CHAPTER 9
POLITICS AND FORM IN XENOPHON
Rosie Harman

Xenophon's works are full of unexpected shifts in structure and peculiarities in tone: his narratives and arguments sometimes seem to change direction mid-flow, pointing the reader in opposite directions at once. In this chapter, I will suggest that these oddities of Xenophon's style, which are such a distinctive feature of his writing but have proved a puzzle to scholars, can be explained in terms of the political effect of his works. For Xenophon, problems of form reveal and instantiate the political problems of his time. I argue that the disjunctive feel of Xenophon's writing, rather than being a problem to be explained away, must be addressed as fundamental to his works' historical significance.

A notorious example is the ending of the *Cyropaedia*.[1] Here, after almost 8 books presenting an apparent praise of the achievements of Cyrus the Great and his Persians, the final chapter suddenly changes tack to argue that contemporary Persia is the most corrupt, decadent and immoral of states (*Cyr.* 8.8). A similar shift famously takes place in chapter 14 of the *Lakedaimonion Politeia*: whereas the other chapters seem to praise the mythical Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus' organization of Spartan institutions (and the text is usually read as a eulogy of Spartan society),[2] the penultimate chapter transforms into a savage critique of contemporary Sparta. Although these shifts can of course be understood as shifts in content, as the texts move from one argument about the nature of Persia or Sparta to another, as we shall see in due course, they can also usefully be understood in terms of form: one mode of writing, with its own rhetorical mechanisms, ways of addressing and drawing in the reader, and in-built expectations for interpretation, gives way to another. Such a perspective offers a new way of approaching problems in Xenophon's writing.

These awkward passages have been approached in a number of ways, which all aim to smooth over the disturbing resonances produced by these sudden shifts in direction. They have been regarded as later interpolations;[3] the 1914 Loeb translation of the *Cyropaedia* by Walter Miller interposes a note within the body of the text between chapters 8.7 and 8.8 commenting that although it has been deemed necessary to include the coming chapter as it is found in all manuscript versions, 'the reader is recommended to close the book at this point and read no further'.[4] Another approach has been to regard these chapters as later additions made by Xenophon when his admiration for Persia and Sparta was dashed by historical events.[5]

Of those who see the problematic chapters as original, the majority attempt to wipe out all sense of contradiction either by arguing that Xenophon's focus on contemporary degeneration gives added weight to his praise of the past achievements of Cyrus the

Great and Lycurgus by showing the catastrophe that ensued when their models of rule were no longer applied,[6] or (in the case of the *Lak. Pol.*) by seeing Xenophon as offering a careful, dispassionate analysis of Sparta's positive and negative characteristics.[7] Alternatively, these texts have been read as wholly condemnatory, either (in the case of the *Lak. Pol.*) by reading the apparent praise of Sparta in the earlier portion of the work as a heavily veiled ironic pastiche through privileging the rather strange leaps and contradictions in its argument,[8] or (in the case of the *Cyropaedia*) by linking the final chapter to the disturbing aspects of the representation of Cyrus as a ruler which occur throughout the text;[9] these aspects of the texts are further discussed below. These different interpretations have led to huge variations in the dating of the texts, based on assumptions about Xenophon's biography which have been used, rather reductively, to speculate on his attitude towards Sparta and Persia at different times.[10]

Readings which claim a logical continuity between *Cyr.* 8.8, *Lak. Pol.* 14 and the rest of their respective texts do not do justice to the very real sense of shock which these chapters generate in the reader. Although these chapters do refer to a present when the Spartans no longer follow the laws of Lycurgus and the Persians are no longer like the Persians of Cyrus' time, the earlier portions of these texts do not appear to deal only with a lost past. On the contrary, in reading the *Lak. Pol.* one gets the impression that one is being presented with the nature of Spartan society very much as it is in the present:[11] the text describes what the reader would see and experience on an imagined visit to Sparta (*Lak. Pol.* 3.5, 9.1, 13.5), and advises the reader to look at the Spartans if they wish to test out the truth of the text's assertions (*Lak. Pol.* 1.10, 2.14), for example. Similarly, the *Cyropaedia* repeatedly links Cyrus' time with the now, noting, as it describes Persian customs, that they are still practised today.[12] The swift shift in argument at *Lak. Pol.* 14 and *Cyr.* 8.8, as the texts suddenly impose a distinction between past and present which the reader had not been aware of up till this point, disorients the reader.

Readings which deny a contradiction between these chapters and the earlier portions of their texts aim to explain away those texts' complexities; as we shall see, these complexities must be understood as intrinsic to the functioning of these texts. I will argue that the disjunctions in Xenophon's writing, which produce such an unsettling reading experience, enact and instantiate the political problems which the texts address.[13] I suggest that it will be useful to approach these questions through an examination of the concept of genre.

Xenophon is unusual for his period in that he wrote works across a number of genres, including historiography, rhetorical set pieces and Socratic dialogue. He also produced works which are difficult to classify in terms of pre-existing prose genres. The *Anabasis* is in some ways akin to history writing in its account of real events, but its focus on the narrow experiences of an individual and his men on a journey has also led to it being compared to the *Odyssey*.[14] The framing of the narrative via the experiences of the character 'Xenophon', presented in the third person, have also led scholars to attempt to categorize the text using the terminology of autobiography.[15]

Similarly, the *Cyropaedia* has been described as historiography, political philosophy, biography, or as an early version of the novel – centuries before the novel's inception.[16] In these texts Xenophon has been described as producing experimental prose which sits between classifiable forms, or even as initiating previously unknown genres.[17]

I would like to examine a couple of examples of occasions where Xenophon seems to switch from one form of writing to another mid-text. The examples that I will focus on come from texts we can broadly describe as narrative historiography – the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* (and we will go on briefly to compare these examples with the examples from the *Cyropaedia* and *Lak. Pol.* mentioned above). In the *Hellenica* my example will involve a shift from narration of events to dialogue; in the *Anabasis* the shift I am interested in is from narration of events to the language of praise; and we have already noted the shifts in the *Cyropaedia* and *Lak. Pol.* from praise to blame.[18] I would like to approach these shifts in focus, organization and tone as shifts in 'genre'.[19] By using the term 'genre' in this context I am not attempting to suggest that we should be interested in labelling different sections of Xenophon's writing within any given text under different genre appellations. To attempt to do so would beg the question of how to approach Xenophon's writing as such: since we have no clear way of classifying the *Cyropaedia* (for example) as a whole, attempting to come up with subsidiary classifications for the majority of the work on the one hand and the final chapter on the other is not a meaningful exercise. Rather, what I am suggesting is that the concept of genre as an analytical category provides a useful heuristic tool with which to approach Xenophon's disjunctive style and cut-up structure.

In the light of Adorno's examination of form as a crystallization of social relations,[20] Conte has posited a reading of genre as the instantiation of an ideological model for understanding the world, whereby within any particular genre, particular ways of thinking about the way the world works are inscribed, encoded and imposed on the reader[21] – or, in the language of Jauss, a particular horizon of expectation is offered to the reader, which both reflects and constructs historical experience.[22] Bakhtin's examination of the co-existence and interaction of different such generic models is helpful in the case of Xenophon. Bakhtin posits the modern novel as a dialogic form, where different generic voices come into conflict and affect each other, producing a hybridized or 'double-voiced' text. He argues that this produces a unique political experience, whereby the text clashes together different ideological modes and conceptions which impinge and reflect on each other.[23] As we shall see, this concept of dialogism is helpful for a reading of Xenophon.

