

"THE SOCRATIC KING" (CONTD.)

CHAPTER 4

COURAGE (BOOK FOUR OF THE *ANABASIS*)

Book four of the *Anabasis* is the book of necessity. This characterization, suggested by the frequent use of ANAGKĒ in chapter 4.1, is supported by an analysis of the contents of the book.¹ For the Ten Thousand encounter several necessities, several mortal dangers, in book four: a succession of hostile and warlike tribes, including the Kardouchoi, the Kolchoi, and the Chalubes, hamper their retreat and launch a series of deadly attacks that result in the loss of good soldiers; the army also struggles through a bitter winter in Armenia, where starving men and pack animals, marching through six feet of snow, are frozen stiff by glacial winds and dying of cold and exhaustion. Book four thus paints the struggles of the Ten Thousand during their forced march to the sea. It culminates on Mount Ēchēs, where a worn out host famously glimpses its long-awaited goal—The Sea! The Sea!

Yet uplifting as the scene on Mount Ēchēs is, it is preceded by some of the most melancholy episodes of the *Anabasis*. In order to overcome their mortal dangers—as well as the recurrent despondency of the soldiers—the rulers of the Ten Thousand are compelled to resort to a series of unsentimental measures. Book four is the book of death. The jaws of Hades are visible on its every page.² More precisely, it is the book of the human

¹ ANAGKĒ ("necessity") and the cognates of the word occur six times in the relatively short chapter one (§9, §12, §15, §16 [2X], §19). One of these occurrences is found only in the best MSS. (at §16). No other chapter of the *Anabasis* contains as many occurrences. (Chapters 3.4 and 6.4 contain five each and chapter 5.5 contains four.)

² The first deaths are mentioned at 4.1.10. Death is thenceforth a regular occurrence among the Greeks (4.1.18–20, 4.2.17–18, 4.2.23–34, 4.5.4, 4.5.12, 4.7.13) and their enemies alike (4.1.22, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.4.21, 4.6.26, 4.7.13–14).

response to death. Recall that Xenophon suggested, in and through his speech to the rulers in book three, that the human awareness of death is somehow linked to the love of the noble (3.1.43). On this basis, it is reasonable to anticipate that book four will explore the theme of the noble. This expectation will be fully met, as we shall see—so much so that book four is rightly described as the book of *both* necessity and the noble; it is the book of the noble precisely because it is the book of death. For, while book four depicts many scenes of loss of life, it also celebrates the noblest men among the Ten Thousand. These men distinguish themselves by their courage amid mortal perils—Eurulochos of Lusía, Kallimachos of Parrasia, Agasias of Stumphalia, and several others.³ The *Anabasis* commemorates the deeds of such noble men and wreathes them with a garland of immortal glory. If the imminence of death sinks humanity to the level of its necessities, it also uplifts our soul to the level of our aspirations.⁴

1. Necessity and the Noble (Courage)

In the last scene of book three, the Greek generals had considered what options remained open to them as the path along the Tigris ended abruptly. They concluded that it was necessary to go north (3.5.17). As book four opens, they endeavor to invade Kardouchia at dawn. They are trying to escape the locals' notice and, at the same time, to get a jump on them in capturing the heights. For Kardouchia is a very mountainous country. In this effort they succeed: led at a quick pace by Cheirisophos, the vanguard of the army crests the first peak before being noticed. The Kardouchoi are caught unawares and they flee to the higher ground with

³ In book four, Xenophon uses the formula "a good man" (AGATHOS ANĒR) to speak of a courageous or brave man. Courage is also conveyed by the single word ANDREIA (4.1.18, 4.1.26, 4.2.23, 4.3.29). On one occasion, Xenophon speaks of two "noble and good men" (KALŌ TE KAGATHŌ ANDRE: 4.1.19). To interpret book four properly, however, we must also be mindful of the adjective ITĒS, which means to be "forward," "bold," "audacious," or "daring." The word is related to the verb "to go" (EIMI) and can have a noble meaning (e.g., Plato's *Protagoras* 349e3) or a shameful meaning (e.g., Aristophanes's *Clouds* 445). This ambiguity must be kept in mind throughout. The passage from the *Clouds* connects shameful audacity with Socrates and his disciples, of whom Xenophon was of course one.

