CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

CHAPTER 1

Xenophon and His Literary Project

Those who obeyed him [Socrates] profited,
but those who did not obey him regretted it.
(*Mem.* 1.1.4)

1.1 Introduction

Xenophon's literary output is extraordinary for the number of genres it appears to cross, and we can agree on that even if we do not agree on how precisely to categorise some of his writings: *Sokratikoi logoi* (*Memorabilia*, *Apology*, *Oeconomicus*, *Symposium*), encomium (*Agesilaus*), history (*Hellenica*), autobiography (*Anabasis*), didactic treatise (*On Hunting*, *The Cavalry Commander*, *On Horsemanship*), economic pamphlet (*Poroi*), political philosophy (*Lacedaimoniôn Politeia*, *Hiero*, *Cyropaedia*).[1] He is not the only literary experimenter of his generation. Plato, though his generic framework is generally always the *Sokratikoi logoi*,[2] plays with and satirises other types of writings within his dialogues: for example, the funeral oration in the *Menexenus*, and encomiastic writing in the *Symposium*.[3] Likewise Isocrates, though broadly speaking his works are either oratorical or epistolary in form, explores manifold rhetorical approaches.[4]

Xenophon is, however, (on the basis of our limited knowledge) the only one of his contemporaries who attempts such radically different structural approaches in his writing. This fact is why we have such

[1] This rough categorisation is my own, though it will become clear that I think that Xenophon's works are more interconnected than this list implies. E.g., see Humble 2018a on the thread of Socratic elements running through his corpus. See also Humble 2020b, which explores Xenophon 'as a pioneer experimenter in biographical forms' (the quotation coming from Momigliano 1993: 47).

[2] Excepted by some is the *Apology* on the grounds that it is a (quasi-)historical document; see, e.g., Guthrie 1962–81: 3.349 and Kahn 1996: 88; arguing for its inclusion, see, e.g., Morrison 2000: 239; McCoy 2007: 24–5; and Dorion 2012: 419–20. There are many discussions of the nuances and problems of how to define *Sokratikoi logoi*. For a range of views, see, e.g., Clay 1994; Kahn 1996: 1–35; Rossetti 2004, 2011.

[3] The bibliography on this aspect of Plato's works is vast. Nightingale 1995 is particularly good; see also briefly Clay 1994: 41–7; more broadly and with different approaches, see, e.g., Kahn 1996 and Rowe 2007a.

[4] Nicolai 2004 and 2018.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

difficulty finding an easy label for him: is he a historian, a (Socratic) philosopher, a rhetorician, a memoirist, a biographer? We have no such difficulty, by contrast, with Plato (a philosopher) or Isocrates (an orator). Whether or not Xenophon had an overarching purpose to his whole literary project is a question not always asked, partly of course because we look at his corpus in such a fragmented way. It has certainly been noted repeatedly that his works are united by an obvious interest in leadership,[5] but why he should be so interested in leadership is not usually addressed. Perhaps this is because for the most part we think the answer is obvious: he himself had experience as a leader; he was part of the Socratic circle and good leadership was one of the topics that circle debated; he was in close community with other leaders, Spartan and Persian and Athenian, so his observation of them in action led to further enquiry, etc. This may be as close as we can come to answering this question, though I am going to explore an additional reason below.

Two problems have hampered investigation of this sort of broad topic, one of our own devising, the other inherent in the study of most ancient literature. First is the fact that, at least until very recently, Xenophon's literary works have not been deemed particularly worthy by comparison with his seemingly more illustrious contemporaries, and that where we perceive references to the views of others (such as Isocrates or Plato) these are invariably thought to be Xenophon's reworkings, borrowings or responses rather than the other way around (i.e. that the conversation is viewed as being one-way). Secondly, there is no way of determining with any degree of certainty when he wrote most of his works and in what order.

Regarding the first problem, I think it is possible to show that Xenophon's literary project was both serious and also deemed so by his contemporaries (and this second task will be the particular focus of Chapter 7).[6] The second problem is not solvable, but it is difficult to avoid joining the debate since chronological speculation has played a key part in the study of Xenophon's view of Sparta in general. Understanding of works which contain significant Spartan material has frequently been predicated on elaborate dating schemas put in place to explain perceived shifts in focus or approach.[7] The following is a simple example of this

5 Breitenbach 1950: 47–104 is still a classic. Recent explorations include Gray 2011a; numerous essays in Hobden and Tuplin 2012a; Sandridge 2013; Buxton 2016a and 2016b.