To a certain extent, we could see Bakhtin's dialogism as a characteristic of early Greek historiography per se. In the fifth and early fourth centuries BC, prior to Aristotelian literary criticism, there is not yet a fixed genre of history writing – and indeed prose writing as such is still very much a new and experimental form.[24] Xenophon's combination of – for example – impersonal narration of events with dialogue is nothing new. In Herodotus and Thucydides we see repeated movements between narration and direct speech, whether presented as set piece speeches or as dialogue.[25] Indeed, as Boedeker has

shown, from the earliest inception of historiography Herodotus' text is defined through and against prior forms of writing in prose and verse.[26] Herodotus' distinctive contribution, his articulation and questioning of modes of authority and categories of truth value, is performed through a negotiation between different genres, each encoding their own expectations.[27] I will suggest that Xenophon's historical narration not only participates in a similar dynamic, but produces a particularly marked awareness of genre as a problem.[28]

I will begin with an example from the *Hellenica*, in order to indicate some of the political effects of Xenophon's disjunctions in focus, tone and structure.[29] In a second step, we will move on to an example from the *Anabasis*, where the stakes are slightly different – where Xenophon's writing seems to inscribe awareness of the constructed nature of the text as a text and to allow the nature of its contract with the reader to become open to speculation, producing in the reader a critical cognizance of the political effects of form. A third section will place the production of formal awareness in the context of some other examples from fourth-century BC prose writing, examining the evocation of readerly critical attentiveness to the effects of praise discourse in both Xenophon and his contemporaries. In a final step, we will use the insights gained in these discussions to return to the problem of the *Cyropaedia*'s ending in conjunction with the analogous problem of the *Lak. Pol.*'s chapter 14, offering a reading of Xenophon's disjunctive style in terms of both the ideological contradictions of Xenophon's time and the textual construction of critical reading practices.

Hellenica 4.1.1–4.1.15

At the opening of *Hellenica* book 4, Xenophon presents a dialogue between Agesilaus, King of Sparta, Spithridates, a Persian who has revolted from the Persian King (3.4.10), and Otys, King of the Paphlagonians, regarding the prospect of Otys marrying Spithridates' daughter. Agesilaus first questions Spithridates as to whether he would be willing to give his daughter to Otys; next Agesilaus holds a dialogue with Otys in which he leads Otys to consider marrying Spithridates' daughter.

What is particularly striking about the sequence is the detail with which Xenophon presents this narrative moment. Rather than simply summarizing the arrangement of the marriage in a couple of lines, we are treated to direct speech between the participants, much of it presented via question-and-answer exchanges along the lines of Socratic dialogue:[30]

> [Agesilaus] began a conversation with Otys by asking, 'Tell me, Otys, what kind of family does Spithridates comes from?' Otys replied that he was not inferior to any of the Persians. 'You have seen how handsome his son is?' 'Yes, indeed. In fact, I dined with him last evening.' 'And yet they say that Spithridates' daughter is even more attractive than his son.' 'Yes, by Zeus,' said Otys, 'she is beautiful indeed.'
>
> *4.1.6*[31]

The narrative slows right down, presenting a (largely) mimetic blow-by-blow account of the verbal interaction through which the marriage got arranged. The sequence stands in striking contrast to the surrounding context, which presents a dense, impersonally narrated account of fast-moving events. Book 3 ends with an account of the fighting between the Thebans and Spartans at Haliartus in Boeotia (3.5.17–25): the movement of troops (3.5.17), the fighting outside the walls (3.5.18–19), the death of Lysander (3.5.19), the Theban pursuit of Lysander's troops (3.5.19) and their self-defence (3.5.20), the departure of the Phocians (3.5.21), the arrival of Pausanias (3.5.21), the arrival of the Athenians in support of Thebes (3.5.22), Pausanias' request for the return of bodies under truce (3.5.23), the Spartan withdrawal (3.5.24), and Pausanias' prosecution, abscondment and death (3.5.25). Major incidents, such as the death of Lysander or the dishonour, exile and death of Pausanias, are treated in a couple of swiftly narrated lines. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, when the text continues with a shift not only from events in Greece to events in Asia, but to an intricately presented dialogue on the arrangement of a marriage.

In terms of the wider narrative context, the arrangement of the marriage does not seem to have that great a significance.[32] Its aim is presumably to shore up the newly agreed alliance between the Spartans, Spithridates and the Paphlagonians,[33] but this alliance in fact falls apart within a few short chapters: Agesilaus' subordinate Herippidas refuses to share booty with Spithridates and the Paphlagonians after their joint capture of Pharnabazus' camp, and Spithridates and the Paphlagonians respond by packing up in the night and going over to Ariaeus (4.1.26–7). We are told that their desertion 'caused Agesilaus more grief than anything else that happened in this campaign' (4.1.28). This statement marks how the arrangements so carefully set up in fact came to nothing; the comment draws our attention to the disparity between the space given to the account of the establishment of the marriage agreement and its lack of long-term historical impact.

Xenophon's use of the dialogue therefore could do with some explanation. As Gray has shown, a particular function of dialogue as a form is that unlike impersonal narration or even a set-piece speech, it most effectively communicates the processes of manipulation of one interlocutor by another.[34] We are shown step by step how Agesilaus leads Spithridates and Otys to fall in with his plans. Agesilaus' initial exchange with Spithridates reveals Spithridates' willingness to agree to the marriage but his assumption of Otys' unwillingness, on the grounds that Otys is a great king whereas he is an exile (4.1.4). Agesilaus' subsequent persuasion of Otys pre-empts this potential difficulty by insisting on the high birth and great power of Spithridates (4.1.7).[35] As Gray indicates, the result is a reversal of attitudes: Otys seems to have been led by Agesilaus to believe that, rather than being the loser in the arrangement, he would get the most out of the marriage deal, and it is now he who shows eagerness while doubting Spithridates' willingness (4.1.10–12).[36] Agesilaus then stages the need to persuade Spithridates, sending Herippidas out to speak to him, as though this were the first time the arrangement had been mentioned (4.1.11). The dialogue form, which shows Agesilaus' persuasive moves and Otys' responses, reveals Agesilaus' methods in asserting control over his interlocutor, and the clever way in which he is able to achieve his aims.[37]

We must ask about the political effect of this dialogue on the reader. One function of dialogue is to introduce a range of competing voices. Indeed, one reading of Platonic dialogue would see dialogue as an essentially democratic genre, by staging and involving the reader in the openness of debate. However, Platonic dialogue frequently privileges the controlling voice of Socrates, whose arguments trump or overshadow those of other speakers.[38] In this context, dialogue has a contrary political effect: it offers alternative positions to the reader, but only to close those alternative positions down. In the *Hellenica*'s scene of Agesilaus' marriage brokerage, the dialogue form works not only to demonstrate the controlling power of Agesilaus' voice at the expense of other voices, but to draw the reader in to this dynamic, so that the reader acquiesces to the powerful voice of Agesilaus just as his interlocutors do. As we are shown each step in Agesilaus' persuasive process, it is difficult not to be impressed and won over by him, just as the internal audience seems to be.[39] We are drawn in, identifying with Agesilaus as he takes control of his audience, and taking pleasure in witnessing his success. But in doing so, we are also acquiescing to the power of Agesilaus, who argues, for example, that Otys' alliance with him will be an alliance with the whole of Greece since Sparta is the leader of Greece (4.1.8).[40] What we are witnessing is, after all, an attempt to consolidate Sparta's military and economic self-interest in Asia Minor, as the aftermath of the dialogue, when Spithridates and the Paphlagonians are used for a military venture but not permitted to share the spoils, makes clear.

