CHAPTER 9

Xenophon

Tim Rood

Scholarly treatments of Xenophon's handling of characterization point to an apparent paradox. On the one hand, Xenophon is seen as 'a pioneer experimenter in biographical forms',[1] because he wrote a memoir on Socrates, the first war memoir (*Anabasis*), and the encomiastic biography *Agesilaus*, which reworks (with minor differences) many of the same events treated in the historiographical *Hellenica*. Passages like the obituaries of Cyrus and the Greek generals (*Anabasis* 1.9, 2.6) are also seen as evidence of an increased interest in the individual in the fourth century.[2] On the other hand, Xenophon's historical writings are notorious for downplaying some prominent individuals, for instance Pelopidas, who appears only at *Hellenica* 7.1.33–40. Discussions of Xenophon's model of ideal leadership[3] also seem to militate against a strong interest in character: individuals are often seen as good or bad depending on how they match the qualities attributed to the character Xenophon in *Anabasis*. In this chapter—which is devoted mainly to *Anabasis*, though I will draw comparisons with *Hellenica*[4]—my focus will be restricted to narratological aspects of character: the narrator's modes of introducing characters; the use of obituaries and their interaction with the narrative; and the characterization of Xenophon as a character in his own story (I will henceforth use 'Xenophon' to refer to the character rather than to the author).

Character Introductions

Naming

There are about 150 named individuals in *Anabasis*, together with a number of collectives (e.g. Cyrus' Greek mercenaries, often referred to as 'the Greeks' (though they included some non-Greeks), and various ethnic groups, called

1 Momigliano 1971: 43.

2 E.g. Pomeroy 1991: 33.

3 E.g. Gray 2011.

4 For *Hellenica* see now Flower 2015; older discussions with much on characterization include Gray 1989, Tuplin 1993, and Dillery 1995.

either 'the barbarians' or by their ethnic names). Besides these named individuals and groups, there are a number of unnamed individuals who are at most defined by age, sex, and ethnic group.

While it is not always easy to offer plausible narratological reasons for the naming or non-naming of characters (e.g. the anonymous 'young man' (*neaniskos*) at 2.4.19, discussed below),[5] a pattern can be detected for anonymous Persians. Minor Persian characters are often defined by family ties rather than by name (e.g. 'the daughter of the king', 2.4.8, 3.4.13; 'the bastard brother of Cyrus and Artaxerxes', 2.4.25; cf. e.g. *Hell.* 5.1.28). While their anonymity may reflect the limits of the narrator's knowledge, the use of familial terms does point to the importance of familial ties within the Persian monarchical system. Such familial ties are also of some thematic importance: intra-familial rivalry initially drives the plot of *Anabasis*, and dynastic issues return in the Thracian episodes (e.g. Xenophon is offered the daughter of the dynast Seuthes in marriage, 7.2.38).

Low social status may explain the non-naming of certain characters. An anonymous Rhodian (*tis anēr Rhodios*, 3.5.8) who makes a detailed proposal that the army cross the Tigris on inflated animal-skins may have belonged to the group of 200 Rhodian slingers established at 3.3.16. Another anonymous character of low status is the Macronian peltast who appears just before the army arrives at the sea. The army is confronted by a local tribe that is blocking its way to the sea when a peltast 'who said that he had been a slave in Athens' (4.8.4) approaches Xenophon to indicate that he recognizes the local language; with his help the army is able to negotiate its way through the Macronians' territory. This peltast also fits a pattern whereby characters who enable Xenophon to help the army are not themselves named (e.g. 4.3.10, 5.8).

Gender and ethnicity are further factors in the naming or non-naming of characters. No names (but some personal details) are given for two Greek women in Cyrus' camp who are captured by the Persians (1.10.2). By contrast, the narrator does name two powerful non-Greek women (Parysatis, Cyrus' mother, and Epyaxa, wife of the Cilician ruler) and one Greek woman who belongs to a powerful family within the Persian empire (7.8.8). It is nonetheless revealing that between her first and last appearances (1.2.12, 25) Epyaxa is identified seven times as 'the Cilician woman'—a reflection of the way she was talked about by the Greeks, who gossiped about her relationship with Cyrus?

5 Cf. Tsagalis 2009.

Ethnicity

Members of the army are normally identified by an ethnic at their first appearance, and often again on later appearances (thus Agasias who appears in nine scenes in the last five books is identified as Stymphalian in all but one of these). More distinguished characters such as generals have a definite article before their ethnic identification ('Proxenus the Boeotian', 'Sophaenetus the Stymphalian', 'Socrates the Achaean', 1.1.11); definite articles are used for later appearances of some less distinguished characters (e.g. Agasias), though others have their ethnic tag repeated like a formula in the same terms.[6] For some ethnic groups, both local and broader identifications are found: in the case of Arcadians, characters who are prominent in the narrative or in some way close to Xenophon receive a local tag, while others are simply 'Arcadian' (Roy 1972). Greeks who are not part of Cyrus' army also receive ethnic tags (e.g. Seuthes' sidekick Heraclides of Maronea), with the exception of two Greeks who were with the camp of the Persian king (Ctesias and Phalinus) and some of Seuthes' other courtiers (Polynicus, Bi(t)on, Nausiclides). In *Hellenica*, by contrast, ethnics are much less common because they can readily be inferred from the context.[7]

The widespread use of ethnic tags in *Anabasis* contrasts with the rareness of patronymics, which are used only for three of the Athenian participants (and hence are an indirect ethnic marker): Lycius when he is appointed cavalry commander at 3.3.20; Amphicrates and Cephisodorus at 4.2.13, immediately before their deaths at 4.2.17 and their pathetic burials (their comrades 'did everything they could under the circumstances that is usually done when burying brave men' (*andrasin agathois*), 4.2.23). Lycius' patronymic may be explained by the fame of the family (his father is probably the defendant in [Lysias] 20, who was involved in the first oligarchic coup at Athens), while the patronymics and the personal naming of the two Athenian war-dead stand in pointed contrast with Athenian civic ceremonial. The rare use of patronymics in *Anabasis* contrasts with *Hellenica*: thus Socrates receives a patronymic for his single

6 Manuscript variations make certainty impossible, e.g. some manuscripts have the article for Aristeas of Chios at 4.6.19 (accepted by Marchant, rejected by Hude-Peters). See also 'Soteridas the Sicyonian' at 3.4.47, with Huitink and Rood (fc).