⁴ More individual men are named in book four than in all the other books of the *Anabasis* combined: 4.1.18, 4.1.27–28, 4.2.13, 4.2.21, 4.2.28, 4.3.22, 4.4.15, 4.5.24, 4.6.1, 4.6.20, 4.7.8–2, 4.7.13, 4.8.18, 4.8.25. But observe that the two youths who contribute decisively to the safety of the army at 4.3.10ff. are *not* named. Was their action not noble?

their wives and children. On the first day, successive waves of Greeks ascend the first summit and descend again into the villages scattered in the hollows and nooks of the mountain. Yet the march soon becomes laborious. The Greeks would like to traverse Kardouchia as through a friendly territory since they too, like the Kardouchoi, are enemies of the King. To this end they spare the Kardouchoi a little, leaving untouched the bronze implements in their houses and not giving chase to their people. But perhaps not surprisingly, the Kardouchoi pay no heed to the calls of the Greeks nor do they make any friendly gestures of their own. In fact, since the Greeks seize whatever provisions they chance upon—"it was necessary"—war breaks out (4.1.9).

The road cuts a sinuous path through the mountains. The enemy, having recovered from his surprise, mounts a series of attacks. The Kardouchoi are excellent archers. Their ponderous arrows can penetrate right through shields and breastplates. On the third day, after some skirmishes, a great storm arises. But the Greeks are compelled to push on since their supplies are running low. The Kardouchoi begin to apply intense pressure. The Greeks are compelled to march slowly as they pursue and force the Kardouchoi, in turn, to retreat. More than once, as the enemy is pressing hard, Xenophon sends word to Cheirisophos from the rear to halt the march. The latter does so. Yet once Cheirisophos disregards the request and leads on quickly. The march becomes like a rout for the rearguard. At that point, two good men⁵ are killed, Kleōnumos the Laconian and Basias the Arcadian. When the army reaches the day's station, Xenophon goes up to Cheirisophos, just as he is, and he blames him for having refused to wait "whereby we were compelled to flee and fight at the same time. And now two noble and good men are lying dead, and we were unable to take them up or bury them" (4.1.19).

Cheirisophos points ahead and says: "Look at the mountains and see how inaccessible they all are. There is only this one road, which you see—a steep one—and beside it you can see what throng of people have seized the pass and are standing guard over it. This is why I made haste and did not wait for you, that I might somehow seize the pass before they did. The guides say that there is no other road" (4.1.20–21). "But," Xenophon replies, "I have two men. When the enemy was giving us troubles, we set an ambush, which enabled us to catch our breath, and we

⁵ To be more precise, Xenophon describes only the first of these two individuals as a "good man" in his narrative (ANĒR AGATHOS: 4.1.18). But in his rebuke of Cheirisophos, he describes both of them as "noble and good men" (KALŌ TE KAGATHŌ ANDRE: 4.1.19).

killed some of them; we were also eager to capture some alive in order that we might have the use of guides who know the country”:

They brought in the people right away and cross-examined them separately about whether they knew any road other than the one that was visible. The one denied that he did, even when threatened with many frightening things. When he kept failing to say anything beneficial, he was slaughtered in sight of the other. The one left said that the former had denied knowing because he chanced to have a daughter living there with a man to whom she had been given in marriage. He himself said that he would lead them on a road on which it was possible even for baggage animals to pass. Asked if there was any place on it that was hard to pass, he said there was a summit that would be impossible to get by unless someone took it in advance. (4.1.23–25)⁶

