis is upon Cyrus' deed (and not the Mede's request).

Xenophon uses the same device - a short dialogue linked to an action which is meant to illustrate the character of Cyrus the Great - at Cyr. 8.3.3-4. Here Cyrus presents beautiful Median robes to the Persian leaders to wear at the inaugural procession about to take place, and tells them to deck out their friends as well. One of those present - again, an anonymous interlocutor - asks Cyrus about his own costume and the Persian leader replies that he adorns himself by adorning his friends: any robe will do, if he treats his friends well. In actual fact Cyrus wears the fanciest robe of all at the procession, overwhelming all those present by the splendour of his appearance (cf. 8.3.13-14), so that his words here are not corroborated by his later actions (see below, pp. 394-396).

Here, however, Xenophon wishes to emphasize Cyrus' concern for his men and again, he does not simply tell of Cyrus' deed and the thought behind it, but invents a conversation to stress the point. Cyrus' words are, of course, the essence of the dialogue; his anonymous interlocutor, like the music-loving Mede, serves as a "feed". Returning for a moment to our first dialogue, Cyr. 2.4.5-6, we find that when Cyaxares tried to convince Cyrus to wear a fancy Median robe, he expressed the same viewpoint that Cyrus does here, saying that if his nephew were to be impressively attired it would also reflect well on him (καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ἂν κόσμος ἦν τοῦτο 2.4.5). At the time, Cyrus rejects this view, preferring sweat, speed and discipline as decorations, and we are made to feel that Cyaxares is, as usual, ignoring the essentials and concentrating on outer trappings. In our dialogue, Cyrus adopts, as it were, his uncle's approach and adorns his men, but this act of his (unlike that of Cyaxares) is presented as a thoughtful, generous one. In the Anabasis we find the identical sentiment attributed to Cyrus the Younger: he too thinks that the best ornament of all is well-adorned friends φίλους δὲ καλῶς κεκοσμημένους μέγιστον κόσμον ἀνδρί (Anab. 1.9.23; cf. Cyr. 6.4.3 and see above, p. 299), but in the Anabasis, there is no anecdote or conversation "proving"the point.

The structure of Cyr. 8.3.3-4 is like that of our first short dialogue, 2.4.5-6, for in both conversations Cyrus at first simply acts (in praiseworthy fashion); only afterwards does he explain his behaviour, in response to a question by another. This kind or pattern of anecdote is also found in the Anab. (7.3.44-45), with Xenophon himself as the exemplary hero. When urged by Seuthes to follow with his men as quickly as possible, Xenophon dismounts from his horse, afterwards explaining to the puzzled Seuthes that the hoplites will proceed more quickly if he leads them on foot (cf. Anab. 3.4.44-49).

In general, the anecdotes or anecdotal conversations of the Cyr., like those

of the Anabasis, are all of this "action" kind, i.e. consist of an action followed by speech. There are no χρεῖαι λογικαί in the Cyr., no speech anecdotes whose main point is a witty saying, such as are found in the Hell. (1.6.2-3, 15, 32; 2.3.56) or in the Mem. (3.14). Cyrus' comparison between a shepherd and a king (which is reported only indirectly - cf. Cyr. 8.2.14) is the closest thing to an apophthegm in the Cyr. In Herodotus we find several anecdotes revolving around pointed or witty sayings (see e.g. Hdt. 2.172-173; 6.1; 7.226; 8.59; 8.125; 9.72), but there are also a few short conversations which combine action and speech, as with the short dialogues of the Cyr. Hdt. 9.82, the story of how Pausanias arranged for a Persian meal and a Spartan one to be set side by side and then laughingly pointed out the Persians' folly in coming to rob the Greeks of their poverty, is perhaps closest in form to the anecdotes of the Cyr. (cf. too Hdt. 7.147).

Our next short dialogue, Cyr. 8.3.7-8, again involves clothing. The commoner Peraulas approaches the leaders of the Persian army with instructions for the forthcoming inaugural procession. He goes to the leaders one by one and pretends to offer each the "better" of two mantles, in order to make the instructions coming from him more palatable (see above, pp. 227-228). Here too a short dialogue is used to enhance an action (the supposed choice between two mantles), but Peraulas' behaviour is less exemplary than that we have encountered so far, because he is manipulating these Persian leaders. Xenophon could have simply told of the commoner's stratagem, but by reproducing Peraulas' cheerful banter and feigned fear of the consequences of his act, he gives his readers a much better appreciation of the commoner's powers of persuasion and deception.[3]

It is interesting to see how many stories in the Cyr. revolve around the presentation of clothing. Besides the three tales already mentioned (Cyr. 2.4. 5-6; 8.3.3-4; 8.3.7-8), we also hear of young Cyrus receiving a Median robe

when he comes to visit his grandfather Astyages in Media (1.3.3). Cyrus presents this robe as a gift to his bestfriend Araspas before he returns to Persia (1.4.26; cf. 5.1.2) and Astyages confiscates this gift (along with the others that Cyrus has given when leaving Media), but his grandson insists that he return it (1.4.26). Another story involving the possession of clothing is the story of Cyrus' mistaken decision to have two boys exchange tunics (1.3.16; cf. above, pp. 106-108). Since robes were a favourite gift of Persian kings (cf. Cyr. 8.2.8; 8.5.18; Anab. 1.2.27; Hdt. 3.22), it is not surprising that they feature so often in the pages of the Cyr. It may be true, however, that for the Persians clothing was more than a regular gift and a certain mystique or power was thought to be attached to robes that came from the king, with the royal robes symbolizing the authority of the king himself. The story of Artaynte's disastrous request for Xerxes' robe (Hdt. 9.109 ff.) is perhaps best understood along these lines; see too Herodotus' tale of Darius and Syloson's flame-coloured cloak (3.139-140; cf. Plut. Artax. 4 and Esther 6.8).[4] The many stories involving robes in the Cyr. may then be another peculiarly Persian feature of the work.

Three other short conversations in the Cyr. concern booty or treasure. Cyr. 7.4.12-13, Croesus' suggestion that Cyrus make use of a written inventory of the booty taken from Sardis, has already been discussed above (pp. 353-354); the dialogue again combines action and explanation and helps to characterize both the Persian and the Lydian rulers. In a second conversation, Cyr. 5.3.2-4, Cyrus suggests to his forces that most of their recently acquired plunder be given to Gobryas, who has just entertained them (5.2.1 ff.; cf. above, pp. 202 ff.). By doing so, Cyrus states, they will demonstrate to Gobryas their desire to outdo him in generosity. Cyrus' men agree to his proposal and one (εἷς 5.3.3) adds that this gift will prove to the Assyrian that men can be

gentlemen (ἐλευθερίους 5.3.3) even if they are not rich. Earlier, he continues, Gobryas seemed to look down upon them because they had no gold coins or gold cups. While the moralizing reflections found here are far from novel, it is interesting to find that these words are assigned to an anonymous interlocutor and not to the Persian leader. This speaker actually seems to have read Gobryas' mind - cf. 5.2.16 ὁ Γωβρύας... πολὺ σφᾶς ἐνόμιζεν ἐλευθεριωτέρους εἶναι αὐτῶν (sc. the Persians; see above, p. 207). Once again Xenophon uses a dialogue between Cyrus and an unnamed figure to stress a certain thought or maxim, but in this case it is the anonymous speaker who produces the didactic thought.

