THE DIALOGUES OF THE CYROPAEDIA

by

Deborah Levine Gera

Volume Two

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the

University of Oxford



Trinity Term 1987

Wolfson College, Oxford

Appendix I

Cyrus of the Cyr.: An Ideal Ruler?

Throughout most of the Cyr. there is, of course, very little room for doubt that Cyrus is indeed meant to be an ideal figure, a successful ruler whose model conduct is well worth emulating. So Xenophon introduces him at the very opening of the Cyr. and so the Persian leader appears for most of the work: Cyrus is wise, virtuous and ever successful in achieving his ambitions. However, after the conquest of Babylon, when Cyrus goes about establishing his empire and its administration (Cyr. 7.5 ff.), the Persian's behaviour and principles of government are not always consonant with earlier precepts set forth in the Cyr. There seems, at times, to be a gap between Cyrus' original ideas of good conduct and the notions and actions he adopts as ruler of Babylon. It is clear from the final scene of the Cyr., Cyrus' departure from this world (8.7), that Xenophon means to portray the Persian as a heroic figure even after his rule in Babylon, but he scatters several obstacles to viewing him in this light along the way. My purpose here is first to examine the apparent inconsistencies in Cyrus' conduct and then to try to understand Xenophon's reasons for introducing them into the Cyr. This question is, as we have seen (above, p. 15) related to the problem of the authenticity of the epilogue of the Cyr., for if Xenophon criticizes Cyrus (even implicitly) in the main body of the Cyr. then the highly negative tone of the epilogue is less surprising.[1]

The difficulties begin immediately after the conquest of Babylon, with Cyrus' desire to be established there in a manner befitting a king (ἐπιθυμῶν ὁ Κῦρος ἤδη κατασκευάσασθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς βασιλεῖ ἠγεῖτο πρέπειν (7.5.37).[2] Cyrus wishes to appear in public only rarely and in majestic fashion (σπάνιός τε καὶ σεμνός) but is anxious to avoid arousing jealousy. He therefore contrives a way (ἐμηχανᾶτο) to win his friends' approval for this new way of life. Cyrus'

stratagem is a simple one. He stood in a public place one morning and allowed all who wished to do so, to approach him with requests. Naturally, great crowds soon gathered, and Cyrus' close friends were forced to fight their way through the throng to reach him, only to be left waiting at his side all day long. Cyrus dismissed his friends at night with the request that they return early the next morning for a talk with him. They hurried off gladly, Xenophon tells us, having been forced to neglect nature's calls all day long.[3] The next day, the crowds surrounding Cyrus were even larger and Cyrus stationed men around himself to fend off all but his friends and allies, so that they could hold their discussion. Cyrus' friends quickly realize, as they are meant to, that he must be protected and secluded from the masses, if they are to have any opportunity to see him themselves. The end result of their talk is that Cyrus, following his friends' suggestion (cf. above, pp. 231-232 on Chrysantas' role here), moves into the royal palace (7.5.57). Almost immediately afterwards (7.5.58-69), he selects a personal and palace bodyguard to serve him.

While it is only natural that Cyrus wishes to reap the fruits of victory (i.e. take over the Babylonian royal palace and be respected from afar), the way he goes about doing so is slightly disturbing. Cyrus devises a stratagem which he uses against his friends, and manipulates them into offering him what he considers his due. Cyrus has been taught by his father that a good commander must know how to invent and make use of new stratagems (τὰ καινὰ μηχανήματα 1.6.38) - against the enemy. Here, for the first time, we find Cyrus tricking his friends, other than for reasons of military security (cf. 2.4.15; 6.3.11). Xenophon could easily have shown Cyrus as first being disturbed by masses of petitioners and only then deciding, along with his friends, that he must become a less accessible figure. Instead, the crowd scenes are arranged by Cyrus himself and the effect on the reader is disquieting.

We are left even more uneasy by Cyrus' next move, his forming a bodyguard composed of eunuchs - πάντας τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα θεραπευτῆρας ἐποιήσατο εὐνούχους (7.5.65). It is not clear from the expression ἐποιήσατο εὐνούχους whether we are to understand that Cyrus actually had those who served under him castrated or merely chose his bodyguard from a pool of available eunuchs.[4] It seems unlikely, however, that the first interpretation is the correct one. Herodotus' description of castrating as an ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον (8.105.1, 106.3; cf. above, p. 330) appears to reflect the general Greek view[5] and in the Cyr. itself, one of the young Assyrian king's worst deeds is the emasculation of Gadatas (see above, pp. 321-322). Cyrus is hardly likely to repeat his enemy's crime on a much greater scale. In any event, even the use of eunuchs as servants was a strange and barbaric custom in Greek eyes, as Xenophon seems well aware for he carefully lists all of Cyrus' reasons and justifications for using eunuchs, taking pains throughout (7.5.58-65) to indicate that he is presenting the Persian's reflections - cf. [sc. ὁ Κῦρος] ἐνόμισε... ἔγνω... ὁρῶν... ἡγήσατο... ἠγεῖτο... ἐφαίνετο αὐτῷ... ἐτεκμαίρετο... ταῦτα γιγνώσκων... etc.[6] Eunuchs are, according to Cyrus, without family ties and thus are free to love their master above all; they are particularly vulnerable to ill-treatment by others and consequently grateful to a master who affords them protection; they, like gelded horses and castrated bulls and dogs, are less aggressive and self-assertive than formerly, but are still capable of performing their duties well; they are extremely loyal to their masters, even in times of misfortune; even if physically weaker than other men, they can ply a sword, in battle, equally well (7.5.59-65).

All these arguments may possibly be valid, but Cyrus' utilitarian and selfish outlook, his "zynische Beschönigung"[7] of the issue is hardly calculated to lay Greek scruples to rest. The views attributed to Cyrus may simply be Xenophon's own less-than-successful attempt to explain (away) a sticky fact of Persian life,

but it is also possible that Cyrus is deliberately portrayed here in a rather negative fashion. In the Cyr. Xenophon often omits or transmutes unsavoury features of the historical Cyrus' life and he could well have ignored the whole eunuch question. Alternatively, by altering his story only slightly - e.g. a group of the defeated Assyrian king's former eunuchs approach Cyrus with the request that he take them on as servants, and using the same arguments, convince him - Xenophon could have both dealt with the eunuch issue and presented Cyrus in a more favourable light. As the Cyr. stands, Cyrus, on his own initiative, forms a bodyguard composed of eunuchs and adds to them a palace guard of 10,000 Persian spearmen (7.5.65-68).

Next (7.5.71-86) comes a speech by Cyrus to the Persian and allied leaders on the need for continued discipline, moderation and practice of virtue on their part - old, familiar themes - if they are to keep and administer the empire properly. Cyrus suggests that the leaders spend their time at the royal court just as the ὁμότιμοι back in Persia do, and that their children be educated at court as well. Cyrus seems to be suggesting here that the old practices of the Persian court be transferred to Babylon, and, spurred on by Chrysantas (8.1.1-5), many men agree to stay and put themselves at Cyrus' disposal (8.1.6). Cyrus quickly establishes a bureaucracy, along army lines, for running the fiscal side of the empire (8.1.9-15) and then turns to the training of his associates (κοινῶνας 8.1.16).[8] He employs, we learn, various means to compel the nobles to attend his court, as those absent are automatically suspected of wrongdoing (8.1.16 ff.). One method was to have an absentee noble's possessions seized by a close friend of Cyrus. When the noble came forward to complain, Cyrus would at first postpone giving him a hearing and even after listening, would delay his verdict. Another, more drastic measure he used was to confiscate all of a missing noble's property and hand it over to another, potentially more loyal friend.

(It should be remembered that these measures were directed against Persians and other allies, not against the vanquished Babylonians.) It is thus clear that Cyrus' court in Babylon is not, in fact, run the same way as the court found in Xenophon's imaginary Persia (1.2.2-15). In Persia only the need to work for a living keeps men away from their civic duties (1.2.15); Persian elders, not Cambyses, serve as judges (1.2.14) and property rights are greatly respected (1.3.17), not subject to the whims of the ruler. In Cambyses' Persia τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν δίκαιον νομίζεται- fair possession is considered just - and the king, described as a kind of "constitutional monarch", accepts the city's decrees and is ruled by the law μέτρον δὲ αὐτῷ οὐχ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀλλ' ὁ νόμος ἐστίν (1.3.18; cf. above, pp. 108-110). In Babylon, on the other hand, Cyrus is the standard of justice, a living, seeing law (βλέποντα νόμον 8.1.22) who supersedes (if only to improve upon) written laws.

This implicit contrast between Cambyses' government in Persia and his son's rule in Babylon is made explicit by Xenophon during Cyrus' first visit home after his great conquest (8.5.21-27). Cyrus, bearing gifts and animals for sacrifice, enters his native country accompanied only by his friends, having left his army outside the Persian borders. We are not told, as might be expected, of any warm, tumultuous welcome for the conquering hero (cf. e.g. 3.3.2). Instead we find that Cambyses convenes a meeting between Persian nobles and his son because he is fearful that the delicate balance of power in Persia will be disrupted by Cyrus. Cambyses negotiates a compact between Cyrus and the native Persians: each party is to respect the other's rights and come to its aid in time of need.[9] In addition it is arranged that Cyrus shall be king of Persia after Cambyses' death (although it is clear that he will visit there only rarely, leaving the actual rule to another member of the royal family). Cyrus is not, however, to rule Persia as he does the rest of his empire, with a view to his

own advantage καὶ Περσῶν ἄρχειν ἐπὶ πλεονεξίᾳ ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων (8.5.24). This description of Cyrus as one who rules his empire ἐπὶ πλεονεξίᾳ is significant, for it is, as Cyrus has been told in his youth, a characteristic of a tyrant, as opposed to a king. Cyrus' mother, fearing that her son would be corrupted by his grandfather during his stay in Media, had warned him not to learn ἀντὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τὸ τυραννικόν, ἐν ᾧ ἐστι τὸ πλέον οἴεσθαι χρῆναι πάντων ἔχειν (1.3.18; cf. above, p. 110). While it is rash, perhaps, to conclude from Cambyses' statement that he considered his son a tyrant, it can safely be said (on the basis of 8.5.24) that Xenophon distinguishes quite clearly between two types of régimes - the traditional Persian "constitutional monarchy" described in Book I and Cyrus' more despotic form of rule over his empire, described in Books 7 and 8: only one of the two régimes, at best, can be said to represent an ideal form of government.[10]

Returning to Babylon and Cyrus' court there, we find that Cyrus has decided that he and his κολνῶνες should adopt the Median form of dress - their rich robes, high shoes and elaborate make-up (8.1.40-42; cf. 8.3.1-4, 13-14), in place of the simple Persian style. This decision is surprising, to say the least.[11] Many commentators point out that this attitude is inconsistent with the rejection of cosmetics and other artificial aids to the appearance expressed by Ischomachus in the Oec. (10.2-9),[12] but it is also inconsistent with earlier episodes in the Cyr. itself. We are told, for example, that the young Cyrus is fascinated by his rouged and richly attired grandfather and delighted to receive an elaborate Median costume of his own - ἅτε παῖς ὤν because he is a child (1.3.2-3). Persian dress is traditionally much plainer, and when an older Cyrus leaves Media to return home, he is careful to leave his Median robe behind (1.4.26). Later, Cyrus clashes with his Mede uncle over the question of clothes. Cyaxares thinks that Cyrus will impress an Indian delegation favourably if he

is attired in fancy Median robes, while Cyrus contends that he will make a better impression by arriving on the scene as quickly as possible ὑδρῶτι καὶ σπουδῇ... κεκοσμημένος (2.4.1, 5-6; see above, pp.357-358). Cyaxares concedes that his nephew's attitude is the correct one, but he has not really taken the lesson to heart, for he later keeps a large group of his allies, about to hold a council of war, waiting, while he dresses (6.1.1). It is perhaps not insignificant that when he finally does appear σεμνῶς κεκοσμημένος (6.1.6), his contribution to the discussion is minimal. In sum, throughout most of the Cyr. elaborate dress and make-up are shown to be an indulgence, an affectation of the idle (cf. 8.8.15-17). Even after Cyrus institutes Median dress he slips back into the old, moralizing attitude one last time. After distributing to his men Median costumes to be worn during the grand procession, he is asked what dress he himself will wear. He replies that his dress does not matter - for him the best possible adornment is having adorned his friends (8.3.3-4; cf. above, pp. 358-359). Nonetheless, he subsequently appears in the procession decked out in majestic purple and larger than life (8.3.13-14). Why does Cyrus change his views?

It seems that Cyrus thinks that it is not enough for rulers to be better than their subjects - they must bewitch (καταγοητεύειν) them as well (8.1.40). Making use of σεμνότης, the pomp and trappings of royal power, is one way to ensure that a government will be properly respected τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι (8.3.1; cf. 7.5.37). Here again we see Cyrus adding to, or to be more exact, straying from, his father's teachings Cambyses has advised his son that the best way to guarantee the willing obedience of one's subjects is, simply, to be better than them and thus convince them that it is to their own advantage to obey (1.6.21-22; see above, pp. 92-93). Cambyses has nothing to say about a ruler having to enchant or dazzle his subjects, and he and his nobles dress simply (1.3.2; cf. 4.5.54). Cyrus' techniques, if new, are nonetheless seemingly

effective: when he makes his grand entrance in the procession, all prostrate themselves before him (8.3.14). Xenophon rather cynically adds that perhaps all bow down to Cyrus not because they are impressed by his appearance but because they have been commanded to do so. He also notes that this is the first time that the Persians prostrate themselves before Cyrus. The Persians, it seems, have adopted a new attitude towards their leader but given the Greeks' feelings about προσκύνησις (cf. Arrian, Anab. 4.11.9) one wonders if we are meant to think that it is a better one.

Cyrus, as ruler, undergoes a similar change in his attitude towards rich and elaborate food. He has stated, time and again, that one should eat only simple food in moderate quantities, stressing that "hunger is the best relish" (Cyr. 1.5.12 and 4.5.4; cf. 4.2.38; 5.2.16-17 etc.) and this traditional Persian approach is again opposed to that of the Medes (1.6.8; 4.5.7 etc.; cf. 8.8.16, 20). If in his youth Cyrus did not enjoy or appreciate his grandfather's rich table (1.3.4-6), as ruler of Babylon he is served expensive and elaborate meals that could well rival those of Astyages (8.2.4 ff.). It is interesting to note, in fact, how closely Cyrus has come to resemble Astyages - in dress, eating habits, his attitude towards the law, πλεονεξία and the property of others, and in his aloofness from his subjects.[13] This state of affairs is all the more striking because in the beginning of the Cyr., Astyages is deliberately and unfavourably contrasted with Cyrus' father, Cambyses (1.3.2 ff., especially 2, 11, 18).

Cyrus, as head of an empire, also reminds us of a different tyrant who appears in Xenophon's writings - Hiero. Cyrus, like Hiero, wants to have good men help him run his empire, but is afraid of competition from potential rivals (Cyr. 8.1.46-48; cf. Hiero 5.1, 6.15-16, and see above, p. 331).[14] Hiero is

forced to rid himself of the able men and make use of less worthy ones (Hiero 5.2) but Cyrus overcomes the problem by using a combination of carrot and stick to keep his men loyal to him but at odds with each other. Thus he sympathizes with his men in good fortune and bad (Cyr. 8.2.1-2), honours worthy men with food sent especially from his table (8.2.3-4), gives them lavish gifts (8.2.7-9) and uses them as "treasurers" for his wealth (8.2.15-23). He also sends doctors and medicines to them when they are ill (8.2.24-25). On the other hand, Cyrus also makes use of great numbers of spies, the "eyes and ears of the king", so that men everywhere are afraid to speak out against him (8.2.10-12). So too he organizes contests, not only to encourage ἀρετή but also to stir up contention and rivalry (ἔριδας καὶ φιλονικίας) among the nobles (8.2.26). In addition, he makes contestants (legal or otherwise) choose their own judges, knowing that they will hate those who give judgement against them, but not appreciate those who decide in their favour (8.2.27). Thus Cyrus contrives that all the strongest men will like him more than each other ὡς ἐμηχανᾶτο τοὺς κρατίστους αὐτὸν μᾶλλον πάντας φιλεῖν ἢ ἀλλήλους (8.2.28; cf. 8.1.48).

This policy of "divide and conquer" again leaves us uneasy.[15] In the past, Cyrus although well aware of the merits of contests and competitions, had been bothered by the jealousy and rivalry they engendered and was anxious to turn his men's negative feelings towards the Assyrian enemy (3.3.10). Once men praised Cyrus spontaneously and willingly because they were impressed by him (1.4.25; 3.1.41; 3.3.4 etc.) but now, with spies everywhere, they have no choice but to speak well of him (8.2.12). Even Cyrus' more positive actions, such as his distribution of lavish presents, do not necessarily lead to desirable results. Thus we are told that Cyrus' generous gifts caused men to prefer him to their brothers, fathers and children (8.2.9). In view of Cyrus' own strictures to his sons on the naturalness and importance of fraternal devotion (8.7.14-16; cf. 8.8.4 and

compare Mem. 2.2 and 2.3), such loyalty on the part of his subjects, though convenient for Cyrus can hardly have been considered morally good even by him. Furthermore, all of Cyrus' seemingly kind and thoughtful policies are consistently shown to be motivated by utilitarian, if not selfish, considerations.[16] A king, says Cyrus, like a shepherd, must keep his charges happy while making use of or deriving benefit from them (εὐδαίμονας... ποιοῦντα χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς 8.2.14) and one cannot but suspect that they are kept happy only because it causes them to produce better and more abundant fleece. It is instructive to compare this statement by Cyrus to a similar one attributed to Socrates in the Mem. (3.2.1). Agamemnon, Socrates says, is called ποιμένα λαῶν because like a shepherd with his flock, a general must see to it that his troops are safe, supplied with their needs, and fulfil their function. Socrates makes no mention of the general's using or benefitting from his men, only of the soldiers improving their fortune (cf. ὕνα... εὐδαιμονέστεροι ὦσιν Mem. 3.2.1). The Persian leader's attitude seems much closer to that of Thrasymachus in the Republic (343 A-B).[17]

A good case in point is Cyrus' behaviour towards his slaves. The Persian leader takes pains, we are told, never to let his slaves go hungry or thirsty, and feeds them with tidbits from his table, hoping to engender their good will (εὔνοια) as one does with dogs (8.2.4). During hunting expeditions free men are not provided with food, but Cyrus carefully leads the slaves to drink, as with beasts of burden, and pauses to allow them to have a meal so that they will not be overly hungry. Cyrus' solicitude for his slaves earns him the title "father", for his care has reconciled them to a state of lifelong servitude ἐπεμέλετο αὐτῶν ὅπως ἀναμφιλόγως ἀεὶ ἀνδράποδα διατελοῖεν (8.1.44). Are we meant only to admire such a "father"?[18]

Each of these less-than-ideal features of Cyrus' behaviour as ruler of an empire, taken by itself is, perhaps, no more than slightly disquieting; taken

cumulatively, they are quite disturbing and require some sort of explanation. The discrepancies are too numerous and obtrusive not to have been deliberately included by Xenophon. On the other hand, Cyrus and his rule continue to be praised as exemplary (cf. e.g. 8.1.33; 8.2.1) and there are scenes in Book 8, such as the symposium (8.4.1-27; cf. especially 6-8) and Cyrus' peaceful departure from this world (8.7), where Cyrus seems more of a model figure than ever. Why does Xenophon introduce these inconsistencies?

The answer appears to be that Cyrus, after the conquest of his empire, has become a benevolent despot. Xenophon wishes to show us that both - benevolence and despotism - are needed to run a large empire successfully. At times Xenophon emphasizes the autocratic, even tyrannical nature of Cyrus' rule and at times he continues to demonstrate Cyrus' kind and outstanding character, which has been in evidence throughout the Cyr., but it is the two taken together which make his hero's rule so uniquely successful. This is one of the important lessons of the Cyr. and it has several corollaries.

The first is that absolute rule or despotism is the type of rule needed to govern a large and varied empire well. Once master of an empire, Cyrus begins to act as a despot, both because he wishes to be treated as a king and because such measures are necessary if he is to remain in control. We have seen that Xenophon consistently shows the virtuous Cyrus as deliberately adopting and initiating some of the least attractive features of his new regime and we are given his well-thought out and highly practical reasons for doing so. This lends an air of necessity, even inevitability to Cyrus' actions. If the sovereign of a large and varied empire is to succeed in its government, he must, it seems, become an absolute and remote figure. We have also noted that Cyrus, once in Babylon, changes or ignores many of the teachings of his father Cambyses - the Persian "constitutional monarchy" is rejected. The ideal and idyllic society of

Cyrus' youth had left him dissatisfied even before he set out on his great conquest. It does not actively encourage the pursuit of great gain and glory, and one can grow old there, practising virtue, with nothing to show for it (1.5.8 ff.). The simple rustic monarchy with its careful system of checks and balances, is excellent as a training ground for Cyrus, but does not leave him enough scope for his ambitions and capabilities. It is not, as Xenophon himself seems to admit, a realistic model of government for a large and complex empire. One must choose, apparently, between the careful and moral rule of a small-scale polity and the glamorous, but despotic rule of an empire.

The second consequence of Cyrus' enlightened absolutism is that it must, in fact, be enlightened. The rule established by Cyrus in his empire depends to a large extent on the character of the man in charge ὅταν μὲν ὁ ἐπιστάτης βελτίων γένηται, καθαρώτερον τὰ νόμιμα πράττεται· ὅταν δὲ χείρων, φαυλότερον (8.1.8; cf. 8.8.5). Cyrus uses methods which are very effective in his own hands, but are, in themselves, far from perfect. His achievement as a ruler was unique (1.1.4) but this is, in part at least, because he failed to create institutions or inaugurate ways of life which would guarantee the continuation of his achievement. We have seen (above, p. 14) that Xenophon often describes practices Cyrus initiated in Babylon and then adds that they are still found ἔτι καὶ νῦν i.e. in fourth century Persia (cf. 7.5.70; 8.1.6-7, 20, 24, 36; 8.2.4, 7-9; 8.3.9, 10, 34; 8.4.5; 8.5.21, 27; 8.6.5, 9. 14, 16 etc.). Some of these passages can be taken simply as an attempt to glorify Cyrus, i.e. many of the Persian practices known in Xenophon's time are shown by him to have actually been devised long ago by the clever Cyrus (cf. above, p. 15), but there may be more to some of the other ἔτι και νῦν passages than that. If the present day Persian government is less than perfect, Xenophon seems to imply, it is not because the practices instituted by Cyrus have been abolished or neglected - they still exist, but are not a sufficient safeguard of success.[19]

Xenophon, in the very opening of the Cyr. (1.1.1 ff.) has mentioned Cyrus as an exception to the general observation that it is difficult, if not impossible, to rule men. Before ending his book he must explain why Cyrus is an exception, demonstrating not only the positive side of Cyrus' achievements, i.e. how he extended his rule over a large empire of obedient subjects, but also the negative one - that is, why Cyrus was only an exception and did not manage to have his good works last beyond his lifetime (cf. above, p. 15). When Xenophon portrays Cyrus as a benevolent despot, he does answer both these points. Cyrus' benevolence and good character guarantee the well-being of his empire, but these are his own special characteristics. The despotism he inaugurates (along with the conquered empire) is what is left to the following generations of Persians - and it is a poor legacy.

Xenophon does not criticize the hero of the Cyr. - his hero - overtly, nor does he explicitly state that the legacy Cyrus has bequeathed is wanting in any way. Nonetheless, in the final portions of the Cyr. he has Cyrus institute practices which cannot be considered - either by him or his readers - ideal. The closest hint of any forebodings for the future of Cyrus' creation is to be found in the Persian's final words to his sons where he repeatedly and vehemently warns them about the dangers of fraternal strife (8.7.13-17). The two brothers do, of course, quarrel and Cyrus' empire begins to disintegrate immediately after he dies, as Xenophon states in the epilogue (8.8.2). The tone of the epilogue may be unusually sarcastic and sharp, but its content should come as no surprise to the readers of the Cyr.

Appendix II

Persian Sources in the Cyropaedia

In this appendix I shall look at the question of Persian sources in the Cyr. We have seen (above, passim) that in his tale of Cyrus the Great Xenophon includes Persian customs, concerns and motifs, such as deliberations over wine, an emphasis on truthfulness, gifts at parties, an interest in royal robes etc. There is certainly, as one commentator puts it, a Persian "flavouring" to the Cyr.[1] Where do these Persian spices come from? What Persian sources were available to Xenophon and what use does he make of them in the Cyr.? This question is, as we have seen (above, p. 256), of particular interest in relation to the novelle of the Cyr. for these colourful stories seem to derive (in part) from Eastern sources.

Xenophon had ample opportunity to learn of Persian sources, particularly oral ones, if he were so inclined. On the Anabasis expedition Persians and translators were, of course, present. Later too, while residing at Scillus, where in all likelihood he first turned to writing the story of Cyrus the Great, Xenophon could have met many of the Persians involved politically with Agesilaus at Sparta. Although Xenophon may not have been particularly interested in historical research (and we must bear in mind that Cyrus the Great lived almost 200 years before the writing of the Cyr.), it surely would have been simple and convenient for him to listen to Persian tales of Cyrus.[2]

What Persian sources were available to Xenophon? Persian literature of Xenophon's period (and certainly of Cyrus' period) is a great unknown. The only Persian writings extant from the Achaemenian era are the royal inscriptions written from Darius' time (ruled 521-486) onwards;[3] the inscriptions attributed to Cyrus may be much later.[4] It seems unlikely that Xenophon knew of these inscriptions or made use of them in any way.

There were written royal Persian chronicles as well, as we know from the Books of Esther (6:1; cf. 2:23) and Ezra (4:15); Ctesias claimed to have consulted the royal leather records βασιλικαὶ διφθέραι for his Persica (FGrH 688 F 5).[5] The Iranian scholar Christensen has suggested that these royal writings were not a dry, annalistic record of events but rather a royal epic, "une littérature d'amusements" containing more than a simple chronicle of royal Achaemenid activities. He bases his argument on Esther 6:1 where the sleepless king Ahauserus has ספר הזכרונות, דברי הימים "the Book of Memorable Deeds, the Chronicles" read to him and is reminded to reward Mordechai; presumably the insomniac king wanted to be entertained rather than listen to a dry, dull record of events. Furthermore, argues Christensen, there are royal Persian epics of a much later era -i.e. the (largely lost) Pahlavian work Xwadāy Nāmag "Book of Rulers" and the eleventh century Modern Persian Shāhnāmah "Book of Kings" - and these may well be, in both title and contents, a continuation of the tradition of the Old Persian royal annals.[6] The "Royal Memoirs" βασιλικὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα (cf. the Hebrew ספר הזכרונות) used by Agathias in his history of the Sasanian period (Histories 4.30.3) should also be noted in this context.[7] Christensen's theory, a speculative one, has not been generally accepted[8] and in any event it seems unlikely that Xenophon consulted the royal chronicles, whatever their form.

A source much more likely to have been tapped by Xenophon would be oral Persian tales, in poetry or prose, telling of the marvellous deeds of Cyrus the Great - a Persian epic. Again almost nothing is known about Persian epic of Xenophon's time; its very existence is doubted by some.[9] It would seem, however, that the burden of proof would lie upon those who would deny the Persians (or any other people) any kind of folk narrative dealing with men of the past. Cyrus the Great, in particular, left his mark upon Babylonian and Jewish literature; it is hard to imagine that his own people did not commemorate him in some fashion.

Generalizations aside, the evidence for early Persian epic is of four kinds: (1) References in Greek sources to Persian and Median tales of gods and men. (2) Stories found in Iranian epic of a much later period that can be traced back to our period. (3) Gaps or obscure allusions in the tales of the Avesta which presuppose widespread knowledge of mythical lore. (4) Stories found in Greek writers (e.g. Herodotus, Ctesias, Xenophon) which seem to stem from Persian sources. I shall examine each of the four categories in turn.