The scene shows a potentially disturbing political moment: a Spartan arranging an alliance with a Persian and a Paphlagonian.[41] In contrast to the language of Greek versus barbarian with which the venture of Agesilaus in Asia is earlier described,[42] in this scene we are shown that it is quite possible for Agesilaus to throw in with Persians (elsewhere the enemy; in the *Anabasis* Spithridates appears as a subordinate of Pharnabazus who fights against the 10,000 in Bithynia: *An.* 6.5.7) and Paphlagonians (depicted in the *Anabasis* as an extremely alien people)[43] when it suits his interests.[44] One effect of the use of the dialogue form, however, is effectively to obscure the potentially shocking political realities which this episode encodes. The dialogue, which takes us up close and personal with the various speakers, presents a jokey exchange with an erotic feel (note the comments on the attractiveness of the son, with whom Otys dined last night, and of the daughter); in the *Agesilaus,* Spithridates' son Megabates is presented as a beautiful centre of erotic interest for Agesilaus (*Ag.* 5.5). We could be in the erotic environment of the symposium, where elite males rub shoulders. The ideal reader (positioned as male and elite) might be led by the charming and witty tone of the exchange[45] to feel almost as if witnessing the interactions of peers. The dialogue both calls on the reader's acceptance of Spartan power mongering, and, by the comfortable ease of the interaction, smoothes over and obscures the reader's awareness that this is indeed what pleasurable identification with Agesilaus' charming, clever and controlling voice would imply.

However, as noted above, the introduction of the dialogue embodies a shift which is sudden and jarring. In the previous sequence we are in Boeotia, where Thebans, Athenians, Spartans and allied Greek communities square off. If in the marriage dialogue it is obvious with whom we are to identify – with the clever and seductive Spartan leader

whose successful building of his power against the Persian King forms the central concern of this portion of the text – in this earlier narrative the interests of Sparta compete with the interests of other Greeks. As we read the dialogue, the easy seductiveness of Agesilaus' voice lulls us into identification and acceptance; yet as we read, the contrast with the preceding narrative impinges on our experience of the dialogue, undercutting our pleasure and making us aware of the political context of Agesilaus' actions. Equally, our experience of the dialogue and our immersion in our enjoyment of Agesilaus' success reflect back on our reading of the conflicts in Greece, calling on us to consider whether we might be able to read Spartan actions not as a narrative of competing hegemonies, where each side promotes only its own interests, but as a narrative of Greek endeavour.

Hellenica's book 3 seems to pose this problem more widely – as we shift backwards and forwards from events in Asia (Spartan action under the leadership of Thibron and Dercylidas, 3.1.1–3.2.20) to events in Greece (Sparta's conquest of Elis and problems in Sparta, 3.2.21–3.3.11), to events in Asia (Sparta's expedition under Agesilaus, 3.4.1–3.4.29) to events in Greece (the attempts of other Greek states to oppose Sparta, 3.5.1–3.5.25). The focus throughout is on Sparta, but whereas the sequences set in Asia make reference to the language of Greek–barbarian conflict,[46] in the sequences set in Greece, the Asian endeavour is set in the context of Sparta's imposition of hegemony on other Greeks. The campaign of Dercylidas is framed through the claim that in threatening to besiege Greek cities until they capitulate and accept Spartan governance and garrisons, the Spartan commander is providing 'freedom and autonomy' (3.1.16; 3.1.20–1).[47] In one sequence, Dercylidas takes over the cities of the Troad region which had previously been under the control of the Greek Meidias, who had himself taken them over following his assassination of his mother-in-law Mania (also Greek), who had won a concession from Pharnabazus to rule them in the place of her deceased husband, based on her continued supply of tribute to him. In a dialogue with Meidias after the capitulation of Gergis and Meidias's home city of Skepsis, Dercylidas questions Meidias on the extent of his property inherited from his father:

> 'Meidias, tell me, did your father leave you in charge of his house?' 'Yes, indeed,' Meidias replied. 'And how many properties were there? How many estates? How many pastures?'
>
> *3.1.25*

The rest of Dercylidas' exchange with Meidias and the other Skepsians present concerns who now owns the house of Mania in Gergis, which Meidias had taken for himself. The conclusion is reached that since Mania served Pharnabazus, now that Dercylidas is fighting Pharnabazus and in that context has captured her property, it must belong to him:

> When Meidias had finished making his list of his inheritance, Dercylidas said, 'Now tell me, to whom did Mania belong?' They all said that she belonged to Pharnabazus. 'Well then,' he continued, 'is it not the case that all of her property

also belonged to Pharnabazus?' 'Yes, indeed,' they replied. Dercylidas then said, 'Well, then, those possessions would now belong to us, since we now are in control of them and Pharnabazus is our enemy.'

3.1.26

Dercylidas proceeds to take over the house of Mania. We are subsequently presented with another dialogue exchange. Meidias asks where he will live now ('And what about me? Where am I to live, Dercylidas?', 3.1.28); Dercylidas replies that he will live 'In that very place where it is most just for you to live, Meidias – in your hometown of Skepsis and in your father's house' (3.1.28).

As with Agesilaus' dialogue with Spithridates and Otys, in this dialogue we witness Dercylidas' mastery of the interaction[48] and are invited to identify with him, taking pleasure in his pithy put-down of the upstart Meidias who has inappropriately grasped what does not belong to him. Of course, simultaneously, our awareness of the wider context might allow us to feel some discomfort. If it is just for Meidias to stay in his native city and his father's house, we might wonder if the same might arguably apply to Dercylidas and the Spartans: do they really have more right to these cities than Meidias did?[49] However, the use of dialogue in this sequence of the narrative discourages such disturbing suggestions, allowing us to imagine that we are there, listening in to the encounter, witnessing and appreciating Dercylidas' cleverness and poise, and enjoying his triumph over Meidias. The insertion of dialogue interacts with the wider surrounding narrative: whereas the surrounding context might allow a more critical perspective on Spartan power, the dialogue encourages a sympathetic and unquestioning attitude towards Spartan actions.[50]

In these shifts between the wider contextualising narrative and the dialogue, the reader experiences a shift in the horizons of expectation on offer. Each mode of presentation engages the reader in a different way and has its own political repercussions. By moving between them, the reader is forced to experience the narrative through a shifting political lens. Each mode impinges on the experience of the other, allowing each experience in turn to be questioned by an alternative experience. Through presenting different ways of telling the story, the reader is forced to question what that story means.[51] In the *Hellenica*, the reader is both immersed in an admiring identification with Spartan leaders and reminded of the threatening dangers of Spartan power.

Anabasis 1.9

Our second example comes from *Anabasis* book 1, where, after Cyrus the Younger's death at Cunaxa, we are presented with an account of his life, reviewing his childhood and youth, and his methods of leading men and of ruling his satrapy (1.9).[52] The chapter focuses on Cyrus' various virtues and frames its account of Cyrus through the language of praise:[53] Cyrus is 'the most kingly and the most worthy to rule of all the Persians who have been born since Cyrus the Great' (1.9.1).[54] As a boy, while being educated among the Persian elite, he was regarded as 'the best of them all in all respects' (1.9.2) and was

'the most modest of his fellows, and even more obedient to his elders than were his inferiors in rank' (1.9.5). He was conspicuous in performing the practices marking elite status, being 'the most devoted to horses and the most skilful in managing horses' (1.9.5), 'the most eager to learn and most eager in practising military accomplishments, alike the use of the bow and javelin' (1.9.5), and he was 'fondest of hunting, and more than that, fondest of incurring danger in his pursuit of wild animals' (1.9.6). The chapter also suggests that he was the most successful leader through his methods of managing rule over others. We are told that 'he counted it of the utmost importance, when he concluded a treaty or compact with anyone or made anyone any promise, under no circumstances to prove false to his word' (1.9.7). His firm maintenance of control is indicated:

> None could say that he permitted malefactors and wicked men to laugh at him; on the contrary, he was merciless in the last degree in punishing them, and one might often see along the roads people who had lost feet or hands or eyes; thus in Cyrus' province it became possible for either Greek or barbarian, provided he were guilty of no wrongdoing, to travel fearlessly wherever he wished, carrying with him whatever it was in his interest to have.

