Xenophon's *Anabasis* and its Reception

Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes

Edited by
Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos

Volume 134

Xenophon's *Anabasis* and its Reception

Edited by
Tim Rood and Melina Tamiolaki

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-079337-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-079343-7
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-079348-2
ISSN 1868-4785

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022942747

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Editorial Office: Alessia Ferreccio and Katerina Zianna
Logo: Christopher Schneider, Laufen
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

To the memory of our fathers,
Pearce Rood (1933–2021)
& Nikolaos Tamiolakis (1941–2022)

Acknowledgements

This volume arose from a conference co-organised by Nikos Miltsios, Tim Rood, and Melina Tamiolaki in Heraklion (Crete), in October 2018. We are grateful to all participants for their excellent contributions and the stimulating discussion, which made this event a truly rewarding experience. The organisation of the conference was made possible thanks to the support of the Special Account of Research Funds of the University of Crete (Grant of Type B Proposals), the Department of Philology of the University of Crete, and the Region of Crete. We also wish to thank Antonios Rengakos and Franco Montanari for accepting this volume into the series *Trends in Classics* of Walter de Gruyter. Finally, Melina Tamiolaki would like to acknowledge the support of her research by the Foundation of Education and European Culture (IPEP, Athens).

The title of the conference back in 2018 was *Anabases in Antiquity and Beyond. Xenophon's* Anabasis *and its Legacy*. Our initial aim was to offer a fresh interpretation of both Xenophon's *Anabasis* and of other *Anabases* in Antiquity and modern times. However, when we started designing this volume, we realised, following also the suggestions and comments of colleagues who read an initial draft, that Xenophon's *Anabasis* deserved in itself a more in-depth exploration, necessitated, among other reasons, by the recent explosion of Xenophontic studies. We thus decided to reconceive the scope of volume: we invited additional contributions on specific aspects or episodes of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, so as to offer a broader coverage of readings and themes; we reduced the papers on Arrian, who initially occupied a whole section at the conference; and we considerably enriched the section on reception. We thank all contributors for their flexibility and patience, and their timely responses, throughout this long process. We are also grateful to Panagiotis Androulakis for compiling the indexes.

The volume appears four years after the conference took place. In the course of these years, several important works on Xenophon have been published, including, most notably, in 2021, the *Landmark Xenophon's* Anabasis, edited by Shane Brennan and David Thomas. We have tried to take account of new findings and we hope that the present book will be a timely and useful addition to the (still growing) body of Xenophontic scholarship.

We would like to dedicate this volume to the memory of our fathers, Pearce Rood and Nikolaos Tamiolakis, who both passed away in the last years of the preparation of this project.

Tim Rood, Oxford
Melina Tamiolaki, Heraklion
May 2022

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110793437-203

Contents

Part II: **Themes in Xenophon's *Anabasis***

Part III: **The Reception of Xenophon's *Anabasis* from Antiquity to Modern Times**

Abbreviations

We have used the following abbreviations for Xenophon's works:

Ages.	*Agesilaus*
Anab.	*Anabasis*
Apol.	*Apology*
Cyn.	*Cynegeticus*
Cyr.	*Cyropaedia*
Eq.	*De re equestri*
Hell.	*Hellenica*
Hier.	*Hiero*
Hipp.	*Hipparchicus*
Lac. Pol.	*Lacedaemonion Politeia*
Mem.	*Memorabilia*
Oec.	*Oeconomicus*
Por.	*Poroi*
Smp.	*Symposium*

– The *Oxford Classical Dictionary* has generally been followed for the abbreviations of other ancient works and authors.

– Other abbreviations include:

FGrHist	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1923–1930; Leiden: Brill, 1940–1958, 15 vols.
LSJ	Liddell, H.G./Scott, R./Stuart Jones, H., *A Greek-English Lexicon* [1843], Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996.
TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, University of California, Irwine.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110793437-205

List of Figures

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110793437-206

Tim Rood and Melina Tamiolaki

Introduction

In the early 1730s, a French priest, J.A. Pagi, pondered what would have been at that time the unusual step of writing a history of Greece. As he contemplated this project, he wrote a short introductory discourse on Greek history in which he spoke of how he had sought in vain for 'the spirit of Athens and of Greece' in the antiquarian collections of Graevius and Gronovius. Instead, his Ariadne's thread through the labyrinth of Greek history would be the city of Athens, through whose story he would resuscitate ancient Greece and reveal the human spirit both in its glory and in its decadence. Pagi only got as far, however, as offering a short philosophical sketch of the development of Greek civilisation. As its title suggests, the work this sketch introduced — published in 1736, four years before his premature death — was restricted to a much shorter period of that history: *Histoire de Cyrus le jeune et de la retraite des Dix mille*.[1]

Pagi's monograph was the first in a line of books that have been devoted to re-telling the story of Xenophon's *Anabasis*. For Pagi, this work offered a celebration of Xenophon's skill, grounded in the teachings of Socrates, as both a philosopher and a warrior. His endeavours did, then, partially anticipate the themes of the Athenian history for which he was testing the waters. But more broadly they foreshadowed the way in which for many later readers the *Anabasis* would come to be a first step into the world of Greece, even as the spirit of that Greek world would be reconfigured according to their successive interests.

Pagi's idea of re-writing Xenophon has been pursued by many successors. Thirty years later, in 1766, another French paraphrase appeared, written by an officer in the French army, J.-L. Le Cointe, as a didactic treatise for young officers. This work was followed in the early years of the nineteenth century by the two-volume *Xenophon und die zehntausend Griechen*, by a German pastor, J.C.L. Haken. Drawing on the emerging trends of German historical criticism, Haken supplemented Xenophon from other sources and through his own reconstructions of characters' motivation.[2] The impulse to re-write Xenophon then took a new turn as explorers in the Ottoman empire began trying to follow on the ground the route taken by the Ten Thousand and as the *Anabasis* became the main text used for introducing schoolchildren to the Greek language. Some writers of works for children adopted fictional personae, introducing new characters through

1 Pagi 1736, 3–6. For Voltaire's dismissal of this work, see Pontier (this volume).

2 Haken 1805; the work was reviewed by Christian Gottlieb Heyne 1805.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110793437-001

whose perspective the story could be told. In time, this fictionalising tendency spread to the market for adult historical fiction: *The Falcon of Sparta*, a 2018 novel by Conn Iggulden, a popular author of historical fiction (and co-author of *The Dangerous Book for Boys*), is but the latest of a series of novelistic re-workings of Xenophon's classic story.

The impulse to re-cast the *Anabasis* may seem paradoxical in view of the fact that Xenophon's own literary artistry has been admired by numerous readers since antiquity. How could a modern author hope to improve on that vividness that was admired by Plutarch? This vigorous reception history doubtless speaks to a desire to read the *Anabasis* from new perspectives, and to conceive afresh that spirit of Athens that it has often been felt to embody. But it speaks, too, to a sense of the *Anabasis* as both familiar and unfamiliar: familiar for the products of modern imperial and supposedly post-imperial ages in its own proto-imperial setting, unfamiliar in the way it resists easy assimilation to the allures of the exotic and to the modern colonial imagination.

Popular engagement with Xenophon's writings has run alongside a varied reception in classical scholarship. When the Socratic wisdom prized by Pagi lost its appeal, and classical scholarship became more professional, Xenophon was for a long time a neglected author, mainly examined in the shadow either of Thucydides or of Plato (and consequently perceived as a second-class historian or philosopher). This picture has changed, however, over the last few decades: scholars now emphasise Xenophon's literary qualities, his experimentation with different genres, and his contribution to political thought.[3] The *Hellenica*, for instance, is considered no longer as naïve historiography to be discarded because of its blatant omissions, but as a work of some literary and political sophistication.[4] In a similar vein, Louis-André Dorion and other scholars have demonstrated that the Xenophontic Socrates deserves to be appreciated for his own sake and not as an insufficient imitation (or distortion) of his Platonic counterpart.[5]

Like Xenophon's other works, the *Anabasis* too has been undergoing a serious rehabilitation. On the one hand, scholars in recent years have paid considerable attention to the complex historical, chronological, prosopographical and topographical issues raised by this work,[6] often re-visiting problems raised in

3 See Tuplin 2004a; Azoulay 2004/2018; Pontier 2006; Tamiolaki 2010 and 2012; Gray 2011; Hobden and Tuplin 2012; Lu 2015.

4 See Gray 1989; Riedinger 1991; Tuplin 1993; Dillery 1995; Tamiolaki 2008 and 2014.

5 Dorion 2000, 2011, 2013; Danzig 2010; Pangle 2018; Danzig, Morrison and Johnson 2018.

6 Historical: Cawkwell 1972; Roy 1986; Tuplin 1999; Bassett 1999 and 2002. Chronological: Brennan 2012. Prosopographical: Bassett 2001; Roisman 1985–1988; Roisman 1988; Hyland 2010. Topographical: Manfredi 1986; Wylie 1992.

earlier scholarship, but now setting the *Anabasis* in the framework provided by the emerging field of Iranological and Near-Eastern studies.[7] In addition, recent studies dwell on the work's generic innovation, its literary sophistication, its political messages, and on the need to pay serious attention to Xenophon's linguistic choices.[8] The debate on the genre and purpose of the *Anabasis* has been particularly intense. Whether it is viewed as a war memoir[9] or, more recently, as a 'lieu de mémoire',[10] its apologetic dimension is frequently underlined — even though some critics have been willing to see darker shades in Xenophon's self-presentation.[11] The work's panhellenic purpose, which was once widely assumed, has also been questioned.[12] Further fruitful angles of interpretation consist of analysing the social and political aspects of this work, and adding thereby considerable nuance to the old image of the Greek mercenaries as a *polis* on the march.[13] Finally, the controversial approach (associated above all with Leo Strauss) of treating the *Anabasis* as a work of political philosophy that requires to be read against the grain of its surface meanings has been revived by Eric Buzzetti.[14]

This volume on Xenophon's *Anabasis* and its reception aims to make a new type of contribution to the rapidly developing field of Xenophontic studies. The first large-scale collaborative reflection on Xenophon's *Anabasis*, it comprises three sections: the first section offers a series of linear readings of central episodes of this work from Book 1 through Book 7; the chapters of the second section deal with important themes that have been underexplored in early scholarship; the third section, finally, contains a number of essays (both general and specific) that explore the work's complex and fascinating reception history.

John Dillery opens the first section by exploring the opening of the *Anabasis*. His linguistic analysis brings out both its distinctiveness within the ancient historiographical tradition and its contribution to the broader structuring of the work: the sequence initiated at the beginning yields to the new beginning, centred on Xenophon, that emerges in Book 3 and is rounded off in Book 7. In the next chapter, Gabriel Danzig reads the apologetic portrayal of Cyrus alongside the methods employed by Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia* and *Memorabilia*:

7 Briant 1995; Tuplin 2004b; Petit 2004.

8 Rood 2010b; Flower 2012; Grethlein 2012; Tuplin 2014; Baragwanath 2016; Nicolai 2018; Huitink and Rood 2016 and 2019.

9 Laforse 2005.

10 Flower 2012.

11 Duerrbach 1893.

12 Erbse 1966; Cawkwell 2004; Rood 2004b.

13 Nussbaum 1967; Dalby 1992; Aupperle 1996; Lee 2007; Waterfield 2011.

14 Strauss 1975; cf. Strauss 1939 and 1941; Buzzetti 2014; cf. the review by Tamiolaki 2015.

Xenophon, it is suggested, both downplays and justifies Cyrus' actions, the better to justify his own actions. With the following two chapters, the focus is on Xenophon's self-presentation as it is depicted in Book 3: Xenophon's other writings again prove an important source of comparative material in Louis-André Dorion's analysis of the famous meeting of Socrates and Xenophon, while Carol Atack reads Xenophon's account of his emergence as leader and of the formation of the Greek army as community against heroic, Spartan and Athenian templates.

With the next two chapters we turn from concentrating on Xenophon himself to analysis of the Ten Thousand's encounters with the alien spaces and peoples of Armenia and the Black Sea shore. Shane Brennan and Christopher Tuplin compare the modes of geographical description found in the narrative of the march through Armenia in Book 4 with those in the rest of the work; this comparative analysis enables them to cast light on the issues involved in attempts to track the army's route in this section of the text. Emily Baragwanath, by contrast, demonstrates Xenophon's artful employment of speech and narrative in his presentation of encounters between Greeks and non-Greeks in Books 5 and 6. Rather than seeing war as a force for moral deterioration, in the Thucydidean mode, the more upbeat Xenophon, in Baragwanath's reading, seeks to convey a moral message about ideal human relations. A similar narrative sophistication is revealed in the concluding chapter in this section, in which David Thomas uses both philological and historical evidence to argue that in the final book of the *Anabasis* Xenophon deliberately presents readers with material that underlines, in a way he could readily have avoided, how he failed in his role of mercenary commander through a breakdown of relations both with the men under his command and with his employer, the Thracian princeling Seuthes. Thomas also presents Xenophon as alluding to the example of the distinguished Athenian general Iphicrates in order to underline his own failings.