Our most general piece of information in Greek sources comes from Strabo who when describing Persian mores tells us of Persian teachers who blend useful instruction with the recitation of myths καὶ μέλους χωρὶς καὶ μετ' ὠιδῆς ἔργα θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἀρίστων (15.3.18). Herodotus tells us of a theogony recited by the Magi, the Median priests, during sacrifice (μάγος ἀνὴρ... ἐπαείδει θεογονίην 1.132.3), while from Athenaeus we learn of a well-established tradition of court poetry in the first half of the sixth century in Media. Athenaeus first commends the barbarians for using song as the ancient Greeks did, to celebrate τῶν ἡρώων τὰς πράξεις καὶ τῶν θεῶν τοὺς ὕμνους and then brings as an example of their poetry a story from Dinon's Persica (Athen. 633 C-E = FGrH 690 F 9). Dinon tells how Angares, the most celebrated of the minstrels (ᾠδοί) in Astyages' court, once sang songs from his usual repertoire (ᾖδεν... τά τε ἄλλα τῶν εἰθισμένων) and then turned to political allegory, warning the king of a beast more dangerous than a wild boar (i.e. Cyrus).[10]

Athenaeus also furnishes evidence of a folk tale widely told among the barbarians (= Persians and Medes) during the fourth century, the love story of Odatis and Zariadres. Chares of Mytilene, the Alexander historian, who is the source here (Athen. 15.575 = FGrH 125 F 5) first tells this story of love at first sight and then describes how popular the tale is among the Asians of his time (i.e. the second half of the fourth century B.C.). Odatis, the heroine of

the tale, is like the Cyr.'s Panthea, the fairest woman in Asia (καλλίστη τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν γυναικῶν). She first sees - and falls in love with - Zariadres in a dream. When Odatis is about to be wed to another against her will, Zariadres arrives opportunely on the scene and carries her off to be his wife. This ancient Median romance[11] has a happy end, but the lovely and loyal Odatis resembles Panthea in many ways.[12]

Finally, there is the Greek evidence for Persian (and Median) tales of Cyrus the Great. Xenophon himself mentions stories and poems current in his day ὁ Κῦρος λέγεται καὶ ᾄδεται ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων (Cyr. 1.2.1; cf. 1.4.25 οἱ... πάντες τὸν Κῦρον διὰ στόματος εἶχον καὶ ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς and see 8.5.28). Herodotus when presenting his version of the life of Cyrus the Great says he knows of three other (Persian) accounts as well (1.95; cf. 1.214). In short, there is, if not an abundance, an ample amount of Greek evidence attesting to Persian and Median tales current in classical times, including stories of Cyrus.

I turn now to the trickier question of late Persian epic reflecting, many centuries later, traditions already current in Xenophon's time. It is generally accepted (pace Christensen) that Persian literature began to evolve from an oral to a written form only during the Sasanian era (third to seventh centuries A.D.). Oral tradition seems, however, to have been very tenacious and to have survived in transmission over hundreds of years.[13] Thus, in theory at least, a Persian story of the classical era could have been transmitted orally, generation after generation, and have first been written down sometime in the Sasanian period, many centuries later. Sometimes this first written Middle Persian version then survived, if only indirectly, in Arabic derivatives or in reshaped form in the Shāhnāmah.[14] Hence it is not altogether unreasonable to suggest that a Persian tale of Xenophon's time can be found, in altered form, in Modern Persian writings such as the eleventh century A.D. Shāhnāmah. An outstanding example of this

process at work is the survival of the romance of Odatis and Zariadres (mentioned above), a tale already current in the fourth century B.C. A strikingly similar, but not identical[15] story is told by Firdausi in the Shāhnāmah over 1300 years later.[16]

A second, more complex illustration of Persian material seemingly preserved (in different form) in Persian epic of a much later date is the tale of the boyhood and rise to power of Ardashir I, the founder of the Sasanian dynasty. His story, which is preserved both in the Kārnāmag i Ardashir i Pāpakān ("Book of the Deeds of Ardashir, son of Papakan"), a short historical novel written toward the end of the Sasanian era, and in a later, fairly close redaction of the Kārnāmag in the Shāhnāmah,[17] has much in common with the tale of the rise of Cyrus the Great, as it is found in Ctesias-Nicolaus (FGrH 90 F 66).[18] Although this coincidence may be merely a repetition of a "dynasty founder" motif popular with Persian storytellers,[19] another way to explain the correspondences between the Cyrus and Ardashir tales is to postulate a more or less direct link - legends surrounding the founder of Persia's first great empire have been transferred to the founder of its second. Despite the existence of accurate historical records for the reign of Ardashir I, the historical details have been effaced by legends of Cyrus the Great still in circulation. These legends were written down in the Kārnāmag and then reproduced in the Shāhnāmah. This would mean both that Ctesias' version of Cyrus' youth and rise to power came from Persian sources and that the Kārnāmag itself stems from genuine Old Persian traditions (unlike most of surviving Iranian epic, which comes from eastern Iran). If these assumptions are correct we would then have evidence of: (1) a Persian source reproduced by a classical Greek author which (2) later appeared (in altered form) in a written Sasanid source and (3) subsequently was incorporated into the Shāhnāmah.

Although we are no longer on very firm ground methodologically, certain

Iranian scholars carry their investigations one stage further. Relying upon the continuity of Persian tradition for over a thousand years they look for rough parallels between classical Greek writings dealing with Persian affairs and the Shāhnāmah in an attempt to reconstruct early Persian epic. The Shāhnāmah, which is derived indirectly from the late Sasanian chronicle Xwadāy Nāmag, tells the story of Iran in a fairly continuous way, from the creation of the world down to the Arab conquest, using the successions of kings and dynasties as a framework. Ideally then, in our attempt to find traces of early Persian epic in the Cyr. we should compare stories of Cyrus the Great found in Xenophon to those of the Shāhnāmah. Unfortunately Cyrus does not appear in the Shāhnāmah at all.[20] In all likelihood Cyrus is missing from the eleventh century epic not only because ancient king lists were incomplete or lost when the Xwadāy Nāmag was compiled but because Cyrus is completely absent from Zoroastrian traditions and it is these that underlie the Xwadāy Nāmag and thus, indirectly, the Shāhnāmah.[21] To trace and understand Cyrus' disappearance from late Iranian epic we must turn from traditions of the west, i.e. Persia and Media to those of eastern Iran, the homeland of Zoroaster and the Avesta, the scripture of the Zoroastrians.

The extant Avesta[22] is all that remains of a collection (three or four times the size) of religious texts in the Avestan language (some of which go back to Zoroaster himself) made in Sasanian times; our manuscripts date from 1278 onwards. It contains many stories of mythical heroes and eastern rulers or Kavis, particularly in the Yashts, the hymns dedicated to divinities. These stories in the Yashts are often not told in full and many people and details are alluded to in a very obscure way, making them almost incomprehensible to us. Clearly, however, the stories were known and understood when the Yashts were composed (i.e. some time after Zoroaster) so that a mere hint was sufficient for the original audience. This would mean that there was a well developed cycle of stories of heroes and

rulers, an epic tradition, in Eastern Iran as well. Some of the missing details of the Avesta stories can be found in the Shāhnāmah or in Pahlavi (Middle Persian) literature and scholars are divided as to whether these details survived through Zoroastrian texts that are now lost to us or through an unbroken secular oral tradition.[23] In any event the fact that the patron of Zoroaster Vishtaspa (Hystaspas) was a Kavi meant that Zoroaster was introduced into the Kayanian cycle. This seems to have ensured both the survival of east Iranian, Kayanian traditions and their use much later on as the basis for the early sections of all-Iranian epic, i.e. the Shāhnāmah, since the Xwadāy Nāmag, the indirect source of the Shāhnāmah, was a chronicle arranged by priests in accordance with the Zoroastrian world view.

There is very little evidence, apart from the survival of the romance of Odatis and Zariadres (cf. above, pp.404-405), that Kayanian stories were recited in western Achaemenian Iran in Xenophon's time and west Iranian epic apparently developed quite independently. Yet in a curious way the Zoroaster-Hystaspas link may also explain the complete absence of Cyrus from Zoroastrian tradition (and, as an indirect consequence, from the Shāhnāmah as well).

In the past many scholars thought that there was no trace of Cyrus in Zoroastrian writings simply because he (along with other early Achaemenian kings) was not a Zoroastrian. The long established Sasanian tradition that Zoroaster is to be dated 258 years before Alexander would make Zoroaster a contemporary of Cyrus and it is unlikely that the prophet's teachings would have spread from eastern to western Iran during his lifetime. Now, however, there is considerable evidence (archaeological and otherwise) that the early Achaemenians were indeed Zoroastrians, while the date of Zoroaster has been pushed further back.[24] Why then did Cyrus disappear from Zoroastrian sources? Mary Boyce offers the following, rather ingenious explanation.[25] The traditional "258 years before Alexander"

date was in all likelihood taken by Zoroastrian priests from the Babylonians, for they had no precise chronology of their own. The Babylonians supplied the date of the greatest Iranian victory, i.e. the conquest of their land by Cyrus but the priests understood the great victory to be the emergence of their prophet Zoroaster.[26] The priests thought that Cyrus had adopted Zoroastrianism and fought against unbelievers, as had Zoroaster's patron Vishtaspa (Hystaspas). Furthermore they knew that Cyrus was soon succeeded by Darius the Great, the son of (another) Hystaspas, and in Iran, sons regularly followed their fathers on the throne. Thus the Zoroastrian priests concluded that Cyrus was the Achaemenian Hystaspas, father of Darius, and none other than the homonymous Kavi Vishtaspa of the Avesta. In this way, claims Boyce, Cyrus was completely erased from Zoroastrian sources, name and all.

This theory is, of course, highly speculative but it does explain two troublesome points - the late date usually assigned to Zoroaster and the silence surrounding Cyrus. In any event, Cyrus' absence from the Shāhnāmah and more generally, the preponderance of east (rather than west) Iranian traditions in that work make the task of reconstructing Persian (or Median) epic with which the Greeks may have been acquainted quite difficult. Nonetheless, as the example of Cyrus - Ardashir shows, certain old, genuinely Persian elements are to be found in the Shāhnāmah (or the few surviving pre-Islamic writings). Consequently, stories or bits of stories with a Persian setting that appear in Herodotus, Ctesias, Xenophon etc. are checked by Iranian scholars for any broad similarity to tales in the Shāhnāmah. The common elements found are then said to be traces of, or motifs from, Old Persian epic.[27]

The Cyropaedia is used by Christensen and other Iranologists in the same way - both as a quarry for mining traces of Old Persian epic and (consequently) as proof of Xenophon's dependence upon Persian sources. Some of the arguments and

parallels adduced by these scholars are stronger than others; none is conclusive nor can be because of the nature of the material available. Three examples will suffice to illustrate the difficulties involved in trying to pinpoint Persian influences.

According to most Greek sources Cyrus the Great died a sudden and violent death on the battlefield, after having ruled for some thirty years.[28] In the Cyr., however, Cyrus dies peacefully in his bed old (μάλα... πρεσβύτης ὤν 8.7.1) and content. He is told of his forthcoming death in a dream and, after sacrificing to the gods, he gathers his family and friends round his bedside for a long farewell address. In this final speech he delivers his political testament, appointing his older son king and his younger son satrap of various territories, and cautioning the brothers on the importance of fraternal devotion. He also reflects upon the nature of the soul and asks to be buried simply. Finally, bidding those at his bedside farewell, he covers himself and dies (Cyr. 8.7.1-28).

Christensen thinks that the alternate version of Cyrus' death found in the Cyr. is the strongest bit of evidence, even decisive proof, of Xenophon's dependence upon Persian epic. In the Shāhnāmah, which, claims Christensen, preserves patterns already formulated by ancient Persian epic, model kings generally have a carefully arranged death scene. The pattern seems to be that the exemplary king, before dying, arranges his succession, makes his last wishes known, delivers his political testament and presents a few well-chosen reflections; naturally, not all these elements are always present. Cyrus of the Cyr. does follow this model and specific details of his last scene - the message from the gods about his approaching death, the naming of his successors, the call for unity, not rivalry between the brothers and the short review of his own life - have fairly close parallels in different episodes of the Shāhnāmah.[29] Christensen could have added that from a fragment of Onesicritus, the Alexander historian, it seems

that Cyrus' longevity was attested in Persian sources, with Cyrus dying of grief (over Cambyses' behaviour) at the age of 100 (FGrH 134 F 36).

Is all this clear proof of Xenophon's acquaintance with early Persian epic? One complication is that Xenophon's description of Cyrus' deathbed scene may well have been influenced by Ctesias' version in the Persica (FGrH 688 F 9.7-8; cf. above, p. 269). Cyrus, according to Ctesias, was wounded in battle (in the thirtieth year of his rule), but died three days later. Before dying he appointed his older son king, the younger one satrap of certain areas, arranged other political matters and told his sons (and stepsons) to obey their mother in every area and to be loyal to one another. Only then did Cyrus die: ταῦτα εἴπας ἐτελεύτησε . Even in the abridged version of Ctesias given us by Photius the similarities between this account of Cyrus' dying words and the later version by Xenophon are quite plain; many of the elements in the Persian pattern conjectured by Christensen are already to be found in Ctesias. Even if Ctesias has been influenced in his description by Persian epic, the Persian elements in Xenophon's account here can be attributed to an intermediary Greek source (i.e. Ctesias). Furthermore, the prototype "farewell of a king" scene discussed by Christensen may not be peculiarly Persian. One is reminded, for example, of the patriarch Jacob's final words to his sons (Genesis 34) and of the supernatural summons to Sophocles' Oedipus (S.O.C. 1621 ff.). "Dying king names successor" and "wise words of dying father" are both common folk-motifs.[30] Finally, Xenophon may have attributed a late and peaceful death to Cyrus because it is more in keeping with the idealized figure of the Cyr. Cyrus is not only a successful conqueror but also an ideal ruler of an empire and as such deserves a timely, dignified death. Many of Cyrus' pronouncements in this farewell speech - on the immortality of the soul, on the gods, on the importance of fraternal devotion etc. - have close parallels in the words of Socrates of the Mem. and there is certainly a Socratic

side, besides a Persian one, to Xenophon's description of his hero's death in the Cyr.[31] In short, while Xenophon may have been directly acquainted with a Persian source ascribing a long farewell speech to the dying Cyrus and made use of it in the Cyr., he may simply have adapted a part of Ctesias' version for his own purposes; the strongest evidence produced by Christensen for Xenophon's use of ancient Persian epic in the Cyr. is not, it would seem, proof enough.[32]

Another instance of Persian elements found by Christensen in the Cyr. is the story of the death of Gobryas' son (4.6.2-8; discussed above, pp. 314-317). Christensen compares a similar tale told of Ardashir I; it is found both in the Kārnāmag and in the Shāhnāmah.[33] Ardashir, who has been accepted by Ardavan (last of the Arsacid kings) as a privileged member of his household, went hunting with the king's son. He killed a wild ass with an expert shot but Ardavan's son claimed that he had hunted down the animal. Ardashir then reprimanded the prince for lying but Ardavan took his son's side and punished Ardashir by sending him to work in the stables. The similarities between the two incidents are clear; can we assume, as Christensen does, that these is a direct connection? We have already seen that the Kārnāmag stems from Old Persian traditions and the story of Ardashir has been influenced to a certain extent (directly or indirectly) by tales of Cyrus. This story in the Cyr., however, concerns not Cyrus himself but the son of one of his allies. In addition, as we have seen, a similar story is told both by Ctesias and Curtius Rufus (cf. above, p. 315). The custom that no one is to shoot before the king is clearly a Persian (or Oriental) one; Xenophon himself terms it βασιλικῶς in the Cyr. (1.4.14). So too tales of the dire consequences resulting from outdoing a royal despot at a hunt naturally belong to the Persian and Oriental world, not to the Greek one. Clearly then Xenophon is making use of a Persian motif here but he is not necessarily adapting a bit of Persian epic. Momigliano's "international story telling with a Persian background"[34] would seem a much closer description of Xenophon's source here.

Finally, our third illustration from the Cyr. concerns the lovely and virtuous Panthea. This famous and influential tale is a good test case for, more than any other episode in the Cyr., the source of this story arouses our curiosity. Was the romance invented by Xenophon or has he made use of some (Persian or Eastern) story then in circulation? Here Christensen, or to be just, the limitations of the Persian material available, disappoints. We cannot answer the question with any degree of certitude. Although Christensen is reminded of love stories in the Shāhnāmah, he does not mention any specific parallels (other than comparing Panthea's lament for Abradatas (Cyr. 7.3.8-14) to a mother's much more violent lament for her son;[35] and one suspects that there is, in fact, no similar heroine to be found in that long work.[36] The story of Panthea (or her Persian equivalent) may have been part of the Persian traditions of Xenophon's time (compare the romance of Odatis and Zariadres, discussed above, pp. 404-405), but without even a foothold in the Shāhnāmah we can only speculate. Furthermore, the tale here, like that of Gobryas' son, is only loosely connected with Cyrus the Great, so that it may well have come from traditions totally unrelated to the monarch. This could mean in turn, either that Xenophon had a fairly broad acquaintance with Persian epic and his knowledge was not restricted to a Cyrus cycle of stories or that we are dealing with the rather nebulous "internationally circulating stories" of his era. Again, much as we would like to know, we can only speculate.

In summary, the evidence seems to indicate that there was some sort of Persian epic, including stories of Cyrus, circulating in Xenophon's time. Xenophon could have been, and probably was, acquainted with parts of this epic. Unfortunately Old Persian epic has disappeared, leaving very few traces behind; those that remain are found chiefly in the eleventh century work, the Shāhnāmah. While these vestiges tempt us to conjecture links between the Cyr. and Old Persian epic, since they are no more than traces, we are unable to go beyond conjecture

to probability, let alone solid evidence. Any curious episode in the Cyropaedia which seems to hint at Persian origins, will, barring the discovery of new material, have to remain for us just that.

Appendix III

The Speeches of the Cyropaedia

Reference	Speaker	Audience	Content	Part of Series?
1.5.6-14	Cyrus	Homotimoi	Hortatory	
2.1.11	Cyrus	Homotimoi	Announces Plan	Yes - 1
2.1.12-13	Anon. Homotimos	C. & Homotimoi	Further Suggestion	2
2.1.14-19	Cyrus	Persian Army	Proposal	3
2.3.1-4	Cyrus	Persian Army	Assembly-Proposal	Yes - 1
2.3.5-7	Chrysantas	Persian Army & C.	Favours Proposal	2
2.3.7-16	Pheraulas	Persian Army & C.	Favours Proposal	3
2.4.21-29	Cyrus	Persian Taxiarchs & Chrysantas	Plan of Attack	
3.2.3-5	Cyrus	Persian, Mede & Armenian Leaders	Hortatory & Battle Instructions	
3.3.7-8	Cyrus	Valiant Persians	Hortatory & Congratulatory	
3.3.34-40	Cyrus	Homotimoi	Pre-Battle Hortatory	Yes - 1
3.3.40-42	Cyrus	Rearguard Persians	Pre-battle Hortatory	2
3.3.43-45	Assyrian King	Assyrian Army	Pre-battle Hortatory	3
4.1.1-6	Cyrus	Persian Army	Post-battle Thanks-giving-Hortatory & Congratulatory	
4.2.21-26	Cyrus	Persian, Mede & Hyrcanian Leaders	Hortatory & Battle Instructions	
4.2.38-45	Cyrus	Persian Taxiarchs	Proposal (& Didactic)	Yes - 1
4.2.46	Hystaspas	Persian Taxiarchs & C.	Acceptance	2
4.2.47	Cyrus	Persian Taxiarchs	Implementation	3
4.3.3-15	Cyrus	Persian Taxiarchs	Proposal	Yes - 1
4.3.15-21	Chrysantas	Persian Taxiarchs & C.	Acceptance	2
4.3.22-23	Cyrus	Persian Taxiarchs	Implementation	3
4.4.9-13	Cyrus	Captured Assyrians	Terms of Surrender	
5.1.19-24	Cyrus	Leaders of Medes & Allies	Council - Future Plans	Yes - 1
5.1.24-26	Artabazus	Leaders of Medes, of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	2

Reference	Speaker	Audience	Content	Part of Series?
5.1.27	Tigranes	Leaders of Medes, of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	3
5.1.28	Hyrcanian Leader	Leaders of Medes, of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	4
5.1.29	Medes	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	5
5.1.29	Cyrus	Leaders of Allies & Medes	Council - Future Plans	6
5.3.29-45	Cyrus	Leaders of Allies	Proposal & Implementation	
5.4.19-22	Cyrus	Cadusians & Leaders of Allies	Didactic & Instructions	
5.5.44-48	Cyrus	Select Friends	Plan & Instructions	
6.1.6	Cyaxares	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	Yes - 1
6.1.7	Hyrcanian Leader	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	2
6.1.8	Cadusian Leader	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	3
6.1.9-10	Artabazus	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	4
6.1.11	Gobryas	Leaders of Allies & C.	Council - Future Plans	5
6.1.12-18	Cyrus	Leaders of Allies	Council - Future Plans & Proposal	6
6.2.13-20	Cyrus	Leaders of Army & Others	Hortatory	Yes - 1
6.2.21-22	Chrysantas	Leaders of Army & C.	Hortatory	2
6.2.23-41	Cyrus	Leaders of Army	Proposal & Implementation	3
6.3.22-34	Cyrus	Leaders of Army	Plan & Instructions	
6.4.12-20	Cyrus	Leaders of Allies	Pre-battle Hortatory	
7.5.19-24	Cyrus	Leaders of Army	Hortatory & Battle Instructions	
7.5.41-47	Cyrus	Close Friends & Allies	Council - Requests Advice	Yes - 1
7.5.48-54	Artabazus	Close Friends, Allies & C.	Council - Restates Problem	2
7.5.55-57	Chrysantas	Close Friends, Allies & C.	Council - Proposal	3

Reference	Speaker	Audience	Content	Part of Series?
7.5.71-86	Cyrus	Leaders of Persians & Allies	Hortatory & Proposal	Yes - 1
8.1.1-6	Chrysantas	Leaders of Persians, of Allies & C.	Seconds Proposal	2
8.4.32-36	Cyrus	Friends & Officials	Didactic	
8.5.22-27	Cambyses	Cyrus, Elders & Officials in Persia	Proposes Compact	
8.6.1-7	Cyrus	Chief Officials	Plan	Yes - 1
8.6.10-13	Cyrus	Future Satraps	Hortatory & Instructions	2
8.7.5-28	Cyrus	Sons, Friends & Officials in Persia	Deathbed Farewell - Instructions, Hortatory etc.	

Notes to Chapter I

1. A. Momigliano, The Development of Greek Biography (Cambridge, Mass. 1971), p. 55.

2. See the brief survey in Momigliano (above, n. 1), pp. 46-57.

3. For the more general problem of the relationship between the historical Socrates and his portrayal in the writings of the Socratics see Breitenbach, RE 1771-1776 and the further bibliography there. A. Dihle, Studien zur griechischen Biographie (Göttingen 1956), sees such portraits of Socrates, particularly Plato's Apology, as the first true biography (pp. 18 ff.)

4. See H. Homeyer, "Zu der Anfängen der griechische Biographie", Philologus 106 (1962), pp. 75-85, esp. pp. 76-78, on the formal biographical elements in Herodotus' account of Cyrus. She considers Herodotus a forerunner of later Greek biography and thinks that the nature of Herodotus' Persian sources (centreing round tales of kings) led him to arrange his material this way.

5. Cf. e.g. L. Pearson, Early Ionian Historians (Oxford 1939), p. 119.

6. For the little that is known of Herodorus' life, see F. Jacoby, "Herodorus", RE VIII.1, 980-981.

7. On this aspect of Herodorus' work, see G.K. Galinsky, The Herakles Theme (Oxford 1972), pp. 56 and 78, n. 37; R. Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala 1948), pp. 29-31. Jacoby, FGrH Ia, p. 502 is more skeptical about Herodorus' Heracles serving as a model of ethical behaviour.

8. For this point, see Jacoby (above, n. 6), 984-985.

9. Stesimbrotus is called a contemporary of Cimon and Pericles (FGrH 107 T 1, T 2), and it is clear from the reference in F 11 to the death of Pericles' son in the plague that his work on Themistocles, Thucydides and Pericles appeared after 429. F. Schachermeyr, "Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift über die Staatsmänner", SB Wien Akad. 247.5 (1965), pp. 3-23, argues persuasively that the work appeared around 420; other scholars date the work earlier (cf. pp. 9-10).

10. Schachermeyr (above, n. 9), contends that Stesimbrotus was interested in the character and behaviour of demagogues and that his composition was a forerunner of later works περὶ δημαγωγῶν, περὶ τυράννων etc. He finds no evidence in the fragments of any malice towards the Athenians and their policies. Other scholars - cf.e.g. Jacoby, FGrH II B, p. 343 (and the further references there) - consider the work "eine politische tendenzschrift", although there is no real agreement as to which political policies are being attacked. See F.J. Frost, Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary (Princeton 1980), pp. 16-17; H.D. Westlake, CQ 5 (1955), pp. 64-65.

11. The fragment dealing with the education of Themistocles (F 1) is particularly noteworthy in this context, in view of the later debate in the writings of Socratics (including Xenophon) as to whether Themistocles owed his success as a statesman to his natural abilities or to the teachers he had; cf. Xen. Mem. 2.6.13; 4.2.2; Symp. 8.39; Aeschines, Alcibiades frr.7-9 (Dittmar) and P.Oxy. 13.1608 and see Gigon II, pp. 136-139.

12. Jacoby, FGrH IIIb (text), pp. 191-192 and IIIb (notes), pp. 125-126, dates Ion from 480 to 422 B.C. The Epidemiae was written after 440 B.C. (cf. F 6) and Jacoby thinks that it may have appeared as late as the first years of the Peloponnesian war - cf. IIIb (text), p. 194.

13. See E. Lévy, Athènes devant la défaite de 404 (Paris 1976), pp. 203-205, for further references and discussion. He describes the Greek attitude towards Persians as "un mélange de fascination et de répulsion" (p. 203). See too C.G. Starr, "Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.", Part I, Iranica Antiqua 11 (1975), pp. 48-61 and Hirsch, pp. 1-5 (with notes on pp. 149-150) and passim.

14. Cf. Breitenbach, RE 1708 for this point.

15. On Antisthenes' life and works in general see e.g. O. Gigon, Sokrates: Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte (Bern 1947), pp. 289-299; Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 304-311. For a detailed survey of modern scholarship on the Cyrus fragments, see G. Giannatoni (ed.), Socraticorum Reliquiae (Naples 1983), Vol. III, nota 31, pp. 269-281; cf. in particular pp. 278-281 for opinions on the possible relation (chronological and otherwise) between the Cyrus fragments and the Cyr. and compare Höistad (above, n. 7), pp. 73-94. K. Joël, Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates, II (Berlin 1901) believes in the all-pervasive influence of Antisthenes on Xenophon and the Cyr.; see esp. II.1, pp. 381-390 and II.2, pp. 1053-1061.

16. The numbering of Antisthenes' fragments used here is that of F. Decleva Caizzi, Antisthenis Fragmenta (Milan 1966). Giannatoni (above, n. 15) re-arranges and re-numbers the fragments in vol. II of his more recent edition.

17. Cf. Giannatoni (above, n. 15), pp. 269-273, for a survey of the various solutions proposed. F. Susemihl, "Der Idealstaat der Antisthenes und die Dialoge Archelaos, Kyros und Herakles", Jahrb. f. klass. Phil. 135 (1887), pp. 207-214, esp. p. 210, argues that the two works entitled Cyrus found in volumes 4 and 5 respectively are, in fact, two halves of the same work, i.e. Antisthenes wrote only one Cyrus; his view has not been generally accepted.

18. On dialogues by Antisthenes, see Hirzel, pp. 118-129 and A. Patzer, Antisthenes der Sokratiker (Diss. Heidelberg 1970), pp. 94-95. H. Dittmar, Aischines von Sphettos (Berlin 1912), pp. 80-84, thinks that the Cyrus was a Socratic dialogue, in which the Persian king featured in a central speech addressed by Socrates to Alcibiades; cf. Susemihl (above, n. 17), p. 212.

19. It will be obvious that my discussion here owes much to the presentation found in Dittmar (above, n. 18), pp. 68-76, although I cannot accept the remainder of his reconstruction of the Cyrus fragments. See too the brief discussion by Caizzi (above, n. 16), pp. 93-94, who is correct, I think, in seeing frr.19-21 as the sole remnants of one Cyrus composition, for the simplest hypothesis is that this Cyrus, which apparently was a companion piece to Antisthenes' Heracles, was found together with the Heracles in vol. 4. Fr.29A, the remaining fragment specifically linked to a Cyrus by Antisthenes (cf. ἐν θατέρῳ τῶν Κύρων) tells us that Alcibiades was reprimanded for his incestuous behaviour, similar to that of the Persians. Perhaps Antisthenes contrasted the decadent Persians of his time with the noble contemporaries of Cyrus the Great (as Xenophon does in the final chapter of the

Cyr.). This Alcibiades-related fragment should, if only for simplicity's sake, be separated from the Heracles-linked fragments we have seen so far and assigned to the second Cyrus, Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας, of volume 5.

20. For a more detailed comparison of the two Cyruses in Xenophon, see e.g. Hirsch, pp. 72-75 (with notes on 172-175) and pp. 82, 85-88; cf. too Holden's introduction to his commentary on the Cyr., vol. I, pp. liii-liii. Breitenbach, RE 1712-1714, shows how in the Cyr. Xenophon uses names of contemporary Persians mentioned in the Anabasis.

21. Cf. Breitenbach, RE 1708. See M. Treu, "Pseudo-Xenophon: Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία" RE IX A 2, 1935-1947 for a brief but useful survey of πολιτεία literature.