7 For examples in polyethnic armies see e.g. *Hell.* 1.6.32, 2.1.18. Some further examples: repetition of 'Procles, a Phliasian' (*Hell.* 6.5.38, 7.1.1) is in line with Xenophon's strong focus on the vicissitudes of this small Peloponnesian town, while mention of 'Aeneas, a Stymphalian' (*Hell.* 7.3.1) links with his homonym (presumably a member of the same family) in *Anabasis* (4.7.13) and perhaps with the extant work on siegecraft.

appearance in *Hellenica* (1.7.15), where he is a *prutanis* during the Arginusae trial, but not in *Anabasis*, where 'Socrates the Athenian' offers Xenophon advice before the expedition (3.1.5); and the same pattern is found with Clearchus, a major character in *Anabasis*, but given a patronymic only at *Hell.* 1.1.35.[8]

There are three exceptions to the principle of giving ethnic identifications for members of the army. Two *lokhagoi* are mentioned by name alone on their single appearances, when their deaths are mentioned (Cleaenetus 5.1.17; Clearetus 5.7.14); the absence of an ethnic for Clearetus may be explained by the fact that his death is narrated by Xenophon in a speech to the army, who may be presumed to know his ethnic origin. The third case is more interesting. After the arrest of the five generals, Xenophon calls a meeting of officers at which Apollonides—who 'spoke like a Boeotian' (*boiōtiazōn tēi phōnēi*, 3.1.26)—proposes that the army should continue to negotiate with the Persians. Xenophon then abuses Apollonides for his defeatism, proposing that he should be removed from office and used as a baggage-carrier (3.1.30)—like an animal, that is. Agasias then claims that Apollonides 'doesn't belong in Boeotia or anywhere in Greece; he has both ears pierced, Lydian-style' (3.1.31), and Apollonides is expelled from the meeting, never to be heard of again. The lack of distinct ethnic identification of Apollonides reflects the uncertainty that remained over his status.[9]

The quasi-formulaic use of ethnic identifications has other functions both locally and in relation to broader themes of the work. In the case of the anonymous Rhodian mentioned above, it may be that the ethnic identification characterizes Rhodians as rapacious, given that he requests the high sum of a talent as payment (Rhodians have earlier been offered financial incentives to serve as slingers, 3.3.18).[10] An ethnic stereotype is certainly involved in the case of the Spartiate exile Dracontius, who is chosen to supervise the athletic competition at Trapezus. While Dracontius is given a back-story (he had been 'banished from his home while still a boy for having accidentally stabbed another boy with his dagger and killed him', 4.8.25) which in both technique and content recalls Homeric epic, his Spartan character is suggested by his choice of a hillside for a wrestling contest on the grounds that 'it'll be a bit more painful for the one who is thrown' (4.8.26).[11] Like the blunt talk of

8 *Hellenica* is still notably irregular: thus it is hard to see why only one of the two generals introduced at 1.4.21 is given a patronymic.

9 The *indices nominum* in Marchant and Hude-Peters both claim unambiguously that he is a Lydian, though this is not warranted by the narrative.

10 Huitink and Rood fc.: ad loc.

11 For ethnic characterization cf. e.g. *ton Thettalikon tropon* at *Hell.* 6.1.3.

Agasias cited above, Dracontius' pithy utterance is a good example of characterization by speech.[12]

More broadly, ethnic tags bring out the extent of the Greek participation in Cyrus' expedition, ensuring that the Greek participants can in some sense be seen as representative of Greece. At the same time, ethnic identifications can help to focus on divisions within Greece. The prominence of Spartans in the leadership is a reflection of Spartan power in Greece: it is notable that when Chirisophus speaks first in the assembly of the whole army after the arrest of the generals, he is 'Chirisophus the Spartan' (3.2.1), whereas he is just 'Chirisophus' when he speaks at the preceding meeting of surviving officers (3.1.45). His Spartan identity explains his precedence; Xenophon goes on to suggest that Chirisophus should lead 'since he's a Spartan' (3.2.37). The importance of the army's having a Spartan commander is further stressed as the army approaches Greece (notably through Xenophon's own thoughts as to whether to seek the leadership, 6.1.26).

Ethnic divisions are especially important in the march along the Black Sea coast, when the Arcadians and Achaeans break away from the rest of the army (6.3). This breakaway is foreshadowed through the characterization of individual Arcadians earlier in the march. Three volunteers at 4.1.27, Callimachus, Aristonymus, and Agasias, are unusually given both local and Arcadian ethnics.[13] Together with another Arcadian, Eurylochus, these three men are also prominent in the attack on the Taochian stronghold, where the narrator comments on their competitiveness ('All four of these men were constantly involved in a keenly contested rivalry to see which of them was the bravest, and on this occasion their rivalry enabled them to take the stronghold', 4.7.12), picking up an earlier remark on Callimachus' attempted one-upmanship (*antistasiazōn*, 4.1.27). Continuity between this local rivalry and Arcadian ethnic feeling is suggested by Callimachus' later role in the separatist movement (6.2.9).

Rank and Personal Qualities

Besides ethnicity, the rank and position of characters is regularly mentioned where this is important for the narratee's understanding of their actions or of actions taken against them. A particular concern is shown for positions within the Persian hierarchy, and in some cases this concern is combined with direct characterization of personal qualities:

12 For Agasias cf. also 6.1.30 and the dispute at 6.6.7–28.

13 The Arcadian ethnic (found also at 4.2.21, 7.6.40) is deleted by Marchant, following Bisschop, but defended by Roy 1972: 131 on the basis of inscriptional parallels and retained by Hude-Peters.