The second section fleshes out this series of linear readings by exploring in depth a number of important recurrent themes in the *Anabasis*. Earlier scholarship has placed emphasis on topics such as lying and deceit, heroes, advisers, political agency, and Spartan friendship.[15] While building on this work, this section offers fresh readings of different themes, based on new approaches and scholarly trends. Paul Demont explores the concept of *philia* (friendship), a key ethical theme in many of Xenophon's works. Roberto Nicolai then discusses the presentation of direct speech, the prominence of which is one of the most notable narrative features of the *Anabasis*: by contrasting the way Xenophon presents his

15 Lying and deceit: Wencis 1977; Hirsch 1985; Danzig 2007. Heroes: Tuplin 2003. Advisers: Rood 2006. Political agency: Ferrario 2012. Spartan friendship: Millender 2012.

own speeches and those made by others in the course of the work, Nicolai sheds new light on the work's claim to exemplarity. The next two chapters turn to the role of rumour and misrepresentation (Sarah Brown Ferrario) and the depiction of the emotions (Melina Tamiolaki). In both cases, Xenophon's portrayal of the words and feelings (in particular, lies and negative emotions) of characters within the text has important implications for his narratorial compact with the reader. The last chapter of this section (by Antonis Tsakmakis) discusses another of the *Anabasis*' marked narrative motifs, its presentation of the suffering of the human body. The Greek mercenaries have to fight against extreme weather conditions, famine, injuries and physical pain, illness and exhaustion. Tsakmakis shows that Xenophon's attention to the body is not limited to the soldiers' satisfaction of bodily needs. In a work which explores the boundaries between Greek and barbarian, the body becomes an important cultural signifier which plays a pivotal role in the negotiation of personal and collective identities.

The section devoted to reception spans both antiquity and modernity and embraces a variety of media and genres.[16] It starts by analysing the influence Xenophon's *Anabasis* exerted on later writers in antiquity. The versatile second-century AD writer Arrian was the most famous literary imitator of Xenophon and antiquity: in successive chapters, Estelle Strazdins explores Arrian's detailed engagement in his *Periplus of the Black Sea* with Xenophon's account of the surrounds of Trapezus, including the mountain from which the Ten Thousand famously first saw the sea, and Nikos Miltsios shows how Arrian's portrayal of Alexander's leadership in his *Anabasis of Alexander* is inflected by Xenophontic paradigms. Ewen Bowie then analyses the detailed linguistic and structural engagement with the *Anabasis* in the ancient novel.

The story of the reception of the *Anabasis* is then carried forward by Scott Kennedy and Noreen Humble in chapters that portray the rich and hitherto almost unresearched Byzantine and Renaissance receptions of the *Anabasis*. Further chapters zoom in on specific instances of reception: Tim Rood shows through case-studies spanning the fifteenth and twentieth centuries the ideological issues involved in pictorial representations of the *Anabasis* in editions and translations; Pierre Pontier discusses Voltaire's readings of the *Anabasis* (partly moulded by antagonism to the insufficiently critical work of Pagi from which we started); and Luke Pitcher looks (with a particular focus on Arnold J. Toynbee) at how Xenophon's account of his retirement in Scillus has fostered ancient and modern visions of the historian's task. Finally, Panayiota Mini brings to light, with the help of new sources, the story of how the most popular modern reception of the

16 For earlier studies of the *Anabasis*' reception, see Rood 2004a, 2010, 2012.

Anabasis, Walter Hill's cult 1979 film *The Warriors*, was shaped in the period after the film's release by changes in its marketing.

The volume concludes with an *envoi* by Michael Flower on the importance and benefits of teaching the *Anabasis* — a fitting acknowledgement of the *Anabasis*' long history as a pedagogical text, and of the potential for that history to be continued, informed by the range of approaches covered in the preceding chapters.

References

Aupperle, K.E. (1996) 'Spontaneous organizational reconfiguration: A historical example based on Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Organization Science* 7/4, 445–460.

Azoulay, V. (2004/2018) *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir: De la* charis *au charisme* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne) (English translation, *Xenophon and the Graces of Power*, Swansea 2018).

Baragwanath, E. (2016) 'Knowing future time in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in A. Lianeri (ed.), *Future Time in and Through Ancient Historiography* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter) 95–116.

Basset, S.R. (2001) 'The enigma of Clearchus the Spartan', *American History Bulletin* 15, 1–13.

Basset, S.R. (1999) 'The death of Cyrus the Younger', *Classical Quarterly* 49, 473–483.

Basset, S.R. (2002) 'Innocent victims or perjurers betrayed? The arrest of the generals in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Classical Quarterly* 52, 447–461.

Brennan, S. (2012) 'Mind the gap: A "snow lacuna" in Xenophon's *Anabasis*?', in F. Hobden/C. Tuplin (eds.), 307–339.

Briant, P. (1995) (ed.) *Dans les pas des Dix-Mille: Peuples et pays du Proche-Orient vus par un Grec* (Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail).

Buzzetti, E. (2014) *Xenophon the Socratic Prince: The Argument of the* Anabasis of Cyrus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Cawkwell, G.L. (1972) 'Introduction', in *Xenophon: The Persian Expedition*. Translation by R. Warner (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics) 9–48.

Cawkwell, G.L. (2004) 'When, how and why did Xenophon write the *Anabasis*?', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), 47–57.

Dalby, A. (1992) 'Greeks abroad: Social organization and food among the Ten Thousand', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112, 16–30.

Danzig, G. (2007) 'What's wrong with Tissaphernes? Xenophon's views on lying and breaking oaths', in C.J. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction With(in) the Achaemenid Empire* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales) 27–50.

Danzig, G. (2010) *Apologizing for Socrates: How Plato and Xenophon Created our Socrates* (Lanham: Lexington Books).

Danzig, G./Johnson, D. (2018) (eds.) *Plato and Xenophon: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill).

Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London: Routledge).

Dorion, L.-A. (2000–2011) *Xénophon.* Les Mémorables. 3 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).

Dorion, L.-A. (2013) *L'autre Socrate* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).

Duerrbach, F. (1893) 'L'apologie de Xénophon dans l'*Anabase*', *Revue des études grecques* 6, 343–386.
Erbse, H. (1966) 'Xenophons *Anabasis*', *Gymnasium* 73, 483–505.
Ferrario, S.B. (2012) 'Historical agency and self-awareness in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*', in F. Hobden/C. Tuplin (eds.), 341–375.
Flower, M. (2012) *Xenophon's* Anabasis *or* The Expedition of Cyrus (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Gauthier, P. (1985) 'Xénophon et l'odyssée des Dix-Mille', *L'Histoire* 79, 16–25.
Gray, V. (1989) *The Character of Xenophon's* Hellenica (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press).
Gray, V. (2011) *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes. Reading the Reflections* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Grethlein, J. (2012) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis* from character to narrator', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 132, 23–40.
Haken, J.C.L. (1805) *Xenophon und die zehntausend Griechen* (Magdeburg: G.C. Kiel).
Heyne, C.G. (1805) 'Review of Haken, J.C.L., *Xenophon und die zehntausend Griechen*, Magdeburg: G.C. Kiel 1805', *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 20, 1221–1224.
Hirsch, S.W. (1985) *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover, N.H: University Press of New England).
Hobden, F./Tuplin, C. (2012) (eds.) *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Inquiry* (Leiden: Brill).
Huitink, L./Rood, T. (2016) 'Subordinate officers in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Histos* Supplement 5, 199–242.
Huitink, L./Rood, T. (2019) *Xenophon:* Anabasis. *Book III* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Hyland, J. (2010) 'The desertion of Nicarchus the Arcadian in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Phoenix* 64/3, 238–253.
Laforse, B. (2005) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis*: The first war memoir', *Syllecta Classica* 16, 1–30.
Lane Fox, R. (2004) (ed.) *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Le Cointe, J.-L. (1766) *Commentaires sur la retraite des Dix-mille*, 2 vols. (Paris: Nyon).
Lee, J. (2007) *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's* Anabasis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Lendle, O. (1995) *Kommentar zu Xenophons* Anabasis (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
Lossau, M. (1990) 'Xenophons *Odyssee*', *Antike und Abendland* 36, 47–52.
Lu, H. (2015) *Xenophon's Theory of Moral Education* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing).
Manfredi, V. (1986) *La strada dei diecimila: Topografia e geografia dell'Oriente di Senofonte* (Milan: Jaca Book).
Millender, E. (2012) 'Spartan friendship and Xenophon's crafting of the *Anabasis*', in F. Hobden/C. Tuplin (eds.), 377–425.
Nicolai, R. (2018) 'Genre, models and functions of Xenophon's *Anabasis* in comparison with Isocrates' λόγοι', in M. Tamiolaki (ed.), *Xenophon and Isocrates. Political Affinities and Literary Interactions*, Special Issue, *Trends in Classics*, 197–217.
Nussbaum, G.B. (1967) *The Ten Thousand: A Study in Social Organization and Action in Xenophon's* Anabasis (Leiden: Brill).

Pagi, Abbé (1736) *Histoire de Cyrus le jeune et de la retraite des Dix mille* (Paris: Didot).
Pangle, T.L. (2018) *The Socratic Way of Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
Petit, T. (2004) 'Xénophon et la vassalité achéménide', in C.J. Tuplin (ed.), 175–200.
Pontier, P. (2006) *Trouble et ordre chez Platon et Xénophon* (Paris: Vrin).
Pontier, P. (2014) (ed.) *Xénophon et la rhétorique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires Paris-Sorbonne).
Riedinger, J.-C. (1991) *Etude sur les* Helléniques: *Xénophon et l'histoire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Roisman, J. (1985–1988) 'Klearchos in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 8–9, 30–52.
Roisman, J. (1988) 'Anaxibios and Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *American History Bulletin* 2, 80–87.
Rood, T. (2004a) *The Sea! The Sea! The Shout of the Ten Thousand in the Modern Imagination* (London: Duckworth Overlook).
Rood, T. (2004b) 'Panhellenism and self-Representation: Xenophon's speeches', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), 305–329.
Rood, T. (2006) 'Advice and advisers in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in D. Spencer/E. Theodorakopoulos (eds.), *Advice and its Rhetoric in Greece and Rome* (Bari: Levante) 47–61.
Rood, T. (2010a) *American Anabasis: Xenophon and the Idea of America from the Mexican War to Iraq* (London/New York: Duckworth).
Rood, T. (2010b) 'Xenophon's parasangs', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 130, 51–66.
Rood, T. (2012) 'A delightful retreat: Xenophon and the picturesque', in F. Hobden/C.J. Tuplin (eds.), 89–121.
Roy, J. (1986) 'Xenophon's evidence for the *Anabasis*', *Athenaeum* 46, 37–46.
Strauss, L. (1939) 'The Spirit of Sparta or the Taste of Xenophon', *Social Research* 6, 502–536.
Strauss, L. (1975) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Interpretation* 4, 117–147.
Strauss, L. (1941) 'Persecution and the art of writing', *Social Research* 8, 488–504.
Stronk, J.P. (1995) *The Ten Thousand in Thrace: An Archaeological and Historical Commentary on Xenophon's* Anabasis*, Books VI, iii-vi-VII* (Amsterdam: Gieben).
Tamiolaki, M. (2008) 'Les *Helléniques* entre tradition et innovation: Aspects de la relation intertextuelle de Xénophon avec Hérodote et Thucydide', *Cahiers des études anciennes* 45, 15–52.
Tamiolaki, M. (2010) *Liberté et esclavage chez les historiens grecs classiques* (Paris: Presses Universitaires Paris-Sorbonne).
Tamiolaki, M. (2012) 'Virtue and leadership in Xenophon: Ideal leaders or ideal losers?', in F. Hobden/C.J. Tuplin (eds.), 563–589.
Tamiolaki, M. (2014) 'A l'ombre de Thucydide? Les discours des *Helléniques* et leur influence thucydidéenne', in P. Pontier (ed.), 121–138.
Tamiolaki, M. (2015) 'Review on Buzzetti, *Xenophon the Socratic Prince. The Argument of the* Anabasis of Cyrus, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2014', *CJ* online 2015.10.07.
Tsagalis, C. (2002) 'Xenophon homericus: An unnoticed loan from the *Iliad* in Xenophon's *Anabasis* (1.3)', *Classica e Medievalia* 53, 101–122.
Tuplin, C.J. (1993) *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon's* Hellenica *2.3.11–7.5.27* (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag).
Tuplin, C.J. (1999) 'On the track of the Ten Thousand', *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 101, 331–366.
Tuplin, C.J. (2003) 'Heroes in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in A. Barzanò *et al.* (eds.), *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea.* Vol. 4 (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider) 115–156.

Tuplin, C.J. (2004a) (ed.) *Xenophon and his World* (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag).
Tuplin, C.J. (2004b) 'The Persian Empire', in Lane Fox (ed.), 154–183.
Tuplin, C.J. (2014) 'Le salut par la parole: Les discours dans l'*Anabase* de Xénophon', in P. Pontier (ed.), 69–120.
Waterfield, R. (2005) (trans.) *Xenophon:* The Expedition of Cyrus (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Waterfield, R. (2011) 'Greed and the mixed constitution in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Αριάδνη* 17, 127–156.
Wencis, L. (1977) '*Hypopsia* and the structure of Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Classical Journal* 73, 44–49.
Wylie, G. (1992) 'Cunaxa and Xenophon', *Antiquité Classique* 61, 119–131.

Part I: **New Readings of Xenophon's *Anabasis***

John Dillery

Starting and Restarting the *Anabasis*

Abstract: The paper starts with a quick and selective survey of beginnings in historical works. Then follows the argument relating to the start of the *Anabasis*. Beyond the obvious point that the work opens in some fashion, the start of the *Anabasis* is clearly composed in a manner that relates it to genealogical accounts and stories of dynastic in-fighting. This connection is achieved largely through the use of the *praesens tabulare* γίγνονται at *Anab*. 1.1.1. The *Anabasis* is 're-started' at the beginning of Book 3, specifically at the famous 'introduction' of the character Xenophon at *Anab*. 3.1.4. The paper concludes with an analysis of various ring- or closural-features that bring the reader back at the end of the *Anabasis* both to its formal start and to its second beginning, suggesting that *Anab*. 3.1.4 is in fact a very deliberate refashioning and launching of the narrative with a different orientation.