22. E. Barker, Greek Political Theory[5] (London 1960), p. 115. Barker hastens to add that Xenophon lacks Plato's deep philosophical mind.

23. On Gellius' problematic statement concerning the "duo fere libri" of the Republic which were published separately, see the introduction by A. Diès to the Budé Rep. (Paris 1932), pp. xxxix-xliii.

24. Hirsch, pp. 97-100, is probably right in suggesting that Plato's favourable description of the relationship between Cyrus and his subjects at Laws 694 A-B was influenced by the Cyr.

25. For a brief survey of political conditions and attitudes in the time of Plato and Xenophon, see G.C. Field, Plato and his Contemporaries[3] (London 1967), pp. 77-90, 107-121 and G.R. Morrow, Plato's Epistles (Indianapolis 1962), pp. 123-137.

26. Hence modern scholars hold a variety of opinions on the political message of the Cyr. - see E. Scharr, Xenophons Staats- und Gesellschaftsideal und seine Zeit (Halle 1919; repr. Tübingen 1974), pp. 25-45 and 102-108 and P. Carlier, "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon", Ktema 3 (1978), pp. 133-163, esp. pp. 139-140, for a brief survey of scholarly views; see too below, Appendix I, pp. 389-401.

27. See Cyr. 8.8.8 vs. 1.2.16 (on exercise); 8.8.12 vs. 8.1.34-36 (on hunting); 8.8.13, 19 vs. 4.3.23 (on horsemanship); 8.8.9 vs. 1.2.11 (on number of daily meals); 8.8.10, 12 vs. 5.2.17 (on temperance) etc.; in the first three instances Xenophon mentions that these Persian customs are still upheld in his own day (ἔτι καὶ νῦν). For further discussion of the problems raised by the epilogue, see Holden in his commentary ad loc.; Hirsch, pp. 91-96 with notes on pp. 180-182; E. Delebecque, Essai sur la vie de Xénophon (Paris 1957), pp. 405-409.

28. W. Miller, in his Loeb edition of the Cyr., is so disconcerted by this ending that he recommends to his readers "to close the book... and read no further" (vol. II, p. 439).

29. For a survey of modern views on the epilogue, see Holden's introduction to the Cyr., vol. I, pp. xviii-xix and his commentary ad loc., vol. IV, pp. 196-197; see too M. Bizos' introduction to the Budé Cyr., p. xxvii. (I have not seen G. Eichler, De Cyrupaediae capite extremo [Diss. Leipzig 1880].)

30. Cf. Higgins, p. 158, n. 70, who sees a "clear necessity for a balancing falling action to complement the first chapter" of the Cyr.

31. The only unusual linguistic feature of the epilogue is the frequent use of the particle μήν; see Holden's commentary on Cyr. 8.8 (vol. IV, p. 197, n. 3). See too Gautier, p. 130, n. 1; J. Luccioni, Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon (?Paris 1947), pp. 247-248, n. 281.

32. One further argument used to establish the authenticity of the Cyr.'s last chapter is the parallel instance of the Lac.Pol. where we again find an epilogue (Chapter 14) which seems at odds with the rest of the work, for Xenophon criticizes contemporary Spartans after praising the Spartans of long ago; see Hirsch, p. 95, for a discussion of this point.

33. For this approach to the dating of the Cyr. see Carlier (above, n. 26), p. 137, n. 13; Scharr (above, n. 26), p. 40, n. 78 and E. Schwartz, Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman^2 (Berlin 1943), p. 70. On the probable date of Xenophon's recall from exile, see Breitenbach, RE 1576.

34. See e.g. R. Nickel, Xenophon (Erträge der Forschung, Band 111) (Darmstadt 1979), pp. 57-58 and J.K. Anderson, Xenophon (London 1974), p. 2.

35. E. Schwartz, RhM 44 (1889), pp. 191-192 (= Gesammelte Schriften, vol. II [Berlin 1956], pp. 171-172), thinks that the many cross-references and repetitions in Xenophon's writings indicate that Xenophon wrote most of the works during a relatively short period (in his old age); this view has found favour with several scholars - see Gautier, p. 132 and Higgins, p. 131.

36. See the comments of Gautier, pp. 131-132; Nickel (above, n. 34), p. 131; Breitenbach, RE 1901.

37. For a detailed, convincing demonstration of this point, see J.K. Anderson, Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970), pp. 165-191, 211, 217, 218. See too S.J. Pease, "Xenophon's Cyropaedia, 'the compleat general'", CJ 29 (1934), pp. 436-440, for an appreciation of the Cyr. as a military treatise.

38. Delebecque (above, n. 27), pp. 400-404, uses other military information in the Cyr. to arrive at an even later date for the work. He argues that the important military role assigned to the Egyptians in the Cyr. stems from the attention the Egyptians aroused in Agesilaus' final campaigns and concludes that the Cyr. was written after the winter of 361/60.

39. See Breitenbach, RE 1639-1644, for a detailed discussion of the date of the Anabasis.

40. G.L. Cawkwell, Introduction to: Xenophon: The Persian Expedition (Harmondsworth 1972), p. 26.

41. H.R. Breitenbach, "Xenophon von Athen", RE IX A 2 (Stuttgart 1966); reprinted separately. (I refer to the work as Breitenbach, RE.)

42. See above, n. 34.

43. See above, n. 34.

44. See above, n. 37.

45. W.E. Higgins, Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis (Albany 1977). (I refer to the work as Higgins.)

46. L. Strauss, On Tyranny: An Interpretation of Xenophon's Hiero (N.Y. 1948); Xenophon's Socratic Discourse (Ithaca, N.Y. 1970) - a running commentary on the Oec.; Xenophon's Socrates (Ithaca, N.Y. 1972) - a running commentary on the Mem.

47. O. Gigon, Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien (Basel 1953); Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien (Basel 1956). (I refer to the two volumes as Gigon I and II, respectively.)

48. See above, n. 27.

49. J. Luccioni, Xénophon et le Socratisme (Paris 1953); see above, n. 31 for the second work.

50. See above, n. 26. Scharr also reviews earlier scholarship on the Cyr. and refutes the once-popular allegorical interpretation (i.e. ancient Persians = contemporary Spartans) given to the work.

51. Holden in the preface to his 1887 commentary on the Cyr., laments that "the popularity of Xenophon has not prevented his greatest work from falling into neglect". K.J. Dover, writing nearly a century later, states that the Cyr. "is probably less read today by students of Greek than any other major text...", Ancient Greek Literature (Oxford 1980), p. 104.

52. Cawkwell (above, n. 40), p. 47.

53. A.B. Breerbaart, "From Victory to Peace: Some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's Cyrupaedia", Mnemosyne 36 (1983), p. 117.

54. See e.g. the recent Cambridge History of Classical Literature, vol. I: Greek Literature (Cambridge 1985), pp. 458-462, 478-480.

55. Cf. e.g. Barker (above, n. 22), pp. 114-115 and T.A. Sinclair, A History of Greek Political Thought^2 (London 1967), pp. 172-173.

56. J.J. Farber, "The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship", AJP 100 (1979), pp. 497-514.

57. See above, n. 26.

58. W. Weathers, "Xenophon's Political Idealism", CJ 49 (1953/54), pp. 317-321 and 330.

59. N. Wood, "Xenophon's Theory of Leadership", Classica et Mediaevalia 25 (1964), pp. 33-66.

60. See above, n. 53.

61. See e.g. R. Helm, Der antike Roman (Berlin 1948), pp. 9-12; T. Hägg, The Novel in Antiquity (Oxford 1983), p. 113.

62. See above, n. 33.

63. S.W. Hirsch, The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire (Hanover and London 1985). (I refer to the work as Hirsch.)

64. H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, Yauna en Persai: Grieken en Perzen in een ander perspectief (Diss. Leiden 1980); there is an English summary on pp. 266-271. One of the arguments she uses, on the resemblance between the Persepolis reliefs and Cyrus' triumphal procession after the capture of Babylon described in the Cyr. was anticipated by S.K. Eddy, The King is Dead (Lincoln, Nebraska 1961), pp. 53-55.

65. H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's Cyropaedia as a Source for Iranian History", Acta Iranica 25 (1985), pp. 459-471.

66. A. Christensen, Les gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique (Paris 1936); see too his "Sur la question des sources de la Cyropédie de Xénophon", Atti del XIX Congresso degli Orientalisti (Rome 1935), pp. 248-249.

67. W. Knauth (and S. Nadjmabadi), Das altiranische Fürstenideal von Xenophon bis Ferdousi (Wiesbaden 1975).

68. P. Briant, "Contrainte militaire, dépendance rurale et exploitation des territoires en Asie achéménide" and "Sources grecques et histoire achéménide" in Rois, Tributs et Paysans (Paris 1982).

69. M. Boyce, A History of Zoroastrianism, vol. II (Leiden 1982), pp. 211-216 is a recent example of the use of the Cyr. as a source by an Iranologist.

70. Xénophon, Cyropédie (Paris 1971-1978) - edd. M. Bizos (Tomes I-II) and E. Delebecque (Tome III).

71. H.A. Holden, The Cyropaedia of Xenophon, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1887-1890).

72. L. Dindorf, Xenophontis Institutio Cyri (Oxford 1857).

73. L. Breitenbach, Xenophons Kyropädie[4] (Leipzig 1890).

74. I.I. Hartmann, Analecta Xenophontea Nova (Leipzig 1889), esp. pp. 5-91.

75. L. Gautier, La langue de Xénophon (Geneva 1911). (I refer to the work as Gautier.)

76. H. Montgomery, Gedanke und Tat: Zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian (Lund 1965), pp. 133-143.

77. R. Hirzel, Der Dialog: Ein literaturhistorischer Versuch, vol. I (Leipzig 1895), pp. 140-174, esp. pp. 162-168. (I refer to the work as Hirzel.)

78. There has been a series of excellent literary studies of some of Xenophon's works by V.J. Gray, in recent years. Most notable are: "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 31 (1981), pp. 321-334; "Xenophon's 'Cynegeticus'", Hermes 113 (1985), pp. 156-172; and "Xenophon's Hiero and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature", CQ 36 (1986), pp. 115-123.

79. Besides oratio recta (a direct quotation, as it were, of the speaker's words) and oratio obliqua (again a quotation of the speaker's words, but in indirect form), Xenophon sometimes simply summarizes a character's response, e.g. ταῦτα συνέδοξε τῷ Κυαξάρῃ (3.3.25) or οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες συνήνουν ταῦτα ποιεῖν (4.4.8). This sort of summary should, perhaps, be distinguished from oratio obliqua; it is an even lower form of reported speech.

80. On the difficulties of defining and delimiting the various kinds of reported speech (in Thucydides) see O. Luschnat, "Thukydides", RE Suppl. XII (1970), 1152-1166.

81. This "definition" of a speech (again, a working one) has been influenced by the one given in R. Heni, Die Gespräche bei Herodot (Diss. Heidelberg, Heilbronn 1976), pp. 18-19. See too his remarks on the differences between speeches and conversations (in Herodotus).

82. Earlier I have distinguished between "narrated" and "dramatic" novellistic dialogues. Since the majority of novellistic dialogues are reported ones, contributing to the background, rather than the plot of the Cyr., the group as a whole will be considered, for convenience's sake, a "speech" one.

83. Of the nine conversations without Cyrus, 3 are private ones between husband and wife (3.1.41, 6.1.47, 6.4.2-11), 3 are instigated by Cyrus in one way or another (5.3.5-7, 8.3.7-8, 8.3.30-32) and in the remaining three (4.5.-9-12, 8.3.35-48, 8.4.31) he is a central topic.

84. See J. Andrieu, Le dialogue antique: structure et présentation (Paris 1954), pp. 283 ff., for a very good discussion of all the technical features related to the presentation of ancient dialogues. He also surveys the ancient testimony on the distinction between narrated and dramatic dialogues.

85. The papyri texts are conveniently assembled in A.H.R.E. Paap, The Xenophon Papyri (Leiden 1970).

86. I have noticed only three passages where editors differ as to who is speaking (ὥς γ' ἐμοῦ 1.6.11; ἀλλὰ μέντοι ἐπὶ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι 1.6.24; καὶ νῦν μέν, ἔφη, ἀπέλα 8.3.32; see below, p. 432, n. 73).

87. He never, as far as I have seen, uses any form of the verb ἠμί.

88. Pace Andrieu (above, n. 84), pp. 316 ff., who compares Xenophon's use of "insérendes" (especially in the Hiero) to that of Plato's and accuses him of "sécheresse" in comparison with the rich variety found in Plato.

Notes to Chapter II

1. See Gigon I, pp. 133 and 156 and II, pp. 13 and 25 for a discussion of this method.

2. Socrates was not necessarily the first to employ this technique and we find several instances of teaching by means of an analogy in Herodotus. Bias/Pittacus uses this kind of reasoning (ἐπίλογος) to guide Croesus (Hdt. 1.27), as does Cambyses' sister when reproving her brother (3.32); cf. too Aristodicus' testing of the oracle at Branchidae (1.159).

3. εἰπέ μοι is not, of course, used exclusively (either in the Mem. or in the Cyr.) for this purpose and often opens conversations of an entirely different sort (Mem. 2.3.11-13 begins λέγε δή μοι).

4. Several other dialogues - most notably Cyr. 5.1.2-18; 6.1.36-44; 7.2.9-29; 8.2.15-23 and 8.3.25-48 - have many Socratic elements, but they are discussed elsewhere, either as novellistic or sympotic dialogues (Cyr. 2.4.5-6 and 8.3.3-4, two brief didactic dialogues, are closer to anecdotes, while 3.1.38-39 will be discussed in this chapter (below, pp. 129-132) because of its obvious pertinence to Socrates himself.

5. See Breitenbach, RE 1780 for a list of such references and a discussion of their context and worth; cf. too G.C. Field, Plato and his Contemporaries[3] (London 1967), p. 140, n. 1.

6. Both Antiphon and Aristippus have two-round duels with Socrates (1.6.1-10, 11-14; 3.8.1-3, 4-7) and in both cases the presence of an audience is specifically mentioned only in the first round, but it seems very likely that followers were present at the second one as well.

7. O. Gigon, "Xenophontea", Eranos 44 (1946), pp. 133-140, was the first to identify and discuss this indirect technique of reproach in the Mem. He compares Plut. Mor. 70E-F and notes that Plato's Socrates does not make use of this method. See too Gigon I, p. 56 and cf. Xen. Symp. 4.23-28, where Socrates and his friends discuss Critoboulus, who is also present. Socrates addresses Critoboulus personally, before and after this interlude.

8. 2.1, 2.6 and 3.5 are the only dialogues in which Socrates' interlocutor makes a fairly long speech.

9. See Dover's remarks ad Pl. Symp. 199c3-201c9.

10. For a discussion of the "question and reply" form of conversation in Plato, see R. Schaerer, La question platonicienne[2] (Neuchâtel 1969), pp. 25-38 and H. Thesleff, Studies in the Styles of Plato (Helsinki 1967), pp. 35-41.

11. See e.g. De Iusto 374 A-E and cf. C.W. Müller, Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 17) (Munich 1975), pp. 323-325.

12. See in particular Aeschines Alcibiades, P.Oxy. 13.1608 fr.1 and compare Aspasia's interrogation of Xenophon and his wife in Aeschines' Aspasia (fr.31 Dittmar). Cf. too Demetrius, De Eloc. 296-7, for Aeschines' use of this Socratic technique (discussed on p. 51).

13. For a good, concise discussion of sophistic βραχυλογία and μακρολογία and the "Socratic" method of question and answer, see G.B. Kerferd, The Sophistic Movement (Cambridge 1981), pp. 32-34.

14. See Guthrie, HGP IV, pp. 67 ff. for a discussion of Plato's early Socratic dialogues and the arguments in favour of recognizing such a group.

15. Reading with the MSS. ὡς... τεκμαιρόμενοι . Several scholars have adopted Jacob's conjecture οἷς... τεκμαιρόμενοι, i.e. people think this about Socrates, judging on the basis of what others have written or said about him. The MSS. reading need not, however, be changed. See on this point - and the passage in general - Gigon I, pp. 118-122; H. Erbse, "Die Architektonik im Aufbau von Xens Mem.", Hermes 89 (1961), pp. 271-274 and S.R. Slings, A Commentary on the Platonic Clitophon (Amsterdam 1981), pp. 52, 54 n. 11, 89-102.

16. Slings (above, n. 15), p. 93, n. 5, convincingly argues that κολαστηρίου ἕνεκα should be translated "as a means of correction" rather than "chastisement".

17. So too the complaint that Socrates is good at refuting and exhorting but does not actually lead people to ἀρετή is found in the Platonic Clitophon 408D-E, 410B-E; cf. too Mem. 4.4.9.

18. Such positive exhortations are not, of course, spoken by Socrates in Plato's early dialogues; cf. nonetheless Pl. Apol. 29D-30B.

19. The distinction drawn here between προτρέπειν and προαγαγεῖν disappears later on in the Mem. where προτρέπειν seems equivalent to the προαγαγεῖν of our passage - see, in particular, 2.1.1; 3.3.15; 4.5.1; 4.7.9 and cf. 1.2.32. See too Slings (above, n. 15), p. 94, n. 8 and Erbse (above, n. 15), p. 271.

20. The classic discussion of ἔλεγχος in early Plato is R. Robinson, Plato's Earlier Dialectic^2 (Oxford 1953), pp. 7 ff. "The art of elenchus is to find premisses believed by the answerer and yet entailing the contrary of his thesis", p. 15. See now the rather different approach of G. Vlastos, "The Socratic Elenchus", Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 1 (1983), pp. 27-58.

21. Hence the harsh verdict of A.H. Chroust (Socrates, Man and Myth [London 1957], p. 6) that "invariably the method of argumentation introduced by the Xenophontean Socrates amounts to nothing other than a rather crude effort of asking leading questions merely for the sake of arriving in a round-about fashion at a cut and dried moral commonplace" is not true. Nonetheless it is true that Hippias' description of Socrates in the Mem. (4.4.9) τῶν ἄλλων καταγελᾷς ἐρωτῶν μὲν καὶ ἐλέγχων πάντας, αὐτὸς δ' οὐδενὶ θέλων ὑπέχειν λόγον οὐδὲ γνώμην ἀποφαίνεσθαι περὶ οὐδενός is not generally substantiated in the Mem. itself. See A.R. Lacey, "Our Knowledge of Socrates" in: The Philosophy of Socrates (ed. G. Vlastos, N.Y. 1971), pp. 38-40.

22. In the Mem. Charmides is the only one to suspect that something is happening for he asks ἆρ' οὖν πρός τί με ταῦτ' ἐρωτᾷς; (3.7.2). Generally, however, the further ramifications of Socrates' questions are more obvious to a reader of the Mem. than they would be to Socrates' actual respondent, since Xenophon

tells us at the outset why the interlocutor has been approached by Socrates, i.e. what Socrates wishes to correct.

23. All of Socrates' respondents pronounce judgement against themselves indirectly when discussing the original, hypothetical situation. Sometimes, however, they refuse to apply the analogous verdict to themselves; cf. 2.1.1-8 and 3.7.1-2 versus 2.2.1-3; 2.9.1-3; 2.10.1-5, and compare the Armenian king at Cyr. 3.1.13 (below, p. 118).

24. Note, however, 2.6.4 where Socrates and Critoboulos exchange their roles of questioner and respondent; cf. too Theodote's many questions in 3.11.

25. 4.6 is written, it seems, as an illustration of Socrates' statement at 4.5.12 ἔφη δὲ καὶ τὸ διαλέγεσθαι ὀνομασθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ συνιόντας κοινῇ βουλεύεσθαι διαλέγοντας κατὰ γένη τὰ πράγματα. Cf. too 4.6.15 ὁπότε δὲ αὐτός τι τῷ λόγῳ διεξίοι, διὰ τῶν μάλιστα ὁμολογουμένων ἐπορεύετο and Breitenbach, RE 1833-1834.

26. It is interesting to note in this context a passage in the Platonic Alc.I in which Socrates argues that when a statement is made in answer to a question, it is the respondent, not the questioner who is in fact making the statement (112 D - 113 B). There are, of course, certain such positive ἔλεγχοι in Plato as well, i.e. passages where Socrates' characteristically brief "yes or no" questions are employed to convey constructive teachings. The most famous example is Socrates' questioning of Meno's slave in Meno 84 D - 85 B. Socrates, of course, provides the solution to the problem with his questions and the slave simply answers in the affirmative throughout. Crito 46 B - 50 A (especially 47 A - 48 B; 49 B-C) is another instance of positive doctrine cast in the form of questions to which the answer is simply "yes". 49 E 4-5 is particularly noteworthy: Crito: ἀλλὰ λέγε. Socrates: λέγω δὴ αὖ τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο. μᾶλλον δ' ἐρωτῶ i.e. Socrates is going to continue his (positive) argument by means of questions, rather than a statement. See too Phaedo 73 A - 77 A (esp. 73 C - 75 C) and Euthydemus 278 E - 282 D, Socrates' protreptic addressed to Cleinias, in the form of brief questions and replies, in which "Cleinias contributes nothing more philosophically advanced than his consent" (except at 282 C; Hawtrey on Euthyd. 280 D 7). Such "positive" questioning in Plato is related to Socrates' maieutic approach and the theory of anamnesis. See Slings (above, n. 15), pp. 149-158; H. Thesleff (above, n. 10), p. 37, n. 3 and R.R. Wellman, "Socratic Method in Xenophon", JHI 37 (1976), pp. 307-318 (esp. pp. 307-308).

27. The statements of 3.9.9 and 3.14.7 are obiter dicta, while the paraphrases 4.1 and 4.7 are more a description (and justification) of Socrates' teaching methods than actual speeches.

28. Gigon I, 121 calls 1.7 "eine allgemeine Streitrede gegen die ἀλαζόνεια ". Xenophon himself twice uses the more negative ἀποτρέπειν (1.7.1 and 1.7.5), as opposed to one mention of the positive προτρέπειν (1.7.1) to characterize the content of 1.7.

29. Cf. too 1.4.10 and 4.4.18, 23 where Aristodemus and Hippias, respectively, are shown to be at least partially convinced in the course of an argument.

30. The remaining instances are 1.2.37 where it is fitting that Charicles, as one of the 30 who is tyrannically laying down a law, should have the final

word; 3.10.15, where Pistias teasingly sees through Socrates' didactic methods, and 3.10.5, a rather abrupt ending.

31. Of the remaining A dialogues that do not end with a lengthy address by Socrates, most show Socrates' opponent as defeated, if not persuaded (2.6; 3.8; 4.2 and 4.4; cf. 1.2.40-46), while in one conversation Socrates presumably is the loser (1.2.32-38). Only 3.5.1-28 is a bit puzzling and does not seem to fit the pattern.

32. As the frames at the beginning and end of some of these dialogues clearly show - cf. 1.4.1-2, 19; 2.1.1; 3.6.1.

33. See too the inconclusive endings of the Hiero and the Oec., discussed below. Gigon II, p. 83 (ad Mem. 2.1.34) suggests that the point of Socrates' speeches is to convince the wider circle of listeners, the συνόντες (and Xenophon's readers), if not the actual interlocutors.

34. Again, not only the Platonic Socrates; cf. e.g. Aristotle, Metaph. 1078b27-29 and Rose ad loc. For the use of analogic argument prior to Plato see G.E.R. Lloyd, Polarity and Analogy (Cambridge 1966), pp. 384 ff.

35. A closely related complaint directed against Socrates by his opponents is that he is always talking about the same things - see Mem. 4.4.5-6; Pl. Gorg. 490 E and Symp.221 E with Gigon I, p. 62.

36. I have found Robinson's discussion of analogy and epagoge in Plato (above, n. 20), pp. 33 ff. very useful and have adopted much of his terminology here.

37. 3.10.9-15 seems to be the only other instance of μαιευτική in the Mem., pace Wellman (above, n. 26), pp. 309-310. There it is Socrates who discovers that he knows more about a thing (i.e. armourmaking) than he realized.

38. Only once does an interlocutor of Socrates' (Aristippus 2.1.9) make use of an argument by analogy. Xenophon, as narrator, twice employs analogies in the Mem. (1.1.7-8 and 1.2.27).

39. Müller (above, n. 11) was the first to designate this class of Kurzdialoge on the basis of the short, pseudo-Platonic dialogues; he summarizes the main characteristics of the group on pp. 320-326. Slings (above, n. 15), pp. 24-41, further elaborates Müller's work, and making use of Gigon's analysis of the Mem. as well, again analyzes the chief features of the Short Dialogues. Slings argues (against Müller) that such dialogues were first written in the first half of the fourth century B.C. and were ascribed to Aristippus, Simon the Cobbler etc.

40. Cf. J. Andrieu, Le dialogue antique (Paris 1954), pp. 319-320, who thinks that Xenophon was not inventive enough to make better use of the Hiero's narrative framework and L. Strauss, On Tyranny: An Interpretation of Xen's Hiero (New York 1948), p. 11, who argues that Xenophon's noticeable absence is due to a desire to dissociate himself from a defense of tyranny.

41. The passage even contains one of the outstanding idioms of Socratic dialogues, πάνυ μὲν οὖν as "yes" or "certainly". While this expression is not restricted only to philosophical dialogue (see e.g. Aristoph. Pl. 97; Xen. Anab. 7.6.4;

Men. Dysc. 774) it seems to have been particularly favoured by the Socratic writers. See e.g. Aeschines, Alcibiades fr.8 (Dittmar); Xen. Mem. 1.3.9; 2.1.2; 4.6.10 etc.; Oec. 1.7; 17.8 and, in particular, Symp. 4.56-60, besides, of course, Plato passim. J.D. Denniston, The Greek Particles[2] (Oxford 1954), pp. 475 ff., seems to ignore these non-Platonic usages.

42. V.J. Gray, "Xenophon's Hiero and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature", CQ 36 (1986), pp. 115-123, sees the Hiero as a new literary form: a combination - or marriage - of a Socratic dialogue with a story belonging to the tradition of accounts of a meeting between a tyrant and a wise man. It is sometimes argued that the Hiero is unSocratic in its ideas and aims as well as its form; see G.J.D. Aalders, "Date and Intention of Xen.'s Hiero", Mnemosyne IV, 6 (1953), pp. 208-215; Strauss (above, n. 40), p. 59 and his Xenophon's Socratic Discourse: An Interpretation of the Oeconomicus (Ithaca 1970), pp. 208-209. J. Luccioni, Xénophon et le Socratisme (Paris 1953), pp. 158-161, mistakenly sees a great deal of Socratic influence on the Hiero because the work contains several Xenophontic (but not necessarily Socratic) topoi.

43. Cf. Mem. 1.4.2; 2.4.1; 4.4.5; 4.5.2 for similar short opening frames which mention the subject of the conversation (and, often too, the name of Socrates' interlocutor). Some commentators think that the Oec.'s abrupt opening indicates that the dialogue was originally (intended to be) a part of the Mem.; see Breitenbach, RE 1837-1838 and the references there.

44. Breitenbach, RE 1837, thinks that these "friends" are mentioned in order to support Xenophon's claim that he was present at the conversation (ἤκουσα 1.1).

45. At 10.1 there is a single, slight deviation from this method of reporting, where we find a superfluous ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης , i.e. a move from the inner narrative framework to the outer one.

46. See too the interesting discussion in G.J. de Vries, "Novellistic Traits in Socratic Literature", Mnemosyne IV, 16 (1963), pp. 35-42.

47. Socrates too uses a few analogies in the course of his conversation with Ischomachus - see 11.4-6; 12.3; 15.7-8; 15.9; 17.7; 17.9; 20.27-29. Several of the comparisons are playful and arouse Ischomachus' laughter (11.7; 17.10; 20.27-29).

48. The translation is that of Guthrie, HGP III (Cambridge 1969), p. 337, who is very good on Socratic elements in the Oec.

49. Traditionally Ischomachus (who was almost certainly a historical figure, see Breitenbach's discussion, RE 1848-1849) is seen simply as Xenophon's mouthpiece, a figure used to express the author's own ideas on estate management, tout court. Thus e.g. Breitenbach, loc.cit. "Dass X. ... sich schliesslich selbst hineinprojiziert, ist jedem Leser klar". While Ischomachus probably does put forward a great many of Xenophon's own ideas, it is perhaps overly simple to identify the two. Socrates, in any event, apears to have reservations about some of Ischomachus' attitudes - cf. 11.11; 20.26-29.

50. Fortunately, the Socratic problem need not concern us here. For two different views of anamnesis in the Oec. and its relation to Socrates' teachings, see Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 337-338 and Wellman (above, n. 26), p. 315.

51. Cf. Breitenbach, RE 1865-1871, for an excellent survey of parallels between the Oec. and later agricultural treatises, and a discussion of the possible sources.