6 Even if again issues of dating, particularly in the case of Plato, mean that it is important to examine perceived conversations from both sides.

7 Delebecque 1957 has been the most detailed attempt to reconstruct Xenophon's life and works. It is an impressive construct, which includes suggestions that works were written piecemeal over numerous years with revisions at various periods, but it is far from unproblematic, not least

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

phenomenon: section 14 of the *Lacedaimoniôn Politeia* has been argued to have been written separately from the rest of the work, after Xenophon became disillusioned with Sparta, i.e. after the battle of Leuctra in 371 BCE, or possibly slightly earlier, after what are deemed the worst excesses of Spartan imperialistic *hybris*, Phoebidas' seizure of the Theban citadel in 382 BCE and Sphodrias' attempted invasion of Attica in 378 (as if there were no egregious acts of Spartan imperialistic *hybris* prior to this period, or Xenophon had somehow missed them).[8] It is, in fact, notable that it is the perceived shift in Xenophon's view on Sparta which is one of the key factors governing this tendency to split his works up and argue that portions of them were written at different times, and thus the works most affected are those which deal most with Sparta, primarily the *Hellenica* and *Lacedaimoniôn Politeia*.[9]

In the end, we simply do not have enough information to be certain one way or another, and no definitive answer regarding the relative or actual chronological order of his works is going to be attempted here. It has, however, always struck me in reading his corpus that none of his discussions of Sparta or Spartans is consistently praiseworthy, apart from the *Agesilaus*, which we would expect to be so since it is an encomium. Thus, while I would not want to suggest that his opinion of Sparta was

because it is based on the twin assumptions that Xenophon is pro-Spartan and that he is less of an intellect than some of his contemporaries. Richer 2007: 429–32 has recently revived interest in Delebecque's chronology. Lipka 2002 surpasses Delebecque, however, for the complicated compositional schema he proposes for the *Lacedaimoniôn Politeia*.

8 Hooker 1989: 137 is a classic example: 'Xenophon makes no secret of his partiality towards Sparta, but he is not the uncritical admirer of everything Spartan that his biography of Agesilaus might lead one to suppose. It is rather that he cannot help contrasting the present actions of Sparta with the ideal she formerly professed. In his narrative in the *Hellenica*, Xenophon regards the year 382 as the turning point. It was then that the Spartans seized the acropolis at Thebes, contrary to international law as enshrined in the Peace of Antalcidas, and in doing so they committed an act which (in Xenophon's view) led directly to their downfall eleven years later (V 4.1). A similar sense of disillusionment explains the apparent contradiction in Xenophon's *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*. This work … is a paean of praise in 13 chapters for the whole Lycurgan system. The harsh indictment in chapter 14 is all the more telling.'

9 See Chapter 2.2.3 for further discussion of the problems of dating the *Lacedaimoniôn Politeia*. The unity and date of composition of the *Hellenica* have both been subjected to significant debate, with stylistic considerations being central. Generally, most would now (and see Henry 1966 for earlier and often more complex approaches) fall either on the side of viewing the work as a whole with a late date of composition (e.g., Gray 1991) or as composed in two parts (with the break most often being argued to come at *HG* 2.3.10), the first part written early in Xenophon's career, the second written later (e.g., Tuplin 1993: 11; likewise Dillery 1995: 12–15, who gives a good succinct survey of the different approaches). A perceived change from an Athenian to a Spartan point of view at the beginning of Book 3 is often part of the argumentation. The *Agesilaus* is safe from being split apart because it was obviously written after Agesilaus died, c. 360 BCE, and before Xenophon died, c. 354 BCE. Delebecque 1957: 199–206 argued that the *Anabasis* was composed in two halves with the break coming at *An.* 5.3.6, but his view has not gained any real traction.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

completely static over time (something impossible to determine with certainty anyway under our current state of knowledge), it does not seem to me that we can regard him as ever having been, as some have put it, a naïve laconophile, but rather that he ought to be regarded as a critical external observer of a powerful *polis* which, during the course of his own lifetime, was first at war with his own *polis*, Athens, then in a position of hegemonic power over it, and finally in an uneasy off-and-on alliance with it as Thebes briefly took over the hegemonic role.[10]