The third short dialogue concerning treasure, Cyr. 8.4.31, takes place between two opposing groups of Cyrus' soldiers. The Persian leader has just distributed a great deal of the booty taken from Sardis and some of the soldiers think that if Cyrus has given so much away, he must have kept an even greater amount of money for himself. Others are quick to deny the charge and defend their leader, saying that he prefers giving away money to possessing it. Cyrus, hearing of these rumours, assembles his men, displays to them all the treasure that can be seen and lectures them on the true value of wealth (8.4.32-36; cf. too 3.3.2-3 and see above, pp. 223-225 for a discussion of Cyrus' attitude towards wealth). The chief purpose of our short dialogue between the two groups of soldiers may be to motivate - or provide an excuse for - the speech by Cyrus that follows. The situation - Cyrus confronting a group of detractors - is virtually unique in the Cyr. (with 6.2.12 the closest parallel) and this brief sketch of soldiers debating the merits of their leader is more reminiscent of the Anabasis (see e.g. Anab. 5.6.19; 5.7.2).

The remaining short dialogues are less didactic and their aim seens to be to characterize the speakers and the relationship between them. The first two conversations in this group, Cyr. 1.4.9 and 1.4.10, take place during young

Cyrus' visit to Media. The Persian lad has gone out hunting in the wild for the first time and downs a deer and a boar, pursuing his victims courageously, but over-eagerly. Cyaxares, who has accompanied Cyrus on the hunt, reprimands his nephew for his foolhardiness, but an unperturbed Cyrus simply requests permission from Cyaxares to give the game he has caught to his grandfather. Cyaxares refuses at first, for he is afraid that he too will be reprimanded for allowing Cyrus to hunt so boldly, but eventually he gives in to his nephew's request, saying that the youngster appears to be their king ( σὺ γὰρ νῦν γε ἡμῶν ἔοικας βασιλεὺς εἶναι 1.4.9). This is Cyaxares' first appearance in the Cyr. and in essence we learn all there is to know about him from this brief exchange: the Mede is a weak and ineffectual figure and his nephew Cyrus not only consistently outdoes him in performance, but often manages to win him over to his way of thinking as well. (For a fuller description of Cyaxares' role in the Cyr., see above, pp. 145-146 and below, pp. 382-384 ). Cyaxares' final remark, on Cyrus' resemblance to a king, is a curious one: perhaps it is influenced by Herodotus' young Cyrus who also has a kingly air about him (Hdt. 1.114-115). Our Cyrus, in any event, presents the animals to Astyages and puts his blood-stained spears in a prominent place, where they are bound to be noticed by his grandfather. Astyages refuses the game, saying that it is not worth the risks Cyrus has undergone. Cyrus then requests - and receives - permission to distribute the meat to his friends instead (1.4.10). This conversation, too, characterizes the two interlocutors involved and the relationship between them, Astyages, unlike his son, does not give in to Cyrus; he is a loving, but stern grandfather. Cyrus is anxious to impress his grandfather but wishes to avoid a confrontation with him: hence he does not actually show his hunting-spears to Astyages. So too Cyrus is flexible and makes the most of every opportunity, presenting to his companions the gift he had originally intended for Astyages.

Our next conversation, 3.1.42-43, is the only short dialogue which takes place between three (and not two) speakers - Cyrus, the Armenian king and Tigranes. The Persian leader, who is about to depart from Armenia, asks which of the two Armenians will be heading the Armenian contingent that is to accompany him. Father and son reply together, with the king offering to send whomever Cyrus prefers and Tigranes saying that he will go with Cyrus even if he has to be a camp-follower. Cyrus, teasing the newlywed Tigranes, warns him that his wife will not like hearing that her husband is a mere baggage-carrier, but the Armenian prince replies that his wife will be able to see for herself, since she will be accompanying him. Cyrus ends the conversation by instructing Tigranes to ready himself for their departure. In this brief dialogue, we see Tigranes' great devotion to his two loves - Cyrus (cf. 5.1.27) and his wife (cf. 3.1.36, 37, 41; 8.4.24). The Armenian king, who has just recently been out-maneuvred by Cyrus, is clearly a less enthusiastic admirer of the Persian. Xenophon contrasts father and son here, having the two respond simultaneously, but in varying degrees of eagerness to Cyrus' question.

Cyr. 4.1.23-24 is another conversation between Cyrus and a loyal supporter, his Mede "relative" Artabazus (cf. 1.4.27-28 and see above, pp. 253-254). The Persian leader has received permission from Cyaxares to recruit Mede volunteers to join him in pursuing the Assyrians and he asks Artabazus to speak to the Mede officers on his behalf. Cyrus, reminding Artabazus of their first meeting, tells the Mede that he now has a chance to prove if he truly delights in seeing Cyrus (cf. 1.4.28). Artabazus promises that he will be so successful at recruiting his fellow Medes that Cyrus will be delighted to see him. Artabazus does, in fact, praise the Persian leader highly, even calling him a descendant of the gods (ἀπὸ θεῶν γεγονότος 4.1.24) and subsequently almost all of the Mede forces volunteer to join Cyrus on his campaign. This conversation again serves

to characterize the two speakers and the relationship between them (besides contributing to Cyrus' plans): the Persian leader is friendly, but purposeful, making use of Artabazus' admiration for him for his own military ends (see above, p. 201). Artabazus, on the other hand, is playful and light-hearted. He is a staunch supporter of Cyrus throughout the Cyr. (cf. 5.1.22-24; 6.1.9-10), but he combines this loyalty with a sense of humour (cf. 7.5.48-54; 8.4.12, 26-27), as he does here. Of the two characters in this dialogue, Artabazus is, perhaps, the more attractive, precisely because he is less pragmatic and single-minded than the hero of the Cyr.

Cyr. 2.3.22-24, our final short conversation, is another business-like but light-hearted conversation, combining practicality with jocularity. Cyrus has rewarded two companies of his soldiers who have been exceptionally good at their military drills by inviting them to dinner in his tent. A commander of a third company now thinks that his men deserve to be honoured as well. The taxiarch explains to Cyrus that his soldiers march in formation to and from each meal, in forward and reverse order, describing the procedure in detail. Cyrus jokingly replies that the company should be invited to two meals since they do everything twice, but the taxiarch points out that they do not have double stomachs. The Persian leader's solution is to have these soldiers to dinner in his tent two days in succession. This dialogue both imparts information about military maneuvres to Xenophon's readers and portrays the easy relationship between the Persian leader and his officers: Cyrus and the taxiarch joke together as equals. So too we learn in this brief exchange of the friendly rivalry among Cyrus' men, who compete to be noticed and rewarded by their commander.