– 1.2.20: 'a Persian called Megaphernes, a royal secretary (*phoinikistēn basileion*)', mentioned as he is executed on a charge of plotting against Cyrus. The specification of his position presumably adds to the seriousness of the plot.
– 1.6.1: 'Orontas, a Persian who was related to the king and was said to be as good as any Persian at warfare.' The introduction hints at how Orontas puts loyalty to the king above loyalty to Cyrus (to whom he was, after all, related to just the same degree) and also at the significance of his attempted desertion of Cyrus.
– 1.6.11: 'Artapatas, the most loyal of Cyrus' staff-bearers.' Here the introduction does not just explain his role in the execution of Orontas, but also prepares for his brave death at Cyrus' side in battle (1.8.28–29), where the repetition of 'the most loyal of his staff-bearers' together with details of the golden jewellery 'which had been given to him by Cyrus as rewards for his loyalty and reliability' underscores the effectiveness of Cyrus' honorific system.
– 1.8.1: 'Pategyas, a Persian who was one of Cyrus' trusted advisers (*khrēstos*)' comes riding with a sweating horse with news of king's approach. Given that Pategyas appears only here, the detail of his status is hardly necessary for the narrative, but perhaps adds further to the urgency suggested by the vivid detail about the horse.[14]

The officers in the Greek mercenary units gathered by Cyrus receive introductions of this sort only rarely. *Lokhagoi* and other minor officers are sometimes directly introduced as such (e.g. 'Hieronymus of Elis, the oldest of Proxenus' *lokhagoi*', 3.1.34; 'Aeneas of Stymphalos, a *lokhagos*', 4.7.13). Such overt introductions do not always occur at a character's first appearance (e.g. Nicarchus, wounded at 2.5.33, is identified as a *lokhagos* when he deserts with twenty men at 3.3.5;[15] Aristonymus' rank is formally explained on his second appearance at 4.7.9), though the status of some characters can be inferred earlier (Aristonymus' first appearance at 4.6.20 already suggests that he is a commander, and Agasias, who is first overtly called a *lokhagos* at 4.7.9, was present at the conference of Proxenus' *lokhagoi* called by Xenophon at 3.1.15). Occasionally *lokhagoi* or *taxiarkhoi* receive a separate introduction that focuses on their personal qualities. Thus the taxiarch[16] Aristeas of Chios volunteers for a dangerous task, and 'this was not the only time he proved his value to the army in this kind

14 Cf. also 1.7.5 (Gaulites), 2.1.7 (Phalinus).

15 The identity of the two men has been doubted owing to the nature of Nicarchus' earlier injuries, but should probably be assumed.

16 His position can be inferred from the terms of Xenophon's request for volunteers.

of situation' (4.1.28); later he volunteers again (4.6.20). This sort of focus on the qualities displayed by individuals throughout the retreat is a particularly common feature in Book 4: a similar mode of direct characterization at first appearance is offered at 4.4.15 for a non-officer who is sent on a night-time mission, while later the competiveness of some of the Arcadian officers is stressed (4.7.12, cited above).

Direct introductory characterization is used rather differently in the later stages of the narrative. During the narrative of a dinner for *stratēgoi* and *lokhagoi* at Seuthes' court, when the Thracian custom of throwing bits of meat and bread around from one diner to another is described: 'an Arcadian called Arystas, who had a prodigious appetite (*deinos phagein*), could not be bothered with throwing pieces of food around' (7.3.23), and instead picks up the large loaf in front of him and eats it all himself—and then, to laughter all around, refuses his turn for the drinking horn because he is still busy eating (7.3.25). The characterization here is comic. Another *lokhagos*, Episthenes of Olynthus, is introduced as a *paiderastēs* when he intervenes to save a pretty Thracian boy whom Seuthes is about to kill (7.4.7); Xenophon intervenes on his behalf, explaining his character (*tropon*) to Seuthes and telling an anecdote about his past (he had once formed a company 'the sole criterion for entry into which was the attractiveness of the men', 7.4.8). The tone here again seems lighter.

With *stratēgoi*, the focus at their introduction is the personal relationships with Cyrus which led to their being recruited rather than their personal qualities. Proxenus, Sophaenetus, and Socrates were all 'guest-friends' of Cyrus (1.1.11), as was Aristippus (1.1.10), who raised an army for Cyrus in Thessaly. How Clearchus became acquainted with Cyrus is described with increasing detail at 1.1.9 and in his obituary (see below). This stress on personal contacts with Cyrus prepares for the account of how Xenophon was persuaded by Proxenus to come on the expedition by the prospect of becoming a *philos* of Cyrus (3.1.4). The *stratēgos* Meno, by contrast, is introduced simply as 'the Thessalian'; readers are at first left to infer that his contingent was formed from the army that Aristippus was maintaining for Cyrus in Thessaly (1.2.6). An explanation for the different treatment of Meno may be the narrator's unremittingly critical assessment of his character. This character is sketched much more fully in the obituary for Meno, which itself (as we shall see) fills in the earlier narrative gap.