1.2 The Autobiographical Approach

To turn to (auto)biographical details to help to clarify Xenophon's view of Sparta and the bigger question of what his literary project was all about is a task fraught with pitfalls. On the whole, despite his fourteen extant works and a *circa* third-century CE biography by Diogenes Laertius, we know rather less about Xenophon's life than most modern biographical sketches of him imply, and the risk of circular argumentation is high when we use his works and much later biographical details to fill out his life story.[11] Thus, for example, it is argued that because he campaigned under Agesilaus and wrote an encomium of him, Agesilaus is one of his heroes and above criticism – a line of argumentation which does not sit well with the frequently critical portrait of Agesilaus in the *Hellenica*. Or, similarly, Diogenes' comment that Diocles reported that Xenophon had his sons educated in Sparta[12] is used to support the argument that he was a committed laconophile who admired the Spartan education system, as shown in how he lays it out in the *Lacedaimoniôn Politeia* – a line of argumentation which requires glossing over the peculiar presentation of Spartan education in this work, with its focus on fear and punishment, educational techniques which are diametrically opposed to those Xenophon champions in other works such as the *Memorabilia* and *On Hunting*.[13]

[10] See Rowe 2007a: 39–49 for a brief discussion about the dating of Plato's works as well as the 'developmental' reading of Plato's theory of forms, which Rowe rejects, and which can be compared to the 'developmental' reading of Xenophon's view on Sparta, which I am rejecting.

[11] See Humble 2002a for examples of how biographical details are manipulated to support readings of Xenophon's works, usually to his disadvantage.

[12] D.L. 2.54, where the first-century BCE *Lives of Philosophers* by Diocles is cited as the source; cf. also Plu. *Ages.* 20.2.

[13] See Humble 2004b for an examination of how easily this detail about the education of his sons could have been inferred from his writings at a later date and for different motives. Despite the problematic nature of this point, however, it is frequently accepted as fact: e.g., David 1989: 4; Cartledge 2001b: 83; and Richer 2007: 405.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

We are, in fact, not really any better off than ancient biographers were and, as these two examples show, tend to rely just as heavily as they did on using his written works in one way or another to fill in biographical details and argue for points of interpretation.[14] The following example about a supposed antagonism between Plato and Xenophon is even more instructive. The notion that they were engaged in some sort of rivalry, like the notion that Xenophon had his sons educated in Sparta, is based not on any independent contemporary evidence that this is so, nor indeed on any direct statement one of them makes about the other, but on the following: (1) the observation that both wrote an *Apology* and a *Symposium*; (2) a reading of Plato's criticism of Cyrus the Elder's education in the *Laws* (3.694c–695b) as an implicit, and critical, response to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*; and (3) the observation that Plato never mentions Xenophon and Xenophon only mentions Plato once. These points are all adduced by three Imperial-era authors who, if not using one another, are certainly drawing on a common source: Aulus Gellius (*NA* 14.3.2–4), Athenaeus (504f–505a) and Diogenes Laertius (2.57). Interestingly, they all come to different conclusions. Gellius attributes the rivalry to later partisanship and considers Xenophon and Plato as rivals only on the field of virtue, being of equal eminence, 'two stars of Socratic charm'. Athenaeus, on the other hand, does believe there was a rivalry, but puts it down to Plato's jealous nature. Diogenes also agrees there was a rivalry and though he does not explicitly make the same judgement as Athenaeus, the place where he provides details is where he notes numerous rivalries of Plato (D.L. 3.34–6). Modern responses to the very same material have also produced a range of different conclusions, most of them less flattering towards Xenophon than the ancients were. J. K. Anderson, for example, dismisses Gellius' assessment of both men standing above rivalry as absurd not least because 'Xenophon himself probably knew that he was not in the same class as Plato'. This fits with Anderson's assessment that Xenophon stood only on the fringes of the Socratic circle, an assessment which happens not to be shared by any of these three Imperial-era sources.[15] Gabriel Danzig, however, finds that close reading of the respective *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon does support the

[14] Lee 2016 is a good example of another common approach, which surveys the historical events during Xenophon's life (many described in Xenophon's more historical writings) and speculates where Xenophon fits into them, using later biographical details cautiously. This is an important exercise, however, since, even when we cannot be sure where he fits, to dehistoricise Xenophon gets us nowhere.