52. It should be noted that the Oec. is the only Socratic dialogue by Xenophon which is narrated, if only in part, by Socrates; all the rest are narrated by Xenophon and none of the dialogues are presented in direct dramatic form. Plato's early Socratic dialogues, on the other hand, are either in direct dramatic form (Euthyphro, Crito, Hippias Maior, Ion - all with only one other participant besides Socrates - Hippias Minor and Laches) or narrated by Socrates (Lysis and Charmides), and are, of course, never narrated by Plato himself. Aeschines also seems to have preferred to have Socrates serve as narrator for his dialogues - he is the ἐγώ of the Alcibiades and Miltiades.

53. G.J. Woldinga, Xenophons Symposium, Prolegomena en Commentaar (Diss. Amsterdam 1938-1939), p. 74.

54. See for this point Higgins, p. 149, n. 97. His discussion of the Symp., pp. 15-20 (with notes on pp. 147-149), is an interesting one.

55. For an excellent analysis of the roles of Socrates and Antisthenes in the Symp. and the relationship between them, see K. von Fritz, "Antisthenes und Sokrates in Xenophons Symposion", RhM 84 (1935), pp. 19-45, esp. pp. 21-25, 27-31, 40-42.

56. There are no less than five papyri containing bits of the dialogue: P.Oxy. 697, P.Oxy. 698, P.Oxy. 1018, P.Oxy. 2101, P.Varsov. 1 (= Pack^2 1545-1549) out of the dozen or so papyri of the Cyr. now extant; see A.H.R.E. Paap, The Xenophon Papyri (Leiden 1970) for a convenient assembly of the papyri. This would seem to suggest that the dialogue was copied out separately at times, although three of the five papyri (P.Oxy. 2101; P.Oxy. 698; P.Varsov. 1) appear to be part of copies of the entire Cyr. Large chunks of our dialogue (1.6.3-6, 8, 10, 14, 17-19, 20-21, 23-28) also appear in Stobaeus IV.7.68-75 under the heading ὑποθῆκαι περὶ βασιλείας.

57. The most useful discussions of ὑποθῆκαι that I have found are those of P. Friedlander, Hermes 48 (1913), pp. 558-616 (esp. 602-603) and J. Bernays, "Philons Hypothetika", Gesammelte Abhandlungen I (Berlin 1885), pp. 265-266.

58. Other lost ὑποθῆκαι : (1) The fourth-century tragedian Chaeremon may also have had a passage in which Chiron propounded moral precepts in his Κένταυρος (cf. P. Hibeh 224 with Turner's commentary and Aristot. Poet. 1447 b 21); (2) The semi-mythical Musaeus wrote Ὑποθήκας Εὐμόλπῳ τῷ υἱῷ ἔπη according to Suda (DK 2A1); (3) Aristotle (Rhet. 1389b23) knows of τὴν Βίαντος ὑποθήκην (cf. DK I, p. 65 l.11 with note); (4) Clearchus (fr.75 Wehrli) quotes an anonymous verse in which Amphiaraus advises his son Amphilochus and this may have come from another ὑποθῆκαι with a mythological setting.

59. M.L. West, in a wide-ranging survey of ancient Near Eastern didactic literature (Hesiod, Works and Days [Oxford 1978], pp. 3-25), notes that the usual pattern in Sumerian, Akkadian, Egyptian etc. works of instruction is for a father to instruct a son or a sage - a king. Cambyses of the Cyr., a wise father advising a future king, combines both roles.

60. To Nicocles is generally dated soon after Nicocles' accession to the Cyprian throne in 374 B.C.; see e.g. E.S. Forster, Isocrates: Cyprian Orations (Oxford 1912), p. 21.

61. See in particular K. Gaiser, Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumwissenschaft, Heft 40) (Stuttgart 1959), pp. 61-64; cf. the reservations of E. de Strycker in his review of Gaiser, Gnomon 34 (1962), p. 17. On the dialogue form of the two sophistic works see Hirzel, pp. 59-63; cf. the more sceptical views of Gigon II, pp. 60-61 and H. Gomperz, Sophistik und Rhetorik (Berlin 1912), p. 74, n. 158 etc.

62. The question of the authenticity of the Hippias Maior does not really concern us here, for it is generally considered to have been written during Plato's lifetime; see P. Woodruff, Plato, Hippias Major (Oxford 1982), pp. 93-105 for the latest airing of the question.

63. See D. Tarrant's note ad.loc. on the meaning of προσχημα here; see too Gaiser (above, n. 61), pp. 12-13, n. 10.

64. Cf. Hirzel, p. 60.

65. It is true that in Near Eastern didactic literature, the dialogues of instruction are conversations in which a son rejects his father's advice and their discussion is a contentious one; cf. the Sumerian dialogue The Father and his Misguided Son and the Egyptian Educational Instruction of Ani, discussed by West (above, n. 59), pp. 5 and 10. The parallels that West adduces to the Nestor-Neoptolemus exchange are from much further afield, viz. ninth century Ireland and thirteenth century Norway; cf. p. 25, n. 2.

66. The word καταλογάδην used here may hint at a dialogue form. The usual translation of the word is "in prose" - see e.g. Dover's note on Pl. Symp. 177 b 3 and compare Hipp. Min. 368 D and Isoc. Ad Nic. 7. Nonetheless the word also means "by way of conversation" as in Pl. Lysis 204 D where ἃ μὲν καταλογάδην διηγεῖται (i.e. in conversation) is contrasted with τὰ ποιήματα... καὶ συγγράμματα, written works in verse or prose. Hence καταλογάδην could mean "in conversational or dialogue form"; cf. K. McTighe, AJP 104 (1983), pp. 67-68, who understands the καταλογάδην of the Lysis passage as "the spoken language of ordinary conversation".

67. Cf. Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 278-279, n. 2.

68. Scholars are divided as to whether traces of Prodicus' careful distinctions between near-synonymous words can be found in the Mem. version. See e.g. Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 278-279; Gomperz (above, n. 61), p. 101, n. 225a; Gigon II, p. 10.

69. If we understand ὑπολαβοῦσα as "interrupt" rather than simply "reply", this would be even stronger evidence for the conversational form of Prodicus' original composition.

70. See G. Widengren, "The Sacral Kingship of Iran" in: La regalità sacra (Numen Suppl. IV) (Leiden 1959), p. 251; cf. M. Boyce, A History of Zoroastrianism, vol. II (Leiden 1982), pp. 213-216.

71. For a comparison and analysis of the two passages, Mem. 1.1.6-9 and Cyr. 1.6.2-6 (and 44-46), see Gigon I, pp. 11-13.

72. See e.g. Ages. 5.1 ff., 9.3 ff.; Hipparch. 6.3; Hell. 6.1.16; Anab. 4.4.12; Oec. 9.11 etc. and see H.R. Breitenbach, Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons (Diss. Basel 1950), pp. 60-70 for an interesting survey of this τόπος in the Hellenica and elsewhere.

73. The last sentence of Cyr. 1.6.11 beginning ὡς γ' ἐμοῦ (an emendation by Dindorf; the MSS. read ὥστε μου or ὡς ἐμοῦ) is printed by many editors (e.g. Dindorf, Holden, Gemoll etc.) with a capital letter, as if the speakers have changed and it is now Cambyses who is speaking. These words are, however, better suited to Cyrus, who is promising to take his father's advice and tend to supplies at all times; according to the other reading, Cambyses is bragging, saying that he has never neglected the problem.

74. See in particular A. Delatte, Le troisième livre des souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon (Liège 1933), pp. 7-25; he gives a detailed survey of earlier scholarly opinion on pp. 9-16. See too E. Richter, "Xenophon-Studien", Jahrb. f. Klass. Phil. Suppl. 19 (1893), pp. 112-118; H. von Arnim, Xenophons Memorabilien und Apologie des Sokrates (Copenhagen 1923), pp. 186 ff.; Marchant's introduction to the Loeb Mem. (London-Cambridge, Mass. 1923), p. xv.

75. For a detailed comparison of Cyr. 1.6 and Mem. 3.1-7, see Richter (above, n. 74), pp. 114 ff.

76. pace Delatte (above, n. 74), pp. 17 ff.

77. See G. Cawkwell's note on Anab. 3.4.30 in the Penguin (Harmondsworth 1972) translation of the Anabasis (p. 166). For the institution of state physicians mentioned here by Cyrus, see Dodd's note on Pl. Gorg. 445b2 and G.E.R. Lloyd's introduction to Hippocratic Writings (Harmondsworth 1978), p. 15.

78. Cf. G.E.R. Lloyd, Magic, Reason and Experience (Cambridge 1979), p. 129, n. 15, p. 149, n. 124 and pp. 252-253 on the use of μαρτύριον as a technical term (medical and otherwise) for evidence. On the Hippocratic echoes of our passage, see Breitenbach (above, n. 72), p. 73 with n. 110.

79. See Breitenbach (above, n. 72), pp. 82-84 for references to contests and prizes organized by military leaders elsewhere in Xenophon; see too Breitenbach, RE 1724-1725, 1856-1857 for further comment on Xenophon's usual pronouncements on medicine and hygiene.

80. See also Cyr. 1.2.10. καρτερία is, of course, closely related to ἐγκράτεια- see above, p. 83 and cf. n. 72; see too Breitenbach, RE 1784-1785.

81. Cambyses associates here the practice of (forensic) oratory - which is how Persian youngsters learn justice (cf. Cyr. 1.2.6-7) - with the art of wrestling and this combination or comparison of the two is found elsewhere: see Pl. Gorg. 456 D-E; Gorgias fr.8 (if Diels' emendation πλύγμα is accepted; cf. Dissoi Logoi 3.11, where "a wrestler" is perhaps the answer to Cleobuline's riddle); Protagoras' Καταβάλλοντες, the alternate title of his Ἀλήθεια. Dionysodorus, the expert in στρατηγία mentioned above (pp. 87 f.) in relation to Cyrus' teacher of generalship, later turned to forensic oratory and eristic, together with his brother Euthydemus (Pl. Euthyd. 271 C - 272 A), and the two brothers best illustrate the link between physical contests and battles of words.

82. See T.M. Robinson's recent edition of the Δισσοὶ Λόγοι, Contrasting Arguments (Salem, New Hampshire 1979, repr. 1984). Robinson, along with most scholars, dates the work to the very beginning of the fourth century; see his discussion on pp. 34-41. This date is, however, by no means certain - see M.J. O'Brien, The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind (Chapel Hill 1967), pp. 75-76, n. 47.

83. Von Arnim (above, n. 74), pp. 188-189, thinks that Socrates is meant because of the very similar remarks he makes in Mem. 4.2.14-19, while W. Nestle, "Xenophon und die Sophistik", Philologus 94 (1940-41), pp. 35-42, argues that both our passage and the third chapter of the Dissoi Logoi are based upon a lost work of Gorgias, περὶ τοῦ δικαίου which was included in his Τέχνη; Nestle ignores the Mem. 4.2 parallel entirely. Many scholars approach the problem from the standpoint of the Dissoi Logoi and overlook the Cyr. passage altogether. See Robinson (above, n. 82), pp. 179-180 for further views on the source of Δ.Λ. Chapter 3 and see Gigon II, pp. 87-88, who brings further parallels to our passage and thinks that Protagoras may be the source.

84. See E. Tigerstedt, The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity, vol. I (Lund 1965), p. 178 and p. 459, n. 498; E. Rawson, The Spartan Tradition in European Thought (Oxford 1969), pp. 50-51.

85. On Socrates' relation to - and place within - the sophistic movement, see Kerferd (above, n. 13), pp. 55-57.

86. See E.S. Ramage, "An Early Trace of Socratic Dialogue", AJP 82 (1961), pp. 418-424, esp. p. 420, n. 7 and p. 424 with n. 24.

87. See the many references collected by H.W. Smyth, Greek Melic Poets (London 1900), p. 174, who says "love of new songs is as old as song itself".

88. For earlier echoes of the conflict between conservative and modern trends in music, see Aristoph. Clouds 971 (with Dover's note ad loc.) and the further passages noted by G.R. Morrow, Plato's Cretan City (Princeton 1960), p. 341 with n. 155; cf. pp. 314-315, 356.

89. See V.J. Gray, "Xenophon's 'Cynegeticus'", Hermes 113 (1985), pp. 156-172, for the latest discussion of the work's authenticity. She thinks that Xenophon is the author and calls the word a παραίνεσις or something very much like the prose ὑποθῆκαι discussed above (pp. 74 ff.). Compare Breitenbach, RE 1913-1921 and the further bibliographical references cited there; he argues that the work is not by Xenophon, partly on the basis of a comparison between the Cynegeticus and passages in the Cyr. on hunting.

90. Cf. Breitenbach, RE 1722, 1732-1737 for a more detailed commentary on this paragraph and a comparison of the Cyr. material with other writers on tactics.

91. This work by Aeneas Tacticus, who possibly is to be identified with Aeneas of Stymphalus mentioned by Xenophon at Hell. 7.3.1, is normally dated between 360 and 356 (or even more precisely between 357 and 356), according to internal references within the composition. See the remarks by W. Oldfather in the Loeb (London 1923) edition, pp. 5-7 and A.M. Bon in the Budé (Paris 1967) edition, VIII-IX.

92. Supplies and finance: 2.1.21, 2.4.9-14, 2.4.32; health and exercise: 2.1.29; military techniques: 2.1.21-24, 2.3.17-24; enthusiasm: 2.1.11-19, 25-28; obedience: 2.1.22, 2.2.10, 2.3.23-27, 30, 2.3.8; tactics: 2.3.6, 2.4.2-5; deception: 2.4.15-17; religion: 2.3.1, 2.4.18-19, 23-25.

93. This rather careless separation of one conversation from another is rare in the Cyr. Infrequent too is the use made here of oratio obliqua in the narrative framework (down to 1.3.17); see above, Chapter I, p. 35.

94. Xenophon's statement that Cyrus first turned the Persians into horsemen (Cyr. 1.3.3 and 4.3.4 ff.; cf. in contrast Hdt. 1.136.2) is now accepted by many scholars. See How & Wells ad Hdt. 1.136 and Cook, pp. 40-41.

95. The text of the Darius inscription can be found in R.G. Kent, Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon^2 (New Haven 1953), pp. 138-140; for the Xerxes inscription see B. Gharib, "A Newly Found Old Persian Inscription", Iranica Antiqua 8 (1968), pp. 54 ff.

96. See in addition lines 14-15 of the tomb inscription of Arbinas, a dynast of Xanthos of the early fourth century B.C. (SEG 28 [1978], no. 1245, B 11. 14-15): πάντα ἐμ πᾶσι πρέπων ὅσαπερ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες ἴ[σασιν] / τοξοσύνηι τε ἀρετῆι τε, ἵππων τε διώγματα εἰδ[ώς]. Cf. D. Asheri, Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo (Bologna 1983), pp. 102-103 for a discussion of this variation on "una formula iranica originale di chiara marca achemenide", with further references.

97. For βίαιον and ἄνομον used as synonyms see Xen. Mem. 1.2.44 (βία δέ... καὶ ἀνομία τί ἐστιν... ;); Pl. Leg. 856 C, and the other references cited by Breitenbach, RE 1786.

98. See e.g. the surveys in Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 88 ff., 111 ff., 137 ff., 173 ff. etc. and Kerferd (above, n. 13), pp. 115 ff.

99. Said in relation to Antiphon's paraphrase of the νόμιμον - δίκαιον equation (DK 87 B 44 lines 6-11: δικαιοσύνη οὖν τὰ τῆς πόλεως νόμιμα ἐν ᾗ ἂν πολιτεύηται τις, μὴ παραβαίνειν); cf. Kerferd (above, n. 13), pp. 115-116.

100. See in particular T.A. Sinclair's scathing remarks, A History of Greek Political Thought^2 (London 1967), pp. 90-91.

101. J.W. Jones, The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks (Oxford 1956), p. 11; emphasis mine. Sinclair's interpretation of the anecdote (above, n. 100), p. 170, n. 3, as a demonstration of the sacredness of property rights seems

far-fetched (as does his similar interpretation of the Pericles-Alcibiades discussion in Mem. 1.2.40-46).

102. See W. Scharr, Xenophons Staats- und Gesellschaftsideal und seine Zeit (Halle 1919), pp. 304-305 for a good discussion of this point.

103. τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν is generally translated here as "equality of rights", "l'égalité des droits" (cf. e.g. Miller (Loeb), Bizos (Budé), the editions of Jeffery, Gorham etc.) but the immediate context does not seem to justify such a broad interpretation of the phrase. ἴσον here should be understood as "fair, just" rather than "equal" and τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν is contrasted in 1.3.18 with τῶν... πάντων δεσπότην and τὸ πλέον ἔχειν. Cf. Cyr. 2.2.20; Pl. Gorg. 483 C, 508 A, and in particular Pl. Resp. 359 C and Arist. Nic.Eth. 1129 a 32 ff. for a similar contrast between ἴσον ἔχειν and πλεονεκτεῖν, i.e. claiming (more than) one's due. See too the comments of G. Vlastos, ΙΣΟΝΟΜΙΑ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ in: Platonic Studies^2 (Princeton 1981), pp. 184-185 with n. 78.

104. Nestle (above, n. 83), p. 32 sees the possible influence of Protagoras lurking behind the word μέτρον here, but for μέτρον as "guideline", "measure" in other contexts in Xen., see Lac.Pol. 2.1 and Anab. 3.2.21.

105. Cf. too Xen. Ages. 2.16 (quoted above, p. 109) and Anab. 1.9.3-4 - Cyrus the Younger, along with the children of Persian nobles, μανθάνουσιν ἄρχειν τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι, by observing the king's court. See Sinclair (above, n. 100), pp. 38-39, 42, 234-235 for a discussion of the ruling-ruled ideal (and the opposite aim of neither ruling nor being ruled - as in Hdt. 3.83 and Xen. Mem. 2.1.11).

106. For πλεονεξία as the distinguishing feature of a tyrant, as opposed to a king, cf. Arist. Pol. 1279 a 32 ff., 1313 a 1-3; cf. too Xen. Lac.Pol. 15.8.

107. S. Erasmus, "Der Gedanke der Entwicklung eines Menschen in Xens Kyr.", Festschrift... Zucker (Berlin 1954), pp. 114-115 thinks that the use of λαλεῖν in 1.4.1 indicates that Cyrus' words in 1.3.18 (and all of 1.3) were not taken seriously; hence Cyrus is allowed to criticize his tyrannical grandfather freely. The young Cyrus of 1.3 is, according to Zucker, a naive "Kulturkritik", but "a young critic, wise beyond his years" would seem a more appropriate description: λαλεῖν need not mean "chatter".

108. ὥσπερ εἰκός is regularly used in the Cyr. of behaviour that is natural, to be expected (e.g. 2.1.1; 2.1.2; 2.2.5; 2.3.20; 3.1.39; 5.4.5; 6.3.15; 8.7.1 etc.); so too Tigranes' tears are understandable. On the Greek attitude towards weeping see K.J. Dover, Greek Popular Morality (Oxford 1974), p. 167.

109. Holden's translation (in his commentary ad loc.) "when it was a convenient time" obscures the sense of Cyrus arranging things. W. Miller's Loeb version "when everything was in order" and Bizos' Budé translation "quand tout fut prêt" seem closer to the mark.

110. See R.J. Bonner and G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, I (Chicago 1930), p. 30 who give Hdt. 1.14 (Phrygians), 1.96-97 (Medes), 2.129 (Egyptians) among the sources. For the early Greeks see D.M. MacDowell, The Law in Classical Athens (London 1978), pp. 13-16, 23.

111. Cf. D.M. Lewis, Sparta and Persia (Leiden 1977), pp. 22-23 with n. 126, who distinguishes between the king's (seven) counsellors and the various numbers of βασιλήιοι δικασταί mentioned in Hdt. 3.14.5; 3.31.3; 5.25; 7.194.1; Plut. Art. 29.8-12; Aelian VH 1.34; D.S. 15.10-11.

112. See R.C. Zaehner, The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism (London 1961), pp. 36, 40, 60-61. (He dates Zoroaster at 628-551 B.C. - p. 33.) Cf. too Hirsch, pp. 18-19 with notes on pp. 156-157.

113. Behistun Inscription (DB) 1.10; 4.4.5, 6, 8, 13. See too How and Wells, ad Hdt. 1.136.2; Zaehner (above, n. 112), p. 156; R.N. Frye, The Heritage of Persia^2(London 1976), pp. 112-113.

114. Cf. Jones (above, n. 101), p. 136; Bonner and Smith (above, n. 110), p. 148; A.R.W. Harrison, The Law of Athens, II (Oxford 1971), p. 99.

115. See Gharib (above, n. 95), pp. 56, 64. The inscription is by Xerxes and closely echoes the inscription on Darius' tomb (DNb). See too Frye (above, n. 113), p. 113.

116. For this close association in Greek eyes between freedom and the right to dominate or use force against others, see J.A.O. Larsen, "Freedom and its Obstacles in Ancient Greece", CP 57 (1962), pp. 230-234. H.C. Avery, "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus", AJP 93 (1972), pp. 532-533, discusses this point in relation to the freedom of the Persians, i.e. their power to rule over others, in Herodotus.

117. This has been pointed out by several commentators - cf.e.g. Hirzel, p. 168 and J. Luccioni, Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon (Paris 1948), p. 227, n. 162.

118. See e.g. Hirzel, pp. 161, 167-168 and 172; Luccioni (above, n. 42), pp. 135-136 and 146; I.I. Hartmann, Analecta Xenophontea Nova (Leipzig 1889), p. 85.

119. If the Anabasis account is indeed such a sample. Clearchus was Xenophon's (direct or indirect) source for the trial (Anab. 1.6.5) and one wonders how accurate Clearchus' own account could have been. Were the proceedings translated to him bit by bit or did Cyrus simply summarize the case for him at the end? In any event, either Clearchus or Xenophon may have altered the details (or at least the form of the trial) considerably in the retelling.

120. See G. Nussbaum, The Ten Thousand: A Study in Social Organization and Action in Xen.'s Anabasis (Leiden 1967), pp. 24-25 on judicial practices in the army of the Anabasis.

121. There are, however, several instances of paired speeches in other contexts - cf. Hdt. 7.9-10; 8.140-142; 9.26-27 and see R. Heni, Die Gespräche bei Herodot (Diss. Heidelberg 1976), pp. 19-20.

122. For sophistic eristic vs. Socrates' method, see e.g. Guthrie, HGP IV, pp. 248 and 275; N. Gulley, The Philosophy of Socrates (London 1968), pp. 22-32; Kerferd (above, n. 13), pp. 32 ff.; Thesleff (above. n. 10), pp. 35-36 etc. Lloyd (above, n. 78), pp. 86, 252-254, does note the influence of the law courts on Socratic elenchus.

123. On the ἀνάκρισις in general, see Harrison (above, n. 114), pp. 94-99; Bonner and Smith (above, n. 110), pp. 289-293; E.M. Carawan, "Erotesis: Interrogation in the Courts of Fourth-Century Athens", GRBS 24 (1983), pp. 209-226, esp. pp. 211-212. Written pleas had to be handed in by the litigants as part of the initial proceedings only later on, in the second or third decade of the fourth century, possibly in 378/7 B.C. Cf. G.M. Calhoun, "Oral and Written Pleading in Athenian Courts", TAPA 50 (1919), pp. 177 ff. and Bonner and Smith, pp. 353 ff.

124. On the ἐρώτησις see Harrison (above, n. 114), pp. 138 and 162; Bonner and Smith (above, n. 110), II (Chicago 1938), pp. 8 and 122; K. Latte, Heiliges Recht (Tübingen 1920), p. 16 with n. 27. Carawan (above, n. 123) argues for the widespread use of erotesis in fourth-century courts. Aristotle in his Rhetoric (1418b39 ff.) includes advice on the conduct of an ἐρώτησις and this would seem to show "the importance attached to these interrogatories" (Bonner and Smith, II, p. 122). Cf. too the discussion of erotesis in the Rhetorica ad Alexandrum attributed to Anaximenes (1444b8 ff.; Spengel-Hammer, I, pp. 94-95).

125. Aristotle (Rhet. 1419a25 ff.; cf. above, n. 124) recommends that the respondent should include the cause or explanation of his conduct (τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπεῖν) in his replies in an ἐρώτησις and gives two examples of such self-justification.

126. On witnesses see Harrison (above, n. 114), pp. 136-144; Bonner and Smith (above, n. 110), I, pp. 353-362; II, pp. 123 ff.; MacDowell (above, n. 110), pp. 242 and 274, nn. 544-545. For the changeover from oral to written testimony see the references above in n. 123.

127. See, for this point. B.M.W. Knox, Oedipus at Thebes (New Haven 1957), pp. 19, 91 and 95 (with notes 180-182 on pp. 230-231).

128. When witnesses' testimony began to be introduced in written form at trials in the fourth century, the depositions were written by the litigant who had summoned the witness, and the witness was called upon either to confirm or reject the statement as a whole, under oath. In essence, the written affidavit can be seen as one lengthy leading question to which the witness is made to reply with a "yes" or "no".

129. I have found H. Keulen, Untersuchungen zu Platons "Euthydem" (Wiesbaden 1971), pp. 62-73, the most useful discussion of eristic. He considers Pl. Euthyd. the "Grundlage" for our knowledge of sophistic eristic and terms Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi an "Ergänzung und Korrektiv" (p. 62). See too Hawtrey's recent commentary on Pl. Euthyd. (Philadelphia 1981) and the references above, in n. 122.

130. So e.g. Hirzel, p. 161, calls him "ein Kopie des Sokrates". This identification goes back to a 1568 commentary on the Cyr. by Brodaeus; see K. Gaiser, "Griechisches und christliches Verzeihen: Xen. Kyr. 3.1.38-40 und Lukas 23, 34a", Wiener Studien, Beiheft 8 (1977), p. 85.

131. Reading ὡς ἀκρατεστέρας ποιοῦντας at 3.1.39 for the crux ἀμαθεστέρας in Marchant's OCT edition. The conjecture has been convincingly supported by H. Erbse, "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Xenophon", Rheinisches Museum 103 (1960), pp. 150-152, who compares Mem. 3.9.4 (where ἀκρατεῖς and ἀμαθεῖς

are confused in the MSS.) and Mem. 1.2.2 (where the phrase ἀφροδισίων ἀκρατεῖς... ἐποίησεν appears). Cf. too Hier. 3.3 for the same view of the real crime of an adulterer. Gaiser (above, n. 130), p. 79 defends the reading ἀμαθεστέρας as meant to allude to the activity of the sophist more than the adulterer.

132. So, in essence, E. Schwartz, Funf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman[2] (Berlin 1943), pp. 69-70, who says (of the sophist, Tigranes and the Armenian king): "Jeder erkennt Sokrates, Xenophon und das attische Volk auf den ersten Blick" and thinks the scene allows a rare glimpse into the soul "des jungen, des verbannten und des begnadigten Xen.".

133. So especially Gaiser (above, n. 130), pp. 88-92, who makes much of Xenophon's almost Christian attitude of forgiveness. See too Chroust (above, n. 21), p. 260, n. 479 and Luccioni (above, n. 42), p. 146, n. 2.

134. For the Socratic paradoxes in Plato, see e.g. the references collected by G. Calogero, JHS 77 (1957), p. 13, n. 11. Discussions of the Socratic paradox in Xenophon do not, as far as I have seen, take Cyr. 3.1.38 into account. For the contention that Xenophon did not understand Socratic doctrine see e.g. T. Irwin, Philosophical Review 83 (1974), p. 412.

135. These two views of virtue are discussed by Tigranes and Cyrus (3.1.17) with Tigranes expressing the "Socratic" view; see below, p. 135. For an attempt at reconciling the two see O'Brien (above, n. 82), p. 81: "A bridge... appears in his [i.e. the Xenophontean Socrates'] remark that self-control, strengthened by practice (Mem. 4.5.1) is a prerequisite of wisdom (Mem. 4.5.6; 4.5.11)". See too the discussion in Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 455-457.

136. See C.J. Classen, "Xenophons Darstellung der Sophistik und der Sophisten", Hermes 112 (1984), pp. 154-167, for an analysis of all the uses of the word σοφιστής (and its cognates) in Xenophon. He concludes, correctly, that the word is not a terminus technicus in Xenophon and bears a wide range of meanings.

137. For a convincing demonstration that the sophists did develop a method of argument by question and answer, see the discussion in Kerferd (above, n. 13), pp. 32-34. Cf. too C.H. Kahn, "Did Plato write Socratic Dialogues?" CQ 31 (1981), p. 317.

138. On the (unusual) form of the Melian Dialogue see H.L. Hudson-Williams, "Conventional Forms of Debate and the Melian Dialogue", AJP 71 (1950), pp. 156-169 and C.W. Macleod, "Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue", Historia 23 (1974), pp. 387-388. On justice and expediency in Thucydides see e.g. Macleod, p. 389 and Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 84-88.