It has almost become routine for modern students of Xenophon to point out that his two historical works, the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis*, both lack prefaces.[1] In the case of the *Anabasis* in particular, ancient readers also noticed the absence of a proem (Lucian *Hist. Conscr*. 23, 52; cf. [Demetr.] *Eloc*. 3); indeed, Diogenes Laertius observed that Xenophon wrote a preface (*prooimion*) to each of its books but did not for the whole work (D.L. 2.57).[2] But there is a major problem with this observation. If the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* lack prefaces, they do so in different ways. Insofar as the *Hellenica* is in some sense a continuation of Thucydides' *History*, and was conceived of by Xenophon as such, the lack of a preface ought to be seen as an unsurprising feature of that work; while it is possible

I would like to thank M. Tamiolaki and T. Rood for their invitation to the *Anabasis* Conference in Heraklion, and for their editorial help later. I would also like to thank my colleague C. George for bibliographic advice, and A.A. Nijk for providing me with a copy of his dissertation. Throughout this paper emphases in italics are mine.

1 E.g., Kramer 1968, 6; Due 1989, 29; Gray 2003, 111 and n. 2; Flower 2012, 52 and 2017, 304; Marincola 2017a, 103 and 2017b, 22. I do not take up here the issue whether the *Anabasis* is clearly meant to be seen as an historical work. Cf. Bradley 2001, 66–67 = 2010, 530–531.

2 D.L. 2.57 τήν τ' Ἀνάβασιν, ἥς κατὰ βιβλίον μὲν ἐποίησε προοίμιον, ὅλης δὲ οὔ. See Higbie 2010, 17: readers evidently expected an introduction to the whole of the *Anabasis*. See also below. [Demetrius] speaks of the first line of the *Anabasis* as being 'at the beginning' (ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ) of the work, not from its *prooimion* (cf. *Eloc*. 34).

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110793437-002

to imagine a preface to a continuation, the move from Thucydides Book 8 to the start of *Hellenica* Book 1 is certainly made easier by the lack of a formal preface introducing the new work.[3]

The circumstances of the start of the *Anabasis*, though, are very different. It is not a continuation. Its lack of a preface, if true, would not have as ready an explanation. Moreover, the claim that the *Anabasis* does not have a *prooimion* has tended to obscure the fact that the work does in fact begin, and does so in a very deliberate way.[4]

Now, it is absurd to have to say that the *Anabasis* has a beginning. The issue, rather, is distinguishing between a formal preface of some sort, conceived and written with certain expectations in mind, and the simple start of a text — where its first words are literally found, the physical start of the text that will proceed until it stops.[5]

This paper will attempt to account for how the *Anabasis* begins. Specifically, it will argue that there are strong clues in *Anabasis*'s opening sentences that announce what sort of story it seems to want to tell. These indications have the effect of installing Cyrus the Younger as the hero of the work. The problem of course is that this hero is killed off at the end of the first book, rendering the opening of the *Anabasis* as ill-fitting with the majority of the work as is its title — *Anabasis*, or 'Journey Up-Country', as opposed to 'Back'.[6] The work needs a new start, when the 'real' subject of the *Anabasis* is introduced, namely the safe return of the Cyrean mercenaries to the Greek world, thanks in no small part to the new hero of the account, Xenophon.[7]

But before entering on my discussion of the start of the *Anabasis*, it is important to bring up some preliminaries: what do we mean by a preface, and what evidence is there for prefaces in other of Xenophon's works?

3 It is difficult to make out from the fragments of Theopompus' continuation of Thucydides, the *Historiai,* if he had a preface at the start (*FGrHist* 115 TT 13–15, F 5).

4 As does in fact the *Hellenica* also; see below on the μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα formula.

5 Cf. Leander 2008.

6 Cf. Masqueray 1930/1949, 1.6; Breitenbach 1967, 1639; Tatum 1989, 90.

7 My analysis can be seen to share some of the same objectives with Carol Atack's paper in this volume.

1 Prefaces: Antecedents and parallels from other Xenophontic works

The ancients theorised about prefaces a fair amount, but most of their discussion centered on rhetorical *prooimia*, namely, on speeches.[8] To judge by the expectations expressed in modern treatments of Xenophon, what ought to be found in a formal introduction to the *Anabasis* would be: the presentation of the author's name and ethnic; a statement regarding the work's subject matter, together with a brief justification of the choice as worthy of treatment; and (perhaps) a description of the author's methodology. Of course, these components of a notional preface derive from the actual ones we possess from the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides; in the case of Thucydides specifically, his methodological statement is separated by several chapters from his preface, but this did not stop Dionysius from combining the relevant sections (Thuc. 1.1.1–2 + 1.21–3 = D.H. *Thuc*. 20).

Most of Xenophon's other works do have prefaces of one sort or another and of varying lengths.[9] Some of his writings begin with a glimpse into the thinking of Xenophon, an admission that he has wrestled with the question that will form the subject of the subsequent treatise (*Lac. Pol.* 1.1) or long work (*Cyr*. 1.1.1–6).[10] Other of his introductions point to the difficulty of what Xenophon has undertaken to do (to write an encomium worthy of Agesilaus, *Ages*. 1.1), or express surprise that an erroneous view has come to have been accepted, necessitating correction (how the Athenians could have been persuaded that Socrates was impious and a corrupting influence, *Mem*. 1.1.1).[11] Still others are merely scene-setters (*Hier*. 1.1, *Oec*. 1.1), providing only the barest introduction to what will be a dialogue (much like many of Plato's introductory frames). A strong I/we-*persona* is presented at the start of several works, one that justifies the topic to be taken up (*Smp*. 1.1, *Apol*. 1, *Eq*. 1.1, *Por*. 1.1). Finally, one short work, like the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*, seems to lack a preface altogether (*Hipp*. 1.1), whereas another has easily the most elaborate of all Xenophon's beginnings (*Cyn*. 1.1–18), a mythological excursus that is so out of keeping with the rest of

8 E.g. Arist. *Rh*. 1414b; Anaximenes *Ars Rh*. 29.1; cf. Herkommer 1968, 15.

9 Cf., e.g., Kramer 1968, 6.

10 Dillery 2017, 201 and n. 30; 2018, 87–90.

11 Dillery 2018a, 90–91.

his corpus that it excited the view that the work was spurious, or at least the introduction and perhaps also its epilogue.[12]

It is useful here to consider a possible candidate for a preface to the *Anabasis* from the pen of Xenophon himself. At the start of Book 3 of the *Hellenica*, in the context of discussing Spartan naval help for Cyrus in his attempt to usurp the throne of his brother Artaxerxes, Xenophon writes:

> ὡς μὲν οὖν Κῦρος στράτευμά τε συνέλεξε καὶ τοῦτ' ἔχων ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ ὡς ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο, καὶ ὡς ἀπέθανε, καὶ ὡς ἐκ τούτου ἀπεσώθησαν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπὶ θάλατταν, Θεμιστογένει τῷ Συρακοσίῳ γέγραπται.
>
> (Xen. *Hell*. 3.1.2).[13]

> How then Cyrus assembled an army and, taking it with him, marched inland against his brother, and how the battle took place, and how he died, and how after this the Greeks returned safely to the sea, have been written up by Themistogenes the Syracusan

Setting aside the vexed questions of the ascription of an account of the Ten Thousand to 'Themistogenes' and his identity (a *nom de plume* for Xenophon? Cf. Plut. *Mor*. 345e),[14] this thumbnail sketch is remarkable for how it digests the action of the events of the *Anabasis* into discrete episodes, posed in a series of indirect questions, each set off like a bulleted memorandum with ὡς ... καὶ ὡς ... In a sequence at the start of his *Cyropaedia* that is clearly meant to be prefatory, Xenophon anticipates the topics he will treat in that work in precisely the same way, through a series of 'bulleted' indirect questions (*Cyr*. 1.1.6). The recapitulations found in the *Anabasis* at the start of Books 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 (cf. D.L. 2.57), as well as the plot summaries in Chariton at 5.1.1–2 and 8.1.1, which appear to be imitating the text of the *Anabasis* he knew, are phrased in a similar way.[15]

The key points that Xenophon isolates at *Hell*. 3.1.2 as forming the essential story of the Cyreans are, it is true, asymmetrical: three of the four episodes concern action that takes place in Book 1 of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, whereas the last item, the safe return of the Greeks to the sea, corresponds to Books 2–4, with Books 5–7 omitted entirely. I note further that the summary of events from the march of the Ten Thousand from the *Hellenica* seems to assume that the audi-

12 Dillery 2017, 213–214 and n. 72 (considerable bibliography on the question).

13 All translations are mine.

14 See Pitcher 2012, *BNJ* 108; he expresses a slight preference for assuming Themistogenes not to have been Xenophon.

15 Trzaskoma 2011, 13–16 and n. 26. Høegs 1950, and Erbse 1966, 488 = 2010, 480 defend the authenticity of the recapitulations, though they are in the minority. See also Bowie this volume.

ence already knows about them, or at least some of them: Cunaxa is referred to as '*the* battle' (ἡ μάχη), as if that conflict was already widely known as the culminating event in Cyrus' failed effort to wrest the throne from his brother. Indeed, I would stress that for the Xenophon of the *Hellenica*, the events of the march are fundamentally already first a text in his mind, even if written by a shadowy author who is otherwise unknown (Themistogenes), rather than a set of events that he presents in his own summary.[16]

It seems to me that Xenophon could have written pretty much what we see at *Hell*. 3.1.2 as an admirable introduction to his *Anabasis*, making the necessary name change and perhaps moving the statement of authorship to the very start: 'Xenophon an Athenian has written how Cyrus assembled an army, …'.[17]

2 The Problem: *Anab*. 1.1.1–4

But, of course, Xenophon did not do that. Instead, he began the *Anabasis* as follows:

> Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος *γίγνονται* παῖδες δύο, πρεσβύτερος μὲν Ἀρταξέρξης, νεώτερος δὲ Κῦρος. ἐπεὶ δὲ *ἠσθένει* Δαρεῖος καὶ *ὑπώπτευε* τελευτὴν τοῦ βίου, *ἐβούλετο* τὼ παῖδε ἀμφοτέρω παρεῖναι. ὁ μὲν οὖν πρεσβύτερος *παρὼν ἐτύγχανε*· Κῦρον δὲ *μεταπέμπεται* ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἧς αὐτὸν σατράπην ἐποίησε, καὶ στρατηγὸν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀπέδειξε πάντων ὅσοι εἰς Καστωλοῦ πεδίον ἀθροίζονται. *ἀναβαίνει* οὖν ὁ Κῦρος λαβὼν Τισσαφέρνη ὡς φίλον, καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων δὲ ἔχων ὁπλίτας *ἀνέβη* τριακοσίους, ἄρχοντα δὲ αὐτῶν Ξενίαν Παρράσιον. ἐπεὶ δὲ *ἐτελεύτησε* Δαρεῖος καὶ *κατέστη* εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀρταξέρξης, Τισσαφέρνης *διαβάλλει* τὸν Κῦρον πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὡς *ἐπιβουλεύοι* αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ *πείθεταί* τε καὶ *συλλαμβάνει* Κῦρον ὡς ἀποκτενῶν· ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ἐξαιτησαμένη αὐτὸν *ἀποπέμπει* πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν. ὁ δ' ὡς *ἀπῆλθε* κινδυνεύσας καὶ ἀτιμασθείς, *βουλεύεται* ὅπως μήποτε ἔτι *ἔσται* ἐπὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ, ἀλλ', ἢν *δύνηται*, *βασιλεύσει* ἀντ' ἐκείνου. Παρύσατις μὲν δὴ ἡ μήτηρ *ὑπῆρχε* τῷ Κύρῳ, φιλοῦσα αὐτὸν μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν βασιλεύοντα Ἀρταξέρξην …
>
> (Xen. *Anab*. 1.1.1–4)

> Of Darius and Parysatis are born two sons, the elder, Artaxerxes, the younger, Cyrus. When Darius was ill and suspecting an end to his life, he was wishing the two sons both to be present. Now the elder son happened to be present; he sends for Cyrus from the command over which he made him satrap, and he had appointed him general of all the people, however many are assembled in the plain of the Castolus. Therefore, Cyrus heads in-

16 'Themistogenes' is the only author cited in the whole of the *Hellenica*, which inclines me to think, with Plutarch, that the citation is in some way meant to signal Xenophon's actual authorship of the *Anabasis*.

17 Cf. Flower 2012, 43.

> land, taking Tissaphernes with him, in the belief he was his friend, and he went inland having three hundred Greek hoplites, and as their commander Xenias the Parrasian. When Darius died and Artaxerxes entered upon the kingship, Tissaphernes falsely accuses Cyrus to his brother, that he was plotting against him. He is persuaded and arrests Cyrus with the intention to put him to death; but their mother, having gained his release, sends him back again to his command. But he, since he went away having nearly lost his life and dishonored, resolves never again to be under his brother's power, but, if he is able, to become king instead of that one. Parysatis, their mother, was devoted to Cyrus, loving him more than Artaxerxes, the one who was king …

Several important details lurk in the opening words. The first sentence of the *Anabasis*, while internally displaying καί as a copulative, as well as the coordinating μέν … δέ, lacks an orienting particle or conjunction as a whole. In other words, there is asyndeton at the very start of the work. This is the only such case in the entirety of Xenophon's corpus,[18] and one that is rare in Greek prose more generally.[19] One has to assume that Xenophon wanted the opening words of the *Anabasis* themselves, without a particle or conjunction of any sort, to provide the necessary orientation.