[15] Anderson 1974: 28–9. Holford-Strevens 2003: 268–9 likewise accuses Gellius of 'perverse ingenuity' on the grounds that it is clear that Xenophon had no partisans.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

notion that they engaged in attacking one another, not by name but through literary responses to one another's views.[16] A. Swift Riginos, by contrast, argues that the supposed rivalry was a fabrication of Alexandrian scholars.[17] Though we are aware enough of how indiscriminately ancient biographers inferred personal details from literary works, that this assertion of rivalry comes solely from a particular reading of the works of Xenophon and Plato does not, of course, mean that it is not true. Yet the range of responses to the same details serves as an important reminder of the difficulties attendant upon engaging in this sort of biographical reconstruction.

Mindful of these difficulties,[18] I want to review here one type of (auto) biographical material, i.e. what Xenophon says about himself. Although no certain conclusions can be drawn, a different scenario can at least be proposed which sheds different light on his literary project as a whole and, therefore, will, by extension, problematise the traditional view about his relationship with Sparta.

1.3 Xenophon on Xenophon

Classical Greek authors do not tend to talk too much about themselves, or when they do, they frequently do so in the third person, which puts the modern reader, at least, in a bit of a quandary, wondering in what way they are being (mis)led by such a practice.[19] Xenophon does not give us anything substantial to go on in the first person, but he does, in two different works, present himself as a character. Almost all of the pertinent material can be found in the *Anabasis*, Xenophon's autobiographical account of approximately two years of his life (c. 401–399 BCE). Within this work he twice deviates notably from his chronological narrative to provide us with a brief snapshot of certain events in his life before the expedition (*An.* 3.1.4–7) and a brief snapshot of certain events after the expedition (*An.* 5.3.6–13).[20] Apart from this there is only one other occasion in his corpus where he provides any similar material: in the

[16] Danzig 2005, and also 2014, where he reads the negative portrait of Critias in the *Hellenica* as an attack on Plato's milder portrait of Critias in the *Charmides*. Johnson 2018b: 73, in discussing responses in Xenophon's works to Plato's works, does not commit to commenting on the tone of the literary conversation.

[17] Swift Riginos 1976: 108–10.

[18] Thus, like Cartledge 1987: 57, I am 'making assumptions explicit and confessing openly to speculation', as there is really no other viable approach.

[19] Most 1989 is still a useful and salutary discussion of the problems, and see Nicolai 2018: 201–3 for Isocrates' discussion in his *Antidosis* on the difficulties of, and his solutions for, how to self-eulogise.

[20] As well as a brief second reference near the end of the work to note that he is not yet exiled (*An.* 7.7.57).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

Memorabilia, where he depicts his pre-*Anabasis* younger self in conversation with Socrates (*Mem.* 1.3.8–13).[21] It has not gone unnoted that the autobiographical nature of this material confers singular status upon it: when Xenophon chooses to put himself forward as a character within his own corpus of writing he is doing so for a specific purpose. What the purpose is, however, has been vigorously debated, and I will come back to it after some comments on this material.

1.3.1 Pre-401 BCE

It is not possible to know whether the *Memorabilia* preceded the *Anabasis* or not, but for my purposes it does not much matter, as the two glimpses Xenophon gives us of his life prior to the *Anabasis* were both probably written after he had been exiled and together they present a striking and coherent picture. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon shows himself in conversation with Socrates about sexual passion (*Mem.* 1.3.8–13). Socrates asks him his opinion on the sanity of Critobulus, who has rashly indulged himself by kissing Alcibiades' son. Xenophon portrays himself as scoffing at the notion that kissing beautiful young boys is dangerous. Socrates then emphasises his point by means of an extended metaphor comparing such a kiss to the bite of a scorpion. Xenophon follows along but does not give us any evidence that he was convinced about the point, i.e. he does not give himself the last word in the conversation to show that he has learned the lesson Socrates intends.[22] Nor is there any indication that Critobulus learnt anything from this encounter, as other passages confirm (*Mem.* 2.6.32–3; *Smp.* 4.10–18).[23]