Introductions of non-officers tend to be concerned with personal qualities rather than with hierarchy. Tolmides of Elis is called 'the best herald of the time' (2.2.20) when called on by Clearchus to exercise his skills in a crisis (he appears twice later). A Spartan called Cleonymus is called 'a brave man' (*anēr agathos*, 4.1.18)—an introduction that is also an obituary, resonant of patriotic celebrations of the war-dead (see above on 4.2.23). Hecatonymus of Sinope

(spokesman for one of the cities that the army disturbs in its march along the Black Sea coast) had 'a reputation as a formidable speaker' (5.5.7)—but he is rhetorically outmanoeuvred by Xenophon. Other introductions provide back-stories, if not often as dramatic as Dracontius' involuntary manslaughter (4.8.25, quoted above). When the Greek army in Thrace is briefly wooed by a Theban Coeratadas, the narrator explains that he 'was travelling from place to place, not because he was in exile from Greece, but because he wanted to be a general and was offering himself to any city or people that needed one' (7.1.33). Rather comically, he is promptly dropped by the army when he humiliatingly fails to make good his promise of supplies.[17]

Reference to rank or personal qualities when characters are introduced explains the type of actions they are called to perform and in some cases the way they perform those actions; it is not necessarily an indication that a particular character is going to be prominent. There are, moreover, many individuals who appear fleetingly with little attempt at direct characterization, and some who appear several times without any overt judgement of their character. Some of these characters are relatively unproblematic, in that their actions are largely a function of their social or military positions. But there are (minor and major) characters who do pose considerable hermeneutic challenges. One such minor character is Aeneas of Stymphalus, a *lokhagos* who is mentioned only when the Greeks take a Taochian stronghold, when he falls to his death after trying in vain to stop a Taochian wearing a fine cloak from jumping off a sheer cliff (4.7.13). The narrative leaves it unclear whether Aeneas was acting from humane concern to save the Taochian's life (the narrator has just commented that the sight of the Taochian men and women hurling themselves and their children off the cliff was 'terrible', 4.7.13) or because he wanted the fine cloak for himself.[18] This type of interpretative challenge is much greater in the case of major characters such as Tissaphernes. Tissaphernes seems to be a stereotypically deceitful barbarian, but the game he is playing is left unclear (why, for instance, his delaying tactics at 2.3.25?) until he has the generals seized after inviting them to a meeting. And even after the generals' arrests, the ques-

17 He is presumably the same as the Boeotian of the same name defending Byzantium together with Clearchus during the Ionian War (*Hell.* 3.1.15)—in which case he had local knowledge and probably also personal contacts with some of the Greek mercenaries, both of which are suppressed in *Anabasis*.

18 The uncertainty could simply be attributed to the non-omniscient narrator—but since the narrator does at times display knowledge that goes beyond what the historical Xenophon could have known with certainty, such an explanation would raise the question why inference of motivation was not employed here.

tion asked by Clearchus in dismissing warnings not to visit Tissaphernes is left unanswered: why should Tissaphernes perjure himself when he could have gained his ends by force (2.4.7)? The sort of lengthy overt characterizations allotted to Cyrus and the doomed generals might seem to be a way of forestalling such open questions—but as we shall see, they raise new questions of their own.[19]

Obituaries

Obituaries in ancient historiography are important settings for the interaction of different techniques of characterization: they are tools for conveying the importance as well as shedding retrospective light on the character of their subjects.[20] There are some notable examples in *Hellenica*,[21] but their handling in *Anabasis* (where there is a smaller set of leading characters) is particularly distinctive.

The first character in *Anabasis* to receive a major obituary is Cyrus. This obituary runs for five OCT pages (1.9), cutting into the narrative of the battle fought against the Persian king at the dramatic moment of the deaths of Cyrus and his loyal follower Artapatas. The obituary itself is marked off from the main narrative stylistically (it has an unusually large frequency of totalizing vocabulary, including many superlatives and many forms of *pas*) and in narratorial mode: it frequently foregrounds the perspective of contemporaries (e.g. 1.9.1: 'Of all the successors of Cyrus the Elder, no Persian was a more natural ruler and none more deserved to rule, *in the view of all who were held to have been close to Cyrus*')[22] and has an unusual number of first-person forms (note especially 1.9.28: 'it is my personal view that no Greek or barbarian—or none that I have heard of—was loved by more people'; cf. *oimai*, 1.9.22; *emoige … dokei*, 1.9.24). Such overt narratorial interventions are more common in the first two

19 Compare, for the complexity of characterization in *Hell.*, Moles 1994 on Callicratidas and Flower 2015 on Pharnabazus.

20 See in general Pomeroy 1991.

21 E.g. 3.1.14, 4.8.31, also 5.3.20, an obituary of Agesipolis partly focalized through his fellow king Agesilaus. *Hellenica* stands out by contrast for a number of narratorial comments justifying the inclusion of incidents that highlight the character of particular leaders (e.g. 5.1.4, 6.2.31, 39, 6.5.51).

22 Also 1.9.2: 'he was regarded …'; 1.9.5: 'there was reckoned …'; 1.9.14: 'it was universally acknowledged …' (*hōmologēto*); and (with a seemingly gratuitous change of tense) 1.9.20: 'it is universally acknowledged …' (*homologeitai*).

books of the *Anabasis*, before the emergence of the character Xenophon, but they are particularly pronounced in this section.

The obituary starts by identifying ruling as Cyrus' key skill (1.9.1, quoted above). It then adopts a linear approach, dealing with Cyrus' boyhood and education; his beginning to hunt at the proper age; and his holding of political office.[23] The principles he adopted as ruler are then explored through a generalizing account, focusing on his trustworthiness, his system of rewards and punishments, his concern for friends, and the respect in which he was held. This account is supported by some specific examples, some of which supplement or repeat details from the earlier narrative (1.9.29: many deserted from the king to Cyrus (cf. 1.4.3, 1.7.2, 1.7.12) while no one deserted Cyrus for the king except for an attempt by Orontas—and even he was betrayed (cf. 1.6);[24] 1.9.30: the loyalty shown by Cyrus' *philoi* at his death is illustrated by the death of Artapatas, which had been narrated immediately before the main narrative, 1.8.28–29), while the closing mention of the flight of Ariaeus after Cyrus' death (1.9.31) anticipates an event described immediately on the resumption of the main narrative (1.10.1). This variety of characterizing modes employed, and above all the subordination of narrative exempla to broader characterizing categories, are similar to the techniques used in *Agesilaus*.[25]

The obituary interacts with the earlier narrative in other ways apart from simple repetition. The negative/positive formulation used for an account of Cyrus' youthful (Odysseus-like) encounter with a bear ('he did not flinch at a she-bear that charged him, but engaged …', 1.9.6) echoes the use of the same form in the narrative of Cyrus' fatal charge at his brother ('he did not hesitate, but cried out "I see the man"', 1.8.26), suggesting a causal link between Cyrus' courage and the rashness that leads to his death, and a contrast, too, with his earlier caution in battle ('he was not tempted to join in the pursuit, but kept his squadron in close formation', 1.8.21).