To sum up, the short dialogues of the Cyr. are of two types. In the first group of conversations the dialogue is linked to an action, explaining or

illustrating the deed in some way. Often the explanation provided is a didactic or moralistic one and helps to characterize the speaker. The second group of short dialogues have no accompanying action but they too illustrate the personalities involved, and frequently illuminate the relationship between the two (or three) interlocutors. All the short dialogues are background conversations, adding to the literary depth of the work, and they do not affect the main narrative thread of the Cyr.

Information Dialogues

The information dialogues are conversations whose main purpose is to obtain (or impart) information. Requests for information arise often in the Cyr., particularly in the course of arranging a plan (see e.g. Cyr. 2.4.12-13; 3.1.33; 4.2.20; 5.2.27-30), but the dialogues classified as "information" ones are devoted almost exclusively to the communication of knowledge or intelligence of some kind. Generally the information concerns military matters and leads almost immediately to an action; these conversations contribute to the main plot of the Cyr. and are "action" dialogues (see above, pp. 25-26).

Cyr. 3.2.1 is a simple, brief information dialogue in which Cyrus questions Tigranes about the mountain stronghold of the Armenians' hostile neighbours, the Chaldaeans. The Persian leader then uses the information Tigranes has given him in order to capture the Chaldaean heights and arrange a truce between the Chaldaeans and the Armenians. The exchange between the Persian and the Armenian is short and business-like and need not, perhaps, have been cast in the form of a dialogue. Often Xenophon tells of the communication of information in oratio obliqua, with the questions and answers of his characters reported only indirectly (see 1.4.7; 2.3.19-20; 3.3.48; 4.2.20; 4.4.1-4; compare 6.2.9-11) and it is not clear why he uses a more direct and dramatic form of narration for our short dialogue.

Cyr. 5.3.26-29, part of Gadatas' novella (cf. above, p. 326), is another information dialogue which leads to immediate action. The eunuch, hearing that the Assyrian king intends to invade his home territory, requests permission from Cyrus to return home and defend his land. Cyrus questions Gadatas about the logistics of the impending attack and then immediately turns to arrangements for his own army to come to Gadatas' aid. Here too the exchange is brisk and business-like, and the main objective of the conversation is the communication of critical information. In this dialogue, however, the objective, no-nonsense tone of the proceedings also shows us something about the two characters involved. Gadatas, who is often effusive and emotional (see above, pp. 331-333), does not lose his head at this time of crisis and concentrates upon returning home as quickly as possible; Cyrus too is quick-witted and collected, asking only the essential questions and speeding the eunuch on his way. Had the exchange of information between the two been reported only indirectly, the cool behaviour of the Persian and Assyrian alike would, perhaps, have been less apparent.

Our next information dialogue, 6.3.9-11, again serves a dramatic purpose, besides imparting information. Before the critical encounter with the Assyrians and their allies at Thymbrara, Cyrus' men capture some Assyrians from the enemy camp and bring them to the Persian leader for questioning. The prisoners, whose words are reported at first only indirectly (6.3.9), explain to Cyrus that they have been out foraging for provisions, since supplies are scarce. Cyrus, after learning that the Assyrian army is nearby, then questions the captives on morale in the enemy camp, asking if the Assyrians are glad that the Persians and their allies are so close by. Naturally, the reply is that they are not (οὐ μὰ Δί'... οὐ μὲν δὴ ἔχαιρον ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλα ἡνιῶντο 6.3.10). Xenophon tells us that Cyrus deliberately asks this question for the benefit of the other Persians who are

present; presumably he wishes to boost the spirits of his own men. Earlier (6.2.9-12), intelligence reports from the enemy camp have led to panic in the Persian army; this time Cyrus does his best to ensure that such information will have the reverse effect. The Persian leader now learns that the enemy forces are practising their battle line-up, drilled by Croesus, a Greek and a Mede deserter. The Mede deserter is, of course, the spy Araspas and Cyrus, upon learning this, exlaims ambiguously ἀλλὰ... λαβεῖν μοι γένοιτο αὐτὸν ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι (6.3.11; see above, p. 298): he would indeed like to get hold of Araspas - in order to hear his report.

In this dialogue, then, Cyrus does not simply obtain information about the enemy's activities before the forthcoming battle. He uses his interrogation of the prisoners both to encourage his own men and to deceive all concerned about the role of his secret agent, Araspas. This is the only instance in the Cyr. of a direct cross-examination of the enemy soldiers (cf. 3.3.48 for an indirect report of such questioning), i.e. the only information dialogue in which intelligence is obtained from the enemy, but Cyrus conducts the questioning in a mild, business-like way. There are, in fact, several cases of questioning or cross-examination which take place in a much more charged atmosphere, even though both parties to the interrogation are friends and not enemies - cf. 1.3.11; 1.6.9; 5.5.13-17; 8.4.9-10. The information dialogues, as we have seen (above, p. 35), are the most "rapid" conversations in the Cyr., consisting almost entirely of a series of questions and replies. These brief exchanges in information dialogues are similar in form to the "question and reply" interrogations associated with Socrates (cf. above, pp. 51-52), but are very different in tone and content. The questioning in information dialogues is neither hostile nor dialectical and the atmosphere is generally free from tension: the purpose of these conversations is simply to elicit information.

In Cyr. 6.3.14-21, Cyrus' spy Araspas finally does return from the enemy camp to make his report. After Cyrus explains to the surprised onlookers that Araspas has gone over to the Assyrians on his behalf (cf. above, pp. 298-299), all welcome the Mede warmly. Araspas then reports briefly on the enemy's battle plan, answering Cyrus' questions. Once again the Persian leader acts immediatel upon the intelligence he receives, giving his own forces instructions for the forthcoming battle in accordance with what he has just learned (6.3.21-35). This dialogue is partly a continuation of Araspas' (or Panthea's) novella and partly an information dialogue and the transition between the two sections is rather abrupt, with Cyrus suddenly ordering an end to the welcome given Araspas (cf. εἰπόντος δὲ Κύρου ὅτι τούτων μὲν τοίνυν εἴη ἄλις 6.3.17) and calling for the Mede's report. So too Cyrus does not merely question Araspas about the enemy's numbers and tactics; he first points out somewhat didactically that the Mede must not underestimate or detract from the enemy's strength in his report for that will only hinder the Persians.