1.9.13

Cyrus' methods of winning loyalty too are explained:

> Whomsoever in his army he found willing to meet dangers, these men he would not only appoint as rulers of the territory he was subduing, but would honour thereafter with other gifts also. Thus the brave were seen to be most prosperous, while cowards were deemed fit to be their slaves. Consequently Cyrus had men in great abundance who were willing to meet danger wherever they thought that he would observe them.

1.9.14–15

The chapter invites the reader's admiration for and identification with Cyrus. The account of his elite virtues through his training as a youth in military skills, horsemanship and hunting allows the elite Greek reader to perceive Cyrus in terms of familiar, comfortable and appealing class values. Cyrus' Persianness is acknowledged. His education takes place at the King's court ('All the sons of the noblest Persians are educated at the King's court. There one may learn discretion and self-control in full measure, and nothing that is base can be either seen or heard': 1.9.3), and his military skills are Persian (the bow and javelin: 1.9.5). Yet these Persian aspects are assimilated and absorbed into a discourse of elite self-articulation which is still recognizable to a Greek.

The description of the absolute effects of his power in the account of the mutilated miscreants to be encountered on the roads is framed from the perspective of the wealthy traveller who would be pleased to be able to transport his possessions in safety, untroubled by the threat of robbery by the wayward poor ('thus in Cyrus' province it became possible for either Greek or barbarian, provided he were guilty of no wrongdoing, to travel

fearlessly wherever he wished, carrying with him whatever it was in his interest to have': 1.9.13). The lines of distinction are between the well-off traveller and the robber, not between Greek and barbarian: the interests of the elite are imagined as shared across ethnic/linguistic lines, assimilating the reader's interests to the interests of those who maintain order in the Persian sphere.

Similarly, in chapter 1.9, the ability of Cyrus cleverly to control and win over followers is presented as something which someone who might be interested in different practices of ruling should admire:[55] in other words, the perspective seems to be that of a potential ruler. We might compare the accounts of the qualities of leadership of Clearchus, Proxenus and Menon presented after their murders (2.6), where we learn, for example, that harshness and severity are effective in winning the troops' confidence in situations of danger but cannot sustain soldiers' loyalty when the danger is removed (2.6.9–12), whereas overly gentle treatment will win the respect of fellow officers, but not of the men (2.6.19).[56] Chapter 1.9 orients its ideal reader to share the political interests of Cyrus as ruler and to value Cyrus as a model to emulate.

However, we must note that the reader reaches chapter 1.9 after having experienced the earlier portions of book 1, which presents a different sort of account of Cyrus' behaviour as a ruler – a narrative of his leadership of the Greek mercenary force. We follow the Persian prince as he builds his rebellion against the Persian King by collecting his mercenary army and leading them to battle against the King's forces at Cunaxa. A central focus of the narrative is on his methods of successfully controlling his Greek forces: how he manages to get the Greeks to continue in his service after they come to realise their mission – to attack the Persian King – and are reluctant to go on, for example. In the light of this, chapter 1.9 has a slightly curious and unstable feel:[57] we are offered a series of assertions informing us how to respond to and understand Cyrus as a figure of power which position the Greek reader in relation to him in a rather different way to the previous narrative account.

To some extent, the chapter's assertions seem to elucidate, recontextualize and build on ways of relating to Cyrus which have already been on offer in the narrative and which the reader might already, at least partially, have experienced. The licensing and encouragement of a desire for identification with Cyrus – to see him as an appropriate figure for the 10,000 Greeks to follow, whose success the reader can root for – in many ways underpins the reader's experience of book 1: without this possibility, we would be left with a slightly grubby narrative of mercenary Greeks selling themselves to a Persian pretender promoting his own self-advancement.[58]

Nevertheless, the praise of how he gains enthusiastic loyalty from allies and followers might to some extent also disconcert the reader. It focuses on his strategies of manipulation – for example, his methods of conspicuously rewarding those who obey in order to encourage further obedience: those who are most loyal are made wealthy, are made rulers of territory or given gifts. This directly recalls Cyrus' relations with the 10,000 Greeks: 'For the generals and captains who came overseas to serve him for the sake of money judged that loyal obedience to Cyrus was worth more to them than their mere monthly pay. Again, so surely as a man performed with credit any service that he assigned him, Cyrus never let his zeal go unrewarded' (1.9.17–18). While admiring

Cyrus' clever strategies of command, we also see how those strategies are brought to bear on the Greeks. We are reminded that the Greek mercenaries are motivated by both payment and promises of greater future rewards, and that Cyrus not only bribes, but also tricks and coerces them. The claim that he would never deceive his allies (1.9.7) seems to stand in direct contradiction to what we have seen of Cyrus in book 1, where he deliberately deceives the Greeks, concealing from them the true purpose of their journey and directly lying about it when challenged (1.4.20–1).[59]

The narrative at 1.1–8 periodically reminds us that the relationship between Cyrus and the Greek mercenaries is a relationship of power: as their commander, Cyrus is their paymaster but, as a Persian, is also potentially a threat. When the Greeks consider deserting from Cyrus, fear is expressed regarding what might befall them at Cyrus' hands. Clearchus warns, 'Remember that while this Cyrus is a valuable friend when he is your friend, he is a most dangerous foe when he is your enemy' (1.3.12); see also the fears expressed after the desertion of Xenias and Pasion (although we are subsequently told of the Greeks' pleasure when Cyrus decided to respond magnanimously, 1.4.8–9): 'After they had disappeared, a report went around that Cyrus was pursuing them with warships; and while some people prayed that they might be captured, because, as they said, they were cowards, yet others felt pity for them if they should be caught' (1.4.7). Although the 10,000 remain Cyrus' followers, at certain moments the bonds between them are revealed as fragile. In the light of this, the praise of Cyrus' punishment of opponents ('It was manifest also that whenever a man conferred any benefit upon Cyrus or did him harm, he always strove to outdo him', 1.9.11; see also the mention of Orontas, 1.9.29) might seem slightly jarring. Similarly, the description of his treatment of malefactors, which imaginatively places the reader in the position of the traveller witnessing for himself the gory after-effects of Cyrus' merciless punishments ('one might often see along the roads people who had lost feet or hands or eyes', 1.9.13), confronts the reader with the potential violence of Cyrus' regime, and might provoke alarm and distaste as much as reassurance.[60]

Although the possibility of identification with Cyrus is very much on offer in the earlier portions of book 1, such a position is also repeatedly undermined at those moments where Cyrus' exploitation of the Greeks for his own purposes becomes evident. The narrative at 1.1–8 offers a double awareness, as we are invited to identify simultaneously with Cyrus as impressive figure of elite power *and* with the Greeks whom he controls – even as the interests of each are shown, at moments, to diverge.[61] However, in contrast, at 1.9 all aspects of Cyrus' behaviour, including his manipulative characteristics, are presented via the language of praise. As we move from the narrative account of Cyrus' dealings with the 10,000 into the praise of his abilities as leader, the shift into praise – a shift of tone and register, as well as subject matter – encompasses a shift in the horizons of expectation on offer to the reader. This shift in the expectations placed on the reader's experience instantiates a shift in political self-consciousness: the text demands a move into absolute acceptance of Cyrus as model to emulate, and of political identification with him as an ideal of elite power. But, problematically, acquiescence to this political perspective would stand at variance to the earlier experience of political tension created in certain aspects of the representation of his dealings with the Greeks.