I believe that the orienting marker in the opening clause is the verb γίγνονται: 'Of Darius and Parysatis *are born* two sons'. This use of γίγνονται has not infrequently been misidentified as a historical present (hereafter, HP).[20] HPs normally 'lift out' a verb form from a context that is otherwise defined as past (preterite);[21] but when it is the first verb in the text, there is no context established of any sort, so there is no standard register of presentation out of which an item of special interest can be 'lifted'. Wackernagel and others were alert to the problem of the identification of γίγνονται as an HP. The chief purpose of the HP has often been held to be to create 'a particularly vivid form of representation, a strongly present depiction of an event'.[22] But, if that is so, Wackernagel

18 Indefinite ποτε at the start of *Cyr*., *Mem*., and *Hier*.; δέ *Hell*., *Oec*. (δέ ποτε), and *Apol*.; μέν *Ages*., *Hipp*., *Cyn*., *Por*.; ἐπειδή *Eq*.; ἀλλ(ά) *Smp*., *Lac*. *Pol*. (ἀλλ' … ποτέ). Xenophon's preference for indefinite ποτε, alone and in combination, is noteworthy (Dillery 2017, 216–217 and n. 92), as is his use of 'initial' or 'inceptive' ἀλλ(ά), otherwise rare (Dillery 2018a, 89 and n. 30, with bibliography).

19 E.g., Denniston 1954, xliii; Denniston observes (xlv) that Andocides and Xenophon are particularly noted for 'omit[ting] connectives in narrative with a certain naïve awkwardness, and without any apparent justification'. Cf. MacDowell 1962, 214–215; Denniston 1952, 116–117: full-asyndeton sometimes found 'at the beginning of a story or its climax'.

20 See esp. Rijksbaron's survey of commentaries for interpretations of γίγνονται at *Anab*.1.1.1: Rijksbaron 2019, 397–403.

21 Cf. Sicking and Stork 1997, 156 and 165.

22 Wackernagel 2009, 211.

argued, that function cannot be applied to *Anab*. 1.1.1: 'now, nobody would wish to maintain that this is a case of dramatically vivid representation. It is simply an important piece of factual information, necessary for an understanding of what follows, and placed first.'[23] The dismissal of γίγνονται as an HP seems right; but one wishes Wackernagel had said more about how he determined what it meant for γίγνονται παῖδες δύο to be 'necessary for an understanding of what follows'.

What can it mean for a verb to provide 'an important piece of factual information'? Do not all verb forms do this, to a greater or lesser extent? The answer lies with identifying γίγνονται at *Anab*. 1.1.1 as yet another kind of present tense verb for preterite: the *praesens annalisticum/tabulare*,[24] or, as it has been more recently labelled, 'the registering present'.[25] According to Allan, the function of this type of present is not to bring the reader back to a moment in time (something like the popular conception of the HP, i.e through the 'vividness' of the HP), but rather 'to highlight mile-stone events in the past which are viewed as still relevant to the narrator's present'. The verbs that tend to occur in this use concern birth, marriage, death and giving, and help to register certain basic facts that are central to the subsequent story.[26]

That Cyrus and Artaxerxes are/were sons of Darius is the only fact from the more distant past that is recorded in the opening frame of the *Anabasis*, and it is registered with a *praesens annalisticum/tabulare*. All of the other presents, with one exception,[27] concern the more recent circumstances of the conflict between Cyrus and Artaxerxes: Cyrus *is sent for* by the dying Darius; he *journeys* inland; Tissaphernes *falsely accuses* Cyrus of plotting against Artaxerxes; Artaxerxes *is persuaded* and *arrests* Cyrus; Parysatis *sends* Cyrus out of danger back to his province; Cyrus *resolves* not to be under his brother's power again. These verbs are best understood as present tense forms that summarise the past circumstances that led to Cyrus' revolt; in particular the pairing διαβάλλει … ἐπιβουλεύοι shows in no uncertain terms that the verbs are clearly past tense in orientation, since an optative has replaced an original indicative in a dependent clause. While some present tense verbs do indeed bring vividness to the events they relate (they are 'mimetic' and are HPs in the conventional sense), these

23 Wackernagel 2009, 212.

24 See esp. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 272; also, Allan 2011, 246.

25 See the pioneering work of Nijk 2019, esp. Chapter 4.

26 Allan 2011, 246.

27 ἀθροίζονται clearly refers to an administrative unit defined by where specific levies are expected to gather. It is present because this is an ongoing activity; cf. *Hell*. 1.4.3: Darius states in a letter καταπέμπω Κῦρον κάρανον τῶν εἰς Καστωλὸν ἀθροιζομένων.

clearly do not. Rather, they function to provide the crucial background explanation for what follows: why did Cyrus go to war with his brother?[28]

But unaccounted for still is the use of γίγνονται at the very start of the *Anabasis*, and in particular how it may have facilitated the interpretation of the opening of the work precisely *as a prologue*, laying the groundwork for the audience to surmise what the story was going to be about. Schwyzer-Debrunner noted that one location where one would typically find the *praesens annalisticum/tabulare* was at the beginning of major sections of narrative or even whole books.[29] It is important to follow up on Schwyzer-Debrunner's observation here. Indeed, it would be helpful to find parallels for the *praesens annalisticum/tabulare* not just anywhere in a text, but specifically at the *start* (or perhaps end) of narratives. These parallels would help to show that a specific initiating or closural function was felt in the deployment of present tense verbs at major 'joins' in a text, and would also aid in identifying what sort of stories were begun (or ended) in this way, that is, what sort of expectations may have been raised for an audience when encountering such a beginning.

In their description of the *praesens annalisticum/tabulare*, Schwyzer-Debrunner point not only to *Anab.* 1.1.1, but also to Hdt. 1.102.1: Δηιόκεω δὲ παῖς *γίνεται* Φραόρτης, ὃς τελευτήσαντος Δηιόκεω, βασιλεύσαντος τρία καὶ πεντήκοντα ἔτεα, παρέδεξατο τὴν ἀρχήν. Not only do we have the same details from *Anab.* 1.1.1 (initial genitive of the parent Δηιόκεω, construed with παῖς γίνεται, the verb γίγνεσθαι in present tense), the structural function of the sentence is similar. It comes at the end of Herodotus' account of the Median king Deioces (cf. esp. the summarising section at Hdt. 1.101) and serves as the introduction to his account of the next ruler, Deioces' son, Phraortes. The subject matter is also the same as *Anab.* 1.1.1, insofar as it concerns the transfer of power from one Persian (or here, Median) king to another. A similar case is found at the end of Herodotus' Book 3, where he concludes the story of Zopyrus, who engineered the recapture of Babylon for Darius:

> Ζωπύρου δὲ τούτου *γίνεται* Μεγάβυξος, ὃς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀντία Ἀθηναίων καὶ συμμάχων ἐστρατήγησε· Μεγαβύξου δὲ τούτου *γίνεται* Ζώπυρος, ὃς ἐς Ἀθήνας ηὐτομόλησε ἐκ Περσέων.
>
> (Hdt. 3.160.2)

28 Cf. Erbse 1966, 488 = 2010, 480. Here I am heavily indebted to the work of Nijk and follow his taxonomy of the HP; for his discussion of the differences between the 'scenic' or 'mimetic' HP and the summarising 'diegetic present', see Nijk 2019, 142–143.

29 Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 272.

> Born of this Zopyrus is Megabyzus, who served as general in Egypt against the Athenians and their allies; and of this Megabyzus is born Zopyrus, who deserted from the Persians to Athens.

The syntax and word choice are again identical with *Anab*. 1.1.1: genitive of the parent (twice), listed first, followed by γίνεται in the present tense (twice). While no doubt again a coincidence, we have yet another Persian lineage being laid out, though in this case not a royal one. It is also worth noting that this particular parallel comes, if not at the beginning, then at the end of, if not one of own Herodotus' own book divisions, then the close of one of his major *logoi*.[30]

Stein has collected a number of parallels from Herodotus to explain Hdt. 3.160.2.[31] Some of these are worth looking at here, precisely as parallels for *Anab*. 1.1.1, not only for their structure, but also for their content. At 4.160.1, Herodotus turns to a narrative of the successor of Battus, founder and king of Cyrene:

> τούτου δὲ τοῦ Βάττου παῖς *γίνεται* Ἀρκεσίλεως, ὃς βασιλεύσας πρῶτα τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ ἀδελφεοῖσι ἐστασίασε, ἐς ὅ μιν οὗτοι ἀπολιπόντες οἴχοντο ἐς ἄλλον χῶρον τῆς Λιβύης καὶ ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν βαλόμενοι ἔκτισαν πόλιν ταύτην ἣ τότε καὶ νῦν Βάρκη καλέεται.
>
> Of this Battus a child is born, Arcesilaus, who, having assumed the throne, quarreled with his brothers until they left him behind and went to another part of Libya and on their own founded that city which then and now is called Barca.

Again, the same opening structure is found (τούτου δὲ τοῦ Βάττου παῖς γίνεται Ἀρκεσίλεως). But more than that, the situation is also strikingly similar to what we see at *Anab*. 1.1.1: strife among royal brothers. Arcesilaus disputed (ἐστασίασε) with his brothers, who left their home city and founded a new one elsewhere, one that will figure in future hostility between the members of the same family. Another example is found at Hdt. 5.92.β.1–2:

---

30 The extant book divisions of Herodotus' *History* are likely Hellenistic in date. But the start of Book 4 of Herodotus is clearly also the start of a new *logos*, recapping Darius' recapture of Babylon and announcing the next topic, namely Darius' invasion of Scythia. On the compositional units of Herodotus and the problem of book-division, see, e.g., Jacoby 1913, 281–282, 327–333; Legrand 1942, 224–227. The Lindian Chronicle refers to a detail from 'Book 2' of Herodotus (C line 38–39: ἐν τᾶι B | τᾶν ἱστο[ρι]ᾶ[ν) which is in fact found in our Book 2, significantly, at its end (Hdt. 2.182.1); also, Diodorus speaks of Herodotus' work as written 'in nine books' (Diod. Sic. 11.37.6). Consult Higbie 2010.

31 Stein 1893, 164 *ad loc*.: Hdt. 4.78.1 (also τελευτᾷ at 78.2), 149.1, 160.1; 5.92.β.1; 6.71.1–2 (again with τελευτᾷ at 71.1), 126.1, 131.2; 7.61.3. Cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 273.

> Ἀμφίονι δὲ ἐόντι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν *γίνεται* θυγάτηρ χωλή· οὔνομα δέ οἱ ἦν Λάβδα. ταύτην Βακχιαδέων γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἤθελε γῆμαι, *ἴσχει* Ἠετίων ὁ Ἐχεκράτεος, δήμου μὲν ἐὼν ἐκ Πέτρης, ἀτὰρ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν Λαπίθης τε καὶ Καινείδης. ἐκ δέ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναικὸς οὐδ' ἐξ ἄλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο.
>
> To Amphion, being one of these men, a lame daughter is born; her name was Labda. Since no one of the Bacchiads wished to marry this woman, Eetion, the son of Echecrates, holds her [as wife], being a commoner from Petra, but by ancestry a Lapith and a descendant of Caeneus. Neither from this woman nor from another were born to him children.[32]

So begins the long account of Sosicles on the origins of Cypselus and the tyranny at Corinth (cf. Hdt. 5.92.η.4 τοιοῦτο … ἐστι ἡ τυραννίς). Needless to say, this story also concerns precisely intra-familial and societal strife (Cypselus, a half-Bacchiad himself through Labda, takes power from the Bacchiads and kills many Corinthians, and his son Periander is even worse: Hdt. 5.92.ε.2).

Examples could be multiplied, from all periods of Greek prose and several genres,[33] but I have yet to find an exact parallel for *Anab*. 1.1.1, namely a *praesens annalisticum*/*tabulare* with γίγνεσθαι at the very start of a work. But a near parallel is, I believe, provided by one text, Xenophon of Ephesus 1.1.1:

> ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, Λυκομήδης ὄνομα. τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδει ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς *γίνεται* Ἀβροκόμης, μέγα δή τι χρῆμα κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῇ πρότερον γενομένου.[34]
>
> There was in Ephesus a man of the people of first rank there, Lycomedes by name. To this Lycomedes from a local woman, Themisto, is born Abrocomes, a great thing indeed of beauty which had not existed before in Ionia or in any other land.

Again, we see no connecting particle or conjunction in the first sentence of the text, nor in the start of the second, as with the *Anab*. Although it is true that Xenophon of Ephesus establishes the temporal outlook of his novel with the preterite ἦν, he shifts immediately to the *praesens annalisticum*/*tabulare*, with the formula gen. + γίνεται + nom. proper noun, when he turns to the origins of the hero of the novel, as Xenophon does at *Anab*. 1.1.1. The status of Abrocomes as the hero of the story is announced not just by the *praesens annalisti-*

32 On the omission of a coordinating negative preceding the οὐδ(έ) in the last sentence: Denniston 1954, 194.

33 E.g., Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3 FF 2, 132; Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4 F 137; Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 24; D.H. *AR* 1.61.2; Jos. *AJ* 1.134 and 143; non-historical, e.g. [Dem.] 57.37.