The obituary also addresses broader ideas of leadership by means of metaphorical characterization. It starts, as we have seen, by linking Cyrus with the elder Cyrus, subject of the *Cyropaedia*; the account of the early promise shown by Cyrus (1.9.2–3) also recalls Herodotus' account of the boyhood of the elder

23 Note that there are no detailed references to his interactions with Lysander and Callicratidas, which are described at some length in *Hellenica*.

24 The alleged plot at 1.2.20 is ignored, though this was not specifically an attempt to defect to the king.

25 Cf. *tekmērion* at 1.9.29 and 1.9.30, used elsewhere in *Anabasis* only in a speech by Xenophon (3.2.13), but also used in a similar way of actions as evidence for virtues at *Agesilaus* 4.1, 4.3, 6.1.

Cyrus, when he displayed his kingly properties during a game (1.114–115). An intertextual link is also activated with Herodotus' account of Persian education. The young Cyrus is taught to ride and to shoot—two of the three aspects of Persian education noted by Herodotus (1.136.2). He is not said to have been taught to speak the truth. The absence may hint at Cyrus' use of duplicity earlier in the campaign, when he lies about the aim of his expedition.

A key theme in the obituary is the use of reciprocal bonds to ensure the loyalty and willing obedience of subordinates. This theme is highlighted in the narrative too, in particular by the use of altero-characterization (a technique used otherwise, as we shall see, primarily with regard to Xenophon). When two Greek generals abandon Cyrus, Cyrus makes a point of proclaiming that he will not pursue them and that he will return their wives and children 'in recognition of the good they did me before' (*tēs prosthen heneka peri eme aretēs*, 1.4.8)—an announcement that is seen by the Greeks as a mark of Cyrus' *aretē* (1.4.9). Meno later encourages his troops with the idea that 'Cyrus will be grateful for your commitment and will recompense you for it—and there is no one better at recompensing than he is' (1.4.15). In a notable instance of altero-characterization, this perception is shared by those who sailed to join Cyrus because they had heard of his *aretē* (6.4.8) and also by Clearchus, who tells the army in trying to quash the mutiny at Tarsus that Cyrus is 'worth a great deal as a friend to anyone who is loyal to him' (1.3.12) and later tells Tissaphernes (who soon betrays him) that he wanted to be a *philos* of Cyrus because 'there was no one alive who was better placed to help those he wanted to help' (2.5.11). While Clearchus' claims in particular are shaped by his immediate rhetorical needs, his characterization of Cyrus is to some extent supported too by the narrator, who comments on Cyrus' distress at not having enough money to pay the troops—'because it was not in Cyrus' nature to refuse to pay a debt when he had the money' (*ou gar ēn pros tou Kurou tropou*, 1.2.11). This foregrounding of perceptions of Cyrus' character highlights a theme that becomes important again in the final books, when Xenophon lectures the Thracian dynast Seuthes on the art of ruling (7.7.20–47), and again in the denouement to Xenophon's own story, when a late windfall leaves him 'at last in a position even to do someone else a favour' (7.8.23).

The long and glowing description of Cyrus does not seem primarily designed to illuminate the preceding narrative. It underlines his importance to the plot while inviting the construction of counterfactuals (what if Cyrus had won?) that perhaps offer an implicit defence of the decision of Xenophon and others to leave Greece to serve with Cyrus. Its striking placement also allows for a stronger focus on the isolated position in which Cyrus' Greek troops do find themselves. At the same time—as with the portrayal of the elder Cyrus

in *Cyropaedia*—it is open to ironic readings. Some critics have been worried about the possible threat to Greek interests if the Cyrus as portrayed in the obituary had been victorious. We have also seen the hints of Cyrus' duplicity and the repeated stress on his reputation. These hints may suggest that his principles of leadership are manipulative and self-interested, designed to play off the perceptions of his subjects and make them content with their own subjection.

Obituaries are also provided for the five generals arrested and killed by the Persians.[26] These obituaries split into two groups: the two generals who have been least prominent in the earlier narrative, Agias and Socrates, are treated last and briefly ('no one ever scorned these men as cowards in war or found fault with them in matters of friendship', 2.6.30), while the other three generals are treated at greater length. The obituaries also differ stylistically. Clearchus' obituary resembles Cyrus' in that it is focused largely around his qualities—in Clearchus' case, his love of war (*philopolemos* 2.6.1, 6, 7) and (as with Cyrus) his capacity as a ruler (*arkhikos* 2.6.8)—and around other people's perceptions.[27] In the case of Proxenus and Meno, by contrast, the narrator focuses much more on the characters' own perceptions—their desires and their thoughts about how to fulfil them[28]—though in Proxenus' case there are also (as with Clearchus) narratorial comments on his abilities and shortcomings as a leader.[29] Finally, Meno's obituary is marked out from the other four in two ways: the narrator does not reveal how old he was when he died, and the obituary is proleptic, in that the narrator first notes that 'the Greek generals who were captured as described were taken to the king and beheaded' (2.6.1) before revealing that Meno was in fact 'kept alive in constant torment for a year, it is said, before being killed' (2.6.29).[30]

---

26 None of the *lokhagoi* or common soldiers killed at the same time is given an obituary. Contrast, too, the lack of an obituary for Chirisophus, who leads the vanguard in the retreat, whose death is mentioned analeptically at 6.4.11.