Cyr. 2.1.2-10 is the most interesting of the information dialogues, if alsc didactic in tone. Cyrus has just arrived in Media with the Persian forces requested by Cyaxares. The Mede ruler is the chief target of the Assyrians and their allies (cf. 1.5.2-3) and naturally is quite eager to learn in full detail about the army that has come to his aid. Cyrus, on the other hand, wishes to know more about the coalition ranged against the Persians and the Medes, so that in this conversation there is an exchange of information with both parties askir and answering questions. After nephew and uncle greet one another Cyaxares immediately questions Cyrus about the size of the force he has brought with him. The Persian does not answer directly, but points out that numbers do not always count: the homotimoi while few in number easily rule the remainder of the Persians. Cyrus, after ascertaining that the threat from the Assyrians is a rea

one - his question as to whether Cyaxares' fears are justified (cf. ἦ μάτην ἐφοβήθης 2.1.3) reflects all too clearly his low opinion of his uncle - asks Cyaxares for a detailed breakdown of the Mede and Assyrian armies. His uncle responds with a census of the enemy's forces, listing the number of cavalrymen, peltasts and bowmen in each contingent. Cyaxares is, of course, simply providing the intelligence that Cyrus has requested, but his list is virtually a catalogue of the Assyrians and their allies. We are reminded of Herodotus' long description of the various contingents in Xerxes' army (Hdt. 7.61-99), of Thucydides' list of the opposing forces at Syracuse (Thuc. 7.57-58) and, of course, of the grandfather of them all, the Catalogue in the second book of the Iliad. Such a list of the enemy's forces is found once again in the Cyr. before the battle of Thymbrara (Cyr. 6.2.9-11; this second list is reported indirectly).[5]

Cyrus, after hearing the numbers on both sides, calculates that the Medes and Persians have approximately one fourth the cavalry and one half the infantry that the enemy does. Once again Cyaxares expresses concern about the small size of the Persian army and he suggests that they send to Persia for reinforcements. (He pointedly adds that if the Medes are conquered, the Persians will be next in line.) Cyrus replies that there are not enough Persians in all of Persia to equal the enemy in numbers and recommends arming the Persian commoners instead, in order to improve their side's fighting strength (2.1.6-10). Cyaxares agrees and they immediately act upon the plan (2.1.10-19).

This exchange between Cyrus and Cyaxares seems to some commentators to have a Socratic air.[6] It is true that Cyrus, as usual, guides and corrects his uncle but their dialogue is closer in spirit to a conversation between Xerxes and Demaratus found in Herodotus (7.101-104). The Xerxes-Demaratus discussion, which follows upon the lengthy survey of the Persian king's vast army (cf. the catalogue of contingents in our dialogue), also deals with the question of quantity

versus quality. Xerxes cannot understand how the heavily-outnumbered Greeks will be able to withstand his massive army and Demaratus replies that numbers have little to do with the Spartans' military prowess (cf. ἀριθμοῦ δὲ περὶ μὴ πύθῃ ὅσοι τινὲς ἑόντες ταῦτα ποιέειν οἷοί τέ εἰσι 7.102.3), just as Cyrus has pointed out to Cyaxares that the numerical strength of the homotimoi does not reflect their true position in Persia. Demaratus then goes on to say that the Spartans, unlike the members of Xerxes' army, are free men, subject only to the law; this too affects their fighting ability. This is, of course, an argument that Cyrus cannot use in his discussion with his uncle, for the Medes, like the Assyrians (and to a lesser extent the Persians - cf. above, pp. 109-110), have a king, not the law, as their master. In any event, the Persian leader in his dismissal of mere numbers, seems to be expressing a Greek view while his uncle Cyaxares takes a more Persian or Xerxes-like stand: the Persians, as Herotodus tells us both directly and indirectly, think that there is strength in numbers (τὸ πολλὸν δ' ἡγέαται ἰσχυρὸν εἶναι Hdt.1.136).[7]

The last of our information dialogues, Cyr. 7.5.24-25, is like Cyr. 3.2.1, a brief, business-like exchange which does not seem to serve any dramatic purpose and could have, perhaps, been reported indirectly. Cyrus is about to invade Babylon by stealth and he asks Gobryas and Gadatas to guide his forces to the royal palace. Gobryas and his men reply that the palace will be guarded, but the gates may be left open because of the celebration in the city. Cyrus then suggests moving forward quickly and they enter the city. The most interesting feature of this conversation is that it is the only information dialogue in which information is volunteered, rather than being elicited by Cyrus.

In sum, the information dialogues are conversations between Cyrus and another person, in which the Persian leader obtains military information; this newly-acquired knowledge then leads to some action on his part. These dialogues

naturally include a great many questions and answers, and Cyrus, who acts as interrogator, conducts the proceedings in a calm, no-nonsense manner. Some of these dialogues are designed simply to impart information, while others have an additional dramatic purpose, often illuminating the characters involved.

Negotiation Dialogues

The negotiation dialogues of the Cyr. are again "action" dialogues, for the transactions in these conversations always contribute to the main plot of the Cyr. As we have seen, these dialogues sometimes take place between three rather than two speakers (i.e. are 3-way rather than 2-way negotiations) and often include group spokesmen as negotiators (see above, p. 32 and p. 33).

Three of our negotiation dialogues involve the Armenian king - Cyr. 3.1.5-6; 3.1.31-37 and 3.2.14-23. In the first of the three conversations, Cyr. 3.1.5-6, the Persian leader parleys with the rebellious Armenian king. The latter is trapped on a hillside and surrounded by Cyrus' men and he is persuaded by Cyrus to surrender and stand trial (cf. above, p. 113). This dialogue consists of a series of brief, pointed questions and replies (relayed by a messenger) and the conversation is a dramatic one, largely because of the Armenian's dramatic and dangerous predicament. Cyrus, who clearly holds the upper hand, does not so much negotiate with the Armenian king in this dialogue as dictate terms to him.

In the next negotiation dialogue, a conversation between Cyrus, the Armenian king and Tigranes, Cyrus comes to practical terms with the Armenian ruler, agreeing upon the number of soldiers and amount of money to be given to him and arranging the release of the king's family (Cyr. 3.1.31-37). The king has already stood trial and been convicted by means of his own testimony, but the Persian leader allows himself to be persuaded by the king's son, Tigranes, to permit the ruler to remain on his throne (cf. above, pp. 138-139). The relieved Armenian king offers to put the whole of his armed forces and wealth at Cyrus'

disposal, but the Persian leader asks for only half of the Armenian army - since the Armenians are involved in a dispute with their neighbours the Chaldaeans - and the loan of one hundred talents (3.1.31-34). If the Armenian king is relieved by the outcome of his trial, the Persian leader is delighted by the results since he has accomplished all that he intended and he allows the atmosphere to lighten when discussing the release of the Armenian royal family. Cyrus teases the Armenian king who has stated that he would pay all that he possibly could for the ransom of his wife and then again says that he would give all that he could for the release of his children: the Persian playfully points out that this would amount to twice the Armenian's fortune. So too Cyrus teases Tigranes, asking the newlywed prince how much he would pay to get his wife back, when he has, in fact, no intention of asking for any ransom money at all. In these negotiations the real bargaining takes place between Cyrus and the Armenian king and Tigranes is included, apparently, only in order to be teased about his wife. The exchanges here are less pointed than those in Cyrus' original parley with the Armenian and while the Persian still holds the upper hand the atmosphere is far less tense. The discussion ends on a light, friendly note and Cyrus invites the Armenians to dinner.