34 After χρῆμα is transmitted the phrase ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ, suspected in most editions. Richards 1907, 265 reads γενόμενον instead of γενομένου.

cum/*tabulare* γίνεται, but also by the phrase μέγα δή τι χρῆμα κάλλους; as Bergson has noted, this formula is also employed by Chariton to spotlight Callirhoe as the heroine at the start of his novel, and is used by the other novelists to introduce important characters.[35]

This last parallel prompts an important observation, one that has been made before: the *Anabasis* begins as a novel would. As Flower has put it, '[t]he beginning of the *Anabasis* is a minimal, if artful, sketch. It resembles the beginning of a novel, not a history'.[36] There is merit to this observation, but also a major difficulty: the *Anabasis* predates the earliest Greek novel by at least two and half or three centuries. Nonetheless, that there is a connection between Xenophon and the later authors of the Greek novel is widely acknowledged: not just the *Cyropaedia*, but also the *Anabasis* was thought to be influential on them. In the case of Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, and the author of the *Ninus Romance* in particular, it can be said that Xenophon was a model who was deliberately imitated.[37] That being the case, we are perhaps justified in looking at the start of the *Anabasis* as having a similar function and orientation as those found in the Greek novel — or at least some of them.[38]

At the risk of stating the obvious, for both the *Anabasis* and the Greek novels, the heroes to whom we are introduced at the start of the text define the subsequent narratives: their feelings, their suffering, their adventures, their setbacks and triumphs constitute the story;[39] however, while novels typically feature a heroic pair of lovers throughout, the two heroes of the *Anabasis* take on their leading roles one after the other. The intense focus on the heroes of the

35 Bergson 1967, 107. Cf. Perry 1967, 358 n. 17, comparing Xen. Eph. 1.1.1 and Hdt. 1.36.1 ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἐν τῷ Μυσίῳ Ὀλύμπῳ ὑὸς χρῆμα *γίνεται* μέγα. Possibly a colloquial expression: Collard 2018, 59.

36 Flower 2012, 90.

37 E.g., Perry 1967, 167–174; Reichel 1995; Trzaskoma 2011; Bowie 2017, 406–408: he notes specifically on the name Abrocomes from Xenophon of Ephesus that it may be a Greek calque of the *Cyr.*'s Abradatas (p. 407). Note also that we find an Abrocomas as satrap of Phoencia at Xen. *Anab.* 1.3.20, 4.3, 5, 18, and 7.12, and a brother of Xerxes by the same name at Hdt. 7.224.2, together with a brother named Hyperanthes (cf. Xen. Eph. 3.2.2). Stephens and Winkler 1995, 317 n. 8: 'the names Antheia and Abrocomes … are deliberately modeled on Xenophon's husband and wife, Pantheia and Abradatas'. Cf. Whitmarsh 2018, 76–83.

38 Cf. Morgan 2001, 152, noting that there is no one template for the prologue of the Greek novel; he observes that Xenophon of Ephesus and Heliodorus 'plunge immediately into the narrative, although their opening paragraphs function also as *informal prologues*, adumbrating themes and establishing protocols' (my emphasis); also Rattenbury and Lumb 1960, xviii and 2 n. 1.

39 Cf. Perry 1967, 44–45; Rohde 1914, 5–7.

account, as well as salient facts about them (typically their beauty and essential nobility) are signaled at the very beginning of the ancient novel. The start of the *Anabasis* could be said to have a similar function. The beginnings of the modern novel, too, in signal cases also coordinate the 'natural' start of the hero's life, namely birth, with the start of the text, and often point to the impossibility of the 'I' narrator having first-hand knowledge of their own birth (e.g., the first words of *David Copperfield*: 'I am born').[40] That no other historian, or any author for that matter, predating the first Greek novel can be said to have had as much influence on the novel as Xenophon did must cause us pause.[41] Not only did Xenophon provide various linguistic and structural models for the novelists, his own work, in particular the *Anabasis*, *Cyropaedia*, and we may want to add the *Agesilaus*, could be read as truly proto-novelistic, with a similar orientation found throughout all of them: works whose worlds are fundamentally defined by the heroic individual.

So far, I have demonstrated that the *praesens annalisticum*/*tabulare* γίγνεσθαι is a distinct formula, and one associated specifically with the boundaries of narratives — introducing important characters at the start of *logoi*, or commenting on their lineage at the ends of them, and sometimes even forming the starts of whole works. Furthermore, several examples from Herodotus and others suggest that narratives beginning in that manner often deal specifically with intra-familial strife among elite, if not royal, persons (and in not a few cases of high-born Persians specifically). But was it regarded as a recognisable starting formula that could stand for a preface in antiquity? The answer seems to be 'yes', if we can trust Lucian. In the same place where he discusses 'prefaceless' works in the *Historia Conscribenda* (23), Lucian speaks of writers who imitate Xenophon at the start of his *Anabasis* by beginning their own works without introductory statements, 'not knowing that there are certain kinds of virtual *prooimia* (δυνάμει τινὰ προοίμια) that have escaped the notice of many',[42] suggesting that he understood *Anab*. 1.1.1 precisely to function as the equivalent of a preface.[43]

40 Leander 2008, 22–25.

41 Cf. Ewen Bowie's contribution to this volume.

42 For the adverbial use of δυνάμει meaning 'potentially' or 'virtually', cf. e.g. Arist. *APo*. 86a28, *Metaph*. 1007b28; *LSJ* s.v. δύναμις IV, Bonitz *Index Aristotelicus* s.v. 2 (pp. 207–208).

43 Cf. Flower 2012, 43; Herkommer 1968, 15 and n. 3, citing Caesar's *Gallic Wars* as a comparandum for the *Anabasis* in lacking a preface. Also, Morgan 2001, 152, on the 'informal prologues' of some Greek novels.

3 Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes* 1.2 and Ctesias

One parallel that I deliberately have not brought up yet in my examination of *Anab.* 1.1.1 is the corresponding section from the start of Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes*. After giving the background to the first Artaxerxes, Plutarch continues:

> ὁ δὲ δεύτερος, περὶ οὗ τάδε γράφεται, Μνήμων ἐπικληθεὶς ἐκ θυγατρὸς ἦν ἐκείνου. Δαρείου γὰρ Παρυσάτιδος παῖδες *ἐγένοντο* τέσσαρες, πρεσβύτατος μὲν Ἀρτοξέρξης, μετ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ Κῦρος, νεώτεροι δὲ τούτων Ὀστάνης καὶ Ὀξάθρης...
>
> (Plut. *Art.* 1.1–2)

> the second [Artaxerxes], about whom is written the following account, was surnamed Mnemon and was from the daughter of that man [that is, Artaxerxes I]. For there were four children of Darius and Parysatis, the eldest Artaxerxes, after him, Cyrus, and the ones younger than these, Ostanes and Oxathres...

Plutarch goes on to explain that Cyrus took his name from Cyrus the Great, whereas Artaxerxes was born Arsikas and only later was called Artaxerxes. Plutarch closes the same paragraph with the observation that, despite the fact that Ctesias could produce nonsense, he is to be preferred to Deinon on the matter of Artaxerxes' birthname, because 'it is not likely that he did not know the name of the king at whose court he lived, doctoring the king himself, his wife, mother, and children'.[44] This observation only makes sense if what has gone before, both the listing of the family of Darius and Parysatis, and the names of the two eldest, came from Ctesias of Cnidus.[45]

The phrase that is obviously of greatest interest here is *Art.* 1.2: Δαρείου γὰρ καὶ Παρυσάτιδος, παῖδες *ἐγένοντο* τέσσαρες, πρεσβύτατος μὲν Ἀρτοξέρξης, μετ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ Κῦρος, νεώτεροι δὲ τούτων Ὀστάνης καὶ Ὀξάθρης. If the attribution to Ctesias is correct, and the words we find at the start of Plutarch's *Life* belong in fact to Ctesias, then there is a distinct possibility that Xenophon was deliberately reworking Ctesias in the introductory sentence to his own *Anabasis*.[46] In the late summary of Ctesias by Photius, it is stated that Ctesias reported that he

---

44 Plut. *Art.* 1.4 οὐκ εἰκός ἐστιν ἀγνοεῖν τοὔνομα τοῦ βασιλέως, παρ' ᾧ διέτριβε θεραπεύων αὐτὸν καὶ γυκαῖκα καὶ μητέρα καὶ παῖδας.

45 Cf. *FGrHist* 688 F 15a; Lenfant 2004, F 15a (p. 141), Stronk 2010, 181 and 352–354; Haug 1854, 90.

46 Contrast Smith 1881, 36, who assumes Xenophon to have been the source for Plutarch 'at first or second hand'.

had heard the details about the children of Parysatis from the queen herself;[47] whether true or not, the emphatic nature of the claim in Photius suggests that it was important to Ctesias and may reflect his original language. Plutarch, for one, knew that Xenophon was aware that Ctesias had served in the retinue of Artaxerxes, and that it is clear that Xenophon had read Ctesias' books (τοῖς βιβλίοις τούτοις ἐντετυχηκὼς δῆλός ἐστιν, *Art*. 13.6).[48]

It seems to me distinctly possible that the other parallels from the start of the *Life* which echo what we read in the *Anabasis*, instead of regarding them as borrowings from Xenophon directly by Plutarch, could be original formulations by Ctesias that were then adapted by Xenophon. The start, then, of the *Anabasis* would consequently have to be seen as being in a close intertextual dialogue with Ctesias, with whose work we know for other reasons Xenophon had more than a passing familiarity.[49] Indeed, most notably, we know from Xenophon's description of the battle of Cunaxa that he was familiar with Ctesias' version of events, specifically that Ctesias himself witnessed the wounding of Artaxerxes by Cyrus, and that he tended to the king afterwards (*Anab*. 1.8.26 = *FGrHist* 688 F 21, Lenfant 2004: F 21 (pp. 150–151), Stronk 2010, 368–369).[50] Further, Xenophon also reports that the casualty figures for Artaxerxes' forces at Cunaxa are available in Ctesias (*Anab*. 1.8.27). And there are other passages from the introduction of Plutarch's *Artaxerxes* that have distinct echoes with the first sections of Xenophon's *Anabasis*: especially noteworthy are *Art*. 2.3 and *Anab*. 1.1.4, where both authors describe Parysatis' preference for Cyrus over his brother.[51] Traditionally thought to be a sign of Plutarch's dependence on Xenophon, the passages in question may in fact show Xenophon's dependence on Ctesias, and that Plutarch is merely reproducing Ctesias' words that were also deployed by Xenophon.[52]

---

47 *FGrHist* 688 F 15 (section 51): καί φησιν ὁ συγγραφεὺς αὐτὸς παρ' αὐτῆς ἐκείνης τῆς Παρυσάτιδος ταῦτα ἀκοῦσαι. Cf. Tuplin 2004, 320.

48 Stronk 2007, 26.

49 Cf. Almagor 2012, 25–26 with n. 127.

50 Cf. Tuplin 2004, 320–321.

51 Plu. *Art*. 2.3 *ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ὑπῆρχε τὸν Κῦρον μᾶλλον φιλοῦσα* καὶ βουλομένη βασιλεύειν ἐκεῖνον. Xen. *Anab*. 1.1.4 Παρύσατις μὲν δὴ *ἡ μήτηρ ὑπῆρχε τῷ Κύρῳ, φιλοῦσα* αὐτὸν *μᾶλλον* ἢ τὸν βασιλεύοντα Ἀρταξέρξην.

52 Traditional view: Flacelière and Chambry 1979, 9 and n. 4. See now Almagor 2012, 31. Though well-argued, I cannot agree with Almagor's claim (pp. 28–36), following Dürrbach 1893, that the references to Ctesias in Xenophon's *Anabasis* are later interpolations. I do not see that accepting them entails the difficulties Almagor raises; while both Herodotus and Thucydides clearly knew a range of competitors, each alludes essentially only to one by name (Herodo-

Art. 1.2 is clearly parallel to *Anab.* 1.1.1. But though the same material is treated in both passages, in similar language, there are two crucial differences between them. In these differences, perhaps, we can get a better sense of what Xenophon was doing at the start of the *Anabasis*. First, in the passage from Plutarch, the form of γίγνεσθαι is the aorist ἐγένοντο, which is temporally fixed and explanatory in function (note the γάρ), as opposed to Xenophon's γίγνονται, which is strictly speaking essentially timeless.[53] It has to be admitted that Plutarch could easily have changed a *praesens annalisticum/tabulare* to a more conventional aorist. On the other hand, Photius, in the equivalent part of his summary of Ctesias, also has a number of present tense verbs, perhaps reflecting the original tense choices of Ctesias.[54] Second, *four* sons of Darius and Parysatis are listed. These two differences illustrate what Xenophon seems to be doing, but through contrast. In Plutarch, the aorist ἐγένοντο and the mention of the four sons of Darius and Parysatis make unremarkable the facts of the royal family at this period: they happened to have had four sons, and they were as follows…

In Xenophon, the *praesens annalisticum/tabulare* emphasises these same details and tells the reader or listener that they have entered a timeless story whose broad outlines they already know, whether or not they are familiar with the specifics of Cyrus' family: an older brother and a younger brother *are* born to a ruling family. It is almost as if we are expected to fill in the blanks from there: they will (of course) become hostile to each other and will (of course) come to blows, no doubt when the succession to their father's throne becomes a reality, and, no doubt, with tragic consequences for at least one of them. This 'timeless' narrative is also why only two sons are reported in Xenophon, whereas Plutarch/Ctesias has four: the two younger brothers are not only not needed in such a tale of fraternal strife, they are positively not wanted. They distract (if mentioned, a number of questions would have to be answered: did they have a

tus and Hecataeus of Miletus; Thucydides and Hellanicus), and both somewhat intrusively. Recall, too, Xenophon in the *Hellenica* only cites 'Themistogenes'.