27 2.6.1: 'Clearchus was universally held by those who knew him …'; cf. *elegeto* 2.6.8; *ephasan* 2.6.10, 11; *edokei*, *ephaineto* 2.6.11. For a similar stress on perceptions in overt characterizing comments, see e.g. *Hell.* 3.1.3 (*doxas*), 3.1.8, 4.8.31 (*dokōn*).

28 Proxenus: *epethumei*, *epithumian* 2.6.16, *epithumōn* 2.6.18, *ōieto* 2.6.17, 18, 20. Meno: *epithumōn* 2.6.21 (three times), *epithumoiē* 2.6.22, *ebouleto* 2.6.21, *ōieto* 2.6.22, 24 (twice), 26, *enomizen* 2.6.26, *ēxiou* 2.6.27.

29 Note especially the use of *hikanos* at 2.6.8 (twice) of Clearchus and at 2.6.16, 17, 19 of Proxenus.

30 The chronological relation of the obituaries of the other generals to their actual deaths is not clear. As with Cyrus' obituary, they are placed at a point in the narrative before the Greek soldiers could have heard of their deaths; Ariaeus has told them that Clearchus has been killed for conspiring against the Persians, but the trustworthiness of that information

The placement of the obituaries has two main advantages. It provides a premature closure to the question of the part played by Proxenus and Meno in the events leading up to the arrest of the generals. In response to the Persian claim that Proxenus and Meno had denounced Clearchus, Xenophon asks that they be allowed to return (2.6.41). During the Greek debate the following night, the position of the arrested generals is uncertain (Xenophon suggests they are 'being beaten, tortured, brutalized, and denied the death their suffering surely makes them long for', 3.1.29), but the possibility of their return is forgotten. They are formally replaced as generals, and their position is no longer a subject of debate with the Persians when discussions resume. A further reason for the placement of the obituaries is that the differing characters of the three main generals prepare by contrast for the portrayal of Xenophon, who rises to prominence immediately after the obituaries.[31]

How do the obituaries relate to the earlier narrative?[32] That Clearchus was a good leader in times of danger is reflected in the way he effectively takes command after Cyrus' death, 'not because they had elected him to this position, but because he was plainly the only one with the mentality of a leader, while the rest were untried' (2.2.5). The strictness of his leadership had earlier been seen when he had one of Meno's men flogged (1.5.11)—leading to a dangerous escalation of a dispute between Meno's contingent and his own. Now, after Cyrus' death, his strict personal leadership proves more effective: he stops a panic (2.2.20–21) and, when the army has to cross water-filled trenches on logs from fallen palm trees, he beats shirkers and lends a hand himself, 'which shamed everyone into working just as hard as him' (2.3.11–12). In this way the narrator's earlier use of implicit characterization through action receives explicit endorsement from the obituary.

In some ways, however, the obituary does not do justice to the character Clearchus has displayed earlier. During the mutiny at Tarsus, Clearchus initially tries to use force to make his men continue with the journey (1.3.1–2)—in much the manner suggested by his characterization in the obituary. When not successful through force, however, he proves a master of guile, affecting loyalty

---

is compromised by Ariaeus' further claim that Proxenus and Meno are in favour with the Persians for denouncing Clearchus (2.5.38).

31 Cf. Høeg 1950: 177; Roisman 1985–1988: 51–52. Howland 2000: 885–886 ambitiously suggests that Xenophon's portraits of the three arrested generals (2.6) reflect the three parts of the Platonic soul.

32 I do not consider here Proxenus, who plays a much smaller role in the narrative than Clearchus and Meno and receives a shorter obituary—though its placement between Clearchus and Meno perhaps reprises his role as a mediator between their forces at 1.5.14.

to the troops while at the time serving Cyrus' interests (as with other duplicitous characters such as Tissaphernes, Clearchus is characterized in this scene implicitly, with no explicit report of his motivation). His guile is also shown through a couple of close echoes between obituary and narrative. Speaking of some money he had been given by Cyrus, Clearchus tells the troops that 'I did not bank it for my own personal use or waste it on luxurious living; I spent it on you' (1.3.3). In the obituary, the narrator agrees that Clearchus 'did not spend the money on a life of ease'—but sees this as a mark of his devotion to war rather than to the men under his command: 'Just as other men are happy to spend money on their boyfriend or on some other pleasure, so he spent his on warfare' (2.6.5–6). Again, while Clearchus claims that he would be prepared to follow another leader because 'I know as well as anybody in the world how to take orders as well as give them' (1.3.15), the obituary closes with the claim that 'it was widely held that he was not very good at being led by others' (2.6.15). The gap between the obituary and the narrative points to the exceptional nature of Clearchus' behaviour during the mutiny, while not diluting the contrasts between the Clearchus of the obituary and the Xenophon of the ensuing narrative: Xenophon can be as strict as Clearchus (e.g. in his recourse to violence), but he is also shown using speech for positive ends.

The relation of Meno's obituary to the earlier narrative is also interesting. The picture of his devotion to self-aggrandizement seems to be a straightforward confirmation of the impression created by the scene at the Euphrates where Meno urges his men to cross the river first—a move that will win them favour with Cyrus if the other troops agree to cross too, but cost them nothing if the other troops refuse (1.4.14–17); Meno's speech to his troops overturns the usual ethical connection between toils and rewards (1.4.14), and he is himself rumoured to be the recipient of Cyrus' largesse (1.4.17). More complex is the way that the extreme picture of Meno's duplicity (which echoes Thucydides' account of *stasis* at 3.82–83—a form of metaphorical characterization by intertextuality) moulds the narratee's perception of the complicated diplomacy between Greeks and Persians in the aftermath of Cyrus' death. The earlier narrative has included strong hints of Meno's close links with the Persian Ariaeus: Clearchus gave Chirisophus and Meno the task of escorting two envoys back to Ariaeus, and 'Meno specifically wanted the job, since he was on good terms with Ariaeus, who was his guest-friend' (2.1.5); Chirisophus then returns 'without Meno, who had stayed with Ariaeus' (2.2.1); later a deceitful Persian messenger seeks out Proxenus or Clearchus, but 'he did not ask for Meno, despite the fact that he had come from Ariaeus, Meno's guest-friend' (2.4.15: Meno must have returned in the meantime). Meno's close relations with Ariaeus are relevant because the narrative brings out how Ariaeus gradually abandons the Cyreians'