Cyr. 3.2.14-23, the last of the three negotiation dialogues involving the Armenian king, is a genuine 3-way discussion, in which Cyrus arbitrates between the Armenians and their hostile neighbours, the Chaldaeans. In this conversation Cyrus is a master negotiator and manipulator for he arranges peace terms to the mutual satisfaction of the two warring parties, while ensuring that neither nation will ever trouble him - cf. 3.2.4 σωφρονεῖν ἀνάγκη ἂν εἴη πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀμφοτέρους τοῦς τε Ἀρμενίους καὶ τοῦς Χαλδαίους.[8] Cyrus learns details of the hostile relations between the Chaldaeans and the Armenians from Tigranes, who also points out the location of the Chaldaean forces (Cyr. 3.2.1; see above, p.366). The Persian leader then quickly gathers together the forces accompanying

him - Persians, Medes and Armenians - and captures the Chaldaean heights (3.2.4-10). Cyrus begins constructing a fort on the heights at once; he sends the Chaldaeans he has captured home with a peace offer, explaining that he has taken over the heights only in order to convince them to come to terms with the Armenians (3.2.12-24). The Persian leader also sends for the Armenian king, asking him to bring builders and stonemasons to expedite the building of the fort. The king, when he arrives, is delighted by Cyrus' conquest. The Armenian is in a somewhat philosophical mood, musing upon man's inability to predict the future or the consequences of his own actions (3.2.15): here the Armenian is a Croesus-type figure, a ruler who becomes wise only in defeat.[9]

The actual negotiations begin when the Chaldaeans return, expressing their desire for peace (3.2.17). Cyrus, the arbitrator, conducts the negotiations between the Armenians and the Chaldaeans by addressing each of the two sides separately. He asks both sides a series of parallel or analogous questions, first interrogating one party to the dispute and then the other. The Chaldaeans (followed by the Armenian king) agree that the leasing of Armenian farm land would be beneficial; so too both parties see the advantage of having Armenian herds graze upon Chaldaean soil, for a fee. The two sides make these concessions to the Persian leader separately and in turn and do not communicate with one another directly. Finally, both sides respond in identical fashion to Cyrus' suggestion that an ally hold the fortress on the Chaldaean heights: each party thinks that a friend of his, and not one of the enemy, should be in control. Cyrus then suggests that the Persians remain the masters of the Chaldaean heights and prevent either side from injuring the other. His proposal is eagerly accepted by Armenians and Chaldaeans alike and the two sides finally address one another, exchanging pledges of peace and friendship (3.2.17-24).

In this dialogue Cyrus proves himself a clever and skilful negotiator. The

method he uses to bring about peace is in many ways a Socratic one, for it involves the use of leading questions and "applied analogies" (cf. above, p. 42). The Persian leader asks each party involved a series of leading questions and then interrogates the enemy in corresponding fashion, thus compelling each side to recognize the parallel, but conflicting, claims of his foe. So too, Cyrus, like Socrates, begins the conversation with a certain goal in mind and he elicits the agreement of his interlocutors to his plan, step by step (cf. above, pp. 143-144). Cyrus, who holds the conversational reins firmly in his hands, does not allow the two enemies to address one another directly until a solution has been reached, thus avoiding mutual recriminations or useless references to past grievances. Finally, the Persian leader benefits in every way from his role as peacemaker, for he retains control of the Chaldaean heights and wins the friendship and alliance of Armenians and Chaldaeans alike.

It is interesting to compare our dialogue with another conciliation of opponents described in the Cyr., Adusius' mediation between the two warring factions in Caria (Cyr. 7.4.1-7). The two rival sides in Caria have both appealed to Cyrus for assistance and the Persian leader sends his lieutenant Adusius to Caria. Cyrus himself remains in Sardis preparing siege engines and battering rams to be used against recalcitrant Carians, if the need arises. Adusius, Cyrus' deputy, is a wise and experienced soldier who has pleasing manners as well (καὶ τἆλλα οὐκ ἄφρονα οὐδ' ἀπόλεμον, καὶ πάνυ δὴ εὔχαριν 7.4.1). He arrives with an army at Caria and negotiates secretly with each of the two factions there, reaching identical agreements with both. Adusius will enter their strongholds by stealth, concealing this alliance from the opposite side, in order, he explains, to catch them unawares and will then act for the benefit of those who have admitted him (ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τῶν δεχομένων 7.4.3). Each Carian faction promises in return to admit Adusius to their stronghold for the benefit of Cyrus and the

Persians ( ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τῷ Κύρου καὶ Περσῶν 7.4.3). Adusius enters and takes control of the strongholds of both sides on the same night and then, stationing his army in the middle of the city, invites both factions to meet with him. At first, both Carian parties are angry and feel that they have been deceived by the Persian, but Adusius explains that he has, in fact, acted in good faith and for the good of all concerned, since peace and security will benefit them all (cf. Anab. 7.1.21-22 where Xenophon also promises to act for the benefit of his followers, and does so, but not in the way they have anticipated). The Carians, won over by Adusius' words make peace with each other, live happily together and later ask Cyrus to appoint Adusius as their satrap (Cyr. 7.4.5-7; cf. 8.6.7). Thus, when messengers arrive from the Persian ruler with the offer of more men and equipment, Adusius is able to reply that even the army he has with him can be employed elsewhere; the Persian officer has succeeded brilliantly in his peacemaking efforts.

Adusius' tactics here are both like and unlike those used by Cyrus in his negotiations with the Armenians and Chaldaeans. Cyrus first conquers the Chaldaean heights in order to bring both sides to the negotiating table and then questions the two opposing parties in identical fashion, bringing them to the realization that their needs are complementary while their fears and suspicions are the same. Adusius also treats the two opposing sides in identical fashion, but he negotiates with each party separately and secretly in order to gain hold of their strongholds without engaging in fighting. Adusius, like Cyrus, brings the two enemies together only after he has become master of the military situation, in order to lend greater force to his arbitration efforts. The Persian officer is, perhaps, wilier than his leader, using guile and deception rather than speedy military action to gain control, and the fact that Cyrus is first shown as readying military machinery for Caria and then offering further men

and supplies to solve the problem only emphasizes his lieutenant's cleverness. It is rare to find such an unfavourable contrast between Cyrus and one of his men, and this implicit contrast or comparison between the two is particularly interesting in view of the fact that Adusius appears only in this chapter of the Cyr. This diplomatic Persian officer seems to have been invented by Xenopho especially for the Carian episode; in Herodotus, for example, the Carians are subdued by Cyrus' lieutenant, Harpagus (Hdt. 1.174).[10] Finally, it should be noted that Adusius' negotiations with the Carians are recorded almost entirely in oratio obliqua with only the Persian's final speech in which he calls upon both factions to join together in peace (Cyr. 7.4.5) quoted directly; this is not a negotiation dialogue. Had Adusius' opening talks with the two sides in which he offered them identical (but contradictory) terms been reproduced directly, his stratagem would probably have seemed all the more impressive.