In the shift between the narrative and praise portions of Cyrus' representation, the political experience encoded by one formal mode impinges on and affects the reader's experience of the other mode. The shift into praise at 1.9 invites the reader to look back on the earlier narrative in a new light, repositioning themselves so as to accept and accommodate its praise. But the process works the other way around too: we cannot read 1.9 without the experience of its claims being affected by our prior experience of Cyrus at 1.1–8. The effect is similar to that of our example from the *Hellenica*, where the narrative account of events in Greece and the up-close engagement with Spartan leaders in dialogue offer contrasting political perspectives which engage the reader in different ways of understanding, relating to and positioning themselves against Spartan figures of power and their actions. However, the *Anabasis*'s shift into praise at 1.9 has a slightly more disconcerting effect. The reader is invited to engage politically with Cyrus in ways which are not just different, but, at least to a certain extent, contradictory. The language of praise at 1.9 can seem a little hard to swallow in the light of what has gone before.

Whereas the shifts between impersonal narrative and moments of dialogue in the *Hellenica,* discussed above, remind the reader of different possible political perspectives, and in clashing these perspectives together open up for the reader a critical political self-consciousness, in *Anabasis* 1.9 we also become aware of the mediating effects of the text as such. By forcing the reader to accept a new model of understanding, but one which in some ways feels difficult to accept in the light of the wider reading experience, the reader becomes conscious of the text as a literary construction. The impositions demanded by the formal regime of praise become perceptible to the reader.

Praise and readerly critical awareness

In the examples discussed so far, shifts in emphasis, focus and argument are accomplished through and entail shifts in the form of writing, producing shifts in the ideological awareness of the reader, and allowing a complex and nuanced engagement in Xenophon's representation of political figures and political action. In our second example there seems, further, to be opened up for the reader an understanding of the way that form imposes ideological expectations. While immersed in the exposition of praise in *Anabasis* 1.9, the reader is led to accept its arguments; but the contrast with the earlier narrative account allows some awareness of the constraints of the praise form.

In contemporary Greek literature, 'paradoxical' encomia praising subjects difficult to praise evoke the reader's awareness of the artificiality of praise as a form. Extant examples are Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen* and Isocrates' *Helen* and *Busiris*; we also have evidence of encomia to notorious courtesans or figures such as Clytemnestra and Paris, and to counterintuitive or incongruous subjects such as death, mice, bumblebees and salt.[62] By using the traditional language of praise to praise the unpraisable, such accounts expose 'the contingency of the value systems that regulate the orthodox use of praise', revealing 'the role that rhetoric plays in creating and dismantling "orthodox" beliefs and values'.[63]

Plato invites a similar critical reflection on the encomium genre in the *Symposium*. The various symposiasts offer speeches in praise of *eros*, only for Socrates to express disappointment that the praise speech as professed by them is concerned not with telling the truth, but with ascribing the greatest and most beautiful qualities to the speech's subject, whether or not it really possesses them.[64] Socrates reveals the way that praise discourse is constrained by its conventions. The reader, who so far may have been carried along by their enjoyment of the speeches, is challenged to rethink and question the nature and implications of their engagement in them. Socrates' criticism allows the reader to look back on the expectations encouraged by the speeches at a critical distance.

As Nightingale has shown, Plato's appropriation and importation into his dialogues of various rhetorical genres (such as the funeral oration in the *Menexenus*, or the encomium in the *Symposium* or *Lysis*) is used to throw into relief the new genre of philosophy. In the *Symposium*, the praise speeches offered by the other symposiasts are criticized and then trumped as Socrates goes on to offer his own account of *eros*, thereby setting out in contrast the possibility of a new form of philosophical discourse.[65] With reference to distinctions articulated by Bakhtin, Nightingale describes the relationship between different genres set up by Plato as suggestive of parody:[66] the appropriated genre, such as the encomium in the *Symposium*, is offered explicitly to be rejected, and to show up by contrast the superiority of Socratic philosophy.

This is not the sort of relationship between forms which we find in Xenophon. The reader is not led to reject one of the offered forms in preference for the other – to distance themselves, for example, from the view of the Spartans offered in Agesilaus' marriage-brokerage dialogue in favour of a view proposed by the *Hellenica*'s narrative of the conflicts in Greece (or the other way around). Both visions are offered as different but equally possible ways of perceiving and relating to Spartan power. In the *Anabasis*, the reader is not led to reject the praise of Cyrus at *Anab.* 1.9 in the light of the experience of the earlier narrative. Rather the Greek reader is asked to take it seriously, to perceive Cyrus as an admirable icon of elite power with whom they can identify, while also being made aware, through the sense of disjunction created through the text's discontinuities, that their identification with Cyrus' power can only ever be partial, and is undermined by awareness of the realities of the context in which his power is enacted. The reader is fully engaged in the horizons of expectation created by each of the juxtaposed formal modes, which each have their own authority, but also impact upon and question each other. As Nightingale notes, in a hybridized text which appropriates and imports the language of another genre, 'When the targeted genre is denied authority, parody may decrease the "dialogism" of the text. Non-parodic hybrids which grant the targeted genre full semantic autonomy, by contrast, have a greater degree of "dialogism"'[67]

A closer comparison to the use of praise discourse at *Anabasis* 1.9 might be the interrogation of the conventions of praise in Isocrates' *Panathenaicus*,[68] which presents a series of arguments about Greek history seeking to prove that Athens has always acted for the communal good of the Greeks whereas Sparta has acted out of self-interest; but in the final chapters the narrator changes tack, claiming to have become uneasy about his

criticisms of Sparta (Isoc. *Panath.* 231–2). He reads the speech up to this point to his pupils, one of whom claims to perceive that the speech has been produced with a double meaning (Isoc. *Panath.* 239–40), so that its statements about Sparta (such as that Sparta conquered its neighbours in the Peloponnese) are just as capable of being read as praise as they are capable of being taken as criticism[69] – but, the primary narrator explicitly refuses either to authorise or reject the pupil's interpretation (Isoc. *Panath.* 265).[70] Isocrates' treatment of praise and blame should not be seen as parodic: the possibility of praising Athens and blaming Sparta is not overturned by the pupil's re-reading. Rather the speech allows its audience to perceive how the same historical events are equally capable of being transformed into either praise or blame – which renders the pupil's view just as easy to undercut as the initial speaker's argument. The text does not valorise or reject either one, but, through their juxtaposition, reveals how the conventional expectations of the rhetoric of praise or blame intervene in the processes of political response – even as the reader experiences their effects and is swayed by them. The result is a greater critical awareness about how political claims, and political self-positioning, work.

Xenophon expresses a similar set of concerns in the *Agesilaus*, which offers a rhetoric of praise of Agesilaus which is both highly emotive and affecting, and produces critical awareness of its conventions.[71] The text praises Agesilaus as a champion of Greek values: a lover of Greeks and hater of Persians (*Ages.* 7.4, 7.7) who defended Greeks in Asia and subdued Persians (*Ages.* 1.8, 1.34), lamented violence between Greeks (*Ages.* 7.4–6) and was a virtuous example of austere personal behaviour in contrast to the luxuriousness of the Persian King (*Ages.* 8.6–9.5); yet in many places its rhetoric has a contrived feel, as the text skates over Agesilaus' violent promotion of Spartan interests at the expense of other Greeks, or even finds ways to reconfigure these actions as signs of Panhellenic commitment.[72] In questioning how best to go about praising Agesilaus' organization of his troops for battle, the *Agesilaus* draws attention to the way that Agesilaus' actions are being fitted into the constraints of the praise form:

> I am not going to say that he had far fewer and far inferior forces but that he nevertheless accepted battle. If I were to say this, I think I would show Agesilaus as foolish and myself as stupid, if I praised him for rashly endangering the greatest interests. On the contrary, I admire him for this very reason – that he equipped himself with a force in no way smaller than that of the enemy.
>
> *Ages.* 2.7[73]