cause for that of the Persian king. Any suspicions raised by Meno's closeness to Ariaeus are then refracted through Clearchus, who thinks that the ambitious Meno has been telling Tissaphernes that Clearchus is plotting against him (2.5.27–28: it is this suspicion that lures Clearchus to the fatal meeting with Tissaphernes, who has promised to reveal the names of his accusers). The bleak account of Meno's character seems to lend credence to those suspicions while still leaving unresolved the questions raised by the narrative of mutual suspicions and murky diplomacy after Cyrus' death.[33]

The critical presentation of Meno continues with a more detailed account of how he had come to join the army:

> It is possible to be mistaken about things that are unseen, but there are aspects of his life which are public knowledge. While he was still in the bloom of youth, he managed to secure an appointment as one of the generals of the mercenary corps from Aristippus, and although Ariaeus was a barbarian, Meno became very close to him, because Ariaeus had a fondness for beautiful young men. Also, Meno himself, though still a beardless youth, had Tharypas as his boyfriend, although Tharypas was mature enough to have a beard.
>
> 2.6.28

The perversions of Meno's moral code are matched by his sexual conduct, details of which are here introduced for the first time: the suggestion is that Meno exploited his personal attractiveness for self-advancement. Meno's corruption of conventional age distinctions may also explain why his age is not revealed at the end of his obituary.

Xenophon

Xenophon receives privileged treatment in *Anabasis*. He is the only character whose dreams are narrated. He is allowed numerous speeches, some of which rehearse and defend his own earlier actions. The narrator has more frequent access to his thoughts (sometimes revealing his manipulative use of speech); at one point Xenophon's thoughts are even narrated in direct speech, a passage unique in extant classical Greek historiography (3.1.13–14).[34] Xenophon also

33 Another sign of the non-omniscient narration of *Anabasis*: cf. n. 18 above.

34 With the possible exception of Ctesias F8d.12 Lenfant.

receives a more detailed explanation than any other soldier of how he came to serve with Cyrus (3.1.4–9) and a more detailed account of his life after the end of the expeditions (5.3.7–13).

Xenophon's formal introduction comes after the arrest of the generals: 'There was in the army a man called Xenophon, an Athenian' (*ēn de tis en tēi stratiai Xenophōn Athēnaios*, 3.1.4). This mode of introduction is paralleled in many genres, e.g. epic (*Il.* 5.9, 10.314, 13.663–664). A particularly neat parallel is the introduction of Themistocles in Herodotus ('there was an Athenian … whose name was Themistocles' (*ēn de tōn tis Athēnaiōn …*), 7.143.1)—like Xenophon, an Athenian saviour-figure. In both cases the archly underplayed introduction prepares for the character's extraordinary later achievements. Herodotus' Themistocles can be seen, then, as a form of metaphorical characterization. In Xenophon's case, the emphasis given by this mode of characterization is later bolstered by echoes of characters in Thucydides (the control exercised by Pericles, Nicias' reluctance to endanger success, Alcibiades' desire for fame)[35] and also by the use of the *Odyssey*, notably when Xenophon steers the army away from any thought of remaining within the Persian empire by invoking the lotus-eaters (3.2.25).[36]

Scholars have suspected that the narrator disguises earlier contributions by Xenophon. Both the philosophical Athenian Theopompus ('divinely sent') who rebuts defeatist advice at 2.1.12[37] and the anonymous 'young man' (*neaniskos*) who points out flaws in a deceptive Persian message at 2.4.19 have been seen as ciphers for Xenophon.[38] Xenophon does, however, make a few appearances before his main introduction at 3.1.4 (1.8.15–17, 2.4.15, 2.5.37–41). So even if the 'young man' and 'Theopompus' are both Xenophon, it is hard to explain the narrator's recourse to anonymity and a pseudonym in these two passages. The most one can say is that the *neaniskos* and Theopompus have (in Greimas' terms) the same actantial function as Xenophon.

35 Rood 2004a: 328.

36 This type of metaphorical characterization is most strongly attached to Xenophon. In addition, the elder Cyrus of *Cyropaedia* serves as a model against whom the younger Cyrus is evaluated; while in the *Hellenica* the invocation of Agamemnon in the context of Agesilaus' sacrifice at Aulis offers interesting perspectives on Agesilaus himself (Stanke 2006).

37 Some manuscripts have the reading 'Xenophon', which is accepted by Hude-Peters, but it seems easier to suppose that this displaced 'Theopompus'.

38 Covert self-reference is thought typical of our author: thus 'the leader of the Cyreans' at *Hellenica* 3.2.7 is generally thought to be Xenophon; cf. Körte 1922: 19 on 'one of [Agesilaus'] companions' at *Agesilaus* 5.4–6.

Other details that the narrator reveals about Xenophon in his introduction contribute both to the plot and to ethical themes. His identity as an Athenian is important initially because (as Socrates warns him) he joins the man who had funded the Spartan victory over Athens (3.1.5). It also explains his distinctively Athenian memories of both the Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian Wars (3.2.12–13; 6.1.27–28, 7.1.27); his kinship links with Seuthes (7.2.31, 7.3.39, cf. 7.2.19, when Seuthes' sentries ask 'whether he was the Athenian from the army'); and perhaps also his rhetorical versatility (see below). Again, it is foregrounded in some Spartan-Athenian joshing about thieving (4.6.14–16, alluding to the Spartan *krupteia* and to Athenian public corruption) and perhaps in the Spartan suspicion that Xenophon may be a 'demagogue' (7.6.4). And it is also part of the way he is perceived by other characters: after Xenophon's speech to the surviving officers the night after the generals' arrest, Chirisophus comments that 'up until now, Xenophon, I knew nothing about you, except that people had told me you were an Athenian' (3.1.45)—a metatextual comment on Xenophon's delayed introduction.