Few scenes of the *Anabasis* are equally moving. A man tries to hide the existence of a road to protect his daughter. He is slaughtered trying to save her from slavery or worse.⁷ The Greeks act like barbarians, while the Kardouchian father glows with the fire of noble dedication. Compounding the pathos of the scene is the realization that the father's sacrifice was made in vain. The episode, however, is arresting beyond its dramatic power. For it raises hard questions about necessity and the noble. In one sense, these notions are of course mutually exclusive: no human being can be reasonably praised or blamed for doing (or failing to do) what is beyond his control, that is, for acting (or failing to act) under necessity. Noble action requires choice. Yet the episode makes us wonder whether necessity is ever present in human affairs aside from cases of strict involuntariness. Though death is widely believed to be the greatest evil, the avoidance of death is manifestly not “necessary” in the sense of being a compulsory or an irresistible end. The natural impulse to self-preservation, imperious as it is in the human breast, can be subdued by higher or more potent concerns. Some people, like the Kardouchian father, will choose to die protecting loved ones, or serving ends they view as worthy of their dedication.

Of course, this choice is not made by everyone. The second captive reveals the hidden road, though he must have known that doing this would harm his fellow Kardouchoi (cf. 4.2.22). Did he act shamefully? We may concede that he did not act courageously. But was he blameworthy? On the one hand, it could be argued that self-preservation excuses

⁶ Translation by Ambler (2008).

⁷ Consider 4.1.14 and 4.3.19.

otherwise shameful actions if they are forced upon us by necessity. On the other hand, however, an action like harming one's compatriots is inherently wrong, it is often said. Besides, the example of the father shows that the second captive could have acted differently. To the second point, however, one might reply that the sacrifice of the father, precisely because it was so noble and impressive, went above and beyond the call of duty. The second captive might have been a hero had he chosen to die for his compatriots but was probably not a criminal for refusing to make that choice. Can the same argument be used to justify the unnamed Greek who slaughters the father? Though the army's survival hinged on the discovery of the second road (4.2.2–4)—and though the killing of the father did lead to that discovery—it is not entirely clear that this harsh interrogation method was strictly necessary to secure the information in question. This much, at any rate, is obvious: the slaughter of the father was *not* a noble deed. Book four opens with a melancholy illustration of the weakness of the noble against necessity even as it shows how necessity brings nobility to the fore.

i) Necessity and the Noble: The Longing for Immortality

The contrast between the father and the second captive finds a parallel among the Greeks.⁸ Indeed, Xenophon adduces powerful evidence of the existence of such a thing as human nature, amid the infinite variety of laws and customs under which human beings always live, when he depicts the enduring appeal of the noble for Greeks and non-Greeks alike. We witness this appeal at once. When the generals learn that a summit must be captured if the army is to travel safely on the second road, they make a call for volunteers from among the captains: Is anyone willing to be a good man, they ask, and offer to march on to seize the summit in question (AGATHOS ANÉR: 4.1.26)? Three captains step forward: Aristónomos of Methudria, Agasias of Stumphalia, and, in rivalry with them, Kallimachos of Parrasia. All three are Arcadian Greeks (4.1.26–28 cf. 6.2.10). Necessity creates a need for noble deeds but it would be reductionist and distorting to conceive of noble deeds as a mere means for the taming of necessity. ANAGKĒ creates an opportunity in the eyes of these gallant captains: they are *welcoming* the chance to be good men. They are manifestly pursuing the noble as something intrinsically choice worthy even apart from considerations of honor, superiority, or reputation. Yet why is the noble so attractive to them? After all, courage is risky. Most of

⁸ Of course, fathers vary in point of nobility as well: 4.6.1–3.

the captains actually refused to offer their services.⁹ Why is the noble so attractive to a high-minded minority?

Let us go back to the sacrifice of the father, perhaps the noblest of the noble deeds depicted in book four. Evidently at the root of the father's deed is parental love or, more generally stated, *eros*. We are therefore invited to reflect on the relation between *eros* and the noble. Xenophon helps us see that that relation is not a simple one. In the wake of the invasion of Kardouchia, the generals of the Ten Thousand release most of the pack animals and all the recently captured slaves. Smarting from their first losses, they seek to reduce the size of the baggage-train:

This having been decided, [the generals] had it proclaimed to [release animals and the slaves]. When [the troops] had had breakfast and were marching, the generals stood in a narrows, and if they found anything that had been mentioned but had not been discarded, they took it away. And the troops obeyed, unless someone concealed something, for example out of desire for an attractive boy or woman. (4.1.13–14, my emphasis)¹⁰