139. G.A. Kennedy, "Focusing of Arguments in Greek Deliberative Oratory", TAPA 90 (1959), pp. 131-138, notes that in the fifth century, arguments used in deliberative speeches tended to focus on one single issue - e.g. expediency (but not justice), honour etc. - and this is Tigranes' approach here. In the fourth century, according to Kennedy, orators attempted to synthesize the various kinds of arguments - claiming, for instance, that a certain course of action was both just and expedient - and this is closer to Cyrus' method.

140. This definition of σωφροσύνη is adapted from H. North's discussion of our text, Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature (New York 1966), p. 131.

141. See the discussion in O'Brien (above, n. 82), pp. 144-146, n. 27.

142. For a survey of the use of παθεῖν with μαθεῖν see H. Dörrie, Leid und Erfahrung: Die Wort- und Sinn-Verbindung παθεῖν - μαθεῖν in griechischen Denken, Akad. Mainz Abh. d. Geist u. Soz. Klasse, 5 (1956). Dörrie (pp. 30-31) thinks that Xenophon is influenced here by the meaning Gorgias attached to the word πάθημα (cf. Hel. 9) and brings other examples from fourth century literature for πάθος as an unreasoning emotion of the soul.

143. The three means of suicide referred to here by Tigranes are the traditional ones (almost a "canon" of 3) which often appear together when suicide is mentioned. See Σ ad P. Ol. 1.97 and cf. E. Fraenkel, "Selbstmordwege", Philologus 87 (1932), pp. 470-473.

144. See too the references given by Holden, ad Cyr. 3.1.23 and 25. The passage in Dio Chrys., which is a close parallel to our text and may have been influenced by it, mentions οἱ... ἐν νηὶ χειμαζόμενοι so perhaps editors are not justified in deleting οἱ πλέοντες μὴ ναυαγήσωσι in 3.1.24.

145. The importance of ruling over willing subjects is a theme found frequently in Xenophon; see e.g. Scharr (above, n. 102), pp. 200 ff.

146. Cf. Breitenbach, RE 1712-1713.

147. The poetic word ἄχος perhaps stresses the force of Cyaxares' grief - cf. Gautier, p. 101, who thinks that the phrase here is a direct echo of Il. 14.475 ... Τρῶας δ' ἄχος ἔλλαβε θυμόν.

148. See the very good remarks of V.J. Gray, "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 31 (1981), p. 326 on the function of the narrative prelude in Hell. 4.1.30.

149. Cf. J. Bremmer, "The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium", ZPE 50 (1983), pp. 173-186, on the significant role of maternal uncles in Greek literature; Cyaxares fits the pattern well.

150. It is interesting to compare Cyrus' reception of Cyaxares' delegate in the Cyr. (4.5.18 ff.) to the way he receives Astyages' messengers, according to Nicolaus of Damascus (FGrH 90 F 66.26-27). In the Cyr., Cyrus greets the messenger kindly and urges his ally, the Hyrcanian leader to do his utmost to entertain the Mede and convince him to stay. In Nicolaus' account, Cyrus and his chief adviser, Oebares, welcome the Mede delegates warmly, inviting them to dinner and plying them with drink, in order to detain them. Similarly, the angry exchange of messages between Cyaxares and Cyrus before their meeting (Cyr. 4.5.9-11, 18, 27-33) has a parallel in the harsh words exchanged between Astyages and Cyrus before they do battle, according to Nicolaus (90 F 66.33). In the Cyr. once Cyrus has his way he is kindly and conciliatory towards Cyaxares, just as in other accounts Cyrus behaves benevolently towards Astyages after he defeats him (Hdt. 1.130; Ctesias, FGrH 688 F 9).

151. See Hirsch, pp. 81-82 with notes 63-67 on pp. 176-177 for further discussion of the "coup" Cyrus stages against Cyaxares in the Cyr.

152. For other references to Socrates' joint investigation with his companions see also Mem. 4.6.1; 4.7.8 (and Pl. Crito 48D; Prot. 330B; Charm. 158D etc.).

153. Note the very similar use of κατὰ ἓν ἕκαστον in Cyrus' point-by-point interrogation of the Armenian king at his trial (3.1.12); cf. too Cyr. 1.6.22; 6.4.5; Hiero 11.1; Oec. 19.14. In the Melian Dialogue (Thuc. 5.85) the Athenians suggest to the Melians that their negotiations proceed in dialogue form κατὰ ἕκαστον... ὑπολαμβάνοντες rather than in an exchange of continuous speeches (συνεχεῖ ῥήσει... ἑνὶ λόγῳ).

154. 4.1.13-18 is the only other instance of Cyaxares using well-reasoned arguments to explain his point of view (on the need for moderation in victory), and there too he makes use of analogies to back up his claims. See below, pp. 382-384.

155. When justifying his conduct to Cyrus, the Armenian king compares his situation to that of a husband whose wife becomes attached to another, and Cyaxares repeats this analogy in our dialogue; see too Hiero 3.3-4.

156. Breitenbach, in an otherwise excellent discussion of our dialogue (RE 1727-1728), suggests that Xenophon is expressing here the impatience felt by an experienced military man for useless speeches. It should be remembered, however, that Xenophon allows himself many lengthy exhortations in the Anabasis - cf. Anab. 3.1.15-25, 35-44; 3.2.7-32; 5.4.19-21; 6.3.11-18; 6.5.23-24.

157. There are very few such military harangues in Herodotus - see Hdt. 6.11; 7.53; 9.17 and cf. 6.109; 8.78, 83 - and no pairs of exhortations by opposing leaders. In the Hellenica too there are relatively few exhortations - see Hell. 2.4.13-17; 5.1.14-17; 7.1.30 and cf. 1.6.9-11; 7.2.20 - and again, no instance of paired hortatory speeches; cf. E. Vorrenhagen, De orationibus quae sunt in Xenophontis Hellenicis (Diss. Elberfeld 1926), pp. 120, 129-131. On military exhortations in classical literature see J. Albertus, Die παρακλητικοί in der griechischen und römischen Literatur (Diss. Strassburg 1908), esp. pp. 24-29.

158. Plato's Socrates does not believe in returning injury for injury - see e.g. Crito 49 B-C and cf. Scharr (above, n. 102), pp. 217-218 and Burnet's note on Crito 49 b 10.

159. Cf. Dover (above, n. 108), pp. 181-184, 313-316; P. Ducrey, "Aspects juridiques de la victoire et du traitement des vaincus" in: Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne (ed. J.-P. Vernant) (Paris 1968), pp. 231-243, esp. p. 232.

160. For more references to this words vs. deeds commonplace in a military context, see K.J. Latham, "Hysteria in History: Some Topoi in War Debates of Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides", Museum Philologum Londiniense 5 (1981), pp. 64-65, n. 21.

161. Cf. Σad Thuc. 5.69.2 μετὰ τῶν πολεμικῶν νόμων and J.K. Anderson, Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970), pp. 81-82.

Notes to Chapter III

1. Three additional dialogues in the Cyr. take place over dinner: the exchange between Cyrus, Tigranes and the Armenian king on the fate of "Socrates" (3.1.38-40) and the two brief conversations between Cyrus and his soldiers at mess (2.3.19-20; 2.3.22-24). These are not considered symposia and are discussed elsewhere (above, pp. 129-132 and below, p. 364).

2. Compare the seating of allies according to their rank at Xerxes' pre-Salamis conference (Hdt. 8.67).

3. This division seems most useful even though some of the themes outlined here overlap. Thus the second and third features are closely related, for at times the guests compete in producing edifying maxims. So too the discussion of poverty and wealth is really one specific didactic topic.

4. Cyr. 1.3.4-12; 2.2.1-2.3.1 and 8.4.1-27 are the most symposium-like, as will be seen below. Cyr. 5.2.5-22 is, in places, more a summary or description of a symposium than an actual depiction of one, while the tête-à-tête in 8.3.35-50 verges on a Socratic dialogue.

5. Although it seems unlikely that Xenophon actually gave the title Συμπόσιον to his work (pace Breitenbach, RE 1871), he repeatedly calls the gathering a symposium (Xen. Symp. 6.5; 7.3, 5; 9.7).

6. This true-to-life quality of Xenophon's Symp. is present in spite of (and not because of) the author's chronologically untenable claim to have been present at the party he describes (παραγενόμενος... γιγνώσκω Symp. 1.1). The dramatic date of the Symp. is 422 B.C. and Xenophon would have been a child then - cf. already Athen. 5.216 D and e.g. Breitenbach, RE 1374-1375).

7. See A. Körte, "Aufbau und Ziel von Xenophons Symposion", Verh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss., Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl. 79 (1927), pp. 7 ff. for a very good analysis of the artistic way Xenophon uses these entertainments to break up one topic of conversation and introduce another, in very natural fashion.

8. See K. von Fritz, "Antisthenes und Sokrates in Xenophons Symposion", RhM 84 (1935), pp. 19-45, esp. pp. 24 ff. for an illuminating discussion of the role of παιδία in Xenophon's Symp.

9. To quote W.K.C. Guthrie, HGP III, pp. 24-25, n. 2.

10. See e.g. H. Thesleff, "The Interrelation and Date of the Symposia of Plato and Xenophon", BICS 25 (1978), pp. 157-170 for a recent airing of the question, and Breitenbach, RE 1372 for further references.

11. The Cyr. as we have argued above (pp. 13-17) was probably written after 371, while Plato's Symp. is plausibly dated to 384-379 by K.J. Dover, Phronesis 10 (1965), pp. 2-10, or more generally to several years before Plato's second visit to Sicily in 367 - cf. Guthrie, HGP IV, p. 53.

12. For a discussion of play and earnest in Plato, see Guthrie, HGP IV, pp. 56-65.

13. Agathon is, of course, following in the footsteps of his teacher Gorgias, who terms his encomium of Helen Ἑλένης μὲν ἐγκώμιον, ἐμὸν δὲ παίγνιον (Hel. 21).

14. See on this point R. Flacelière, "À propos du Banquet de Xénophon", REG 74 (1961), pp. 93-118, esp. pp. 99-100, who perhaps exaggerates the strength of Xenophon's (and Antisthenes' and Aeschines') feminist convictions.

15. See Athenaeus 186 E - 193 C (including 177A - 182 C) for an entertaining, if not always illuminating, analysis of Homeric symposia.

16. Our interest here is in poems which are meant to introduce and instruct convivial celebrations rather than pure "nunc est bibendum" songs. Unless otherwise noted the numbering of the poems is according to M.L. West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci (Oxford 1971).

17. See C.M. Bowra, Problems in Greek Poetry (Oxford 1953), pp. 1-14 for a good discussion of the hortatory character of Xenophanes' poem, and sympotic elegy in general.

18. Other party practices which were competitive to a certain extent such as propounding riddles, drawing comical comparisons, and singing songs in turn, will be discussed below (p. 180).

19. *ἐν μὲν συσσίτοισιν ἀνὴρ πεπνυμένος εἶναι,*
πάντα δέ μιν λήθειν ὡς ἀπεόντα δοκοῖ,
εἰς δὲ φέροι τὰ γελοῖα· θύρηφι δὲ καρτερὸς εἴη,
γυνώσκων ὀργὴν ἥντιν' ἕκαστος ἔχει. (Theognis 309-312). See West's commentary ad. loc.

20. The later elegy Adesp. Eleg. 27 (= P. Berol. 13270), which is generally dated to the end of the fourth century B.C., is worth noting in this context because it mentions combining laughter and seriousness, and tells us of speaking ἐν μέρει, and is generally didactic in tone; cf. F. Ullrich, Entstehung und Entwickelung der Literaturgattung des Symposion, I (Würzburg 1908), pp. 17-18.

21. I have found the survey in Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 23-27 most useful. See too Körte (above, n. 7), pp. 44-48 and J. Martin, Symposion: Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 17.1 & 2) (Paderborn 1931), pp. 126-127, 138-139.

22. See e.g. Ullrich (above, n. 20), p. 28; Hirzel, p. 156.

23. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that Ion was considered φιλοπότην... καὶ ἐρωτικώτατον (Athen. 436 F = FGrH 392 T 8).

24. Or to be more accurate, two abbreviated versions of Ion's narrative - cf. F. Jacoby, "Some Remarks on Ion of Chios", CQ 41 (1947),Appendix III, p. 16.

25. See the previous note and Jacoby's commentary on the Sophocles passage (= FGrH 392 F 6) and n. 18 to his introduction there on Ion (FGrH III b T, p. 197; IIIb N, pp. 126-127). Jacoby thinks that Ion's original version of

both dinner parties included a detailed guest list at the beginning of the narrative, and a description of the setting. Two other fragments of the Ἐπιδημίαι (392 F 4 and 5) mention dinner-party delicacies (and see too F 19 on wine cups), so that there may have been a description of the menu as well.

26. See A. Griffin, Sikyon (Oxford 1982), pp. 55-56; A.R. Burn, The Lyric Age of Greece (London 1960), pp. 205-206; Ph.-E. Legrand's notes ad loc. in the Budé (Paris 1963) edition. R. Macan in his commentary ad loc., Vol. II (London 1895), Appendix XIV, pp. 304-311, brings an interesting Indian parallel to Hippocleides' behaviour, a tale of a dancing peacock.

27. See the discussion in the introduction to Bury's edition of Pl. Symp., pp. xvii-xix. Bury suggests that what is really meant here is a lost work by Polycrates.

28. The scholar is Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 301-308, who points out that Aeschines' dialogue (like Xen. Symp.) deals with the theme of love as a means to attain political ἀρετή. See too Hirzel, p. 359, n. 1 and Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 48-49, n. 1.

29. See K. Joël, Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates II.2 (Berlin 1901), pp. 708-949, whose misguided attempts to see Antisthenes' influence everywhere lead to some interesting byways; cf. Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 28-30, n. 5, for a brief refutation of this view. See too G.J. Boldinga, Xenophons Symposium, Prolegomena en Commentaar (Diss. Amsterdam 1938-39), p. 7 with notes.

30. Cf. Pl. Prot. 343 A; Ephorus, FGrH 70 F 181-182 and the references in Joël (above, n. 29), pp. 763-765. See too Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 269-270, 292; Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 28-30, n. 5; Barkowski, "Sieben Weise", RE II A.2,2252-2254; K. Ziegler, Plutarchos von Chaironeia (Stuttgart 1964), pp. 247-248. B. Snell, "Zur Geschichte vom Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen", Gesammelte Schriften (Göttingen 1966), pp. 115-118, argues on the basis of the opening lines of PSI 9.1093 (= Pack^2, No. 2292) that a tale of a meeting of the seven wise men already existed in the fifth century B.C.

31. See Hirzel, p. 359, n. 1 and the objection by Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 48-49, n. 1.

32. The tale of Alcibiades' drunken intrusion into a party at Anytus' house (Plut. Alcib. 4.5; Athen. 534 E-F) should perhaps also be included here. Cf. Martin (above, n. 21), p. 198, n. 1 and Joël (above, n. 29), pp. 725-726.

33. See Xen. Symp. 3.3-4.64, where Callias' promise ἐπιδείξειν τὴν αὐτοῦ σοφίαν becomes the occasion for everyone to speak εἰς μέσον (3.3). The round of speeches is termed by Xenophon ἡ περίοδος τῶν λόγων (4.64). In Plato's Symp. the series of encomia on ἔρως are spoken from left to right ἐπὶ δεξιά (177 D), in turn ἐν τῷ μέρει (198 C), except for the hiccuping Aristophanes (185 D); cf. too 214 B-C. Alcibiades is meant to initiate another round of speeches in which each man praises the guest on his right (214 C; cf. 222E), but his is the only speech made. There are two such series of speeches in the Cyr. (5.1.19-29; 6.1.6-18) but these are councils concerning future plans, in which each man expresses his opinion.

34. σκόλια and capping verses: Eupolis fr. 361; Aristoph. Wasps 1219 ff.; Dionysius Chalcus 1.1-5. Dance: Anab. 6.1.5 ff. Toasts: Critias 6.6-7. Riddles: Athen. 457 C ff. See too Theognis 493 and Hdt. 6.126 along with Adesp. Eleg. 27.7-8 (West), for the expressions εἰς τὸ μέσον and ἐν μέρει respectively. Cf. Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 127-139, esp. pp. 136ff.; Hug-Schöne's introduction to their edition of Pl. Symp. (Berlin 1909, 3rd ed.), VI-VII, and Woldinga (above, n. 29), pp. 147-149 for more general discussions of ἀγών.

35. Cf. e.g. Epicharmus frr. 34, 35, 37; Ullrich (above, n. 20), p. 25, together with Bury's note ad Pl. Symp. 174 B and Woldinga (above, n. 29), pp. 50-51; Körte (above, n. 7), pp. 44-46.

36. Cf. Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 64 ff.

37. See too Hug-Schöne (above, n. 34), V-VI; Woldinga (above, n. 29), pp. 57-58, 259, 263-265 and Dover's introduction to Pl. Symp., p. 11. For the harmful effects of wine see also Mem. 1.3.5-8, where Socrates is said to have discouraged others from excessive drinking at symposia.

38. To quote F. Lasserre, Ἐρωτικοὶ Λόγοι , MH 1 (1944), p. 177. Lasserre argues that this genre originated at the end of the fifth century and collects all the evidence for early ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι (pp. 169 ff.). Cf. too Hug-Schöne (above, n. 34), X-XV.

39. Gigon, II, p. 153. Cf. also Breitenbach, RE 1810 ff. and Joël (above, n. 29), p. 710. Von Fritz (above, n. 8), pp. 31-39, also discusses all three passages; he thinks Xenophon was strongly influenced by Aeschines' Aspasia.

40. See Breitenbach, RE 1820-1821; Joël (above, n. 29), pp. 716 ff. (who argues that the conversation is taken from a protreptic symposium by Antisthenes).

41. See Thuc. 2.97.4 on the Thracian custom of soliciting rather than presenting gifts. (The guests at the other Anab. party had also arrived bearing gifts (Anab. 6.1.2), probably as a gesture of good will.) Seuthes does, however, distribute food at the party, to those who have won his favour.

42. I have found the surveys in A.T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire (Chicago 1948), pp. 179-183 and Cook, pp. 139-142 (with notes on 250-251) particularly useful.

43. Heraclides of Cyme (FGrH 689 F 2) is our main source for this practice, along with some recently discovered Persepolis tablets. See S. Hornblower, Hausolus (Oxford 1982), pp. 147, 151, 155-156 with notes and Cook, pp. 139-140.

44. See for this point R. Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala 1948), p. 37, n. 1.

45. Or to be more exact, the summary of Ctesias' work found in Nicolaus of Damascus (FGrH 90 F 66); see Chapter IV , n. 9.

46. Again, cf. Höistad (above, n. 44), pp. 82-84.

47. Cf. Joël (above, n. 29), pp. 462-463 for this point.

48. See Cook, pp. 143-144 (with notes on 251-252) and M.L. Chaumont, Iranica Antiqua 10 (1973), pp. 139-141 for the history and meaning of the terms.

49. For cupbearers as eunuchs, cf. Artembares, Cyrus' patron according to Ctesias (FGrH 90 F 66.5-7) and the variant reading εὐνοῦχος for οἰνοχόος in Nehemiah 1:11. In Hdt. 3.34 Prexaspas is Cambyses' audience-master, while his son serves as the king's cupbearer.

50. Later commentators on the "Hermogenes" passage then go on to explain this definition and enumerate the various σπουδαῖα and γέλοια πρόσωπα and πράγματα in Xen. Symp. See Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 1-32, esp. p. 4, n. 1; p. 5, n. 3; p. 7, n. 1, for a useful collection of ancient critics' pronouncements on literary symposia.

51. See Hirzel, p. 359; Ullrich (above, n. 20), pp. 8, 22-23, 47-48 and Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 1-5. The question of an actual genre of Socratic symposia (with or without Socrates as one of the symposiasts) need not concern us here.

52. See Trenkner, pp. 10, 153 for an analysis of these two anecdotes.

53. It is difficult to determine what Xenophon's attitude towards Hermogenes is in the Symp. His views on the gods seem close to Xenophon's own (Symp. 4.46-50); nonetheless Socrates treats him rather ironically (cf. 6.1-5; 8.3).

54. It is interesting to note that both Chrysantas and Hystaspas, Cyrus' two most intimate Persian friends, make their first appearance in the Cyr. in this dialogue and both are introduced simply by name. A fuller description of each of them is given only later (Chrysantas - 2.3.5; Hystaspas - 4.2.46).

55. See J. Hoschander, The Book of Esther in the Light of History (Philadelphia 1923), pp. 181-182,218-219. These Persian deliberations over wine are attested down to Sasanian times; cf. S. Shaked, "Two Judeo-Iranian Contributions: Iranian Functions in the Book of Esther", in: Irano-Judaica (ed. S. Shaked, Jerusalem 1982), pp. 292-303, esp. p. 294.

56. See Dodds on Pl. Gorg. 508 a 6 for the Pythagorean origins of the expression "geometric equality" and cf. Arist. Pol. 1301 b 29 ff. for an explanation of the mathematical terminology.

57. For the "two equalities" see the discussions in W. Scharr, Xenophons Staats- und Gesellschaftsideal und seine Zeit (Halle 1919), pp. 221-229; Guthrie, HGP III, p. 151; G. Vlastos, ΙΣΟΝΟΜΙΑ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ in: Platonic Studies^2 (Princeton 1981), p. 188, n. 89 and pp. 195-196 with notes.

58. Scharr (above, n. 57), pp. 294-296 contrasts Pericles' law of 451/50 (re-enacted in 404/3), which restricted Athenian citizenship to children of two free Athenian parents, and points out that Xenophon had "einen weiteren historischen Horizont" (p. 296).

59. See B. Ehlers, Eine vorplatonische Deutung des sokratischen Eros (Zetemata, Heft 41) (Munich 1966), pp. 88 ff., 104 ff.

60. If, as is generally thought, darics are named after Darius, Xenophon's mention of them here is an anachronism. Some scholars try to derive the word from other etymologies; cf. Cook, p. 70 and R.N. Frye, The Heritage of Persia^2 (London 1976), p. 123.

61. This is more surprising in the case of Cyaxares' daughter, for Cyrus does, after all, marry her. There is a hint that they enjoyed a close relationship during Cyrus' childhood visit to Media (Cyr. 8.5.19) but this is only a retroactive reference, for we first hear of her only minutes before her betrothal to Cyrus (8.5.18-20, cf. 28).

62. See Gigon's commentary on both Mem. passages - I, p. 166 and II, p. 158.

63. It is said that Aeschylus' original audience thought the line referred to Aristides the Just and all turned to look at him (Plut. Arist. 3). In Plato's Republic (360 D - 362 C) Glaucon demonstrates how great a gap there can be between a man's character and his reputation; cf. Pl. Gorg. 527 B.

64. As is to be expected, Joël (above, n. 29), pp. 485-487 thinks that many of these passages are influenced by a "ponoslobschrift" by Antisthenes; see the additional references collected by him there.

65. The affinities between Pl. Prot. 347 C-E and Xen. Symp. 3.2 are apparent (while Pl. Symp. 176 E is less closely related) and have led some scholars to postulate Xenophon's dependence on Plato here. Others think that the two passages indicate that such reflections on the proper pastimes at symposia were commonplace; this second view seems more likely. See e.g. Woldinga (above, n. 29), pp. 58-60; H. Dittmar, Aeschines von Sphettos (Philologische Untersuchungen 21) (Berlin 1912), pp. 210-212.

66. ὑπέπινον in Cyr. 8.4.9 should be understood as drinking after meals, at dessert (cf. LSJ s.v.) and not as drinking to excess. Hystaspas, Cyrus' friend and close cohort throughout the Cyr., does not need to become intoxicated in order to summon up his courage and address Cyrus- pace L. Breitenbach (in his commentary ad loc.) and Sturz (Lexicon Xenophonteum s.v. ὑποπίνειν) - even if he does ask permission to speak his mind freely.

67. Another possible, but less plausible explanation of the lack of entertainments at the banquets of the Cyr. is that Cyrus and his men are too busy with their conquests and empire-building to indulge in making music, just as Themistocles was (cf. Plut. Them. 2.3; Cim. 9.1).

68. In Sparta the hoplites' servants (i.e. the Helots) appear to receive half the rations their masters do (cf. Thuc. 4.16), while Athenian hoplites and their attendants receive equal shares (Thuc. 3.17). So too different types of soldiers could receive different size rations (cf. Thuc. 5.47.6 and D. 4.28). See J.K. Anderson, Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley 1970), pp. 46-52 with notes and W.K. Pritchett, The Greek State at War, Part I (Berkeley 1971), pp. 3 ff., especially the charts on pp. 16 and 51.

69. Rhantines, the winner of the Cadusian competition, is mentioned only here (8.3.33), but it seems likely that he is, in fact, the anonymous new leader chosen by the Cadusians after their military fiasco (5.4.15-23).

70. In R.G. Kent, Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon^2 (New Haven 1953), pp. 142-144, 146.

71. See M. Schwartz in: Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. II (Median and Achaemenian Periods) (Cambridge 1985), pp. 659-660, who refers to Yashts 5.50, 86, 98 and 19.777 in this context.

72. On these Indo-European traditions see H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, Yauna en Persai (Diss. Leiden 1980), pp. 200-203 with notes; G. Widengren, "The Sacral Kingship of Iran", in: La regalità sacra (Numen Suppl. IV) (Leiden 1959), pp. 244, 251-252. On Darius' rise to power, see Cook, pp. 54-55 and p. 238, n. 20 and the various interpretations he quotes there. For a more general survey of horsemanship in Iranian tradition see W. Knauth (and S. Nadjmabadi), Das altiranische Fürstenideal von Xenophon bis Ferdausi (Wiesbaden 1975), pp. 97-104.

73. For a good discussion of the role of gift exchanges in Homer (and in primitive societies in general) see M.I. Finley, The World of Odysseus (London 1956), pp. 73-76.

74. On the relationship between the ὁμότιμοι and δημόται in the Cyr. see further Scharr (above, n. 57), pp. 291-294.

75. ... τἆλλα δ'ἄν τις καταβάλῃ
ἀπέδωκεν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως, οὐ πλέον
ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ μέτρον... Γεωργός 37-39.

76. Pace W. Nestle, "Xenophon und die Sophistik", Philologus 94 (1940-41), pp. 44-45 who thinks that Pheraulas prefers the modest and contented lot of a farmer and speaks in praise of agriculture. Nestle contends that Pheraulas' views here stem from the "Gedankenwelt" of the sophist Prodicus.

77. For other passages in Xenophon condemning or depreciating wealth see the references collected by Scharr (above, n. 57), p. 265, n. 837. Socrates' charming anecdote about the encouraging example of Nicias' penniless but noble horse (Oec. 11.3-6) is particularly noteworthy. For a brief and more general survey of changing attitudes towards wealth in the late fifth and early fourth century, see J.M. Bell, "κύμβιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition", QUCC 28 (1978), pp. 48-50 with notes.

78. Trenkner, pp. 122-126, considers both the tale of Anacreon and our story of Pheraulas and the Sacian illustrations of a prevalent novellistic theme - the poor man whose life is upset by an unexpected treasure.

79. Knauth (above, n. 72), pp. 181-183, claims, chiefly on the basis of Cyr. 1.2.7 and the story of Darius and Syloson's red cloak in Hdt. 3.139-141, that gratitude was "eine speziell iranische Tugend".

80. In our previous dialogue, Cyr. 5.2.5-22, only Gobryas and Cyrus are quoted directly, but many Persian officers participated in the symposium (and impressed Gobryas with their gentlemanly behaviour).

81. The oath "by Hera" is normally considered a woman's one. It seems to have been used frequently by the historical Socrates, and in Plato it is almost always used ironically, simulating admiration - cf. e.g. Apol. 24 E; Gorg. 449 D etc.; see W.M. Calder III, "The Oath 'By Hera' in Plato", in: Hélanges Delebecque (Aix-en-Provence 1983), pp. 35-42. The oath appears one more time (in a variant reading) in the Cyr. (at 1.4.12) and there its use is a straightforward one.

82. See K.J. Dover, Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle (Oxford 1974), pp. 110-111 and the further references there.

83. The word μνηστήρ with its Homeric overtones (and cf. Hdt. 6.129-130, above, p. 178) is seen here by Gautier (pp. 46-47) not as a poeticism but "une coquetterie d'homme cultivé".

84. For an excellent analysis of Hell. 4.1.4-15 - in particular of Agesilaus' deviousness and Xenophon's use of the dialogue form - see V.J. Gray, "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 31 (1981), pp. 321 ff., esp. 321-324.

85. Cf. too Pl. Theaet. 149 A ff. where Socrates states that midwives make the best matchmakers (προμνήστριαί εἰσι δεινόταται) for they are extremely clever at knowing which unions will lead to the best offspring.

86. Why Socrates suddenly assigns his skill as a procurer to Antisthenes is something of a puzzle. None of the various explanations offered - e.g. Socrates is being modest (Ehlers (above, n. 59),p. 113); wishes to disclaim any real knowledge in any area (Körte (above, n. 7), pp. 37-38); or is trying to teach Antisthenes to be more playful (von Fritz (above, n. 8), pp. 25-27) - is altogether satisfactory.