Unable to praise Agesilaus' bravery for entering battle with a much smaller force (like Leonidas), the narrator instead flips the expected argument on its head, and praises his powers of organization in equipping a good-sized army: we see that any action can be made to conform to the requirements of praise. Similarly, the text evinces repeated concern that the reader may not be convinced by its claims, offering strenuous proofs to win over the resistant reader whose scepticism is expected, and licensed ('In case anyone should think this statement incredible...', *Ages.* 3.2; 'What opinion some hold in regard to these matters I know well enough ... No doubt when these things are known to few,

many have a right to be sceptical: but we all know this, that the greater a man's fame, the fiercer is the light that beats on all his actions', *Ages.* 5.6; 'If anyone doubts this . . .', *Ages.* 8.7).[74]

The text's comment on Agesilaus's forced restoration of exiles to Thebes, Corinth and Phleius indicates the ideological problems posed by the rhetorical contortions of praise discourse, where all actions must be praised: 'Possibly some may censure these actions on other grounds, but at least it is obvious that they were prompted by a spirit of true comradeship' (*Ages.* 2.21).[75] This is reminiscent of the claim at *Anabasis* 1.9 regarding Cyrus' treatment of Milesian exiles: 'All the cities of their own accord chose Cyrus rather than Tissaphernes, with the exception of Miletus; and the reason why the Milesians feared him was that he would not prove false to the exiles from their city' (*An.* 1.9.9). In each case, these commanders' violent interventions in the affairs of Greek states are transformed into items to praise.[76] The resistance of Miletus, rather than a sign that Cyrus was not really supported by all, becomes an indication of Cyrus' loyalty to his allies. Similarly, Agesilaus' depredations against other Greek cities become a sign of his care for his supporters. Whereas the contortions effected by the praise rhetoric of the *Anabasis* remain more implicit, the *Agesilaus* directly addresses the possibility that what is being praised might just as easily be open to criticism.

The *Agesilaus*' licensing of readerly critical distance should not be read as parodic: the text's repeated, insistent call on the reader to admire the achievements of Agesilaus and to perceive him as a champion of Greek values in his contests against Persia speak to the real purchase that such sentiments had on an elite Greek audience. It is quite possible, and ideologically desirable, for the reader to perceive Agesilaus in such a way: to see his military successes as signs of Greek success; to appropriate his actions in Asia as part of a reassuring narrative of Greek supremacy; to identify with Agesilaus as a symbol of Greek power. The text is motivated by and constructs such responses. Yet in enabling readerly awareness of the artificiality of its formal devices and in flagging the possibility that the reader might perceive and feel resistant to their constraints, the text simultaneously gives evidence of and produces an awareness that the story is not so simple: Agesilaus, the infamous Spartan power-monger, does not fit so easily into the categories on offer through the praise form. The problems of form reflect and instantiate the political difficulties posed by Spartan leadership to a Greek audience.[77]

Praise and blame: *Cyr*. 8.8 and *Lak*. *Pol*. 14

We opened this chapter by noting the problems posed to scholars by the apparent shifts from praise to blame at *Cyr.* 8.8 and *Lak. Pol.* 14. The preceding discussion of similar shifts in argument, tone and structure in Xenophon, and of the production of readerly critical awareness of praise rhetoric as a form in Xenophon's prose contemporaries and in Xenophon himself, allows us a new way of approaching this problem.

Both in the *Cyropaedia* and the *Lak. Pol.*, aspects of the achievements of Cyrus the Great and of Spartan society which are praised by the texts strike the reader as strange or

disturbing. Cyrus manipulates and exploits his potential followers and allies, and after his successful conquest of his empire takes up strategies of rule (such as overwhelming his subjects with false displays of grandeur, fancy robes and make-up) which receive explicit criticism in the earlier stages of the text.[78] In the *Lak. Pol.* the Spartans' utter difference from other Greeks (manifested in such practices as wife-swapping, *Lak. Pol.* 1.7–8) figures their alien qualities, and many of the arguments about their customs (such as arguments justifying their training of boys in theft, *Lak. Pol.*, 2.6–9) seem logically strained.[79] While these texts ask the reader to take seriously and accept the praise of Cyrus the Great as most impressive leader and of Sparta as most impressive Greek state, such disturbing elements simultaneously make identifying with Persian power or with Spartan culture a slightly uncomfortable experience. As with Cyrus the Younger in the *Anabasis*, the *Cyropaedia*'s Cyrus the Great offers an appealing icon of Greek power to the elite Greek reader: a figure who can successfully conquer vast territories and rule over huge numbers of men; and the *Lak. Pol.*'s exposition on the success of Sparta offers the reader a reassuring image of Greek success. Yet as with Cyrus the Younger, Cyrus the Great is a Persian whose assertion of power led to the subjugation of Greeks; and far from representing wider Greek interests, Spartan success came at a cost to other Greeks. The texts create a horizon of expectation within which Cyrus' establishment of imperial rule and Spartan exceptionalism are to be admired and identified with as models for Greek success, while also enabling awareness that such an identification might not fully be possible.

When we reach the end of the *Cyropaedia* at *Cyr.* 8.8 or the penultimate chapter of the *Lak. Pol.* at *Lak. Pol.* 14, we are faced with a shift from the language of praise to the language of blame, as the contemporary degeneracy of Persia and Sparta are placed before our eyes.[80] A different way of thinking about each is offered. Rather than icons of Greek virtue and success as leaders of the Greek world, Spartans are here those who use their power to advance their interests at the expense of other Greeks:

> And there was a time when they took care always to be worthy of leadership. But now they prefer to busy themselves with how to acquire leadership rather than how to be worthy of it. This was why in the old days the Greeks used to go to Lacedaemon and ask them to take the lead against wrong-doers. But now many exhort one another to prevent them from regaining their ascendancy.
>
> *Lak. Pol. 14.5–6*[81]

Similarly, in the *Cyropaedia* the focus on the present day reminds the reader forcibly of the threat still posed in the current time by the empire established by Cyrus the Great.

These blaming chapters, coming at (or near) the end of their texts, impact upon the reader's experience of the texts up to this point. By imposing a new expectation for response which rejects Persian and Spartan power as a foreign and hostile force, the experience of those moments in the earlier portion of the texts where the reader may have felt alienated from Persian imperial exploitation or Spartan cultural difference is recalled and reinforced. Yet the dominance of the repeated appeals to praise across the majority of the texts and the comforting pleasures of identification with the powerful

which they allow also impact upon the reader's experience of the rhetoric of blame at *Cyr.* 8.8 and *Lak. Pol.* 14, preventing the reader from fully accepting a world-view in which Spartan leadership and Persian imperial might are simply the enemy, and have no ideological appeal. As we move between different arguments and formal registers, the shift in the models of ideological expectation that they encode open up for the reader a critical awareness of the difficulties posed by Spartan and Persian power.

The contradiction between horizons of expectation as we move from praise to blame also draws attention to the ideological effects of form. We are made aware that these texts do not offer a transparent window onto reality, but that the perceptions of the world which they offer are a construction, and are subject to manipulation, contestation and argument. This creates a dialectical relationship between reader and text. Rather than passively accepting the image of the world which the text imposes,[82] the reader is involved in an active, questioning engagement. The reading process becomes an arena for reflection on the construction of ideological meaning.

Conclusion

In this discussion we have seen how Xenophon's works contain shifts in focus, argument, tone and structure which carry different expectations for interpretation, offering a disjunctive, dialogical reading experience which reflects and instantiates the ideological contradictions inherent in his subject matter. In those moments in which such shifts impose particularly striking contradictions, Xenophon's writing also enables the reader to become attentive to the ways in which texts impose ideological meaning; as we have seen, in doing so Xenophon is participating in a wider literary discourse apparent in his fourth-century BC prose contemporaries. The reader is made aware not only of the ideological contradictions of their world, but of how ideological meaning is constructed by texts. The effect is the creation of an active, critically engaged reader. Far from imposing a unified and dominant image of the world to which the reader is expected passively to assent, Xenophon's writing reveals the plurality of expectations of the world which might be possible, places those expectations in tension with each other and reveals the processes through which the text itself creates those expectations.