53 Cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 270.

54 *FGrHist* 688 F 15 (section 51): [Darius II] ἐχρῆτο δὲ συμβούλῳ μάλιστα τῇ γυναικί, ἐξ ἧς πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας, δυὸ ἔσχε τέκνα, Ἀμῆστριν θυγατέρα καὶ Ἀρσάκαν υἱόν, ὃς ὕστερον μετωνομάσθη Ἀρτοξέρξης. *τίκτει* δὲ αὐτῷ ἕτερον υἱὸν βασελεύουσα, καὶ τίθεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου Κῦρον. εἶτα *τίκτει* Ἀρτόστην, καὶ ἐφεξῆς μέχρι παίδων δεκατριῶν. *Praesens annalisticum/tabulare* in the reporting of the births of children after Darius' accession to the throne (τίκτει twice) and the naming of Cyrus (τίθεται), in contrast to the aorist indicating the children he had before he became king (ἔσχε). On the divergences and overlaps between Plutarch and Photius for the passages in question: Lenfant 2004, 274 n. 629; cf. Almagor 2012, 22.

claim? if not, whose side were they on? and so on). Xenophon, through his subtle adaptation of Ctesias, was perhaps sending a not so subtle message: one thing his *Anabasis* was not going to be was a write-up that slavishly followed Ctesias.[55]

4 Building a case for a second prologue: Herodotus and *Anabasis* 3.1.4

In order to understand how the beginning of the *Anabasis* may be working, it is useful to revisit Herodotus' beginning. Keeping in mind the idea of timelessness and the orientation of the beginning of the *Anabasis*, the introductory sections of Herodotus' *History* are in some ways similar, once we get beyond the preface, that is. Herodotus, too, begins with stories that take place in a vaguely defined past, when Phoenician traders carrying Egyptian and Assyrian goods travelled the Mediterranean and put in at Argos, then the most preeminent of Greek cities (Hdt. 1.1.1–2). To be sure, the story of Io and the other accounts of abductions of princesses at the start of Herodotus' *History* are not ones that Herodotus reports in his own voice as a narrator; rather, they belong to others — Persians and Phoenicians.[56] These stories, Herodotus famously states, cannot be corroborated, and so he moves on to the figure he knows to have begun the ἄδικα ἔργα (unjust deeds) against the Greeks, namely Croesus (1.5.3).[57] When Herodotus does finally turn to the main topic of his account, he begins with an identification of his first subject: 'Croesus was Lydian by birth, a son of Alyattes, a tyrant of the nations within the Halys river … this Croesus was the first of the barbarians whom we know to have reduced some of the Greeks to tribute paying status, and others of them he won over as friends' (1.6.1–2).[58] The reorientation in Herodotus is

55 Cf. Almagor 2012, 32: 'Xenophon both borrows details from Ctesias and implicitly argues against the account of the *Persica*.'

56 A detail that is a massive difficulty in its own right: cf. Momigliano 1960b, 14–15: 'I still fail to understand why Herodotus attributed stories that looked so obviously Greek to Phoenicians and Persians.'

57 See e.g. Jacoby 1949, 199, Momigliano 1960b, 15, Fowler 2015, 200–203; cf. Dillery 2019, 49–50 with n. 119.

58 Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος, παῖς δὲ Ἀλυάττεω, τύραννος δὲ ἐθνέων τῶν ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ … οὗτος ὁ Κροῖσος βαρβάρων πρῶτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν τοὺς μὲν κατεστρέψατο Ἑλλήνων ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγήν, τοὺς δὲ φίλους προσεποιήσατο. Note that Jacoby 1913, 283 identifies

launched specifically with the words Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος. Scholars routinely style this move from the stories of the Phoenicians and Persians to Herodotus' own narrative of Croesus and the 'backstory' of the Lydian kingdom as a move from a 'false start' to 'the real serious starting-point of his story'.[59]

Is there a comparable reorientation in the *Anabasis*? Yes, of course there is, but it is considerably later, relatively speaking, than Herodotus' restart, namely, at the beginning of Book 3: ἦν δέ τις ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος … (3.1.4). A couple of objections could be lodged at seeing any similarity between *Anab*. 3.1.4 and Hdt. 1.6.1. First, it could be argued that the expressions themselves are not in fact the same: the statement in Xenophon relies on the verb 'to be' (ἦν) to be construed as existential ('There was a certain …'), whereas the one in Herodotus is a copula ('Croesus was Lydian by birth'). However, while the analysis is accurate, Kahn has observed that the effect of both expressions is fundamentally the same: 'to identify and introduce a personal subject not previously mentioned.'[60]

Second, even if fundamentally equivalent, the expression 'there was a certain' (ἦν δέ (τις)) is modelled on a Homeric formula that is used to introduce characters of secondary importance, many of whom in fact meet unfortunate ends.[61] The implication here is that obviously, from 3.1.4 on, Xenophon is hardly of secondary importance in the *Anabasis*; rather he is a if not the main focus of the narrative. And in any case, would Xenophon the narrator want to be suggesting at the start of Book 3 that Xenophon the historical figure was going to meet with a bad end, implying that it was perhaps unavoidable or even deserved?

The best way to examine *Anab*. 3.1.4 is to consider other places in Xenophon where he uses the same introductory formula, as well to look at a key passage

---

the Proem and 1.5.3 as 'H' ('Hauptlinie der Erzählung' ('the main line of the narrative'), and the intervening barbarian *logoi* as 'E' ('Exkurse' ('digression')).

59 'False start' Lateiner 1989, 38; 'the real, serious starting-point of his story' Gould 1989, 64 (following de Romilly 1971, 318); Thomas 2000, 268. Pelling 2019, 22–30, esp. 28 and n. 29 offers an acute reading of the 'false starts' of Hdt's Proem, citing Pelliccia 1992, for the idea of the 'false-start recusatio' which he finds also in Pindar, Sappho, and Gorgias' *Helen*.

60 Kahn 1973, 260 with n. 29.

61 Already Grote felt that *Anab*. 3.1.4 was composed in a 'Homeric vein' and 'language', citing *Il*. 5.9: Grote 1888, 7.244 and n. 2 (I owe this reference to Tim Rood; cf. Gautier 1911, 103–105). See esp. Tuplin 2003, 126–127; cf. Huitink and Rood 2019, 74, *ad loc*. The formula is Kahn's Type IIB, with *Anab*. 3.1.4 paralleling *Il*. 5.9, 10.314, 13.663, 17.575, and *Od*. 9.508, 15.417, and 20.287 (Kahn 1973, 245, 249–250, 258). Consult Hainsworth 1993, 186 *ad Il*. 10.314–318, Janko 1994, 126 *ad Il*. 13.660–672, de Jong 2001, 499 *ad Od*. 20.287–290.

from Herodotus. There are two other cases of the 'there was a certain' (ἦν δέ (τις)) expression in the *Anabasis*. With both, a subordinate character is introduced who will command the spotlight for some portion of the narrative. At *Anab*. 7.3.16, one Heracleides of Maronea is noticed with the words ἦν τις Ἡρακλείδης Μαρωνίτης. Heracleides acts as an assistant for Seuthes in extracting gifts from Seuthes' guests; he will go on to be an important figure in the subsequent narrative, proving an unscrupulous adversary of Xenophon and a defrauder of the Ten Thousand. Later in the same book we are introduced to Episthenes of Olynthus: Ἐπισθένης δ' ἦν τις Ὀλύνθιος παιδεραστής (7.4.7). Unlike Heracleides, Episthenes is positively characterised in a short vignette, following which we never see him again: a beautiful youth has been captured and is about to be put to death, when Episthenes sees him and begs Xenophon to save the boy's life; Xenophon appeals to Seuthes to spare the youth, leading to a 'grand gesture' on the part of Episthenes in which he offers himself in place of the prisoner. The implications of the scene are clear: Episthenes is to be admired for his devotion to beauty. In fact, Xenophon explains to Seuthes that Episthenes had assembled a battalion of men based solely on whether they were 'good/beautiful' (εἴ τινες εἶεν καλοί), and had himself, together with these soldiers, proved 'a brave man' (μετὰ τούτων ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός 7.4.8).[62]

There are also two cases of the formula ἦν δέ (τις) in the *Hellenica* which are perhaps even more helpful for our examination of *Anab*. 3.1.4. In the framing of another scene replete with symbolic significance, in which Agesilaus and Pharnabazus discuss the question of the obligations of *xenia*, we are introduced to the Greek who brought about the meeting of the two men:

> ἦν δέ τις Ἀπολλοφάνης Κυζικηνός, ὃς καὶ Φανραβάζῳ ἐτύγχανεν ἐκ παλαιοῦ ξένος ὢν καὶ Ἀγησιλάῳ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ἐξενώθη. οὗτος οὖν πρὸς Ἀγησίλαον ὡς οἴοιτο συναγαγεῖν αὐτῷ ἂν εἰς λόγους περὶ φιλίας Φαρνάβαζον.
>
> (Xen. *Hell*. 4.1.29)

> There was certain Apollophanes, a Cyzicene, who happened to be a guest-friend from of old to Pharnabazus and at that time had become a friend also to Agesilaus. This man then said to Agesilaus that he was thinking that he could bring Pharnabazus to him for a discussion about friendship.

The man who will bring about the meeting between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus, in which the mutual obligations of friendship will be discussed, is himself a

62 Cf., e.g., Wade-Gery 1944, 119 n. 2, comparing Episthenes' cohort to the Theban Sacred Band; also, Hindley 1994, 347.

xenos of both parties. The messaging here by Xenophon seems pretty clear. The feature of the introduction of Apollophanes that especially resonates with the introduction of the character Xenophon at *Anab*. 3.1.4 is the way that the serendipity of the moment is signalled: just the right man for the job happens to be available at just the right time. Indeed, the parallel between the passages emerges with great clarity if we read on from the beginning of *Anab*. 3.1.4:

> ἦν δέ τις ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος, ὃς οὔτε στρατηγὸς οὔτε λοχαγὸς οὔτε στρατιώτης ὢν συνηκολούθει, ἀλλὰ Πρόξενος αὐτὸν μετεπέμψατο οἴκοθεν ξένος ὢν ἀρχαῖος· ὑπισχνεῖτο δὲ αὐτῷ, εἰ ἔλθοι, φίλον αὐτὸν Κύρῳ ποιήσειν, ὃν αὐτὸς ἔφη κρείττω ἑαυτῷ νομίζειν τῆς πατρίδος.
>
> There was a certain man in the army, Xenophon, an Athenian, who had come along being neither a commander or captain or solder; rather, Proxenus had sent for him from home, being an old friend. He was promising him that, if he came, he would make him a *philos* to Cyrus, whom he said he considered worth more to him than his homeland.

It is true that we do not have τυγχάνειν or another word denoting the chance nature of Xenophon's participation in Cyrus' expedition, such as we see at *Hellenica* 4.1.29, but the string of negatives delineating what Xenophon *was not*, and hence not the reasons (!) why he was present on the expedition when the critical morning dawned with the Greek army in need of leadership, throws into the sharpest focus *why he was there*: because Proxenus had been his friend from long ago and had encouraged him to join in Cyrus' enterprise.[63] The explanation for the availability of both Apollophanes and the historical character Xenophon at just the right moment is precisely the same: *xenia*, indeed, in both cases, old friends (ἐκ παλαιοῦ ξένος ὤν, ξένος ὢν ἀρχαῖος) who employ their friendship in ways that have significant consequences.[64]

In the second example of the ἦν δέ (τις) formula from the *Hellenica*, the same suggestion of the apparently chance nature of a pivotal character's participation in an event of major importance is also carefully signalled by Xenophon. At *Hellenica* 5.4.1, he famously denounces the Spartans for their illegal seizure of the Theban acropolis (the Cadmea) and their subsequent support of the Theban tyrants in their rule of the city. Having observed that it only took seven men to overthrow the regime of the Spartan-backed tyrants, Xenophon promises to explain how this extraordinary event was accomplished:

---

63 Cf. Azoulay 2004, 196.

64 I take this opportunity to raise the possibility that Xenophon has engineered something of a pun on Proxenus' name in the description of him at *Anab*. 3.1.4: Pro-xenus was a ξένος ἀρχαῖος, that is, a 'friend' (ξένος) from long 'before' (πρό). Cf. 5.3.5.

> ἦν τις Φιλλίδας, ὃς ἐγραμμάτευε τοῖς περὶ Ἀρχίαν πολεμάρχοις, καὶ τἆλλα ὑπηρέτει, ὡς ἐδόκει, ἄριστα. τούτῳ δ' ἀφιγμένῳ Ἀθήναζε κατὰ πρᾶξίν τινα καὶ πρόσθεν γνώριμος ὢν Μέλων τῶν Ἀθήναζε πεφευγότων Θηβαίων συγγίγνεται, καὶ διαπυθόμενος μὲν τὰ περὶ Ἀρχίαν τε τὸν πολεμαρχοῦντα καὶ τὴν περὶ Φίλιππον τυραννίδα, γνοὺς δὲ μισοῦντα αὐτὸν ἔτι μᾶλλον αὐτοῦ τὰ οἴκοι, πιστὰ δοὺς καὶ λαβὼν συνέθετο ὡς δεῖ ἕκαστα γίγνεσθαι ...
>
> (Xen. *Hell*. 5.4.2)

> There was a certain Phillidas, who acted as secretary to Archias and his fellow polemarchs, and in all other regards, so it seemed, he did his job well. To this man, who had come to Athens on some business or other, even from before, Melon, one of the Theban exiles at Athens, was known and he meets up with him; having thoroughly asked about the affairs of the polemarch Archias and Philip and the tyranny, and having recognised that he [i.e. Phillidas] hated still more than himself the situation at home [in Thebes], having given and taken pledges, he made a pact how each thing had to happen.