Cyr. 7.1.41-44, our next negotiation dialogue, is conducted on the battle-field, at Thymbrara. All of the Assyrians and their allies have fled from the battlefield, except for the Egyptians, who continue to resist bravely while suffering heavy losses. Cyrus both admires and pities the courageous Egyptians[I] and after ordering his men to stop their attack, he sends a message to the Egyptians, asking them to surrender. The Persian leader tells the Egyptians that they can both save their lives and retain their reputation for bravery (σωθῆναι ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ δοκοῦντες εἶναι 7.1.41). When the Egyptians wonder how they can still be considered courageous after surrendering, Cyrus replies that they alone, of all the enemy, have stood their ground and continued to fight. He urges them to hand over their arms but the Egyptians are reluctant to join Cyrus without knowing his exact demands and terms (τί ἡμῖν ἀξιώσεις χρῆσθαι; 7.1.43). The Persian leader responds that he is interested in the good of both parties (cf. εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ εὖ πάσχειν 7.1.43) and the Egyptians again press fo

a more specific reply (τίνα εὐεργεσίαν 7.1.43). When Cyrus offers them high wages in wartime and land and houses in peacetime, they agree to go over to his side on the condition that they are not asked to take arms against Croesus, with whom they are acquainted. This acquaintance or friendship with the Lydian king explains, perhaps, their reluctance to join Cyrus without knowing the exact terms of the alliance. We have seen that all of the Assyrians who change sides and join Cyrus - Gobryas, Gadatas and Abradatas - had some grievance against their king which justified their lack of loyalty (above, p. 296). Here the Egyptians have no such excuse and they need to be persuaded by Cyrus that they have been deserted by their allies and will never have to battle Croesus before they change sides: even in the midst of terrible fighting (cf. ἔπασχον δὲ πολλὰ καὶ δεινά 7.1.40) they are loyal and courageous and this makes them even more desirable as allies.

Cyrus' exchanges with the Egyptians, which are conducted via messenger, are very tense and sharp (note in particular the opening of 7.1.43) and there is almost a "Socratic" give-and-take to them. This conversation is reminiscent of Cyrus' preliminary negotiations with the Armenian king (3.1.5-6; cf. above, p. 113 and p. 372), for here too the Egyptians' situation is a dangerous and dramatic one and Cyrus controls the fate of those he is dealing with (see τοῖς αἱρουμένοις ὑμᾶς σῶσαι, ἐξὸν ἀπολέσαι 7.1.42; cf. 3.1.6).

The conversation between Gobryas and the young Assyrian king, Cyr. 5.3. 5-7, in which Gobryas tries to persuade his former king to come out and do battle with Cyrus, is another dramatic negotiation dialogue. Their exchange has already been discussed above (pp. 318-320) as part of Gobryas' novella, but it is worth noting here that this dialogue is exceptional for two reasons. This is the only instance in the Cyr. of direct negotiations with the enemy (other than Cyrus' offer to the Egyptians, just discussed above; cf. 4.4.9-13 where Cyrus dictates

terms to - but does not negotiate with - some defeated Assyrians). So too it is only in this dialogue that negotiations in the Cyr. are unsuccessful and end in a stalemate. Gobryas' parley with the enemy is short and straightforward: the two sides are openly hostile and there is none of the deceit, double-dealing or mutual suspicion which often characterizes negotiations elsewhere in Xenophon - see e.g. Anab. 2.3.17-29; 2.5.2-27; Hell. 3.1.20-28; 3.4.5-6 and contrast Hell. 4.1.29-39).[12] In our conversation, Cyrus' representative, Gobryas, does not achieve his aim, but the Persians do come to terms with the Assyrians over another matter: both sides agree that farming on Assyrian soil should continue as usual, despite the hostilities (Cyr. 5.4.24-27; this exchange is reported only indirectly). On that occasion, Xenophon tells us, the Assyrians did everything in their power to persuade their king to accept Cyrus' proposal and come to a satisfactory arrangement.

The last two negotiation dialogues, Cyr. 2.4.6-8 and 4.2.3-8 are less dramatic. Cyr. 2.4.6-8 is a conversation between Cyaxares, Cyrus and the members of a delegation sent by the Indian king, which takes place in Media. Cyaxares, as we have seen (above, p. 357 ), sent Cyrus a special robe to wear to the meeting but the latter arrives in his usual plain attire. The Indian king, it turns out, is anxious to determine who is the wronged party in the Median-Assyrian conflict. After hearing the versions of both sides, he will decide whom to support in the forthcoming confrontation, reports the embassy. Cyaxares simply replies to the delegation that he has done the Assyrian king no wrong; Cyrus then requests permission from his uncle to add to his reply. The Persian leader suggests that if the Assyrian king does complain of being wronged by the Medes and Persians, the Indian king should arbitrate between the two sides. In this conversation there are no real negotiations and the parties are simply sounding one another out; so too while three speakers participate - Cyaxares, Cyrus and

the Indians - there are only two sides, the Persian-Median allies and the neutral Indians. The most interesting feature of this dialogue is Cyrus' role as helpful auxiliary. The Indians have come to Cyaxares, who is the chief victim of the Assyrians and officially heads the forces opposed to them, and the discussion takes place on Median soil, so that it is natural that the Indians address themselves chiefly to the Median king. Cyrus has not yet proved himself in the eyes of the world and he seems conscious of his subsidiary role, politely deferring (in public) to Cyaxares' judgement (cf. εἰ μή τι ἄλλο Κυαξάρῃ δοκεῖ 2.4.8). Later, of course, it is Cyrus who pursues the contact made at this initial meeting: he first has the Chaldaeans, old acquaintances of the Indians, support his request for funds from the Indian king (3.2.27-31) and then asks the "neutral" Indian representatives who arrive with the money for him to spy on the Assyrians and report back to him (6.2.1-11).

The last negotiation dialogue, Cyr. 4.2.3-8, is a straightforward one in which Cyrus and the Hyrcanians arrange an alliance. The Hyrdanians are neighbours and subjects of the Assyrians, forced to serve as the rearguard of the Assyrian army. After the first Persian victory over the Assyrians, the Hyrcanians approach Cyrus with an offer to become his allies if he continues to pursue the Assyrian king. Their proposal is a timely one (cf. θείως πως 4.2.1) for the Persian leader has just begun to organize a further campaign against the Assyrians and to recruit Mede volunteers for the venture. The Hyrcanians tell Cyrus of the Assyrians' sorry state after their defeat and encourage him to chase after the enemy. Both parties then exchange pledges, with the Hyrcanians promising hostages as a sign of their good faith and Cyrus pledging to treat the Hyrcanians exactly as he does the Medes and the Persians. The two sides shake hands and the alliance is concluded. The partnership proves successful for the Hyrcanians are loyal, staunch (if colourless) allies of Cyrus; he, in turn, helps them achieve their

independence (cf. 5.3.20 ff.). This initial conversation between the two armies, in which they arrange their alliance, is a smooth and rather bland one: there is no real give-and-take or tension between the two sides.