Notes

1. See Tamiolaki 2017: 192–3 on the 'enigma' of the *Cyropaedia*'s epilogue.
2. Ollier 1934: xiii; Tigerstedt 1965: 162–9; Hodkinson 1994: 190–5; Rebenich 1998: 18; Lipka 2002: 31–2. See Humble 2004: 215 n.3 for further bibliography.
3. On both texts: Hirsch 1985: 91–7. On *Cyr.*: Bizos 1971: xxvi-xxxvi.
4. Miller 1914: 439.
5. On *Cyr.*: Eichler 1880; Georges 1994: 234. On *Lak. Pol.*: Delebecque 1957: 194–5; Luccioni 1947: 171. In the case of the *Lak. Pol.* a problem for this interpretation has been the position

of chap. 14 as the penultimate, not final chapter; this has led to the suggestion that chap. 14 was not originally in its current position, but was transposed with chap. 15 by later editors: Breitenbach 1967: 1751–2.

6. On *Lak. Pol.*: Gray 2007: 217–21. On *Cyr.*: Due 1989: 16–22; Gray 2011: 246–63. Gruen 2011: 58–65 also rejects contradiction between *Cyr.* 8.8 and the earlier text, reading *Cyr.* 8.8 as parodying contemporary stereotypes of Persia.

7. Humble 2004.

8. Strauss 1939; followed by Proietti 1987 and Higgins 1977. See Dorion 2010]: 286–8 on *Lak. Pol.* 14 and *Cyr.* 8.8 in the light of Strauss.

9. Too 1998: 286–8; Pangle 1994: 149–50; Nadon 2001: 139–46; Carlier 2010 [1978]; 362–6.

10. The *Lak. Pol.* has been dated to the 390s by those who see it as enthusiastic propaganda for Sparta written in thanks for Sparta's protection of Xenophon while in exile, with chapter 14 a later addition (e.g. Ollier 1934: xxiii-xxix), but to the 360s by those who believe that it betrays Xenophon's disillusionment with Sparta and could therefore only have been written after Agesilaus' death; on this model, chapter 14 is an original part of the work (e.g. Cartledge 1987: 57). On the assumption that it is a later addition, chapter 14 has been variously dated based on different suggestions as to which event could have disillusioned Xenophon about Sparta, such as Phoebidas' seizure of the Cadmea in 382 or Sphodrias' attack on the Piraeus in 378. See Ollier 1934: xxiii-xxix. MacDowell 1986: 12 dates Xenophon's disillusionment to his first visit to Sparta in the 390s. See Humble 2004: 219–220 for an overview of the different arguments about how to date both chapter 14 and the *Lak. Pol.* as a whole. A similar approach has been taken to the *Cyropaedia*: one reading places the rest of the text before, and the final chapter after, the betrayal of the leaders of the Satraps' Revolt in 362 (Georges 1994: 234).

11. Gray 2011: 256: 'Xenophon asserts that readers all know that the Spartans are in the present tense most obedient to the laws (8.1), which contradicts his description of the disobedience of their harmosts in the epilogue.'

12. See the use of the phrase *eti kai nun*; see Due 2002 on the *Cyropaedia*'s narratorial interventions.

13. Cf. Wohl 2015: 1–5 on Euripides.

14. Gauthier 1985; Lossau 1990; Bradley 2001; Purves 2010.

15. Momigliano 1993: 57.

16. On the genre of the *Cyropaedia,* see Reichel 1995; Tamiolaki 2017: 180–9; Gera 1993: 1–13. For the generic complexity of the *Lak. Pol.*, see Humble 2014.

17. Contrast Nicolai 2014, who suggests that the modern difficulty with genre categorization in Xenophon is based on a failure to understand the contemporary inseparability of historical and sophistic writing.

18. See Gray 2011: 75 on the rhetoric of blame in *Cyr.* 8.8 and *Lak. Pol.* 14.

19. Tamiolaki 2017: 181: 'the blending of genres does not concern only the *Cyropaedia*, but constitutes a distinctive feature of the whole Xenophontic corpus: the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis* accommodate elements of encomiastic literature and Socratic-type conversations'. Cf. Tuplin 1997: 67, who describes the *Cyropaedia* as operating within a 'crosscut of four "ordinary" genres: historiography, encomium, Socratic dialectic, and technical pamphlet'.

20. Adorno 1997: 6.

21. Conte 1994: 112: 'Every genre is a model of reality which mediates the empirical world.'

22. Jauss 1982: 41: 'The horizon of expectations of literature distinguishes itself before the horizon of expectations of historical lived praxis in that it not only preserves actual

experiences, but also anticipates unrealized possibility, broadens the limited space of social behaviour for new desires, claims, and goals, and thereby opens paths of future experience . . . [The new form of art] can make possible a new perception of things by preforming the content of a new experience first brought to light in the form of literature.' On genre, see Jauss 1982: 23: 'A corresponding process of the continuous establishing and altering of horizons also determines the relationship of the individual text to the succession of texts that forms the genre. The new text evokes for the reader (listener) the horizon of expectations and rules familiar from earlier texts, which are then varied, corrected, altered, or even just reproduced.'

23. Bakhtin 1981. See 324–5 on different forms of 'double-voiced discourse', including 'the discourse of a whole incorporated genre': 'A potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages.'

24. Pelling 1999; Marincola 1999; Goldhill 2002.

25. See Gray 1981: 333 on elements of dialogue in Herodotus; see Boyarin 2012 on dialogue form at Thucydides 5.84–116 (the Melian Dialogue).

26. Boedeker 2000.

27. Boedeker 2000: 114–15. Cf. Pelling 1999: 334–5: 'So the reader, inevitably trying to define what sort of text this is, finds false leads and distractions: there are initial intimations, but redefinition is swiftly needed . . . It is clear, too, that this is not just a casual game with the reader, not a playing with discourse for discourse's sake or to strike an original clever pose. This is about meaning, how one can make sense of events.'

28. Cf. Nicolai 2014: 82: 'Such experimentation with literary genres allows [Xenophon] to use the codes and communicative strategies appropriate to these pre-existing genres without the new work losing its own identity.'

29. On the complexities of form in the *Hellenica*, see Marincola 1999: 310–11; Marincola 2017: 105–7 (see esp. 107 for comments on the use of dialogue); Dillery 1995: 9–11, 17–27.

30. See Gera 1993: 26–131 and Humble 2018 on Socratic dialogue in Xenophon's non-Socratic writing.

31. Translations from Xen. *Hell.* are taken from Marincola 2009, with my own adaptations.

32. Gray 1981: 323.

33. As Gray 1989: 49 notes, the details of the political alliance are not Xenophon's focus; instead he focuses on the betrothal.

34. Gray 1981: 324. Cf. Boyarin 2012: 64: 'dialogue allows one party to control and manage the discourse in such wise as to assure his own "victory"'. Cf. also Demont 2014 on dialogue in the *Cyropaedia* as producing readerly engagement with Cyrus as controller of the interaction.

35. Gray 1981: 322.

36. Gray 1989: 51; Gray 1981: 323.

37. Gray 1981: 324.

38. See the debate between Euben 1996 and Barber 1996: whereas Euben reads Plato as offering, through its multivocal and dialectical structure, an instantiation of democratic practice, in contrast, Barber argues that unlike the dialectics of tragedy, Plato's Socrates 'looks past the muddled *agon* towards a domain of immovable truth; to reach that domain, he may embark on the road of discourse, but this hardly gives him a talent for the genuine polyphony that is the *sine qua non* of democratic politics' (Barber 1996: 364). On the controlling power of Socrates' voice cf. Boyarin 2012: 61–4; Barrett 1987: 59–62.