[21] There are, of course, also the first-person assertions that he was present at certain conversations Socrates had with others both in the *Memorabilia* (1.3.1, 1.4.2, 1.6.14, 2.4.1, 2.5.1, 4.3.1) and, less assertively, in the *Symposium* (1.1), or at least this is how they are usually read, though Bevilacqua 2010: 18–20 argues for a distinction here between author and narrator. On this hermeneutic approach, see more broadly McCloskey 2017 (whose conclusions I generally agree with though I am not always convinced by the arguments which lead there) and Rood 2018: 186–90. See Johnson 2018b: 76 for reasons why we should regard the first-person narrator in the *Memorabilia* as Xenophon, despite the anachronisms. For the moment I want to deal only with how Xenophon presents the character Xenophon. See also the good discussion in Brown Ferrario 2012: 361–73 on the relationship between Xenophon the character and Xenophon the author *vis-à-vis* historical agency and historical memory.

[22] And, as Gray 1998: 95 notes, he fails also in a broader sense when compared with the role assigned to secondary interlocutors in conversations generally in the *Memorabilia*. Hindley 2004: 127 reads this passage in a completely different way: as evidence that Xenophon is publicly, and seriously, disagreeing with Socrates on this point of male love.

[23] Nails 2002: 18 suggests that the *Memorabilia* passage is 'Xenophon's own invention', which may of course be true, but the passage nonetheless presents a particular picture of Xenophon himself which is not particularly flattering.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

In the *Anabasis*, at the point at which Xenophon starts to play a greater role in events (i.e. after Cyrus and three of the main Greek generals have been killed and the remnants of the Greek mercenaries find themselves abandoned deep inside Persian territory), we are transported back to events leading up to his departure from Athens and to another conversation with Socrates; in fact, we get a mini Socratic dialogue reported by the anonymous narrator (*An*. 3.1.4–7). Here we learn that Xenophon had asked Socrates about whether or not he should take up the offer of his friend Proxenus to pursue friendship with Cyrus. Socrates advised Xenophon that friendship with Cyrus might not be viewed favourably in Athens because Cyrus had supported the Spartans in their victory over Athens in the Peloponnesian War, and suggests that Xenophon ask the god at Delphi whether or not it would be advisable to head off with Proxenus. Xenophon, however, having made up his mind already that he wanted to take up Proxenus' offer, partially ignores Socrates' advice: he does go to Delphi but asks not whether or not he should go on the expedition but to which gods he should sacrifice and pray to ensure a good journey and a safe return. When he tells Socrates what he did, Socrates chastises him for not asking the correct question of the god but says he had better proceed on the basis of the question he had asked, so Xenophon sacrifices appropriately and heads off to join Proxenus in the camp of Cyrus.

In both these passages, Xenophon shows himself an intimate of Socrates, and in both, also, he shows himself to be rather headstrong in nature, asking for or listening to the advice of Socrates but reluctant to take it if it interfered with his youthful pleasures and ambitions. He represents himself, that is, as one of those clever young men who associate with Socrates but who are never quite reined in by him, not quite, perhaps, an Alcibiades (whom Xenophon does not actually present in conversation with Socrates in the *Memorabilia* but rather shows him taking the role of Socrates and brazenly cross-examining his guardian Pericles, *Mem*. 1.2.40–6), but equally not a Euthydemus (another handsome and ambitious young man whom Xenophon presents as thinking he is wise, but who, once he is shown by Socrates not to know as much as he thought he did, immediately becomes a devoted follower of Socrates, *Mem*. 4.2.1–40).[24]

[24] It is worth pointing out that Diogenes Laertius, who at the start of his biography characterises Xenophon as modest and exceedingly handsome (αἰδήμων δὲ καὶ εὐειδέστατος εἰς ὑπερβολήν, D.L. 2.48), only draws on Xenophon's autobiographical anecdote from the *Anabasis* (2.49–50) and not that from the *Memorabilia*, preferring to cite an anecdote from Aristippus' *On the Luxury of the Ancients* which was not in fact originally about Xenophon at all (2.48–9).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

Xenophon's portrait of his younger self thus revolves around his encounters with Socrates, and it is not particularly flattering: he does not depict himself as one who actually learns properly from or heeds the advice of Socrates.[25]