87. Despite the chronological difficulties (i.e. Xenophon is already married in Socrates' lifetime), he is, it seems, our Xenophon. See Dittmar (above, n. 65), p. 32, n. 118.

88. For an attempt to reconstruct Aeschines' Aspasia and in particular a discussion of its probable influence on Xen. Mem. 2.6.28 ff., Symp. 4.56 ff. etc. see Dittmar (above, n. 65), pp. 1-39, esp. p. 36, n. 125; Ehlers (above, n. 59), pp. 31 ff. and 101-123; Woldinga (above, n. 29), pp. 78-86.

89. For other jokes involving the two meanings of ψυχρός, see Aristoph. Achar. 138 ff. (with the additional examples in Starkie's note ad loc.); Athen. 13.530 A. For ψυχρός as a critical term see Arist. Rhet. 1405 b 35 ff., and Russell's note ad [Longin.] π.ὑ. 4.1.

90. On Persians' favourite gifts in general see Hdt. 3.20-21; Anab. 1.2.27; Cyr. 8.2.7-9. More specifically, see for robes or clothing - Cyr. 1.3.3; 1.4.26; 8.3.3; Plut. Artax. 5 ; Esther 6.8; for gold jewellery - Cyr. 1.3.3; Anab. 1.9.22; Plut. Artax. 4; swords - Hdt. 8.120; Anab. 1.9.22. Cf. Knauth (above, n. 72), pp. 189-195; Sancisi-Weerdenberg (above, n. 72), pp. 165-171.

91. Sancisi-Weerdenberg (above, n. 72), p. 207. Her theory (pp. 206 ff.) that our symposium is a blend of two separate parties - one composed of the horse

race winners (Artabazus, the Hyrcanian and Tigranes), who are in the main silent and are there to receive specified presents, and the other made up of more philosophical minds (Gobryas, Hystaspas and Chrysantas), who indulge in matchmaking and receive unspecified presents, is interesting but unconvincing. Not all the horse-race winners are present and Artabazus, as she herself notes, does speak up. Only Tigranes' silence is unexpected; the Hyrcanian is a cardboard figure throughout the Cyr.

92. Most commentators agree that Xenophon in his Symp. is (rather unsuccessfully) adapting Plato's scene - see Körte (above, n. 7), pp. 40-41; von Fritz (above, n. 8), pp. 29-31; Woldinga (above, n. 29), p. 100 and Martin (above, n. 21), pp. 113-117, 131-132.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. The term novella, which seems to have first been used in contexts like our own by E. Rohde, "Ueber griechische Novellendichtung und ihren Zusammenhang mit dem Orient",", Verh. der 30 Philol. Vers. 1875 = Der griechische Roman und seine Vorlaufer[3] (Leipzig 1914), Anhang, pp. 578 ff., is not, of course, one that Xenophon would have recognized. It is difficult to define the term precisely - see e.g. Trenkner, p. xii and the remarks of G.J. de Vries, "Novellistic Traits in Socratic Literature", Mnem. IV.16 (1963), pp. 35 ff., and cf. W. Aly, "Novelle", RE 17.1, 1171-1172 and A. Barigazzi, Athenaeum 35 (1957), pp. 371-372 - but an exact definition is not really necessary for my purposes. I shall, following in the footsteps of e.g. Breitenbach, RE 1717-1718, simply use the terms "novella" or "novellistic dialogue" as a convenient shorthand method to refer to one or more of our 4 stories (or similar dramatic tales in other writers).

2. See Hirsch, p. 175, n. 52, for this Greek habit of terming Babylonians "Assyrians".

3. "as though nineteenth-century English novelists had habitually signed their works 'Richardson'" - A. Heiserman, The Novel Before the Novel (Chicago 1977), p. 7. Cf. e.g. B.E. Perry, The Ancient Romances (Berkeley 1967), p. 167.

4. See the passages related to "das novellistische Element" of the Cyr. collected by Breitenbach, RE 1717-1718. de Vries (above, n. 1), p. 40 is correct in terming the stories of the new Persian recruits in the Cyr. (2.2.2-10) "illustrative anecdotes rather than novelle"; cf. Trenkner, p. 153. The novellistic story of Tigranes' teacher, "Socrates", has been discussed above, pp. 129-132.

5. See Hermogenes περὶ ἰδεῶν B(pp. 405, 406 Rabe) and cf. Plut. Mor. 634 B. See too E. Schwartz, Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman[2] (Berlin 1943), p. 70 who thinks that Xenophon is paying tribute to his own wife here, in the guise of the Armenian princess.

6. Cyrus and Abradatas are not considered colourful enough to be included. The Assyrian king, on the other hand, is listed because even though he appears "onstage" only once in the Cyr., he is a central figure in three of the four novelle.

7. Hirzel, p. 166 mentions very briefly the likelihood that Ctesias influenced Xenophon in the Cyr. Trenkner, p. 26 finds in Xenophon's novelle "the same romance, pathos, sentiment and literary technique" as in Ctesias, but does not elaborate. Schwartz (above, n. 5), pp. 75, 84-88 notes the similarity between the Stryangaeus-Zarianea episode of Ctesias and the Panthea novella and discusses the tremendous impact Ctesias' brand of Ionian romantic history had on its readers. Ctesias and the novelle of the Cyr. are often linked together in discussions of the origins of the Greek novel - see e.g. B. Lavagnini, "Le origini del romanzo greco", Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa 28 (1922), p. 53, n. 1. For Ctesias as a source for the more "historical" aspects of the Cyr. see Breitenbach, RE 1709-1712 and see below, p. 269).

8. For the dates of Ctesias' stay in Persia and the publication of his Persica as well as for his vita in general see F. Jacoby, "Ktesias", RE 11.2032-2036.

T.S. Brown, "Suggestions for a Vita of Ctesias of Cnidus", Historia 27 (1978), pp. 1-19, is overly-speculative. There are two problematic bits of evidence, Diodorus' statement that Ctesias spent 17 years in Persia (FGrH 688 T 3) and Ctesias' own description of the 8 year-old (and hence post 397) palm trees on Clearchus' grave (688 F 27.71), but these are best understood along the lines suggested by Jacoby.

9. Nicolaus of Damascus (FGrH 90) apparently made extensive, direct use of Ctesias' Persica when compiling his universal history, copying (or revising slightly) the original. Hence I shall treat those fragments of Nicolaus' work that stem directly from Ctesias (90 F 2, F 3, F 4, F 5, F 66) as additional fragments of Ctesias himself. Cf. Jacoby's commentary on Nicolaus (FGrH IIC (Berlin 1926), pp. 233-235 and 251) and R. Drews, The Greek Accounts of Eastern History (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), p. 104 with n. 32 (on p. 195) and the further references there.

10. Of the two other women in this group, Sparetra the Sacian queen - whom Jacoby (above n. 8), 2059 calls "eine Doppelgängerin der Zarinaia" - is presented only as a warrior, while with Roxane the emphasis is on the dire results of the passion she arouses in her half-brother.

11. The account here is compiled from all the sources taken together, including Nicolaus of Damascus (i.e. FGrH 90 F 5 and 688 F 1b 34.1-5; F 7; F 8a-b; cf. above, n. 9). See J. Gilmore, The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias (London 1888), frr.20 and 21 and his commentary on p. 107.

12. Besides the two novelle in the Cyr. involving eunuchs there is also an original and curious passage (Cyr. 7.5.58-65) in which Cyrus reflects that eunuchs are the most loyal servants to be had and are no less courageous than other men (cf. below, pp. 391-392).

13. P. Guyot, Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike (Stuttgart 1980), pp. 78-87, surveys the eunuchs appearing in the fragments of Ctesias. His interest in them is historical and his main objective is to glean information on the various functions they perform.

14. Cf. Jacoby (above, n. 8), 2047.

15. I have counted some 26 individual eunuchs (named and unnamed) in the Persica including several mentioned in the Ctesias fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus (cf. 90 F 4, F 5, F 66.5, 22; see above, n. 9). For a prosopographical list of the eunuchs in Ctesias (and other authors) see Guyot (above, n. 13), pp. 181 ff.

16. G. Devereux, JHS 93 (1973), pp. 36-49 (cf. in particular p. 43), points out that for the Greeks blinding symbolizes castration; perhaps then Ninus' threat to blind Semiramis' husband should be considered such an instance. Cf. too P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, "Pain, Mutilation and Death in Herodotus VII", La Parola del Passato 31 (1976), pp. 356-362.

17. See Higgins, p. 53. For the Greek view of Oriental culture and rulers as "female", with effeminate kings and strong women, see H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, "Exit Atossa; Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia", in: Images of Women in Antiquity (eds. A. Cameron & A. Kuhrt) (London 1983), pp. 20-33, esp. p. 27.

18. J.M. Bigwood, "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus", Phoenix 30 (1976), p. 5. Cf. too pp. 2-5 for an excellent discussion of the relation of Photius' summary to the original Persica.

19. See the original publication by C.H. Roberts in Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXII (London 1954), pp. 81-84 and the subsequent series of articles by M. Gigante, RFIC 40 (1962), pp. 249-274; D. del Corno, Athenaeum 40 (1962), pp. 126-141 etc. G. Giangrande, "On an Alleged Fragment of Ctesias", QUCC 23 (1976), pp. 31-41, who thinks that Ctesias could not have been the author of the fragment since it is not in Ionic (cf. 688 T 10, T 13) is not convincing. Demetrius (De eloc. 213 = 688 F 8a) contains an almost exact quotation of the opening of Stryangaeus' letter, while in Nicolaus of Damascus (90 F 5) the papyrus passage is paraphrased.

20. B.Z. Wacholder, Nicolaus of Damascus (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962), pp. 68-69 (with notes 47-53 on pp. 123-124), argues that Nicolaus, who wrote tragedies besides history, dramatized Ctesias' account in the Persica-based frr. (90 F 1-5, F 66) and added the dialogues found there. See the convincing rebuttal by D.A.W. Biltcliffe, "P.Oxy. 2330 and its importance for the study of Nicolaus of Damascus", RhM 112 (1969), pp. 85-93, who points out that (a) dialogue is rarely found elsewhere in Nicolaus and (b) in our fragment (688 F 8b = P.Oxy. 2330) Nicolaus turns the dialogue preceding Zarinaea's letter into indirect speech, both shortening and toning down the whole passage.

21. For Plutarch's direct use of the Persica see J.M. Bigwood, "The Ancient Accounts of the Battle of Cunaxa", AJP 104 (1983), p. 344 with n. 18; cf. Jacoby (above, n. 8), 2070.

22. See above notes 9 and 20.

23. See Biltcliffe (above, n. 20), p. 87, n. 16. Jacoby points out how 90 F 3 (along with F 2, F 4 and F 5) gives us "einen Begriff von Ktesias' schriftstellerischer Art" (FGrH IIC, p. 235). It is worth noting in this context the conversation between Oebares and Cyrus in which the former urges the latter, slowly and step by step, to rebel against Astyages (90 F 66.15).

24. One indication of how little Nicolaus bothered re-editing or re-working the various sources he used in his compilation is the fact that different fragments contradict one another and are written in different dialects; see Jacoby's commentary on Nicolaus (FGrH IIC, p. 233).

25. See Bigwood (above, n. 18), p. 3 with n. 9 on Photius' possible predilection for Megabyzus and for the likelihood that Photius re-arranged the sequence of events found in the original Persica at times.

26. Cf. Photius' remark ἀλλὰ [sc. Ctesias] καὶ πρὸς Ξενοφῶντα τὸν Γρύλλου ἐπ' ἐνίων διαφωνεῖ (688 T 8).

27. See H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's Cyr as a Source for Iranian History", Acta Iranica 25 (1985), pp. 459-471 and Hirsch, p. 83, for a detailed analysis of the two deathbed scenes; see too below, pp. 410-412. Cyrus' playful attempt to pour wine as well as the Sacian (Cyr. 1.3.9 ff.), which is perhaps a sideways glance at Ctesias' claim that young Cyrus was Astyages' cup-bearer (FGrH 90 F 66.5-7) should also be noted in this context; cf. above, pp. 187-188. See too Breitenbach, RE 1709-1712, 1719; Jacoby (above, n. 8), 2067-2068.

28. There is one curious passage in Diodorus' epitome of Ctesias (688 F 1b 21.3-7) which is reminiscent of an entirely different aspect of the Cyr. - Cyrus' reflections on the best way to rule the people of his empire. In Ctesias we find an explanation of why Ninyas chose a new royal guard every year, including observations on the way armies react, on what makes subjects rebel etc., i.e. the passage contains what seem to be the Cnidian's thoughts on the governing of an empire. One wonders if this passage is unique or if the Persica contained other such remarks.

29. For a detailed comparison of their two versions see Bigwood (above, n. 21), pp. 340-357 and compare G. Cawkwell, Xenophon: The Persian Expedition (Harmondsworth 1972), Introduction, pp. 19, 38 ff.

30. Xenophon's account here may be based on the Persica; cf. Jacoby (above, n. 8), 2067.

31. Cf. Guyot (above, n. 13), p. 87, n. 118 and see Higgins, pp. 85-86 for a thoughtful attempt to explain Xenophon's "pause... in a narrative otherwise remarkably swift".

32. In fact, O. Neuhaus, RhM 56 (1901), pp. 272-283, esp. 279 ff. argues that Ctesias is Plutarch's source for the story of Cyrus' "Aspasia".

33. The characters of this story and their awkward situation recall the Armenian family of the Cyr.: the king, Tigranes, their wives etc. at their trial (Cyr. 3.1); cf. above, pp. 112-118.

34. Trenkner, p. xiv. See too Aly (above, n. 1), 1173-1176 who says that Herodotus is "nicht der Schöpfer der Novelle... sondern ihr Entdecker" (1173-1174). Aly's Volksmärchen, Sage und Novellen bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen (Göttingen 1921; repr. 1969) is the classic work on the novelle of Herodotus.

35. See W.J. Keller, "Xenophon's Acquaintance with the History of Herodotus", CJ 6 (1911), pp. 252-259 (and cf. p. 347) and K.A. Riemann, Das herodoteische Geschichtswerk in der Antike (Diss. Munich 1967), pp. 20-27.

36. See R. Heni, Die Gespräche bei Herodot (Diss. Heidelberg, Heilbronn 1976), pp. 136-151, for an analysis of novellistic dialogues in Herodotus. He classifies the dialogues according to their contribution to the plot of the novella. Heni (p. 138, n. 44; cf. p. 15) thinks that Herodotus presents a novella entirely in oratio obliqua when the events narrated are more important than the story's characters, while other scholars think that Herodotus uses indirect speech as a means of distancing himself from a tale and disclaiming responsibility for it - cf. K.H. Waters, Herodotus the Historian (London & Sydney 1985), pp. 69-70. Aly (above, n. 34), p. 241 thinks that direct speech is an important feature of folk tales and a strong indication of "den echt erzählten Logos".

37. The anonymous work γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι better known as De Mulieribus found in Paradoxographi Graeci, ed. A. Westermann (London 1839; repr. Amsterdam 1963), pp. 213-218, is worth noting in this context. It contains a series of 14 short biographical notices of clever and warlike women of the East, including Semiramis, Zarinaea, Tomyris, Artemisia, Atossa etc. The stories of these women are taken from the works of Herodotus, Ctesias,

Timaeus, Hellanicus, Aeschines the Socratic etc., i.e. from Xenophon's contemporaries (more or less). The work shows how popular such female figures were in fifth and fourth century writing.

38. Two devoted couples in Herodotus are Cyrus' adoptive parents - the herdsman Mithridates and his wife Cyno (cf. 1.111.1 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν φροντίδι ἀμφότεροι ἀλλήλων πέρι) and Amasis and Laodice. At first Amasis has difficulties with his Greek wife but he grows to love her (κάρτα μιν ἔστερξε 2.181). Trenkner, pp. 24-25, sees the absence of love stories as the particular difference between Herodotus and romantic historiography.

39. See Waters (above, n. 36), pp. 128-130 for a brief but lucid survey of women in Herodotus.

40. In discussions of the novella, particularly the early Ionian novella, Charon of Lampsacus is almost always coupled with Xanthus. See e.g. A. Hausrath, "Die ionische Novellistik", Neue Jahrb. für Kl. Alt. 17 (1914), pp. 443-444; Q. Cataudella, La novella greca (Naples 1957), pp. 46-47; Trenkner, pp. 24-25; Aly (above, n. 34), pp. 215-225 etc. I do not discuss Charon here because the novelle found in his fragments (FGrH 262 F 1; F 7; F 12; F 17) do not resemble the stories in Xenophon. In the Cyr. there are no stratagems like that of the enemy's horses being made to dance to the flute (F 1) or even the simple expedient of getting the other side drunk (F 17). So too the women in Charon - Lampsace (F 7) and the nymph (F 12) - are not at all similar to Panthea.

41. Jacoby, FGrH IIC, pp. 233-234 and L. Pearson, Early Ionian Historians (Oxford 1939), pp. 122-123, are strong proponents of the view that these fragments of Nicolaus come directly from Xanthus' work. H. Diller, "Zwei Erzählungen des Lyders Xanthos", Navicula Chiloniensis (Festschrift Jacoby) (Leiden 1956), pp. 66-78 = Kleine Schriften (Munich 1971), pp. 451-463, thinks that 90 F 44 and F 47 have undergone Hellenistic revision and elaboration, but finds in the fragments many traces of the original Lydiaca. Even K. von Fritz, Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung, Band I.2 (Berlin 1967), pp. 348-377, who argues that there was an intermediary Hellenistic influence at work between Xanthus and Nicolaus, is willing to concede that Xanthus originally included "anekdotenhafte Erzählungen" in his work (pp. 376-377).

42. Cf. n. 20 above. Here too Wacholder (above, n. 20), pp. 68-69, argues that Nicolaus is responsible for the dialogues, while Biltcliffe (above, n. 20), p. 93, n. 32, plumps for Xanthus.

43. The exact date of Xanthus' Lydiaca is debated by scholars (in relation to its supposed influence on Herodotus' work) but there is little doubt that he was a contemporary of Herodotus. Cf. e.g. von Fritz (above, n. 41), p. 72, n. 49 and Drews (above, n. 9), p. 100.

44. For an excellent analysis of these episodes in the Hell. see V.J. Gray, "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 31 (1981), pp. 321-334. Cf. in particular her discussion of novelle (not under that name) at pp. 330-331.

45. Elsewhere in Xenophon (Ages. 5.4-6) we learn more of the relationship between Agesilaus and Megabates, son of Spithridates, and the Oxyrhynchus historian explicitly states that the Spartan king took up Spithridates because of his son (μάλιστα μὲν ἕνεκα τοῦ μειρακίου Hell.Oxy. 16.4).

46. The poetic word δμωαί appears only here in Xenophon; cf. Gautier, p. 92 on "le style... animé" and Homeric echoes of this passage.

47. For the Greeks' equating stature with beauty see e.g. Hdt. 1.60.4 and the further references collected by Breitenbach in his note on Cyr. 5.1.5. See Od. 6.107-108 and Stanford's note ad loc. The commentators think the use of the phrase διήνεγκε... τῇ ἀρετῇ here an echo of the description of Penelope ἐμὴν ἀρετὴν εἶδός τε δέμας τε/ ὤλεσαν ἀθάνατοι (Od. 18.251-252).

48. Philostratus, in his description of a painting of Panthea at her suicide (Imag. 2.9) has a similar touch; Panthea's pain, he says, does not cause her to become less beautiful and she lacerates her throat without disfiguring it. (2.9.5).

49. See F. Lasserre, Ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι, MH 1 (1944), pp. 169-178, for a survey of the early examples of these works. All we know of many ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι is simply their author and titles - e.g. a περὶ ἔρωτος by Simon the Cobbler (D.L. 2.122) and Simmias (D.L. 2.124); a dialogue Ἐρωτικῶν by Euclides (D.L. 2.108) and περὶ φύσεως ἔρωτος ἢ ἀρετῶν by Critias (DK 88B42). While it is hard to judge, only Antisthenes' work περὶ παιδοποιΐας ἢ περὶ γάμου ἐρωτικός (D.L. 6.15; cf. frr.114, 115 Caizzi) seems to have referred to women in its discussion. See Gigon's commentary on Mem. 1.3.14 (I, pp. 116-117).

50. For reconstructions of the Aspasia see H. Dittmar, Aischines von Sphettos (Berlin 1912), pp. 1-59 and B. Ehlers, Eine vorplatonische Deutung der sokratischen Eros (Munich 1966); the latter's interpretation is more convincing.

51. The main sources for Aeschines' version of the story of Rhodogyne are De Mul. 8 and Philostratus, Imag. 2.5 (= fr.18 Dittmar). For Aeschines' Thargelia see Plut. Per. 24; De Mul. 11; Philostratus, epist. 73; Suidas and Hesychius s.v. (= frr.21 and 22 Dittmar). Apparently Hippias wrote of Thargelia even before Aeschines did; cf. Athen. 13.608 F (= FGrH 6 F 3). Ehlers (above, n. 50), p. 48 with n. 51 is certainly right in linking Semiramis with Rhodogyne rather than with Thargelia, as Dittmar (above, n. 50), pp. 28-29 does.

52. Cf. Dittmar (above, n. 50), pp. 28-29, 44 and esp. 55 and Ehlers (above, n. 50), p. 50 for Ctesias' likely influence on Aeschines here.

53. Dittmar (above, n. 50), p. 55 dates the Aspasia to ca. 386 on the basis of its relationship to Plato's Menexenus and Ctesias' Persica. O. Gigon, Sokrates (Bern 1947), p. 308, arrives at a date of before 380 for the Aspasia (and most of Aeschines' works), since it seems likely that Lysias, who died ca. 380 B.C., referred to the dialogue in his speech against Aeschines (Athen. 13.611 D ff. = Lysias fr.1_2(Thalheim); cf. Harpocration s.v. Ἀσπασία). See R. Jebb, The Attic Orators, I^2 (London 1893), pp. 152-153, 310-311 and J. Humbert, Socrate et les petits Socratiques (Paris 1967), pp. 219-220.

54. The Zoroastrian practice of next-of-kin marriage (khvaetvadatha) should be noted in this context, although scholars do not agree on how widespread the custom was. See M. Boyce, A History of Zoroastrianism, II (Leiden 1982), pp. 75-77 and R.N. Frye, The History of Ancient Iran (Handbuch der Altertumwissenschaft III.7) (Munich 1984), p. 97.

55. See Lasserre (above, n. 49), pp. 175-178 for further references to this τόπος in prose and poetry as well.

56. For a collection of further passages illustrating this connection between love and sight see A.C. Pearson, CR 23 (1909), pp. 256-257; see too Thomson's note on Aes. PV 614-615 (= 590-591 usual numbering). This notion may be related to Empedocles' theory of effluences (ἀπορροαί) and sense perception - see de Vries ad Pl. Phaedr. 251 B and Bluck on Meno 76 C-D. Cf. O. Immisch, Gorgiae Helena (Berlin and Leipzig 1927), pp. 20, 41.

57. This seems to be the only instance where Xenophon has ἅμα μέν followed by 3 ἅμα δέ s; see Cyr. 2.3.19;2.3.23; 6.1.24 (and cf. Hell. 5.4.62) for sentences of the form ἅμα μὲν... ἅμα δὲ... ἅμα δὲ... These sentences are also used (as with our sentence concerning Araspas) to list several complementary factors or reasons which all hold true at the same time.

58. Araspas is apparently the first in a long series of figures who minimize the power of love only to succumb (painfully) later on; see Trenkner, pp. 26-27 with notes.

59. I have already noted several parallels between the discussion of love here in the Cyr. and Gorgias' arguments in his Helen. The similarities may simply be due to Xenophon's reworking commonplaces on love used (among others) by Gorgias, or perhaps, as Nestle argues, "Xenophon und die Sophistik", Philologus 94 (1940-41), pp. 42-43, Xenophon was directly influenced by the sophist here. Cf. C.J. Classen, "Xenophons Darstellung der Sophistik und der Sophisten", Hermes 112 (1984), pp. 161-162.

60. For more such passages and an analysis of them, see J. de Romilly, "L'excuse de 1'invincible amour dans la tragédie grecque", in Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J.C. Kamerbeek (Amsterdam 1976), pp. 309-321. See too F. Heinimann, Nomos und Physis (Basel 1945, repr. 1965), pp. 126-127 and 131-132 for a discussion of love as ἀνάγκη φύσεως.

61. Later Greek novelists also take up this description of love as a σοφιστής; see Achilles Tatius, 1.10.1 and see G. Anderson, Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play (Chico, Calif. 1982).

62. As Classen (above, n. 59), p. 151 notes, the term σοφιστής here is not in itself perjorative; cf. above, pp. 131-132.

63. Cf. R. Hackforth, Plato's Phaedrus (Cambridge 1972), p. 41.

64. It is worth noting that Philostratus (Vitae Sophistarum 1.22.3) tells of a much later (second century A.D.) work describing Araspas' love for Panthea. The tale seems to have been a scandalous one for its author, Hadrian's secretary, Celer, attributed it to an enemy of his, the rhetorician Dionysius of Miletus. Cf. Perry (above, n. 3), p. 169 who suggests that Xenophon may have whitewashed the characters of Panthea and Araspas and supressed an earlier, less ethical version of their relationship; there is, however, no real evidence for this theory.

65. The Greek mentioned here is no doubt a fictional counterpart of Phalinus, the Greek military expert on Artaxerxes' side in the Anabasis (2.1.7). See J.K. Anderson, Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970), p. 173.

66. See Higgins, pp. 6-7 for an appreciation of Xenophon's style here and Gautier, p. 93 on this "récit pathétique"; he notes that the words ἑλεύβετο and παρειῶν are both found only rarely in prose.

67. See e.g. Trenkner, p. 26 and Delebecque's note in the Budé Cyr., ad 6.4.2 ff. for brief references to these Homeric echoes. D. Valla, "Il Mito di Pantea", Atene e Roma 3 (1922), pp. 120-121, has a more detailed comparison between Panthea and Andromache.

68. Cf. J. Griffin, Homer on Life and Death (Oxford 1980), pp. 19, 36-37.

69. See D. Schaps, "The Women of Greece in Wartime", CP 77 (1982), pp. 193-213, especially p. 198 for several instances of Greek women encouraging men to be more war-like. Such stories, Schaps says, are more common than tales of women urging their menfolk not to fight.

70. On the difficult question of the relation between Zoroastrian strictures regarding exposure and the actual burial practices of Cyrus the Great and later Achaemenians, see Boyce (above, n. 54), pp. 54-59, 182; Frye (above, n. 54), pp. 123, 134.

71. For this gesture of holding (or touching) a dead person's head, see D.C. Kurtz and J. Boardman, Greek Burial Customs (London 1971), p. 143 and Macleod's note on Il. 24.712.

72. See Keller (above, n. 35), p. 257, who terms the incident with Abradatas' arm an "incongruous element". Breitenbach, RE 1718, thinks that this "makabre Szene" points to the fact that Xenophon has adapted the entire Panthea novella from another source.

73. Anderson (above, n. 65), pp. 165-191, finds many details in Xenophon's narration of the Battle of Thymbrara (Cyr. 7.1) which seem to have been written as a reaction to the actual happenings at Cunaxa.

74. Other such nurses who serve as confidantes are found in Euripides' Medea, Hippolytus and Stheneboea (for the last, see D.L. Page, Greek Literary Papyri (London 1942), no. 16, lines 10-12). See Steven's note on And. 802 ff. and cf. G. Herzog-Hauser, "Nutrix", RE XVII.2, col. 1498. Trenkner, p. 66, thinks that this stock character in Euripides was "undoubtedly a contemporary type".

75. For further instances of people dying after, or in the wake of, a loved one (ἐπαποθανεῖν) in Greek literature, see R. Hirzel, Der Selbstmord (repr. Darmstadt 1967), pp. 4-5 (= Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 11 (1908), pp. 78-79); see too his discussion of suicide in tragedy, pp. 19-26 (= pp. 93-100). For pre-Euripidean traces of tales of a bereaved wife committing suicide, see Trenkner, p. 71 with n. 2 and Collard's note on Eur. Supp. 980-1113, especially pp. 354-355.

76. Cf. Strabo 15.1.30 and see J. Hornblower, Hieronymus of Cardia (Oxford 1981), p. 94, n. 71.

77. For the evidence that sceptre-bearers were eunuchs, see Guyot (above, n. 13), p. 82 and p. 87, n. 118; for Artapates as a eunuch see too D.M. Lewis, Sparta and Persia (Leiden 1977), p. 16, n. 80.

78. It is especially brief if Dindorf's deletion of the description of the eunuch's monument at 7.3.15 is accepted, along with most editors. Dindorf terms the lines "absurdum recentioris Graeculi additamentum" and notes that neither Zonaras (Epit.Hist. 3.23) nor Tzetzes (Hist.Var.Chil. 3.799) include any reference to this bit in their close summaries of this part of the Cyr. Perhaps the only argument against the deletion of these lines is that it is precisely the kind of detail that Ctesias would have included.