In general, those negotiation dialogues which involve transactions between two hostile camps are brisk and lively, with spare, dialectical exchanges that are generally reported in direct speech (cf. 3.1.5-6; 3.2.14-23; 5.3.5-7; 7.1.-41-44). Negotiations between friendly parties (2.4.6-8; 3.1.31-37; 4.2.3-8) are less vivid and pointed. The case of Adusius, whose skilfull manipulation of the warring Carians is reported almost entirely in oratio obliqua (7.4.3 ff.) shows, however, that Xenophon does not always present negotiations between opposing sides directly and dramatically. While the dialogue form seems particularly well-suited to represent negotiations, such transactions can be conducted in other ways - see, for example, the compact Cambyses arranges between Cyrus and the Persian people, by means of a single speech (8.5.22-27).

Planning Dialogues

The planning dialogues are the largest category of conversations in the Cyr., with 22 dialogues in all. This group of "action" dialogues is a varied one in its formal or external features (i.e. the length of the conversations, number of speakers, dramatic background etc. - see above, pp. 30-37), but in their content almost all these conversations conform to the same pattern: Cyrus suggests a plan related to military matters, which is then accepted by his fellow conversationalists. Cyrus does not participate in one of the planning conversations (4.5.8-12) and two other of the dialogues are not related to military affairs but concern hunting (1.4.18-19) and a forthcoming marriage (8.5.17-20). Nonetheless this basic scheme - of the Persian leader proposing, and others accepting, some sort of military programme is found, with various

variations, in most of the planning dialogues. Often Cyrus comes up with a new military idea on his own initiative and his interlocutors either supply necessary information or simply go along with the idea (1.4.18-19; 2.4.9-17; 3.3.13-20; 4.2.13-14; 4.5.36-55; 6.1.31-44; 6.2.1-3; 7.1.6-9; 7.1.15-18). Sometimes Cyrus' conversational partners are allowed a more active role and assist their leader in formulating a course of action (4.1.10-12; 5.3.8-14; 7.1.19-20; cf. 1.4.11-12). At times, too, a figure other than the Persian leader initiates a plan or proposal, but generally this plan is rejected, often at length, by Cyrus (3.3.29-33; 3.3.46-48 [but compare 3.3.56-57]; 5.2.23-37; 5.4.41-50; cf. 7.5.7-9). Only once (8.5.17-20) does Cyrus fall in with another's scheme.

Several of the planning dialogues are conversations between Cyaxares and Cyrus. In the first two of these conversations, Cyr. 2.4.9-17 and 3.3.13-20, Cyaxares readily accepts proposals that Cyrus makes (to try to win back the Armenians as allies and to attack the Assyrians on their own territory). The Mede ruler is the one to initiate their next two discussions, Cyr. 3.3.29-33 and 3.3.46-48 (cf. 56-57), calling for an immediate confrontation with the Assyrians. In both instances Cyrus manages to persuade his uncle that it would be wiser to wait. At 3.3.56-57, an exchange reported only indirectly, the Persian leader finally does yield, against his better judgement, to Cyaxares' proposals and agrees to launch the attack on the enemy. In all four of these dialogues Cyrus and Cyaxares both play their usual parts in the Cyr. - the Persian is an ambitious, but sensible leader, while the lazy, impulsive Mede displays poor judgement and needs to be guided by his younger nephew.

In the next conversation between the two, Cyr. 4.1.13-23, Cyrus and his uncle discuss plans for the future; here Cyaxares is allotted a more substantial and interesting role and does not simply serve as a poor contrast to his nephew (cf. above, pp. 145-146). This consultation takes place after Cyrus and his

taxiarchs have decided that it would be a waste of an opportunity not to pursue (and plunder) the Assyrians who have just been routed (4.1.10-12). The Persian leader and his confederates reach the decision to continue their Assyrian campaign jointly: this is one of the few planning dialogues where others assist Cyrus in forming a plan (compare 1.4.11-12). Cyrus, in fact, plays the role of devil's advocate in this discussion with his men, allowing himself to be "persuaded" to agree to the plan and approach Cyaxares with a request for Median assistance. After Cyrus and his men put forth their proposal, Cyaxares, who is, Xenophon tells us, both jealous of the Persians' initiative and reluctant to face danger once again, tries to dissuade them from the plan. The Mede ruler uses powerful and persuasive arguments which do not seem to stem from laziness or jealousy, but are prompted by the belief in the need for moderation in victory.[13] Cyaxares reminds Cyrus that the Persians (as opposed to the Medes - cf. above,pp. 185-186), do not generally over-indulge in any single pleasure; hence, they should be especially self-controlled in regard to the greatest pleasure of all, success. The Persians and Medes can grow old in happiness and security (ἀκινδύνως εὐδαιμονοῦντες γῆραν 4.1.15), while repeated pursuit of further successes may lead to the loss of everything. Here the Mede king is in favour of a comfortable and unambitious life, the kind of existence which, as we have seen, Croesus prefers (cf. above, p. 351). Cyrus has rejected such quietism or lack of ambition from the very start of the campaign (1.5.7-11; see above, p. 205). The Persian leader does believe in practising moderation and working hard, but only as a means to achieve greater rewards (cf. 1.5.9 οἱ... τῶν παραυτίκα ἡδονῶν ἀπεχόμενοι... τοῦτο πράττουσιν... ὡς διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἐγκράτειαν πολλαπλάσια εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον εὐφρανούμενοι ). Cyaxares' second argument against continuing the campaign is that the enemy, who are much more numerous than the Persians and their allies, will fight courageously to defend their

wives and children, if they are compelled by Cyrus to do so. The Mede ruler concludes by saying that he does not wish to order the merry-making Medes to go to battle once again. Cyrus, in his reply, does not really react to Cyaxares' arguments against continuing the war. He asks for permission to recruit volunteers among the Medes and reminds his uncle that he owes him a favour.

The reasons Cyaxares brings for ending the campaign against the enemy are similar to those used by two speakers in the Hellenica. Callistratus, arguing in favour of a peace agreement between the Athenians and the Spartans, contends that over-weening ambition in war is bound to lead to a fall (Hell. 6.3.16), while Jason, when trying to dissuade the Thebans from fighting the Spartans, warns that the enemy, if compelled to fight, will struggle to the bitter end (Hell. 6.4.23).[14] Cyaxares' role here, that of an adviser who warns against continuing a campaign, is also somewhat like that of Artabanus in Herodotus, who warns Xerxes against attacking the Greeks; he too thinks that it is wrong constantly to seek ever greater successes (Hdt. 7.16α; cf. 7.10ε).[15] Artabanus' fears prove justified, while those of Cyaxares do not; nonetheless the Mede's arguments here are cogent ones.