1.3.2 401–399 BCE

As a character in the *Anabasis*, Xenophon fares somewhat better overall. He appears only a few brief times in the narrative before Book 3. His first appearance shows that the aim of setting out – to pursue the friendship of Cyrus alongside his friend Proxenus (*An.* 3.1.4) – had been met:[26] just before the battle of Cunaxa, Xenophon depicts himself as on close terms with Cyrus; he approaches Cyrus as the latter rides up and down the drawn up battle lines and asks if he can do anything; Cyrus asks him to spread the word that the sacrifices and omens were in their favour (1.8.15).[27] After the battle of Cunaxa and the death of Cyrus comes Xenophon's second appearance in the work. Here he depicts himself on an evening stroll with Proxenus when a messenger comes with the news of Persian double-dealing (2.4.15). Not long after, he joins two other generals, Cleanor and Sophaenetus, when they set out to find out what has happened to Clearchus, Proxenus and Menon, who have not returned from a meeting with Tissaphernes; Xenophon says he joined the other two out of concern for his friend Proxenus (2.5.37–41). They learn from the Persian Ariaeus that Clearchus has been killed on grounds of perjury, but that Proxenus and Menon are still alive and being treated well. Again, though Xenophon appears to have had no defined role within the mercenary group at this point (as he states at 3.1.4), his friendship with Proxenus, and hence with Cyrus, has clearly conferred upon him an acceptance among the highest echelon of the command structure of the whole group, and it is he who, after Cleanor rails at Ariaeus for his

[25] See Gray 1998: 95–8 for a discussion of these two passages in terms of how they fit in with the agenda to praise and excuse Socrates. Haywood 2016: 90 n. 17 reads both passages likewise as contrasting the naïveté of Xenophon with the wisdom of Socrates, but in arguing that Xenophon was 'unable to appreciate the nuances of oracular consultation' I think he underestimates Xenophon's deliberate manipulation of the oracle.

[26] Contrary to Tsagalis 2009: 451–2, who argues that Xenophon 'is nothing more than a mere name' and 'has deliberately erased his presence' in the early stages of the work. If that were the case, why bring himself into the picture at all? And why allocate himself direct speech, which is generally an indication of the importance of a scene?

[27] Further, later at *An.* 3.1.9 he reports that Cyrus, upon meeting him, had personally urged him to join in the campaign which was at that time said to be against the Pisidians.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47997-4 — Xenophon of Athens
Noreen Humble
Excerpt
More Information

double-dealing, urges the Persians to let the Greek generals return.[28] He thus gives himself the last and most important word in this diplomatic meeting.[29] Confirmation that his plea went unheeded is provided by the obituaries of Clearchus, Proxenus and Menon which follow directly in the narrative (2.6).

Only months after he left Athens, therefore, Xenophon found himself in a position he could not possibly have anticipated: both Proxenus and Cyrus are dead and he and a relatively small and not wholly united body of Greek mercenaries are isolated in the middle of the Persian Empire surrounded by hostile forces. Quite naturally they are all in a state of hopelessness. Yet Xenophon shows himself prising off the grip of despair by encouraging himself to take charge of affairs. His series of questions to himself shows him coming to the realisation that he is now actually in the sort of situation that he had hoped to find himself in one day (albeit more fraught and probably more dangerous than expected, since only a few sections before he reminded the reader that the expedition had been thought originally to be against the Pisidians, and with every chance of being successful and short, 3.1.9), i.e. in a position to take command (3.1.13–14).

Having already worked his way in an unofficial capacity into the commanding circle, he depicts himself shrewdly and confidently conferring with Proxenus' captains and promising either to follow where they lead or to take on a leadership role himself. They urge him to take over as general of their contingent (3.1.26), presumably swayed not just by this display of proactiveness, his keen assessment of the situation and his rhetorical skills but also by what they had experienced of him over the course of the expedition to this point. From now on Xenophon is front and centre in the events he recounts and he plays a significant role in guiding the Greek mercenaries out of the heart of Asia and back to Asia Minor again.[30]

It is not my intention here to go over all his actions in detail but rather to highlight a selection in order to show the complexity of the way in which he presents himself. It is certainly primarily a positive portrait, but

[28] See on this Lee 2007: 53–4, with his speculation that Xenophon might in reality have been Proxenus' *hypostrategos*.

[29] And, as Flower 2012: 121 notes, makes 'so clever an argument for Proxenus's and Menon's release that the Persians are unable to answer it'.

[30] Flower 2012: 120–30 has a good overview on how dominant the character Xenophon is in the narrative at this turning point. See also his pp. 130–40 on the positive aspects of Xenophon's presentation of himself as a leader.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org