And so follows the plot of Phillidas and Melon to overthrow the Spartan backed tyrants of Thebes. The whole episode is of momentous significance for Xenophon: the seizure of the Cadmea by the Spartans, the subsequent overthrow of the regime they installed, and finally the Spartan defeat at Leuctra constitute a series of actions that will show how the gods are 'not unheedful' of those who are 'impious and do unholy things' (τῶν ἀσεβούντων ... τῶν ἀνόσια ποιούντων, 5.4.1) out of all humanity, both Greek and barbarian.[65] The sequence of these events begins with the 'chance' involvement of Phillidas as an (apparently reliable) assistant to the Theban tyrants, and his chance meeting with Melon in Athens: he was there 'on some business or other' (κατὰ πρᾶξίν τινα). The phrase,[66] indeed the whole account, has a Herodotean resonance.[67] Again, as with other episodes we have already examined, serendipity and friendship conspire to put the right people in the right place at the right time.

This brings me to perhaps the best parallel for *Anab*. 3.1.4, namely, Hdt. 7.143.1. As the man who will counter the interpretation of the 'Wooden Wall' oracle by the chresmologues before the battle of Salamis, Herodotus introduces Themistocles into his narrative in the following way:

---

65 Cf. Breitenbach 1967, 1690; Dillery 1995, 179, 221–223.

66 Cf. Hdt. 9.89.3 and esp. 8.106.1; in the latter passage, Hermotimus happens to go to Mysia 'on some matter or other' (κατὰ δή τι πρῆγμα) precisely when the man who castrated him as a youth is also there, and he takes his revenge. See Dillery 1995, 229 and 294 n. 91; Hornblower 2003, 39 and n. 6; Denniston 1954, 212.

67 Gray 1989, 66–70; cf. Dillery 1995, 229–230; Schmitzer 1998, 127.

> ἦν δὲ τῶν τις Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ ἐς πρώτους νεωστὶ παριών, τῷ οὔνομα μὲν ἦν Θεμιστοκλέης, παῖς δὲ Νεοκλέος ἐκαλέετο. οὗτος ὠνὴρ οὐκ ἔφη πᾶν ὀρθῶς τοὺς χρησμολόγους συμβάλλεσθαι.
>
> There was a certain man of the Athenians who had recently joined the ranks of the chief men, to whom was the name Themistocles, called a son of Neocles. This man denied that the chresmologues were interpreting the whole matter correctly.

Many have observed the similarity between this passage and *Anab.* 3.1.4, even arguing for direct imitation on Xenophon's part.[68] Pohlenz's reading of Hdt. 7.143.1 in particular is useful for us in thinking about the narrative effect of *Anab.* 3.1.4. For Pohlenz, Themistocles' entry into the narrative as 'saviour of Greece' happens 'suddenly', even though later we hear that his proposal to build a fleet with the Laureion windfall had already won the day at just the right moment (cf. Hdt. 7.144.1 ἑτέρη τε Θεμιστοκλέϊ γνώμη ἔμπροσθε ταύτης ἐς καιρὸν ἠρίστευσε).[69]

This is a good place to return to the hesitations registered by scholars about the ἦν δέ (τις) formula and its possible effects at *Anab.* 3.1.4 and, by extension, at Hdt. 7.143.1 as well. I would submit that the very details that may look like unwanted associations of Homeric language may in fact have been precisely what Herodotus and Xenophon after him wanted to bring to their accounts. Both Themistocles and the historical actor Xenophon were active in the events leading up to their formal introductions into their respective narratives: we only learn after the fact that Themistocles had already sponsored the use of the Laureion funds for building the Athenian fleet, and Xenophon himself notes by name his own involvement in matters before *Anab.* 3.1.4 (most prominently before Cunaxa at 1.8.15; also at 2.1.12, 2.4.15, 2.5.37, 2.5.41). A new story or narrative arc is launched in both Herodotus' *History* and Xenophon's *Anabasis* when those men are (re)-introduced: the preservation, or, dare I say, 'salvation' of both Greece and the Ten Thousand is secured when its champion (seemingly) by chance was already on hand and steps to the fore.

The Homeric character who is introduced in an identical manner will also command the spotlight, but typically only for a few lines (Dolon, the Phoenician nurse of Eumaeus, and Ctesippus are exceptions), and then they are never

68 E.g. Pohlenz 1937, 69; Immerwahr 1967, 223; Fornara 1971, 68.
69 Pohlenz 1937, 69.

heard from again — indeed in every case but two[70] they are introduced only to be killed off by a more significant figure.[71] While useful for underscoring major thematic issues, especially on the question of human mortality, their function is defined by the episode in which they are found, and the introduction to them 'tailored to the immediate context'.[72] Herodotus and Xenophon both know this Homeric use and deploy it elsewhere.[73] But with Themistocles and Xenophon the character, Herodotus and Xenophon repurpose this introductory formula, capitalising on its capacity to bring emphasis, especially at the beginning of a narrative, but also by exploiting the formula's inherent potential to impart 'suddenness' as well as the apparently 'chance' nature of a character's presence.[74] And if Herodotus refashioned the reach of the formula by making Themistocles a major character through an extensive amount of text (especially the Salamis narrative of Book 8), Xenophon went still further, making Xenophon the character a major focus of the *Anabasis* from Book 3 onward.[75] It is worth pointing out here that Chariton introduces the male hero of his novel with the following words: Χαιρέας γάρ τις ἦν μειράκιον εὔμορφον ... (1.1.3).

5 Restarting and ending the text

If I am correct in my analysis, the *Anabasis* had two distinct 'starts'. Two questions naturally arise: are there parallels for works to restart, ideally from earlier prose authors, and specifically from historiography? Does Xenophon do this elsewhere in his own corpus? The answer to these questions is 'yes' and 'yes'.

In their analyses of the so-called 'second-preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri*, scholars have noted that Arrian modelled the deployment of two prefaces on what Herodotus and Thucydides had done: Arrian *Anab.* 1 Proem and 1.12.2–5,

70 Dares at *Il.* 5.9 is the father of two heroes who are introduced only to be killed by Diomedes; at *Od.* 9.508, Polyphemus recalls being warned by the Cyclops-seer Telemus, who is introduced with the formula ἔσκε τις.

71 Cf. e.g. Griffin 1980, 143 and Schein 1984, 72–73 on the deaths of 'lesser heroes' in Homer.

72 De Jong 2001, 499.

73 In addition to the other cases I have discussed in Xenophon, see also Hdt. 1.205.1 (Queen Tomyris), 4.141 (an unnamed Egyptian), 6.109.2 (Callimachus the polemarch).

74 And in the case of Herodotus, one could add to Themistocles also Croesus: cf. Kahn 1973, 260 n. 29.

75 Huitink and Rood 2019, 74, note further that both Themistocles and Xenophon, though saviors, will both be exiled from Athens.

Hdt. 1 Proem and 1.5.3–4, and Thuc. 1.1.1–3 and 1.22.1–23.3.[76] John Moles, while accepting that Arrian does indeed adapt these earlier texts in writing two prefaces, also notes that Arrian's 'second preface' is different from those of Herodotus and Thucydides in terms of its content and purpose, and that this is to be explained at least in part by dramatic context: with Alexander at Troy and about to launch his conquest of Persia, Arrian is able to relaunch his narrative by stressing different historical and literary associations from what is suggested in the 'first preface', giving his own work greater scope and attaching it firmly to the antecedents he wished the reader to have before their eyes: Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon.[77] John Marincola has gone further and suggested that Arrian's restart can also be seen to encourage an engagement with his work where 'Alexander's wars in Greece which preceded are to be less contemplated by the reader than the campaigns to follow'.[78] The complicated, and, frankly, anti-hellenic suppression of Greece, in particular the notorious destruction of Thebes, is to be disconnected from the heroic narrative of Alexander's conquest of Persia; the second preface allows for this move. But then another question arises: why did Arrian include the first section of his narrative at all then?

It is tempting to look at *Anab.* 1.1.1 and 3.1.4 through a similar lens. As has already been observed, a great deal more narrative intervenes between the two passages in the *Anabasis* compared to that between the 'starts' and 'restarts' in Herodotus and Thucydides. Further, even if it is granted that *Anab.* 1.1.1–5 and 3.1.4 have a similar structuring function to the corresponding passages in Herodotus and Thucydides, they do not contain similar information, nor is the voice the same: while Herodotus and Thucydides begin their accounts referring to themselves in the third-person, even identifying themselves by name in the first words of their texts, they shift to first-person shortly thereafter (Hdt. 1.5.3 ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἔρεων; Thuc. 1.1.3 ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντί μοι, 1.22.1 χαλεπόν … διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοί).[79] While there are a few first-person statements made by the narrator of the *Anabasis*, none is found at

76 Stadter 1981; Moles 1985, 167; Marincola 1989, 187–188.

77 Moles 1985, 167.

78 Marincola 1989, 187.

79 In fact, in Thucydides, first-person continues throughout the narrative between the proem and the methodological chapters. The shift from third-person to first in Herodotus and Thucydides is important in its own regard; I, following Corcella 1996, and others, believe that they adapted Persian royal epistolary edicts, following the lead of Hecataeus of Miletus: Dillery 2018b, 31–32 and n. 65–67.

the start or restart as I have labelled them, though all are confined to Books 1 and 2.[80]

Patrick Bradley has characterised the effect of these editorial intrusions by the narrator of the *Anabasis* as one that 'foster[s] the impression that the narrative in Books 1–2 is of a work of history'; whereas in Book 3, 'the narrator calls the reader to view the narrative as more than an historical exposition'.[81] The voice of evaluation belongs to the narrator in Books 1 and 2 of the *Anabasis*, but shifts over to Xenophon the character through the remainder of the work.[82]

But, if more than a 'historical exposition', what sort of work do we have from Book 3 of the *Anabasis* onward? Bradley offers a 'novelesque autobiography'.[83] This seems right. But if, as with Arrian's *Anabasis*, Xenophon wanted the two stories of his *Anabasis* to be marked off from each other, why put them together in the first place, or why write the first story at all? The answer is, I think, actually straightforward. The autobiographic second story of Xenophon's attempted *nostos*, itself set against the backdrop of the larger story of the attempted *nostos* of the army, cannot be free-standing in Xenophon's accounting, but has to be seen as *replacing* the first story, that of Cyrus and the fate of the army immediately after Cunaxa. It is important to Xenophon that we see the *Anabasis* start as one story with its own hero, but then abruptly change and become another story with a different hero, and indeed, become a different kind of story.[84]

A similar reorientation is engineered by Xenophon in his *Hellenica*. With a telling redeployment of the μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα formula from the beginning of his history,[85] Xenophon wraps up his narrative of the Peloponnesian War by noting Lysander's entry into the Peiraeus, the recall of the exiles, and the demolition of the Long Walls of Athens to the sound of flute-girls (*Hell*. 2.2.23). Full closure of the story is achieved by the report of the establishment of the Thirty Tyrants at Athens, as well as Lysander's reduction of Samos. Following a likely interpolated section listing Spartan ephors for each year of the war (2.3.10–11 init.), itself a closural item, the *Hellenica* resumes with an in-depth treatment of the Thirty at Athens starting at 2.3.11, even though their installation had already been an-

80 *Anab*. 1.2.5, 1.9.22, 24 & 28, 2.3.1, 2.6.6. See esp. Bradley 2001, 70–71 = 2010, 535–536; Grethlein 2012, 34, 38.

81 Bradley 2001, 71–72 = 2010, 537–538.

82 Cf. also Grethlein 2012, 34, 38.

83 Bradley 2001, 60, 70, 74 = 2010, 521, 535, 539–540.

84 Cf. Bradley 2001; 2011, 297; Loraux 1986, 133.

85 Which of course Xenophon redeploys again at the end of the *Hell*. (7.5.27): see Breitenbach 1967, 1698, Rood 2004, 341, 348 n. 20, 349 n. 25; Dillery 2018c, 216–218.

nounced at 2.3.2.[86] Not only do most scholars see a compositional break at 2.3.10, many see with Xenophon's extensive treatment of the Thirty that we have also entered upon a very different *kind of history* from what we encountered in *Hell*. 1.1.1–2.3.9.[87] The reorientation of the *Anabasis* could be said to be similar in structure and impact.