Our dialogue is, in fact, the only planning dialogue in the Cyr. where serious, worthwhile arguments are used to counter a proposal made by Cyrus. The debate or conflict between Cyaxares and Cyrus is a real one (cf. above, pp. 140-149 for the only other actual clash between uncle and nephew) and Xenophon, on this occasion, lets us see that there are two sides to the question. In all the other planning conversations, there is, as we have seen, only one "correct" view, that held by Cyrus. Even if others do make suggestions or proposals of their own very little space is allotted to the presentation of their ideas, which often are rejected by the Persian leader. The planning dialogues of the

Cyr. are meant to glorify the hero of the work and are not normally used by Xenophon to show the advantages and disadvantages of a proposed undertaking. Often in the Cyr. proposals are not put forth in discussions between two or three individuals - i.e. in planning dialogues - but take the form of speeches addressed to a large group of allies, officers etc. in an assembly or council (see pp. 415-417 below for a list of the speeches of the Cyr.). Here too, Cyrus almost invariably suggests the plan and there is never any opposition to his proposals. The assemblies of the Cyr., in which decisions are reached, all follow the same pattern: Cyrus announces or suggests a plan and his motion is then generally seconded by one of his close followers. All those present express their support and the Persian leader closes the assembly with specific instructions on how the new plan is to be implemented - see 2.1.10-13; 4.2.38-42; 4.3.3-15 and 7.5.71-8.1.6. At 5.3.29-45 and 6.2.23-41 there is no loyal seconder, while at 2.3.1-16 there are two. There are also two councils in the Cyr. where Cyrus meets with other leaders in order to decide upon plans for the future.[16] At both councils, 5.1.19-29 and 6.1.6-22, the Persian and his allies have to decide whether to continue their war against the Assyrians. Each of the allied leaders expresses his view in turn, but all speak in one voice, unanimously supporting the decision that suits Cyrus, i.e. to continue with the war. The assemblies and councils of the Cyr. are even less controversial or free-ranging than the planning dialogues: only one position, the orthodox one, is ever presented.

A series of speeches, whether in a council or an assembly, in which speakers react to - or argue with - the words of their predecessors can resemble a dialogue in many ways and both forms of discussion - linked speeches and dialogues - are often used to illustrate the conflicting considerations involved in forming a plan or decision. Herodotus, for example, has a series of war-councils in

which Xerxes must choose between very different courses of action recommended to him by his advisers (Hdt. 7.8-11; 7.234-237; 8.67-69). We are also shown, for instance, the lively debate between Darius, Otanes and Gobryas on the best way to be rid of the Magus and the deliberations of Otanes, Megabyzus and Darius on the form of government to be established after he is gone (Hdt. 3.71-73, 80-82). Thucydides, of course, also uses antithetical speeches to present two conflicting proposals and to illuminate the various factors that have influenced a decision (see e.g. Thuc. 1.67-78, 79-86; 3.36-49; 6.9-23; 6.32-41 etc.), and Xenophon himself uses the same method of presentation in the Hellenica at times (see e.g. Hell. 7.1.1-14 [and cf. 6.3.4-17]; 6.5.33-49). It is particularly interesting to compare the assemblies, councils and conversations of the Anabasis in which plans are formed to those of the Cyr. In some of the many assemblies convened by the Ten Thousand there is general agreement from the very start on the plan to be adopted (see Anab. 3.1.33-47; 3.2.1-39; 6.4.10-13) and at times a single speech (by Xenophon - cf. 4.8.9-14 and 7.3.2-6) is sufficient to win the consent of all concerned; this is similar to the situation in the Cyr. Nonetheless, in the Anabasis there are also a great many conferences in which a variety of views are put forth before a decision is reached (see Anab. 2.1.7-23; 3.1.15-32; 4.6.6-19; 5.1.2-14; 5.6.1-14; 5.6.22-34 and compare Clearchus' manipulations at 1.3.9-20). Even more noteworthy are a series of exchanges between Xenophon and Chirisophus in which they disagree about a course of action to be undertaken or a plan to be adopted (see 3.4.38-42; 3.5.4-6; 4.1.19-22; 4.7.3-7; cf. 3.3.11-19). Xenophon uses these dialogues both to point to opposing tactical considerations and to hint at the friction between the Athenian and the Spartan (see 4.6.14-16 and compare 4.6.3).[17] The dialogue form is well-suited to present such differences of opinion - whether personal or pragmatic - directly and vividly. In the Anabasis, Xenophon uses planning

dialogues to dramatize such clashes (see too Anab. 2.4.2-7; 7.2.12-13; 7.7. 1-12), but in the Cyr. he avoids such confrontations.

Returning to the planning dialogues in which Cyaxares participates, we find that the Mede takes the initiative in both of the remaining conversations, Cyr. 4.5.8-12 and 8.5.17-20. In the first dialogue, the only planning conversation which does not include Cyrus, the furious ruler sends a messenger to overtake Cyrus and demand the return of all the Mede volunteers who have joined him. This conversation helps to characterize Cyaxares as a rough and unreasonable ruler who threatens his subjects. In Cyr. 8.5.17-20, the Mede is in a more gracious mood; he offers his daughter to Cyrus as a bride, with the Median empire as her dowry. Cyrus is, unusually, the passive party in this plan, but naturally he offers no objections to a proposal which is so much to his advantage.

Cyaxares, then, features in a great many planning dialogues in the Cyr. In the majority of them he plays his usual role as "second fiddle" to his nephew, either seconding the Persian's proposals or having his own misguided notions rejected by Cyrus, but in two conversations (Cyr. 4.5.8-12 and especially 4.1. 13-23) his part is more prominent and noteworthy. The Assyrian Gobryas is another frequent partner of Cyrus in planning dialogues: he too is more advisee than adviser and generally has his suggestions modified or corrected by Cyrus - see 5.2.29-37; 5.4.41-50; 7.5.7-9; cf. 5.3.8-14. We have seen (above, pp. 317-318) that Gobryas' role in the Cyr., that of an ally and adviser who helps Cyrus acquire his empire, is akin to that of Oebares or Harpagus (in Ctesias and Herodotus respectively), but the Assyrian is less actively useful than his two counterparts since Xenophon's Cyrus rarely needs the aid or counsel of others. Gobryas plays only a secondary or subsidiary part in the planning dialogues of the Cyr, but he does confer with Cyrus and attempt to advise him

several times and so retains traces of an original counsellor-type role. Cyrus' trusted Persian lieutenants, Chrysantas and Hystaspas, for example, appear far less often than Gobryas as partners to a plan (cf. 7.1.6-9; 7.1.19-20 and 7.5.7-9).

The planning dialogues of the Cyr., the last of the "action" dialogues are perhaps the least dialectical conversations in the work, since plans are almost always evolved along the lines suggested by the Persian leader. While these conversations show that the hero of the Cyr. is a brilliant and original military thinker, quick to take advantage of every opportunity afforded him, they are not, in the end, interesting, precisely because Cyrus never has any need to alter his decisions or take account of the opinions of others. The planning dialogues of the Cyr. are somewhat like the majority of Socrates' conversations in the Mem.: worthy, but dull, because of the author's single-minded attempt to present his hero in an ideal light.