39. Cf. Hau 2016: 231: 'Agesilaus uses his likeable personality and social skills to make friends and benefit Sparta at one stroke.'

40. Krentz 1995: 184. Cf. Gish 2009: 341: 'Agesilaus does not hesitate to speak openly of Sparta as the sole super-power and hegemonic leader of all the Greeks in Hellas and Asia Minor.'

41. See Vlassopoulos 2017: 363 on the *Hellenica*'s marriage-brokerage dialogue as an example of the 'complex political-military triangulations between Greeks, Persians and other non-Greeks'.

42. See *Hell.* 3.4.16–19, the description of Agesilaus' camp at Ephesus, where the spectacle of exercising and garlanded Greeks is contrasted with the white, flabby bodies of barbarian prisoners; see Dillery 1995: 113 on Agesilaus' Ephesus camp as an 'emblem of panhellenism'.

43. See the depiction of Paphlagonian incomprehension of Greek cultural practices (*An.* 6.1.1–13).

44. See Dillery 1995: 23–4, 107–19 on the problematic representation of Agesilaus in the context of Panhellenist thought.

45. See Gray 1989: 12 on 'charm' in Xenophon's depiction of conversation between protagonists.

46. Dillery 1995: 102–3. See the language describing the Ionian cities' request for Spartan assistance in opposition to the rule of Tissaphernes: they send ambassadors 'asking that the Lacedaemonians, since they were leaders of all Hellas, should undertake to protect them also, the Greeks in Asia, in order that their land might not be laid waste and that they themselves might be free' (*Hell.* 3.1.3). At Cebren the city is handed over to Dercylidas by Greeks in the city who 'preferred to be on the side of the Greeks rather than of the barbarian' (3.1.18); after gaining control of Skepsis Dercylidas exhorts the citizens 'to order their public life as Greeks and freemen should' (*Hell.* 3.1.21): Dillery 1995: 105.

47. Dillery 1995: 102–6.

48. Cf. Gray 1981: 330 on the demonstration of Dercylidas' control of his army and imposition of discipline.

49. Cf. the language of 'justice': Derkylidas claims that it is most just (δικαιότατον, 3.1.28) for Meidias to live in his native city and his father's house; Derkylidas earlier promises Meidias that he will get his just deserts (καὶ ὁ Δερκυλίδας μέντοι ἔλεγεν ὡς τῶν δικαίων οὐδενὸς ἀτυχήσοι, 3.1.22). See Gray 1981: 329; Marincola 2017: 114–15.

50. It is important to note that not all moments of dialogue involving Spartan leaders lead to a privileging of the leader's voice. For example, in the dialogue between Agesilaus and Leotychidas regarding which of them has the right to the Spartan kingship after the death of Agis (*Hell.* 3.3.1–4), the relative position of the interlocutors seems much more equal: each has a claim to the throne, and makes equally convincing arguments. Although Agesilaus is eventually chosen as king, the representation of the dispute over the succession suggests a subtle questioning of Agesilaus' position: cf. Laforse 2013: 33.

51. Cf. Conte 1994: 121 (on the confrontation between bucolic and elegy in Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*): 'It is only because the same *carmina* can be intoned in both the elegiac register and the bucolic one . . . that we can become aware of the "formative" function each register possesses.'

52. On form and its ideological implications in Xen. *An.,* see Bradley 2001; Purves 2010.

53. Cf. Gray 2011: 75 on the 'obituaries' of Cyrus and of the Greek generals (Xen. *An.* 2.6): 'The style of Xenophon's obituaries is most of all in keeping with the tradition of praise and blame in rhetoric.' See also Gray 2011: 73–4 on the persuasive rhetorical devices in Xen. *An.* 1.9.

54. Translations from Xen. *An.* are taken from Brownson 1998.

55. Buzzetti 2014: 67.

56. Buzzetti 2014: 104–8.

57. Cf. Braun 2004: 107.

58. Cf. Rood 2004: 309–12; Azoulay 2004a.

59. Hirsch 1985: 23–4; Flower 2012: 191; Braun 2004: 110.

60. Higgins 1977: 83; Flower 2012: 189; Braun 2004: 113.

61. See Harman 2013: 90.

62. See Nightingale 1995: 100–1. Courtesans: Athenaeus 13 592c; Clytemnestra: Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.17.4; Paris: Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1401b20–3; death: Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.48.116; mice: Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1401a13–15, 1401b15–16; bumblebees: Isocrates, *Helen* 12; salt: Isocrates, *Helen* 12, Plato, *Symp.* 177b.

63. Nightingale 1995: 102.

64. Following Agathon's speech, Socrates ironically responds: 'In my foolishness, I thought you should tell the truth about whatever you praise, that this should be your basis . . . But now it appears that this is not what it is to praise anything whatever; rather it is to apply to the object the grandest and the most beautiful qualities, whether he actually has them or not' (Plato, *Symp.* 198d-e). Nightingale 1995: 112.

65. Nightingale 1995: 93–132; Nightingale 1993.

66. Nightingale 1995: 6–8. See Nightingale 1995: 7, f.n. 19 on Bakhtin's terminology. On parodic dialogism within a hybridized text: Bakhtin 1981: 363–4.

67. See Nightingale 1995: 7.

68. See Nicolai 2014 on Isocrates' explicit discussion of his use of a combination of elements from different genres, and on the similarity to Xenophon.

69. See Isoc. *Panath.* 253–4 for the pupil's suggestion that Sparta's conquest of Peloponnesian neighbours might be read as exhalting Sparta; contrast Isoc. *Panath.* 45–7, where the same actions are criticized.

70. Livingstone 1998: 276.

71. See Noël 2014 and Humble (2020) on the *Agesilaus*' relation to contemporary praise genres. See Dillery 2017: 202 and Pontier 2010 on the *Agesilaus* as a text which presents multiple 'retellings' of the story of Agesilaus' life.

72. Laforse 2013; Harman 2012. The text's peculiarities have led it to being read as an apology for Agesilaus: Hirsch 1985: 51; Hamilton 1994: 212.

73. Translations from Xen. *Ages.* are taken from Marchant 1925, with adaptations.

74. Contrast Bundy 1986: 40 (with Xen. *Ages.* referenced at n.14) on 'the use of real or imaginary objections as foil' in both choral and prose rhetorical contexts, and their functioning as a 'frequent means of amplification in enkomia of all kinds'. Cf. Dillery 2017: 204; Pelling 2017: 254. Although the *Agesilaus*'s rhetorical suggestions of doubt do indeed allow the more forceful restatement of praise, I suggest that they simultaneously open up for the reader an awareness of the potential contentiousness of the praise.

75. Cf. Dillery 2017: 204 on the criticism of Agesilaus at Xen. *Ages.* 2.21 as a 'puncturing of the encomiastic fabric' of the text through its acknowledgement of competing views of Agesilaus.

76. See Braun 2004: 110–12 on Cyrus' actions.

77. See Harman 2012 for further discussion.

78. Tatum 1989; Too 1998; Azoulay 2004b; Gray 2011: 263–90.

79. Strauss 1939; Proietti 1987; Higgins 1977.

80. Gray 2011: 255 (on Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8): 'It is partly the rhetorical nature of the epilogue that causes dissonances between the main text and the epilogue.'

81. Translation taken from Jackson 2006.

82. See Conte 1994: 116: 'Genre, modelling the world upon its own language, invites us to believe that nothing exists outside the image that it knows how to give of the world.'