I close with a final observation. If ring composition is an authentic feature of Xenophon's technique as a writer,[88] then how he chooses to end the *Anabasis* could tell us where he thinks it starts. One bracketing effect can be seen in the parallelism of Cyrus and Seuthes in the *Anabasis*: Xenophon and the other Greeks find themselves in the employ of a non-Greek dynast who turns out not to be entirely trustworthy at the start of their adventures and at their close. The parallel could be seen to be worked out in fairly precise ways: the 'watchword' (σύνθημα) that Xenophon reports to Cyrus before Cunaxa is 'Zeus the savior' (1.8.17; cf. 6.5.25); similarly, the watchword that is delivered after Seuthes and Xenophon confer before battle in Book 7 is 'Athena' (7.3.39), on the basis of their shared kinship (cf. 7.2.1).[89] This 'ring' would make Book 1 of the *Anabasis* the true start of the text. However, elements in Book 6 and especially 7 find a natural pairing with details that are found at the start of Book 3. The offer of sole command of the army at 6.1.18 puts Xenophon into a predicament that reminds us of his application for oracular guidance at Delphi before he set out from Greece (6.1.22–3; cf. 3.1.5–7); and his age, or at least his stage of life, becomes prominent at both the start of Book 3 and in Book 7 (3.1.14 and esp. 25; 7.2.38; cf. 6.4.8). Further, granting that the main treatment of Xenophon's exile is found at 5.3, it also serves to launch and end the second, main narrative of the *Anabasis*, lurking in the background of Socrates' worries for his young friend at 3.1.5, and explicitly mentioned at 7.7.57. It has been argued that Hellas, wife of Gongylus, informs Xenophon of the chance he has at acquiring a fortune through a raid on Asidates and predicts an accurate outcome (7.8.8–9), in ways similar to what we see in the scene of Socrates and Xenophon (3.1.5), but also is an enabler of independent action by a male whom she admires, just as Parysatis is for Cyrus

86 Cf. Breitenbach 1967, 1678–1679.

87 A very large question treated by many scholars; for economy's sake, I refer to Dillery 1995, 138–139, 146–163.

88 Breitenbach 1967, 1698, on the repetition of the μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα formula implies as much, as do the other discussions mentioned in n. 85 above concerning the end of the *Hellenica*. For ring structuring in a particular episode in Xenophon, see Moles 1994; for a whole work, e.g., Tatum 1989, 80 and 90 (the *Cyropaedia* and *Memorabilia*), Danzig 2017, 135 (the *Symposium*).

89 As my student Jovan Cvjetičanin reminds me. Other watchwords in Xenophon: *Cyr*. 3.3.58, 7.1.10

(1.1-4).[90] And finally, Zeus, his omens, and their role in Xenophon's own life figure prominently at the start of Book 3 and at the close of Book 7 (3.1.12 & 3.2.4, 9; 7.8.4).[91]

References

Allan, R.J. (2011) 'The *Archaeology*: The case of γίγνεται', in Lalot *et al.* (eds.), 243–251.
Almagor, E. (2012) 'Ctesias and the importance of his writings revisited', *Electrum* 19, 9–40.
Azoulay, V. (2004) *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir: De la* charis *au charisme* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne).
Bakker, E.J. (1997) (ed.) *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature and its Linguistic Contexts* (Leiden: Brill).
Baragwanath, E. (2019) 'Heroes and homemakers in Xenophon', in Biggs and Blum (eds.), 108–129.
Barzano, A./Gattinoni, F.L./Bearzot, C. (2003) (eds.) *Modelli eroici dall' antichità alla cultura Europea* (Rome: L' Erma di Bretschneider).
Bergson, L. (1967) 'Zum periphrastischen χρῆμα', *Eranos* 65, 79–117.
Biggs, T./Blum, J. (2019) (eds.) *The Epic Journey in Greek and Roman Literature*, YCS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Bowie, E. (2017) 'Xenophon's influence in imperial Greece', in Flower (ed.), 403–415.
Bradley, P.J. (2001) 'Irony and the narrator in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in Tylawsky and Weiss (eds.), 59–84. Reprinted in Gray (ed.) (2010), 520–552.
Bradley, P.J. (2011) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis*: Reading the end with Zeus the Merciful', *Arethusa* 44, 279–310.
Breitenbach, H.R. (1967) 'Xenophon von Athen', *RE* IXA part 2, 1569–2052.
Collard, C. (2018) *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy*. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 113 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).
Corcella, A. (1996) 'Ecateo di Mileto così dice', *Quaderni di Storia* 43, 295–301.
Danzig, G. (2017) 'Xenophon's *Symposium*', in Flower (ed.), 132–151.
Denniston, J.D. (1952) *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Denniston, J.D. (1954) *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Derow, P./Parker, R. (eds.) (2003) *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London/New York: Routledge).
Dillery, J. (2017) 'Xenophon: The small works', in Flower (ed.), 195–219.
Dillery, J. (2018a) 'Words of wonder: Initial θαυμάζειν in Isocrates, Xenophon, and related texts', in Tamiolaki (ed.), 77–100.
Dillery, J. (2018b) 'Making *logoi*: Herodotus' Book 2 and Hecataeus of Miletus', in Harrison and Irwin (eds.), 17–52.

90 Baragwanath 2019, 127–128.
91 Well analysed by Bradley 2011.

Dillery, J. (2018c) 'The past in the present and the limits of history: Two Greek cases', in Rollinger (ed.), 207–228.
Dillery, J. (2019) 'Croesus' great nemesis', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 65, 29–62.
Due, B. (1989) *The* Cyropaedia: *Xenophon's Aims and Methods* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press).
Dürrbach, F. (1893) 'L'apologie de Xénophon dans l'*Anabase*', *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 6, 343–386.
Eidinow, E./Kindt, J. (2015) (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Erbse, H. (1966) 'Xenophons *Anabasis*', *Gymnasium* 73, 485–505. Translation into English in Gray (ed.), 476–501.
Flacelière, R./Chambry, E. (1979) *Plutarque* Vies, Vol. 15. Artaxerxes-Aratos Galba-Othon (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Flower, M.A. (2012) *Xenophon's* Anabasis *or* The Expedition of Cyrus (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Flower, M.A. (2017) 'Xenophon as historian', in Flower (ed.), 301–322.
Flower, M.A. (2017) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Fornara, C.W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Forsten, E. (ed.) (1995) *Groningen Colloquium on the Novel*, Vol. 6 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten Publishing).
Fowler, R. (2015) 'History', in Eidinow and Kindt (eds.), 197–209.
Gautier, L. (1911) *La langue du Xénophon* (Genève: Georg and Co.).
Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (New York: Bristol Classical Press).
Gray, V. (1989) *The Character of Xenophon's* Hellenica (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press).
Gray, V. (2003) 'Interventions and citations in Xenophon, *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*', *Classical Quarterly* 53, 111–123.
Gray, V. (2010) (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Xenophon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Grethlein, J. (2012) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis* from character to narrator', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 132, 23–40.
Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Grote, G. (1888) *A History of Greece*, 10 Vols. (London: John Murray).
Hainsworth, B. (1993) The Iliad: *A Commentary.* Volume III: Books 9–12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Harrison, T./Irwin, E. (2018) (eds.) *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Haug, M. (1854) *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Lebenschreibungen der Griechen* (Tübingen: F. Osiander).
Herkommer, E. (1968) *Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke* (Dissertation Tübingen).
Higbie, C. (2010) 'Divide and edit: A brief history of book divisions', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 105, 1–31.
Hindley, C. (1994) 'Eros and military command in Xenophon', *Classical Quarterly* 44, 347–366.
Høegs, C. (1950) 'Ξενοφῶντος Κύρου Ἀνάβασις, Oeuvre anonyme ou pseudonyme ou orthonyme?', *Classica et Medievalia* 11, 151–179.

Hornblower, S. (2003) 'Panionios of Chios and Hermotimos of Pedasa (Hdt. 8. 104–6)', in Derow and Parker (eds.), 37–57.
Huitink, L./Rood, T. (2019) *Xenophon* Anabasis *Book III* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Immerwahr, H.R. (1967) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University for the American Philological Association). Reprinted Atlanta (1986).
Jacoby, F. (1913) 'Herodotos', *Real Encyclopädie* Supp. II, 205–520.
Jacoby, F. (1949) *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press).
Janko, R. (1994) The Iliad: *A Commentary.* Volume IV: Books 13–16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Jong, I.J.F. de (2001) *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Kahane, A./Laird, A. (2001) (eds.) *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius'* Metamorphoses (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Kahn, C.H. (1973) *The verb 'be' in Ancient Greek*: Foundations of Language Supp. 16. (Dordrecht/Boston: Reidel).
Kramer, J.M. (1968) 'De start van de Anabasis (Xenophon *Anabasis* I, 1–3)', *Hermeneus* 40, 1–8.
Lalot, J./Rijksbaron, A./Jacquinod, B./Buijs, M. (2011) (eds.) *The Historical Present in Thucydides. Semantics and Narrative Function* (Leiden/Boston: Brill).
Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press).
Leander, N.B. (2007) 'To begin with the beginning: Birth, origin, and narrative inception', in Richardson (ed.), 15–28.
Legrand, Ph.-E. (1942) *Hérodote: Introduction* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Lenfant, D. (2004) *Ctésias de Cnide* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Translated by A. Sheridan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
MacDowell, D.M. (1962) *Andokides* On the Mysteries (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press).
Marincola, J. (1989) 'Some suggestions on the Proem and "Second Preface" of Arrian's *Anabasis*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, 186–189.
Marincola, J. (2017a) 'Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*', in Flower (ed.), 103–118.
Marincola, J. (2017b) *On Writing History from Herodotus to Herodian* (London: Penguin Books).
Masqueray, P. (1930/1949) *Xénophon:* Anabase, 2 Vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Moles, J.L. (1985) 'The interpretation of the "Second Preface" in Arrian's *Anabasis*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105, 162–168.
Moles, J.L. (1994) 'Xenophon and Callicratidas', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 114, 70–84.
Momigliano, A. (1960a) *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e letteratura).
Momigliano, A. (1960b) 'Some observations on the causes of war in ancient historiography', in Momigliano (ed.), 13–27.
Morgan, J. (2001) 'The prologues of the Greek Novels and Apuleius', in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 152–162.
Nijk, A.A. (2019) *Tense Switching in Classical Greek: A Cognitive Approach* (Dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).
Pelliccia, H. (1992) 'Sappho 16, Gorgias' *Helen*, and the preface to Herodotus' *Histories*', *Yale Classical Studies* 76, 63–84.
Pelling, C. (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin: University of Texas Press).

Perry, B.E. (1967) *The Ancient Romances*. Sather Classical Lectures 37 (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press).
Pitcher, L.V. (2012) 'Themistogenes of Syracuse', *Brill's New Jacoby* no. 108.
Pohlenz, M. (1937) *Herodot: Der erste Geschichtsschreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner). Reprinted Darmstadt (1973).
Rattenbury, R.M./Lumb, T.W. (1960) *Héliodore*: Les Éthiopiques Théagène et Chariclée. Volume 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
Reichel, M. (1995) 'Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and the Hellenistic Novel', in Forsten (ed.), 1–18. Expanded and reprinted in Gray (ed.), 418–438.
Richards, H. (1907) *Notes on Xenophon and Others* (London: E.G. Richards).
Richardson, B. (2007) (ed.) *Narrative Beginnings: Theories and Practices* (Lincoln, NE/London: University of Nebraska Press).
Rijksbaron, A. (2019) 'The Xenophon Factory: One hundred and fifty years of school editions of Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in A. Rijksbaron, *Form and Function in Greek Grammar: Linguistic Contributions to the Study of Greek Literature*, edited by R.J. Allan/E. van Embde Boas/L. Huitink (Leiden/Boston: Brill), 376–406.
Rohde, E. (1914) *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Haertel). Reprinted Darmstadt (1974).
Romilly, J., de (1971) 'La vengeance comme explication historique dans l'œuvre d'Hérodote'. *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 84, 314–337.
Rollinger, R. (2018) (ed.) *Conceptualizing Past, Present and Future.* Ninth Symposium of the Melammu Project (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
Rood, T. (2004) 'Xenophon and Diodorus: Continuing Thucydides', in Tuplin (ed.), 341–395.
Schein, S.L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's* Iliad (Berkeley: University of California Press).
Schmitzer, U. (1998) 'Sieben Thebaner gegen Theben: Bemerkungen zur Darstellungsform in Xenophon, Hell. 5,4,1–12', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 22, 123–139.
Schwyzer, E./Debrunner, A. (1950) *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich: Beck).
Sicking, C.M.J./Stork, P. (1997) 'The grammar of the so-called historical present', in Bakker (ed.) 131–168.
Smith, C.F. (1881) *A Study of Plutarch's* Life of Artaxerxes. *With especial reference to the sources* (Dissertation Leipzig).
Stadter, P.A. (1981) 'Arrian's extended preface', *Illinois Classical Studies* 6, 157–171.
Stein, H. (1893) *Herodotos*, Vol. 2.1 Book III (Berlin: Weidmann).
Stephens, S./Winkler, J.J. (1995) *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
Stronk, J.P. (2007) 'Ctesias of Cnidus, a Reappraisal', *Mnemosyne* 60, 25–58.
Stronk, J.P. (2010) *Ctesias'* Persian History. Part I: Introduction, Text, and Translation. (Düsseldorf: Wellen-Verl.).
Tamiolaki, M. (2018) (ed.) *Xenophon and Isocrates: Political Affinities and Literary Interactions*. Special Issue, *Trends in Classics* 10.1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).
Tatum, J. (1989) *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction*: *On* The Education of Cyrus (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Trzaskoma, S. (2011) 'The Anabasis of Chaereas and Callirhoe', *Ancient Narrative* 9, 1–35.

Tuplin, C.J. (2003) 'Heroes in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in Barzano (ed.), 115–156.
Tuplin, C.J. (2004) 'Doctoring the Persians: Ctesias of Cnidus, physician and historian', *Klio* 86, 305–347.
Tuplin, C.J. (2004) (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*: Papers from a conference held in Liverpool in July 1999. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 172 (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag).
Tylawsky, E.I/Weiss, C.G. (2001) (eds.) *Essays in Honour of Gordon Williams* (New Haven: Schwab)
Wackernagel, J. (2009) *Lectures on Syntax*. Ed., notes, and trans. by D. Langslow from German ed. First published 1920 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Wade-Gery, H.T. (1944) 'The Spartan rhetra in Plutarch, *Lycurgus* VI C. What is the rhetra?', *Classical Quarterly* 38, 115–126.
Whitmarsh, T. (2018) *Dirty Love: The Genealogy of the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).