The narrator goes on to explain that Xenophon did not have a formal rank: 'He had come along not as a general, nor as a company commander, nor as a soldier, but because Proxenus, a long-standing guest-friend, had invited him to leave home and join him, and had held out the promise of friendship with Cyrus' (3.1.4). Xenophon is here removed from the cash nexus and embedded in a code of aristocratic reciprocity.[39] Disappointed in his hopes for Cyrus, Xenophon nonetheless ends the *Anabasis* in a position to do good to others (see above).

The narrator then mentions Socrates' warnings to Xenophon before the expedition. Proleptic references to Xenophon's exile (5.3.7, 7.7.57) confirm that the expedition did prove dangerous for Xenophon, but it is not clear that it was Xenophon's service with Cyrus (as opposed to his later service with Sparta) that was responsible for his exile. At any rate, the introduction foregrounds the role of advice-giving, preparing for Xenophon's change from being the recipient of advice that he ignores to the giver of advice that saves the Greek army.

Xenophon's introduction also stresses the importance of piety.[40] He does follow Socrates' advice to the extent of consulting the Delphic oracle, but is berated by Socrates for asking the wrong sort of question. Later Xenophon consults the gods twice through sacrifices about whether to stay or go, using

39 Azoulay 2004a.

40 See further Rood 2015, with discussion of ironic readings. For the importance of piety in the Xenophontic model of leadership see Flower 2016.

precisely the either/or formulation that Socrates had told him he should have used in the first place (6.2.15, 7.6.44). There is also later a detailed account of the fine festival Xenophon establishes for Artemis of Ephesus with part of a tithe of the army's profits (5.7.7–13).

While Xenophon's introduction sets up some important themes, the ensuing assembly scene where he begins to play a dominant role in the action displays further characterizing techniques. Characterization through emotion is illustrated by the contrast between the despondency of the rest of the army and the spirit shown by Xenophon himself: while the army's varying emotions articulate different stages in the retreat, Xenophon is characterized by his (Periclean) ability both to stir them when they are despondent (as at 3.1–2) and to calm them when they are unruly (e.g. 7.1.18–32). Characterization through appearance is used when Xenophon puts on especially fine armour before addressing the whole army, thinking that this was suitable whether the gods gave victory or death (3.2.7)—perhaps a heroizing touch.[41] Elsewhere manipulation of appearance is important at the level of plot, but physical appearance itself is not much emphasized except in the case of a number of minor characters in erotic contexts (1.10.2, 7.4.7).[42] The assembly scene itself illustrates characterization through speech in the contrast between the short and blunt speeches by Chirisophus and Cleanor (3.2.2–4) and Xenophon's longer speech, which displays elements of Gorgias' apagogic style (3.2.8–32). During the narrative of the retreat itself, speech continues to be used as a characterizing device, but now in particular to bring out the distinctive strategic insight of Xenophon, who points out in speeches the importance of geographical features that have not been mentioned earlier by the narrator.[43]

Following Xenophon's rise to prominence at the start of Book 3, the character he displays as a leader in the retreat is initially left to be inferred from a number of narrative set-pieces (characterization through action). His personal participation is shown, for instance, when he dismounts from his horse and grabs the shield of a soldier (3.4.47–49) or takes the lead in cutting wood during the winter march through Armenia, inspiring others to follow his lead in snow (4.4.11–12). This mode of characterization (the dominant mode in *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*) is refined in the course of the narrative by an increasing use of altero-characterization. Thus when two soldiers approach Xenophon with a new discovery, his accessibility is reinforced by a generalizing comment on people's

41 Cf. Tuplin 2003 on heroic aspects of characterization in *Anabasis*.

42 It is notable that the appearance and voice of Clearchus are stressed in the obituary (2.6.9, 11) rather than in the earlier narrative of his actions.

43 Rood 2014.

perceptions of Xenophon: 'Everyone knew that, if they had a military matter to discuss, they could approach him during mealtimes and could wake him up if he was asleep' (4.3.10). As the narrative advances, Xenophon's character as leader is more and more presented as perceived both by others (e.g. 7.6.4: Seuthes on Xenophon as *philostratiotēs*; cf. 7.6.39) and by Xenophon himself.[44] Like Clearchus' observations on Cyrus (1.3.12, quoted above), such comments have a local function while also contributing to broader characterization and to important themes. This technique is particularly effective in dealing with characters whose actions provoke controversy, like Xenophon himself: the best example of its use comes from the description of Alcibiades' return to Athens in *Hellenica* (1.4.13–17), where the perceptions of those who support and oppose Alcibiades are described at markedly different lengths, in terms which evoke Thucydides' analysis of the problematic relationship between Alcibiades and the Athenians.[45]

Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed a number of different narratological modes used for characterization in *Anabasis*, and some comparisons have been drawn with *Hellenica*. The evidence does at least suggest that it is reasonable to see a pronounced interest in characterization in these works despite the importance of the leadership model (though we should be wary of integrating this interest into overly simplistic developmental narratives of the discovery of the individual). In the case of Xenophon, the distinctive range of characterizing techniques speaks to the narrator's concern for general ethical standards and leadership principles while not neglecting the difficult personal interactions through which those standards have to be maintained. And other characters, too, are not simply drawn in black or white depending on whether or not they match the paradigm of the good leader. They all in their various ways illuminate the complexities involved in the world of political action—by contrast with the Socratic possibility of connecting virtue and leadership in the world of the ideal.[46]

---

44 Rood 2004a.

45 Rood 2004b: 366–369.

46 Cf. Tamiolaki 2012.