79. See J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament[3] (Princeton 1969), pp. 305-307 for a convenient English translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle and compare the translation of our passage by A.L. Oppenheim, "The Babylonian Evidence of Achaemenian Rule in Mesopotamia", in: Cambridge History of Iran, vol. II (Median and Achaemenian Periods) (Cambridge 1985), p. 539. The latter is careful to preserve the two different forms of the name Gobryas (Ugbaru and Gubaru) found in the chronicle.

80. See V. Scheil, "Le Gobryas de la Cyropédie", Revue d'Assyrologie 11 (1914), pp. 165 ff., who notes the correspondences between Xenophon's Gobryas and that of the Nabonidus Chronicle. He thinks that Gobryas should be identified with a commanding officer of Nebuchadrezzar by that name, who had been active some twenty years earlier; cf. however the objections of A.T. Clay, JAOS 41 (1921), pp. 466-467 and compare the long discussion by W. Schwenzner, "Gobryas", Klio 18 (1923), pp. 41-58, 226-252.

81. This seems to be the consensus of the majority of scholars, but untangling the various Babylonian and Persian Gobryases is not an easy task and opinion on the subject is far from unanimous. See e.g. the variety of views found in the recent Cambridge History of Iran (above, n. 79): M. Mallowan (p. 411) vs. I.M. Diakonoff (p. 144) vs. A. Oppenheim (p. 544). See too Cook, pp. 30-31, 46, 168 and Frye (above, n. 54), pp. 94-95 with n. 25.

82. See the further list in Gautier, p. 107, n. 1 and cf. pp. 91-92; compare also Holden's note on Cyr. 4.6.5.

83. See É. Delebecque, Essai sur la vie de Xénophon (Paris 1957), pp. 391-392.

84. It has been argued that our Gadatas should be identified with the satrap of Ionia of that name whom Darius reprimands in a letter - cf. R. Meiggs and D.M. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford 1969), no. 12 - but this identification is not generally accepted; see Mallowan (above, n. 81), pp. 414-415.

85. It has been seen above (pp. 162 and 192-193) that such a mixture of play and earnest is usually found in sympotic conversations. Despite this element of σπουδαιογέλοιον our dialogue does not resemble a symposium in its setting (a group of military leaders gathered in front of Cyaxares' tent) or content (military plans for the future).

86. Even here (Cyr. 5.4.51), Gadatas captures one fort while Cyrus takes over two and the Persian uses harsher tactics - assault and intimidation, as opposed to the eunuch's soft words.

87. Xenophon's account of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus is not overly lucid. Cyrus apparently has no real intention of besieging the city and simply wishes to confuse the Babylonians, but he does not make this clear, at the start, to his own followers - cf. Cyr. 7.5.7 and the troublesome phrase ὅπως ὅτι μάλιστα ἐοίκοι πολιορκήσειν παρασκευαζομένῳ 7.5.12 with Holden's note ad loc.; see too Keller (above, n. 35), pp. 257-258. So too Cyrus comes up with the plan to divert the Euphrates rather abruptly (7.5.9) and the exact method he uses to drain the river is unclear; see Breitenbach, RE 1711-1712.

88. For a comparison of the different sources (Greek, cuneiform etc.) on Cyrus' conquest of Babylon and an attempt to reconcile them, see R.P. Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar (New Haven 1929), pp. 167-200. See too S. Smith, Isaiah, Chapters XL-LV (London 1944), pp. 30-48 and A.R. Burn, Persia and the Greeks (London 1962), pp. 54-55.

89. Dougherty (above, n. 88), p. 169 translates col. iii, line 7 of the Nabonidus Chronicle "the abundance of wine was ample among the [troops]..." (cf. p. 195), while the version of A.K. Grayson, Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1975), p. 109, is "... He made a libation of wine...". Oppenheim, the translator in Pritchard (above, n. 79), p. 306, does not translate the line, considering it unintelligible - see n. 8 there.

90. An English translation of the Cylinder is in Pritchard (above, n. 79), pp. 315-316; for an analysis of the inscription see Oppenheim (above, n. 79), pp. 545-551 and see too Dougherty (above, n. 88), pp. 175-179.

91. Again (cf. above, n. 81), the recent Cambridge History of Iran, vol. II (above, n. 79), includes a variety of views. Diakonoff, p. 147, thinks that Nabonidus was spared as (apparently) does Oppenheim, p. 542. Mallowan, p. 414, argues, partly on the basis of Cyr. 7.5.29-30, that the Babylonian ruler was killed. Elsewhere, Dougherty (above, n. 88), p. 175 with n. 574, contends that Belshazzar was killed, but Nabonidus was not.

92. On Nabonidus' exile at Tema and Belshazzar's co-regency, see Dougherty (above, n. 88), pp. 93-137 and Cook, p. 28. This same argument is used to explain why in the Book of Daniel (5.1-6.1) Belshazzar is king of Babylon at the time of its fall - see Dougherty, pp. 196-197 and C.F. Lehmann-Haupt, "Gobryas und Belsazar bei Xenophon", Klio 2 (1902), pp. 341-345.

93. For an English translation of the "Verse Account of Nabonidus" see Pritchard (above, n. 79), pp. 312-315.

94. See for this point Oppenheim (above, n. 79), pp. 540-542, 546-547, 550-551.

95. See also the discussion of the problem by W. Miller in Appendix II to his Loeb edition of the Cyr., pp. 456-457.

96. For a detailed and thoughtful comparison between Cyr. 7.2.9-29 and Herodotus' account of Croesus, see E. Lefèvre, "Die Frage nach dem βίος εὐδαίμων : Die Begegnung zwischen Kyrus und Kroisos bei Xenophon", Hermes 99 (1971), pp. 283-296, in addition to the works of Keller and Riemann mentioned above (n. 35); I shall draw upon all three in the following discussion. For other Greek versions of the life of Croesus, see Weissbach, "Kroisos", RE Suppl. V (Stuttgart 1931), 455-477, esp. 456-457.

97. Several commentators think that when Croesus calls out for Cyrus from the palace (Κῦρον ἐβόα Cyr. 7.2.5), it is an echo of Croesus repeating Solon's name three times on his funeral pyre, in Herodotus (1.86.3), but the resemblance is not very strong. See Keller (above, n. 35), p. 253 and Riemann (above, n. 35), p. 27, n. 1.

98. For this point, Cyrus as a replacement for Solon, see Lefèvre (above, n. 96), pp. 283, 285. Lefèvre, however, goes too far when he argues that Cyrus, in Xenophon's version, is meant to replace Apollo as well; cf. pp. 292-293.

99. Most editors accept the manuscript reading πρὸς οὓς ἂν ἐγὼ Λυδῶν ἐθέλω (or θέλῳ) at Cyr. 7.2.12, i.e. Croesus will approach certain select Lydians, but Hug's conjecture πρὸς οὓς ἂν... ἔλθῳ , that is Croesus will tell whomever he meets, i.e. everyone, of Cyrus' guarantee, has also found favour - see Lefèvre (above, n. 96), p. 286, n. 1. The idea of Croesus speaking only to chosen, presumably influential, Lydians is not an unlikely one so that there is no real reason to reject the MSS. reading.

100. For this opening exchange (Cyr. 7.2.9-14), Breitenbach's analysis of the situation, "auch bei Xen. ist er [sc. Kroisos] noch der Weise..." (RE 1720), seems closer to the truth than that of Lefèvre (above, n. 96), p. 287, who already finds here a reversal of the Herodotean roles.

101. The advice the Herodotean Croesus gives does not always prove useful or correct - cf. H.-P. Stahl, "Learning through suffering? Croesus' Conversations in the History of Herodotus", YCS 24 (1975), pp. 1-36.

102. Cf. Riemann (above, n. 35), pp. 24-25.

103. See for this point, Lefèvre (above, n. 96), p. 288.

104. Cf. H.W. Parke and D.E.W. Wormell, The Delphic Oracle, vol. I (Oxford 1956), p. 139, who call the oracle in Xenophon "crudely impossible". J. Fontenrose, The Delphic Oracle (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1978), p. 304 agrees, saying that both oracles - on the children and "know thyself" (Q104 and 105 according to his numbering) - were invented by Xenophon.

105. For a brief characterization of oracular responses see Parke and Wormell (above, n. 104), vol. II, p. xxv. According to them (p. xxx), the metrical pattern found in our hexameter occurs only in two other oracular responses. Of the six components of oracular poetry analysed by Fontenrose (above, n. 104), pp. 177-179, our one-line oracle contains three: (A) Salutation, (B) Restatement of the question and (E) Message.

106. See Pl. Prot. 343 A-B; Charm. 164 D etc. and the further references collected by M.J. O'Brien, The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind (Chapel Hill 1967), pp. 80-82. Interestingly, Chilon is supposed to have been enjoined by the oracle at Delphi γνῶθι σαυτόν in reply to his question "what is best?", but the sources for this story are all later than the Cyr. - see Parke and Wormell (above, n. 104), no. 423 and Fontenrose (above, n. 104), Q77. On the maxim in general see U.v. Wilamowitz, "Erkenne dich selbst", Reden und Vorträge[4] (Berlin 1926), vol. II, pp. 171-189.

107. In Plato's Charmides (164 E), for instance, Critias takes the maxim as equivalent to the command σωφρόνει. Other possible interpretations are "know that you are a man", "know your place" etc.; cf. Fontenrose (above, n. 104), p. 294.

108. Other, non-Herodotean, tales of Gyges were also in circulation in Xenophon's time, as can be seen from Pl. Rep. 359 C - 360 B and a fragment of Nicolaus of Damascus (FGrH 90 F 47), which is largely drawn from Xanthus of Lydia. See K.F. Smith, "The Tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia", AJP 23 (1902), pp. 261-282, 361-387 for a valuable discussion and analysis of the various sources. Nonetheless, in view of Xenophon's repeated allusions to Herodotus' History in this dialogue, it seems likely that his Gyges, like his Croesus, comes from the Halicarnassian.

109. Cf. Hdt. 7.147 for another instance of a monarch's sage distinction between "theirs" and "ours". On the resemblance between Cyr. 7.4.12-13 and Hdt. 1.88 see only Delebecque's note ad loc. in the Budé Cyr. (vol. III, p. 66, n. 1).

110. See R. Lattimore, "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus", CP 34 (1939), pp. 24-35.

Notes to Chapter V

1. This category of short dialogues in the Cyr. is, of course, quite different from the literary sub-genre of Kurzdialoge or Short Dialogues discussed above (p. 64) in relation to Socratic dialogues.

2. For a useful discussion of the chreia and its classification by ancient rhetoricians, see R.F. Hock and E.N. O'Neil, The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric (Vol. I: The Progymnasmata) (Atlanta 1986), pp. 3 ff., esp. 27-35. This definition of χρεῖαι μικταί - including both an action and a saying - is that of Hermogenes, Aphthonius, Nicolaus etc., as opposed to Theon; cf. pp. 27-28 and the references on p. 57.

3. See V.J. Gray, "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 34 (1981), pp. 321-334, on the way Xenophon uses dialogue in the Hellenica to convey the ability of Agesilaus (and others) to manipulate their fellow-conversationalists.

4. See for this point, H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, Yauna en Persai (Diss. Leiden 1980), pp. 170-171 with notes on p. 182; see too her "Exit Atossa: Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia" in: Images of Women in Antiquity (eds. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt) (London 1983), pp. 28-29. Compare too W. Knauth (and S. Nadjmabadi), Das altiranische Fürstenideal von Xenophon bis Ferdousi (Wiesbaden 1975), p. 194.

5. For an analysis of the size of the armies in the Cyr. and a discussion of Xenophon's possible sources, see Breitenbach, RE 1715-1716.

6. See, for example, J. Luccioni, Xénophon et le Socratisme (Paris 1953), pp. 146-147.

7. Cf. R. Heni, Die Gespräche bei Herodot (Diss. Heidelberg 1976), p. 110 with n. 28.

8. Since it is hardly likely that Cyrus would make this bald statement in front of Tigranes and the Armenian forces, Hug is right, I think, to postulate a lacuna before ὑμεῖς μὲν... at 3.2.5; see Breitenbach's commentary ad loc.

9. See R. Lattimore, "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus", CP 34 (1939), pp. 24-35, esp. p. 31 for a discussion of this figure - a fallen king who drops his delusions with his power - in Herodotus.

10. See Breitenbach, RE 1711, who calls the Adusius-Carian episode "eine typisch xenophontische Erfindung"; cf. too 1714. E. Schwartz, "Quellenuntersuchungen zur griechischen Geschichte", RhM 44 (1889), p. 190, n. 2, also thinks Xenophon invented Adusius, calling him an idealized Spartan harmost; he compares our passage to Hell. 5.4.55.

11. For a discussion of the military role of the Egyptians in the Cyr. and the historicity of Xenophon's account here, see J.K. Anderson, Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970), pp. 165-191, esp. pp. 166-170.

12. See L. Wencis, "Hypopsia and the Structure of Xenophon's Anabasis", CJ 73 (1978), pp. 44-49 and Hirsch, pp. 14-38 on the constantly recurring themes of deceit and suspicion in the (negotiations of the) Anabasis. On negotiations in the Hellenica, see Gray (above, n. 3), esp. pp. 324-326 and 328-330.

13. Cf. the comments of Breitenbach, RE 1731, on this "ernstzunehmenden Gedankenblock".

14. Cf. H.R. Breitenbach, Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons (Diss. Basel 1950), pp. 136-139 for a discussion of these two passages in the Hellenica. He thinks that the speakers' words here reflect Xenophon's own attitude in favour of moderation in war.

15. See Lattimore (above, n. 9), pp. 24-26 for further instances of such "tragic warners" in Herodotus; see too K.J. Latham, "Hysteria in History: Some Topoi in War Debates of Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides", Museum Philologum Londiniense 5 (1981), pp. 54-67 on the regular appearance of a sober speaker who counsels against war in such debates.

16. Cyr. 7.5.41-57 is another council. There, Cyrus supposedly asks for advice and adopts the proposal made by his chief lieutenant, Chrysantas, but it is likely that he has arranged the plan with Chrysantas in advance - see above, pp. 231-232.

17. See G.L. Cawkwell's introduction to Xenophon: The Persian Expedition (Harmondsworth 1972), pp. 18-21 for a discussion of the relationship between Chirisophus and Xenophon.

Notes to Appendix I

1. For the argument that the epilogue of the Cyr. only serves to confirm the fact that Cyrus' state is not ideal, see J. Luccioni, Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon (?Paris 1947), pp. 251-253 and P. Carlier, "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon", Ktema 3 (1978), pp. 133-163, esp. pp. 160-163.

2. Holden (in his commentary ad loc.) thinks that κατασκευάσασθαι refers to a physical establishment, a palace for Cyrus and translates providere sibi domicilium, probably because Cyrus has just allocated houses to his allies (7.5.35). However, the continuation of the sentence, C.'s concern ὡς... ἂν... σπάνιός τε καὶ σεμνὸς φανείη and indeed his stratagem that follows, seem to indicate that Sturz's se gerere (in his lexicon, s.v. κατασκευάζω) is, in fact, the correct translation. Cf. Luccioni (above, n. 1), p. 237, n. 224.

3. This sort of homely, even vulgar detail is rarely found in the Cyr. Does Xenophon want to emphasize what sorry, manipulated figures Cyrus' friends have become? Cf. too Artabazus' ironic remark (7.5.53) that he has spent the day envied, but unfed, at Cyrus' side.

4. Thus Zonaras, in his epitome of the Cyr., paraphrases: τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα θεραπευτῆρας ἐξέτεμε καὶ εὐνούχους πεποίηκε (Epit.Hist. 3.25B) but male according to Dindorf (ad Cyr. 7.5.65) and most modern scholars, who agree that the second interpretation is the correct one. Delebecque (in his notes to the Budé Cyr., ad loc.) is an exception.

5. On the Greek attitude towards eunuchs see Hug, "Eunuchen", RE Suppl. Bd. III, 449-455.

6. Cf. H. Montgomery, Gedanke und Tat: Zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian (Lund 1965), pp. 137-138.

7. So Hug (above, n. 5), 451. Breitenbach, RE 1738; D.M. Lewis, Sparta and Persia (Leiden 1977), p. 20 and P. Guyot, Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike (Stuttgart 1980), pp. 81-83 all point out how unusual our passage is.

8. There is an interesting change in terminology after the conquest of Babylon (7.5 ff.). The ὁμότιμοι have all but disappeared (cf. however 7.5.85; 8.5.21 only confirms the point) to be replaced by κοινῶνες or κοινωνοί (7.5.35, 36; 8.1.16, 25, 36, 40 etc.; the MSS. often confuse the two). Does this mean that Cyrus no longer has equals or peers, only partners?

9. Commentators compare the compact here between Cyrus and the Persian people to the covenant between the Spartan kings and their state described in the Lac.Pol. (15.1-7); cf. Hirsch, p. 99, who considers the compact of the Cyr. an Iranian feature.

10. For a very good discussion of this point see Carlier (above, n. 1), pp. 138-140.

11. So much so that some editors delete 8.1.40-42 (but not, apparently, the passages in 8.3); cf. Holden and Delebecque in their commentaries ad loc.

12. So e.g. J.K. Anderson, Xenophon (London 1974), pp. 178-179; Breitenbach, RE 1739; Holden ad loc. etc. N. Wood, "Xenophon's Theory of Leadership", Classica et Mediaevalia 25 (1964), pp. 64-65, thinks that Xenophon distinguished between three groups - intimate friends, fellow-citizens and enemies - and thought that deception was forbidden only in relation to the first group, intimate friends; cf. the discussion in A.R. Breebaart, "From Victory to Peace: Some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's Cyrupaedia", Mnemosyne 36 (1983), pp. 123-124.

13. Dress: 8.1.40-42 and 8.3.13-14 vs. 1.3.2; food: 8.2.4 ff. vs. 1.3.4 ff.; laws: 8.1.22 vs. 1.3.18; πλεονεξία: 8.5.24 vs. 1.3.18; property: 8.1.20 vs. 1.4.26; aloofness: 8.3.19-23 vs. 1.3.8. Cyrus does not, however, acquire Astyages' fondness for drink (1.3.10).

14. Other problems that face both Cyrus and Hiero are the need to ensure a loyal bodyguard (Cyr. 7.5.58 ff.; Hiero 2.8 ff., 6.10-11 etc.) and the loss of earlier opportunities for society and companionship (Cyr. 7.5.39 ff.; Hiero 6.1-3). They enjoy some of the same advantages as well - both hear only praise (Cyr. 8.2.12; Hiero 1.14-15), enjoy rich food (Cyr. 8.2.4; Hiero 1.16-25) and are best qualified to reward their friends and harm their enemies (Cyr. 8.2.7, 13 etc.; Hiero 2.2). Simonides suggests to Hiero two methods of making himself more popular which are already employed by Cyrus - Hiero should enrich himself by enriching his friends (Hiero 11.13; cf. Cyr. 8.2.15 ff.) and delegate to others the task of punishing, while awarding prizes by himself (Hiero 9.3; cf. Cyr. 8.1.17, 39; 8.2.27).

15. See Breebaart (above, n. 12), pp. 126-127, for an interesting attempt to justify Cyrus' fostering of envy and distrust among the homotimoi, as intended "to keep the engine of all-embracing unselfish monarchical virtue going".

16. See J.J. Farber, "The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship", AJP 100 (1979), p. 501 on the pragmatism behind Cyrus' φιλανθρωπία.

17. See Adam's note on Rep. 343 A 7 and cf. J.B. Skemp, Plato's Statesman (New Haven 1952), pp. 52-66 on the shepherd metaphor and its Persian origin.

18. Some editors have found this attitude so difficult that they delete the last five words of 8.1.44; see Holden ad loc. Schneider's remark (quoted by Dindorf ad loc.) that these words should be taken as Xenophon's judgement and not that of the slaves, is probably right, and the text need not be altered. See too Luccioni (above, n. 1), p. 241.

19. There are, of course, other ways of understanding the ἔτι καὶ νῦν passages. Sometimes they are intended merely to strengthen Xenophon's particular point and are patently false (e.g. 8.5.27). At other times they are meant to display Xenophon's intimate knowledge of Persia - see Lewis (above, n. 7), p. 23, n. 130; p. 53, n. 21; p. 74, n. 158 etc. For a fairly comprehensive collection of the ἔτι καὶ νῦν passages see E. Delebecque, Essai sur la vie de Xénophon (Paris 1957), pp. 395-404.

Notes to Appendix II

1. Cf. Higgins, p. 44; he underestimates, perhaps, the extent of Persian influence on the Cyr.

2. For a brief survey of Xenophon's sources of information on Cyrus and Persia, see Hirsch, pp. 68-69. P. Briant, "Sources grecques et histoire achéménide", in: Rois, Tributs et Paysans (Paris 1982), pp. 491-506, has a thoughtful, more general discussion of the nature of Achaemenid sources available to classical Greek writers and the ways they used them.

3. See R.G. Kent, Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon^2 (New Haven 1953) for a convenient collection of the texts; M. Mayrhofer, Supplement zur Sammlung der altpersischen Inschriften (Vienna 1978) completes the collection of extant Old Persian inscriptions. On other epigraphical sources - Persepolis treasury tablets, Aramaic inscriptions etc. - see the survey in R.N. Frye, The History of Ancient Iran (Munich 1984), pp. 87-88.

4. The authenticity of the Old Persian inscriptions attributed to Cyrus is hotly debated by Iranian scholars; see Frye (above, n. 3), pp. 95-96 for a brief discussion and further references.

5. See Jacoby, FGrH 696 F 3-11 for other evidence in Greek sources for written Persian records.

6. A. Christensen, Les gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique (Paris 1936), pp. 117 ff.

7. See for this point, O. Klima, in: J. Rypka, History of Iranian Literature (English trans. Dordrecht 1968), p. 23.

8. E. Posner, Archives in the Ancient World (Cambridge, Mass. 1972), p. 126, thinks that the Persian chronicle was "the daily record of royal actions and activities, into which every royal decree was entered... termed daybook (ἐφημερίδες) by the Greeks"; cf. the Hebrew דברי הימים. Such registers, Posner says, could be found in the courts of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria and the princely courts of Israel and Judea. A. Momigliano, "Eastern Elements in Post-Exilic Jewish, and Greek, Historiography", in: Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography (Oxford 1977), p. 27, calls Christensen's theory "incredible"; see too the objections of M. Boyce, "The Parthian Gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Tradition", Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1957), p. 33, n. 4.

9. "There is as yet no proof that... middle [sic]-Persian epic ever existed", says Momigliano (above, n. 8), p. 27, who recognizes Eastern stories in Xenophon, Herodotus, Ctesias etc. but explains them as stemming from "international storytelling with a Persian background". R. Drews, The Greek Accounts of Eastern History (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), p. 107 refuses to grant the Persians (or Babylonians) any sort of historical spirit, claiming "... the average man had little knowledge of what was happening or what had happened... not all people were fascinated with, and remembered, great erga."

10. For a discussion of this passage and the Iranian minstrel tradition in general, see Boyce (above, n. 8), esp. pp. 19-20.

11. Cf. M. Boyce, "Zariadres and Zarēr", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 17 (1955), pp. 463-477, esp. p. 470.

12. See E. Schwartz, Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman[2] (Berlin 1943), pp. 75-76 who discusses the influence of Ionian or Eastern stories like that of Odatis and Zariadres on the Panthea episode in the Cyr.

13. See e.g. M. Boyce, "Middle Persian Literature", in: Iranistik, Literatur (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.4.2.1) (Leiden-Cologne 1968), pp. 31-32.

14. This was the fate of the Xwadāy Nāmag ("Book of Rulers") for example. See Boyce (above, n. 13), pp. 57-59.

15. The two versions of this story are of particular interest to Iranian scholars for they seem to furnish proof of the early diffusion of eastern Kayanian legends to western, Achaemenian Persia in the wake of Zoroastrianism. For a detailed comparison of the two versions, see Boyce (above, n. 11).

16. Firdausi probably finished the Shāhnāmah in 1010; see e.g. Rypka (above, n. 7), p. 156 with n. 74. For a convenient, but somewhat abridged translation of the Odatis tale there see The Epic of the Kings: Shah-Nama, the National Epic of Persia by Ferdowsi (trans. R. Levy, London 1967), pp. 181-188.

17. See Klima (above, n. 7), pp. 44-45 and Boyce (above, n. 13). pp. 32 and 59-60. I have seen only a very abridged translation of the Kārnāmag (in E.G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, Vol. I (London 1902), pp. 137 ff.); for the Shāhnāmah version see pp. 252 ff. of the Levy translation (above, n. 16). More details about Ardashir can be found in other Persian writers as well.

18. Both Ctesias' Cyrus and Ardashir come from a poor family, have their future greatness predicted by interpreters of a dream, do menial tasks in the king's palace, flee to their homeland, rebel etc. For a detailed comparison see A.v. Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften III (Leipzig 1892), pp. 133 f. who was the first, apparently, to point out the similarities. See too Christensen (above, n. 6), pp. 120 ff. On Ctesias - Nicolaus cf. above, Chapter IV, n. 9.

19. So R.N. Frye, The Heritage of Persia[2] (London 1976), pp. 86-87 who thinks that Ardashir's story resembles Herodotus' version of Cyrus' rise to power.

20. Of all the Achaemenians only two are briefly mentioned in the eleventh century epic - Dara son of Darab (= Darius III) who was conquered by Sekandar (= Alexander) and the earlier Darab (= Darius I or II). Some scholars think that Artaxerxes I appears in the Shāhnāmah as well (as Bahman, grandson of Vishtaspa) - see e.g. Boyce (above, n. 13), p. 58 with n. 3. See A. Shahbazi, "The Traditional Date of Zoroaster Explained", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 40 (1977), pp. 32-34 on why these Achaemenians were included.

21. See Boyce (above, n. 13), pp. 57 ff. on the Zoroastrian shaping of the Xwadāy Nāmag.

22. For an excellent, concise introduction to the Avesta see I. Gershevitch, "Old Iranian Literature", in: Iranistik, Literatur (above, n. 13), pp. 10 ff.

23. A discussion of the opposing views and bibliography can be found in Gershevitch (above, n. 22), pp. 25-26.

24. On the spread of Zoroastrianism to the Achaemenids in Cyrus' time see M. Boyce, A History of Zoroastrianism, Vol. II (Leiden-Cologne 1982), pp. xi-xii and 43-48; see too the discussion and further references in Frye (above, n. 3), pp. 120-124. For a recent attempt to push the date of Zoroaster back on linguistic grounds, see T. Burrow, "The Proto-Indoaryans", Journal of Royal Asiatic Society (1973), pp. 123-140.

25. Boyce (above, n. 24), pp. 68-69; cf. Cook, pp. 156-157.

26. See, for this point, Shahbazi (above, n. 20), pp. 32 ff.

27. Christensen (above, n. 6), pp. 107-140, has done the most comprehensive work on the subject; A. Pizzagalli, "L'epica iranica e gli scrittori greci", Atene e Roma 10 (1942), pp. 33-43 adds very little to Christensen's arguments; he even reproduces a wrong reference (to Herodotus) given by Christensen. Th. Nöldeke, The Iranian National Epic (Eng. trans. Bombay 1930; repr. Philadelphia 1979), pp. 5 ff. discusses the Persian influences on Ctesias and Herodotus but does not think that there are many Persian elements to be found in the Cyr. - see p. 7, n. 5. W. Knauth (and S. Nadjmabadi), Das altiranische Fürstenideal von Xenophon bis Ferdousi (Wiesbaden 1975), is the best documented attempt to show the relationship between Xenophon's model hero and Iranian sources. Knauth is less interested in recovering traces of early Iranian epic and concentrates on demonstrating the link between monarchic ideals in the Cyr. and those found in the Shahnamah; he sees Xenophon's Cyrus as a "gräko-iranische Herrschermodell" (p. 206).

28. See e.g. Hdt. 1.204-214 and Ctesias, FGrH 688 F 9.7-8; for a complete collection of the Greek sources on Cyrus' death see Weissbach, "Kyros", RE Suppl. IV, 1156 ff. H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg, "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's Cyropaedia as a Source for Iranian History", Acta Iranica 25 (1985), pp. 459-471 has an interesting discussion of the three versions - of Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon - of the death of Cyrus, but her attempt to find parallels between Cyrus' farewell address in the Cyr. (8.7) and Darius' Behistun Inscription is unconvincing.

29. Cf. Christensen (above, n. 6), pp. 126-134. For the dream, last wishes and appointment of successor cf. the last days of Kay Khosrow (Levy trans. [above, n. 16], pp. 177 ff.); appointment of successor, call for unity - Vishtaspa (Levy, p. 218); review of life - Manuchehr (Levy, p. 49). See too the translations of the parallels given by Christensen, loc. cit.

30. See S. Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk-Literature (rev. ed. Copenhagen 1957), P 17.3 and J 154.

31. See J. Luccioni, Xenophon et le Socratisme (Paris 1953), pp. 148-149 for a comparison between Cyr. 8.7 and various passages in the Mem.; he adduces parallels from Plato's Phaedo and Apology as well. Other commentators see a resemblance between Cyrus' words and those of Solon in Herodotus - see Hirsch, p. 83. Perhaps the best characterization of Cyrus' deathbed speech is that of Knauth (above, n. 27), p. 53, who terms it "ein Musterbeispiel der gräko-iranischen Synthese".

32. One further point Christensen raises about Cyrus' death scene should perhaps be mentioned. In the Cyr. Cyrus asks to be buried in the earth simply, without any coverings of gold or silver (8.7.25). Christensen (above, n. 6),

pp. 132-135, compares two episodes in the Shāhnāmah - "Alexander's" request that he be buried in gold armour and Kasra Nashirvan's lengthy specifications for his tomb, which is to resemble the one built for the historical Cyrus. These stories seem to him to indicate that Cyrus' request in the original Persian version was, in fact, quite different. There, claims Christensen, Cyrus asked for an elaborate tomb and trappings of silver and gold, but Xenophon, adapting the original to his purposes, transformed Cyrus' instructions to a Socratic-type request for simplicity. Here, then, Persian influence on the Cyr. is demonstrated, in a sense, by its very absence.

33. See Christensen (above, n. 6), p. 125 and cf. pp. 255-256 of the Levy translation of the Shāhnāmah (above, n. 16) and Kārnāmag 1.31-39 (above, n. 17).

34. Cf. above, n. 9.

35. The mother and son of the Shāhnāmah are Tahmina and Sohrab; cf. Christensen (above, n. 6), pp. 125-126.

36. Cf. Nöldeke (above, n. 27), pp. 88-89, who, when discussing the limited role of women in the Shāhnāmah, remarks: "... personalities like Penelope, Andromache, Nausicaa, who in their pure womanhood are the equal of men cannot be found in the Persian epic". Panthea is, of course, another such personality.

Bibliography

The following is a list of all the modern references cited in the notes, with the exception of standard commentaries (such as How and Wells on Herodotus or Dodds on the Gorgias). Works cited in abbreviated form in the notes have their abbreviations listed at the end of their reference here.

I. Editions, Commentaries and Translations of the Cyr.

Bizos, M. and Delebecque, E., Xénophon, Cyropédie, 3 vols. (Paris 1971-1978).

Breitenbach, L., Xenophons Kyropädie[4] (Leipzig 1890).

Dindorf, L., Xenophontis Institutio Cyri (Oxford 1857).

Gemoll, W., Xenophontis Institutio Cyri (Leipzig 1912; corr. Peters 1968).

Gorham, G.M., The Cyropaedia of Xenophon (London n.d.).

Holden, H.A., The Cyropaedia of Xenophon, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1887-1890).

Hug, A., Xenophontis Institutio Cyri (Leipzig 1883).

Marchant, E.C., Xenophontis Institutio Cyri (Oxford 1910).

Miller, W., Xenophon, Cyropaedia, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1914)

II. Other Works

Aalders, G.J.D., "Date and Intention of Xenophon's Hiero", Mnemosyne IV, 6 (1953), pp. 208-215.

Albertus, J., Die παραλῆπται in der griechischen und römischen Literatur (Diss. Strassburg 1908).

Aly, W., Volksmärchen, Sage und Novellen bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossn (Göttingen 1921, repr. 1969).

- - -, "Novelle", RE XVII.1, cols. 1171-1179.

Anderson, G., Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play (Chico, Calif. 1982).

Anderson, J.K., Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970).

- - - , Xenophon (London 1974).

Andrieu, J., Le dialogue antique: structure et présentation (Paris 1954).

Arnim, H. von , Xenophons Memorabilien und Apologie des Sokrates (Copenhagen 1923).

Asheri, D., Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo (Bologna 1983).

Avery, H.C., "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus", AJP 93 (1972), pp. 529-546.

Barigazzi, A., Review of: Q. Cataudella, La novella greca, Athenaeum 35 (1957), pp. 371-375.

Barker, E., Greek Political Theory[5] (London 1960).

Barkowski, "Sieben Weise", RE II A.2, cols. 2242-2264.

Bell, J.M., "κύμβις καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition", QUCC 28 (1978), pp. 29-86.

Bernays, J., "Philons Hypothetika" in: Gesammelte Abhandlungen, Vol. I (Berlin 1885), pp. 265-266.

Bigwood, J.M., "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus", Phoenix 30 (1976), pp. 1-25.

- - - , "The Ancient Accounts of the Battle of Cunaxa", AJP 104 (1983), pp. 340-357.

Biltcliffe, D.A.W., "P.Oxy 2330 and its Importance for the Study of Nicolaus of Damascus", RhM 112 (1969), pp. 85-93.

Bonner, R.J. and Smith, G., The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, Vols. I-II (Chicago 1930-1938).

Boyce, M., "Zariadres and Zarēr", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 17 (1955), pp. 463-477.

- - - , "The Parthian Gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Tradition", Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1957), pp. 10-45.

- - - , A History of Zoroastrianism, Vol. II (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.8.1.2.2 A. 2)(Leiden 1982).

Bowra, C.M., Problems in Greek Poetry (Oxford 1953).

Breerbaart, A.B., "From Victory to Peace: Some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's Cyrupaedia", Mnemosyne 36 (1983), pp. 117-134.

Breitenbach, H.R., Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons (Diss. Basel 1950).

- - - , "Xenophon von Athen", RE IX A.2, cols. 1569-2051 (reprinted separately, Stuttgart 1966) = Breitenbach, RE.

Bremmer, J., "The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium", ZPE 50 (1983), pp. 173-186.

Briant, P., Rois, Tributs et Paysans (Paris 1982).

Brown, T.S., "Suggestions for a Vita of Ctesias of Cnidus", Historia 27 (1978), pp. 1-19.

Browne, E.G., A Literary History of Persia, Vol. I (London 1902).

Burn, A.R., The Lyric Age of Greece (London 1960).

- - - , Persia and the Greeks (London 1962).

Burrow, T., "The Proto-Indoaryans", Journal of Royal Asiatic Society (1973), pp. 123-140.

Caizzi, F. Decleva, Antisthenis Fragmenta (Milano 1966).

Calder, W.M., "The Oath 'By Hera' in Plato" in: Mélanges Delebecque (Aix en Provence 1983), pp. 35-42.

Calhoun, G.M., "Oral and Written Pleading in Athenian Courts", TAPA 50 (1919), pp. 177-193.

Calogero, G., "Gorgias and the Socratic Principle Nemo sua sponte peccat", JHS 77 (1957), pp. 12-17.

Cambridge History of Classical Literature, Vol. I: Greek Literature (Cambridge 1985).

Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. II (Median and Achaemenian Periods) (Cambridge 1985).

Carawan, E.M., "Erotesis: Interrogation in the Courts of Fourth-Century Athens", GRBS 24 (1983), pp. 209-226.

Carlier, P., "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon", Ktema 3 (1978), pp. 133-163.

Cataudella, Q., La novella greca (Naples 1957).

Cawkwell, G.L., Introduction to: Xenophon: The Persian Expedition (Harmondsworth 1972).

Chaumont, M.L., "Chiliarque et Curopalate à la Cour des Sassanides", Iranica Antiqua 10 (1973), pp. 139-165.

Christensen, A., "Sur la question des sources de la Cyropédie de Xénophon", Atti del XIX Congresso degli Orientalisti (Rome 1935), pp. 248-249.

- - - , Les gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique (Paris 1936).

Chroust, A.H., Socrates, Man and Myth (London 1957).

Classen, C.J., "Xenophons Darstellung der Sophistik und der Sophisten", Hermes 112 (1984), pp. 154-167.

Clay, A.T., "Gobryas, Governor of Babylon", Journal of the American Oriental Society 41 (1921), pp. 466-467.

Cook, J.M., The Persian Empire (London 1983) = Cook.

Corno, D. del, "La lingua di Ctesia (POx. 2330)", Athenaeum 40 (1962), pp. 126-141.

Delatte, A., Le troisième livre des souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon (Liège 1933)

Delebecque, É., Essai sur la vie de Xénophon (Paris 1957).

Denniston, J.D., The Greek Particles^{2} (Oxford 1954).

Devereux, G., "The Self-blinding of Oidipous in Sophokles: Odipous Tyrannos", JHS 93 (1973), pp. 36-49.

Diels, H. and Kranz, W., Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker[6], 3 vols. (Berlin 1952) = DK.

Dihle, A., Studien zur griechischen Biographie (Göttingen 1956).

Diller, H., "Zwei Erzählungen des Lyders Xanthos", Navicula Chiloniensis (Festschrift Jacoby) (Leiden 1956), pp. 67-78 = Kleine Schriften (Munich 1971), pp. 451-463.

Dittmar, H., Aischines von Sphettos (Philologische Untersuchungen 21) (Berlin 1912).

Dörrie, H., Leid und Erfahrung: Die Wort- und Sinn-Verbindung παθεῖν - μαθεῖν in griechischen Denken, Akad. Mainz Abh. d. Geist u. Soz. Klasse 5 (1956).

Dougherty, R.P., Nabonidus and Belshazzar (New Haven 1929).

Dover, K.J., "The Date of Plato's Symposium", Phronesis 10 (1965), pp. 2-10.

- - - , Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle (Oxford 1974).

- - - , Ancient Greek Literature (Oxford 1980).

Drews, R., The Greek Accounts of Eastern History (Cambridge, Mass. 1973).

Ducrey, P., "Aspects juridiques de la victoire et du traitement des vaincus" in: Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne (ed. J.-P. Vernant) (Paris 1968), pp. 231-243.

Ehlers, B., Eine vorplatonische Deutung des sokratischen Eros (Zetemata, Heft 41) (Munich 1966).

Erasmus, S., "Der Gedanke der Entwicklung eines Menschen in Xenophons Kyrupädie", Festschrift Zucker (Berlin 1954), pp. 111-125.

Erbse, H., "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Xenophon", RhM 103 (1960), pp. 144-168.

- - - , "Die Architektonik im Aufbau von Xenophons Memorabilien", Hermes 89 (1961), pp. 257-287.

Farber, J.J., "The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship", AJP 100 (1979), pp. 497-514.

Field, G.C., Plato and his Contemporaries[3] (London 1967).

Finley, M.I., The World of Odysseus (London 1956).

Flacelière, R., "À propos du Banquet de Xénophon", REG 74 (1961), pp. 93-118.

Fontenrose, J., The Delphic Oracle (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1978).

Forster, E.S., Isocrates: Cyprian Orations (Oxford 1912).

Fraenkel, E., "Selbstmordwege", Philologus 87 (1932), pp. 470-473 = Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Vol. I (Rome 1964), pp. 465-467.

Friedländer, P., "ΥΠΟΘΗΚΑΙ", Hermes 48 (1913), pp. 558-616.

Fritz, K. von, "Antisthenes und Sokrates in Xenophons Symposion", RhM 84 (1935), pp. 19-45.

- - - , Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung, Band I.2 (Berlin 1967).

Frost, F.J., Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary (Princeton 1980).

Frye, R.N., The Heritage of Persia[2] (London 1976).

- - - , The History of Ancient Iran (Handbuch der Altertumwissenschaft III.7) (Munich 1984).

Gaiser, K., Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumwissenschaft, Heft 40) (Stuttgart 1959).

- - - , "Griechisches und christliches Verzeihen: Xenophon, Kyrupädie 3.1.38-40 und Lukas 23, 34a", Wiener Studien, Beiheft 8 (1977), pp. 78-100.

Galinsky, G.K., The Herakles Theme (Oxford 1972).

Gautier, L., La langue de Xénophon (Geneva 1911) = Gautier.

Gharib, B., "A Newly Found Old Persian Inscription", Iranica Antiqua 8 (1968), pp. 54-69.

Giangrande, G., "On an Alleged Fragment of Ctesias", QUCC 23 (1976), pp. 31-41.

Giannatoni, G. (ed.), Socraticorum Reliquiae, 4 vols. (Naples 1983).

Gigante, M., "Lettera alla regina o dello stile di Ctesia", RFIC 40 (1962), pp. 249-272

Gigon, O., "Xenophontea", Eranos 44 (1946), pp. 133-140.

- - - , Sokrates: Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte (Bern 1947).

- - - , Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien (Basel 1953) = Gigon I.

- - - , Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien (Basel 1956) = Gigon II.

Gilmore, J., The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias (London 1888).

Gomperz, H., Sophistik und Rhetorik (Berlin 1912).

Gray, V.J., "Dialogue in Xenophon's Hellenica", CQ 31 (1981), pp. 321-334.

- - - , "Xenophon's 'Cynegeticus'", Hermes 113 (1985), pp. 156-172.

- - - , "Xenophon's Hiero and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature", CQ 36 (1986), pp. 115-123.

Grayson, A.K., Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1975).

Griffin, A., Sikyon (Oxford 1982).

Griffin, J., Homer on Life and Death (Oxford 1980).

Gulley, N., The Philosophy of Socrates (London 1968).

Guthrie, W.K.C., A History of Greek Philosophy, Vols. III-IV (Cambridge 1969-1975) = Guthrie, HGP III or IV.

Gutschmid, A. von, Review of: Th. Nöldeke, Geschichte des Artachsir i Papakan, in: Kleine Schriften, Vol. III (Leipzig 1892), pp. 131-134.

Guyot, P., Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike (Stuttgart 1980).

Hackforth, R., Plato's Phaedrus (Cambridge 1972).

Hägg, T., The Novel in Antiquity (Oxford 1983).

Harrison, A.R.W., The Law of Athens, Vol. II (Oxford 1971).

Hartmann, I.I., Analecta Xenophontea Nova (Leipzig 1889).

Hausrath, A., "Die ionische Novellistik", Neue Jahrb. f. Kl. Alt. 17 (1914), pp. 441-461.

Hawtrey, R.S.W., Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus (Philadelphia 1981).

Heinimann, F., Nomos und Physis (Basel 1945; repr. 1965).

Heiserman, A., The Novel Before the Novel (Chicago 1977).

Helm, R., Der antike Roman (Berlin 1948).

Heni, R., Die Gespräche bei Herodot (Diss. Heidelberg, Heilbronn 1976).

Herzog-Hauser, G., "Nutrix", RE XVII.2, cols. 1491-1500.

Higgins, W.E., Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis (Albany 1977) = Higgins.

Hirsch, S.W., The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire (Hanover and London 1985) = Hirsch.

Hirzel, R., Der Dialog: Ein literaturhistorischer Versuch, Vol. I (Leipzig 1895) = Hirzel.

- - - , "Der Selbstmord", Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 11 (1908), pp. 75 ff., 243 ff., 417 ff. (repr. Darmstadt 1967).

Hock, R.F. and O'Neil, E.N., The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, Vol. I: The Progymnasmata (Atlanta, Georgia 1986).

Höistad, R., Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala 1948).

Homeyer, H., "Zu der Anfängen der griechische Biographie", Philologus 106 (1962), pp. 75-85.

Hornblower, J., Hieronymus of Cardia (Oxford 1981).

Hornblower, S., Mausolus (Oxford 1982).

Horschander, J., The Book of Esther in the Light of History (Philadelphia 1923).

Hudson-Williams, H.L., "Conventional Forms of Debate and the Melian Dialogue", AJP 71 (1950), pp. 156-169.

Hug, "Eunuchen", RE, Suppl. III, cols. 449-455.

Humbert, J., Socrate et les petits Socratiques (Paris 1967).

Immisch, O., Gorgiae Helena (Berlin and Leipzig 1927).

Iranistik: Literatur (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.4.2.1) (Leiden-Cologne 1968).

Irwin, T., Review of: L. Strauss, Xenophon's Socrates, Philosophical Review 83 (1974), pp. 409-413.

Jacoby, F., "Herodoros", RE VIII.1, cols. 980-987.

Jacoby, F., "Ktesias", RE XI.2, cols. 2032-2073.

- - - , Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Berlin-Leiden 1923-) = Jacoby, FGrH.

- - - , "Some Remarks on Ion of Chios", CQ 41 (1947), pp. 1-17.

Jebb, R., The Attic Orators^2, Vol. I (London 1893).

Joël, K., Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates, Vol. II.1 & 2 (Berlin 1901).

Jones, J.W., The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks (Oxford 1956).

Kahn, C.H., "Did Plato Write Socratic Dialogues?", CQ 31 (1981), pp. 305-320.

Keller, W.J., "Xenophon's Acquaintance with the History of Herodotus", CJ 6 (1911), pp. 252-259.

Kennedy, G.A., "Focusing of Arguments in Greek Deliberative Oratory", TAPA 90 (1959), pp. 131-138.

Kent, R.G., Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon^2 (New Haven 1953).

Kerferd, G.B., The Sophistic Movement (Cambridge 1981).

Keulen, H., Untersuchungen zur Platons "Euthydem" (Wiesbaden 1971).

Knauth, W. (and Nadjmabadi, S.), Das altiranische Fürstenideal von Xenophon bis Ferdousi (Wiesbaden 1975).

Knox, B.M.W., Oedipus at Thebes (New Haven 1957).

Körte, A., "Aufbau und Ziel von Xenophons Symposion", Verh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss. Phil-hist. Kl. 79 (1927), pp. 3-48.

Kurtz, D.C. and Boardman, J., Greek Burial Customs (London 1971).

Lacey, A.R., "Our Knowledge of Socrates" in: The Philosophy of Socrates (ed. G. Vlastos) (New York 1971), pp. 22-49.

Larsen, J.A.O., "Freedom and its Obstacles in Ancient Greece", CP 57 (1962), pp. 230-234.

Lasserre, F., "'Ερωτικοὶ Λόγοι", MH 1 (1944), pp. 169-178.

Latham, K.J., "Hysteria in History: Some Topoi in War Debates of Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides", Museum Philologum Londiniense 5 (1981), pp. 54-67.

Latte, K., Heiliges Recht (Tübingen 1920).

Lattimore, R., "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus", CP 34 (1939), pp. 24-35.

Lavagnini, B., "Le origini del romanzo greco", Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa 28 (1922), pp. 9-104.

Lefèvre, E., "Die Frage nach dem βίος εὐδαίμων: Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos bei Xenophon", Hermes 99 (1971), pp. 283-296.

Lehmann-Haupt, C.F., "Gobryas und Belsazar bei Xenophon", Klio 2 (1902), pp. 341-345.

Lévy, E., Athènes devant la défaite de 404 (Paris 1976).

Levy, R. (trans.), The Epic of the Kings: Shah-Nama, the National Epic of Persia by Ferdowsi (London 1967).

Lewis, D.M., Sparta and Persia (Leiden 1977).

Lloyd, G.E.R., Polarity and Analogy (Cambridge 1966).

- - - , Introduction to: Hippocratic Writings (Harmondsworth 1978).

- - - , Magic, Reason and Experience (Cambridge 1979).

Luccioni, J., Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon (? Paris 1947).

- - - , Xénophon et le Socratisme (Paris 1953).

Luschnat, O., "Thukydides", RE, Suppl. XII, cols. 1085-1354.

MacDowell, D.M., The Law in Classical Athens (London 1978).

Macleod, C.W., "Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue", Historia 23 (1974), pp. 385-400.

McTighe, K., "Nine Notes on Plato's Lysis", AJP 104 (1983), pp. 67-82.

Martin, J., Symposion: Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums (17.1 & 2) (Paderborn 1931).

Maxwell-Stuart, P.G., "Pain, Multilation and Death in Herodotus VII", La Parola del Passato 31 (1976), pp. 356-362.

Mayrhofer, M., Supplement zur Sammlung der altpersischen Inschriften (Vienna 1978).

Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D.M., A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford 1969).

Momigliano, A., The Development of Greek Biography (Cambridge, Mass. 1971).

- - - , Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography (Oxford 1977).

Montgomery, H., Gedanke und Tat: Zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian (Lund 1965).

Morrow, G.R., Plato's Cretan City (Princeton 1960).

- - - , Plato's Epistles (Indianapolis 1962).

Müller, C.W., Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 17) (Munich 1975).

Nestle, W., "Xenophon und die Sophistik", Philologus 94 (1940/41), pp. 31-50 = Griechische Studien (Stuttgart 1948), pp. 430-450.

Neuhaus, O., "Die Ueberlieferung über Aspasia von Phokaia", RhM 56 (1901), pp. 272-283.

Nickel, R., Xenophon (Erträge der Forschung, Band 111) (Darmstadt 1979).

Nöldeke, Th., The Iranian National Epic (Eng. trans. Bombay 1930; repr. Philadelphia 1979).

North, H., Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature (New York 1966).

Nussbaum, G., The Ten Thousand: A Study in Social Organization and Action in Xenophon's Anabasis (Leiden 1967).

O'Brien, M.J., The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind (Chapel Hill 1967).

Olmstead, A.T., History of the Persian Empire (Chicago 1948).

Paap, A.H.R.E., The Xenophon Papyri (Leiden 1970).

Page, D.L., Greek Literary Papyri, Vol. I (London 1942).

Parke, H.W. and Wormell, D.E.W., The Delphic Oracle, 2 vols. (Oxford 1956).

Patzer, A., Antisthenes der Sokratiker (Diss. Heidelberg 1970).

Pearson, A.C., "Phrixus and Demodice", CR 23 (1909), pp. 255-257.

Pearson, L., Early Ionian Historians (Oxford 1939).

Pease, S.J., "Xenophon's Cyropaedia, 'the compleat general'", CJ 29 (1934), pp. 436-440.

Perry, B.E., The Ancient Romances (Berkeley 1967).

Pizzagalli, A., "L'epica iranica e gli scrittori greci", Atene e Roma 10 (1942), pp. 33-43.

Posner, E., Archives in the Ancient World (Cambridge, Mass. 1972).

Pritchard, J.B. (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament[3] (Princeton 1969).

Pritchett, W.K., The Greek State at War, Part I (Berkeley 1971).

Ramage, E.S., "An Early Trace of Socratic Dialogue", AJP 82 (1961), pp. 418-424.

Rawson, E., The Spartan Tradition in European Thought (Oxford 1969).

Richter, E., "Xenophon-Studien", Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, Suppl. 19 (1893), pp. 57-155.

Riemann, K.A., Das herodoteische Geschichtswerk in der Antike (Diss. Munich 1967).

Robinson, R., Plato's Earlier Dialectic[2] (Oxford 1953).

Robinson, T.M., Contrasting Arguments: An Edition of the Dissoi Logoi (New York 1979).

Rohde, E., Der griechische Roman und seine Vorlaufer[3] (Leipzig 1914).

Romilly, J. de, "L'excuse de l'invincible amour dans la tragédie grecque" in: Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J.C. Kamerbeek (Amsterdam 1976), pp. 309-321.

Rypka, J., History of Iranian Literature (Eng. trans. Dordecht 1968).

Sancisi-Weerdenberg, H., Yauna en Persai: Grieken en Perzen in een ander perspectief (Diss. Leiden 1980).

- - - , "Exit Atossa: Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia" in: Images of Women in Antiquity (eds. A. Cameron & A. Kuhrt) (London 1983), pp. 20-33.

- - - , "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's Cyropaedia as a Source for Iranian History", Acta Iranica 25 (1985), pp. 459-471.

Schachermeyr, F., "Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift über die Staatsmänner", SB Wien Akad. 247.5 (1965), pp. 3-23.

Schaerer, R., La question platonicienne[2] (Neuchâtel 1969).

Schaps, D., "The Women of Greece in Wartime", CP 77 (1982), pp. 193-213.

Scharr, E., Xenophons Staats- und Gesellschaftsideal und seine Zeit (Halle 1918; repr. Tübingen 1974).

Scheil, V., "Le Gobryas de la Cyropédie et les textes cunéiformes", Revue d'Assyrologie 11 (1914), pp. 165-174.

Schwartz, E., "Quellenuntersuchungen zur griechischen Geschichte", RhM 44 (1889), pp. 161-193 = Gesammelte Schriften, Vol. II (Berlin 1956), pp. 136-174.

- - - , Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman[2] (Berlin 1943)

Schwenzner, W., "Gobryas", Klio 18 (1923), pp. 41-58, 226-252.

Shahbazi, A.S., "The Traditional Date of Zoroaster Explained", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 40 (1977), pp. 25-35.

Shaked, S., "Two Judeo-Iranian Contributions: Iranian Functions in the Book of Esther" in: Irano-Judaica (ed. S. Shaked) (Jerusalem 1982), pp. 292-303.

Sinclair, T.A., A History of Greek Political Thought[2] (London 1967).

Skemp, J.B., Plato's Statesman (New Haven 1952).

Slings, S.R., A Commentary on the Platonic Clitophon (Amsterdam 1981).

Smith, K.F., "The Tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia", AJP 23 (1902), pp. 261-282 and 361-387.

Smith, S., Isaiah, Chapters XL-LV (London 1944).

Smyth, H.W., Greek Melic Poets (London 1900).

Snell, B., "Zur Geschichte vom Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen" in: Gesammelte Schriften (Göttingen 1966), pp. 115-118.

Stahl, H.-P., "Learning through Suffering? Croesus' Conversations in the History of Herodotus", YCS 24 (1975), pp. 1-36.

Starr, C.G., "Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.", Part I, Iranica Antiqua 11 (1975), pp. 39-99.

Strauss, L., On Tyranny: An Interpretation of Xenophon's Hiero (New York 1948).

- - - , Xenophon's Socratic Discourse (Ithaca, N.Y. 1970).

- - - , Xenophon's Socrates (Ithaca, N.Y. 1972).

Strycker, E. de, Review of: K. Gaiser, Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon, Gnomon 34 (1962), pp. 13-21.

Sturz, F.W., Lexicon Xenophonteum, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1801; repr. Hildesheim 1964).

Susemihl, F., "Der Idealstaat der Antisthenes und die Dialoge Archelaos, Kyros und Herakles", Jahrb. f. klass. Phil. 135 (1887), pp. 207-214.

Thesleff, H., Studies in the Styles of Plato (Helsinki 1967).

- - - , "The Interrelation and Date of the Symposia of Plato and Xenophon", BICS 25 (1978), pp. 157-170.

Thompson, S., Motif-Index of Folk-Literature, 6 vols. (rev. ed. Copenhagen 1955-1958).

Tigerstedt, E., The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity, Vol. I (Lund 1965).

Trenkner, S., The Greek Novella in the Classical Period (Cambridge 1958) = Trenkner.

Treu, M., "Ps.-Xenophon: Πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων", RE IX A.2, cols. 1928-1982.

Ullrich, F., Entstehung und Entwickelung der Literaturgattung des Symposion, Teil I (Würzburg 1908).

Valla, D., "Il Mito di Pantea", Atene e Roma 3 (1922), pp. 119-124.

Vlastos, G., "ΙΣΟΝΟΜΙΑ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ" in: Platonic Studies^{2} (Princeton 1981), pp. 164-203.

- - - , "The Socratic Elenchus", Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 1 (1983), pp. 27-58.

Vorrenhagen, E., De orationibus quae sunt in Xenophontis Hellenicis (Diss. Elberfeld 1926).

Vries, G.J. de, "Novellistic Traits in Socratic Literature", Mnemosyne IV, 16 (1963), pp. 35-42.

Wacholder, B.Z., Nicolaus of Damascus (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962).

Waters, K.H., Herodotos the Historian (London and Sydney 1985).

Weathers, W., "Xenophon's Political Idealism", CJ 49 (1953/54), pp. 317-321 and 330.

Weissbach, "Kyros", RE, Suppl. IV, cols. 1129-1166.

Wellman, R.R., "Socratic Method in Xenophon", JHI 37 (1976), pp. 307-318.

Wencis, L., "Hypopsia and the Structure of Xenophon's Anabasis", CJ 73 (1978), pp. 44-49.

West, M.L., Iambi et Elegi Graeci, 2 vols. (Oxford 1971-1972).

- - - , Hesiod, Works and Days (Oxford 1978).

Westlake, H.D., "Thucydides and the Pentekontaetia", CQ 5 (1955), pp. 53-67.

Widengren, G., "The Sacral Kingship of Iran" in: La regalità sacra (Numen, Suppl. IV) (Leiden 1959), pp. 242-257.

Wilamowitz,U.von,"Erkenne dich selbst" in: Reden und Vorträge^{4}, Vol. II (Berlin 1926), pp. 171-189.

Woldinga, G.J., Xenophons Symposium, Prolegomena en Commentaar (Diss. Amsterdam 1938-1939).

Wood, N., "Xenophon's Theory of Leadership", Classica et Mediaevalia 25 (1964), pp. 33-66.

Woodruff, P., Plato, Hippias Major (Oxford 1982).

Zaehner, R.C., The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism (London 1961).

Ziegler, K., Plutarchos von Chaironeia (Stuttgart 1964).

Note. Abbreviations of the titles of classical journals are in accordance with L'Année Philologique or otherwise easily intelligible; the names of non-classical periodicals are written out in full.