Eros caused the father to die trying to protect his daughter; *eros* causes soldiers to smuggle slave-boys or concubines (cf. 4.3.19). Evidently, these soldiers think less of the common good than of their own private desires (EPITHUMEŌ). *Eros* is somehow at the root of both noble dedication and selfish gratification; it underlies the egoistic pursuit of the good as well as the selfless disregard or seeming overcoming of that pursuit. The *Anabasis* does not provide a sufficient textual basis to analyze *eros*. In fact, a comparative glance at the *Education of Cyrus* reveals that the theme of *eros* is almost completely absent from the work. This is an absence that needs to be explained. We will return to the issue.¹¹ But for now, recall that the awareness of death has been linked to the noble by Xenophon. Moreover, if we peek at his *Symposium*, we discover that he links there the performance of noble deeds to the longing for immortality, that is, to the longing to overcome death.¹² But how are "death" and "nobility" linked?

⁹ Not a single captain of the light-armed troops, as opposed to the captains of the hoplites, steps forward in the first call for volunteers (4.1.26). Only after a second call is made does Aristas the Chian step up (4.1.28). In view of this coolness, MSS. CA describe the light-armed captains as "GUMNITŌN" at 4.1.28 instead of the usual GUMNĒTŌN (GUMNITŌN=GUMNOS-ITĒS: "those-destitute-of-daring"—see the *apparata* of Hude/Peters and Dindorf). The same "misspelling" occurs at 4.1.6 (in MSS. CA) and 6.3.15 (in MSS. CBA).

¹⁰ Translation by Ambler (2008).

¹¹ For an interpretation of this absence, see pp. 299–300. The word ERŌS occurs only once in the *Anabasis* (2.5.22).

¹² Xenophon indicates that the noble deeds of gentlemen are done "with seriousness" (META SPOUDĒS: *Symposium* 1.1). He then links the capacity for seriousness to the

Many of the good things of everyday life, beginning with food and drink, must be consumed by us humans to be enjoyed. Our needs or desires for them soon reassert themselves. Greater or more intense goods, such as honors or erotic pleasures, are notably fleeting, and even a good of the soul like knowledge can be and is eventually lost by forgetfulness. The impermanence of our needs and desires, rooted in our finitude, poses the greatest difficulty of all. Present satisfaction, however genuine and deep, is somehow always qualified by an awareness that all satisfaction will one day cease. Yet our human nature is not satisfied with the enjoyment of some goods for some of the time. We long for happiness—a complete, permanent and self-sufficient good.¹³ Can the noble enable us to achieve it?¹⁴ Recall in this connection that Xenophon inspired a group of lovers of the noble by articulating the promise of the noble that it will lead somehow to happiness (3.1.43).

To repeat, *eros* cannot be analyzed adequately on the basis of the *Anabasis*. But it is no accident, I contend, that the lovers of the noble among the Ten Thousand come to the fore as the army is facing its gravest threats yet. Being confronted with death on every side, these men become eager to dedicate themselves. Precisely their readiness to expose their needy and desiring being, and even to sacrifice this being, should it become necessary to do so, instills a hope in their souls that they will thereby lay hold of a good that is unsullied by mercenary considerations. They will partake of a good that is pristine and pure—good-in-itself—not merely as a means to fill the needs and desires of a being at once changing and impermanent; but as the end of all ends. To state this point paradoxically, the lovers of the noble hope to achieve happiness by overcoming or silencing their concern for their own good. The noble is deeply appealing, then, because it promises a kind of self-transcendence—a victory over a human nature steeped in change, becoming, and finitude. And insofar as the noble is put in the service of a higher cause—in this case, the welfare of the army—it promises a participation in the perennity of that cause.

That the Greeks ascribe signal importance to the recovery of the bodies of the slain is stressed in the present context (4.1.19, 4.2.18–19). Of course, burying the dead was a duty of Greek piety. Yet it is less this duty than

preoccupation with immortality or, more precisely, he links the *incapacity* for seriousness to an easygoing dismissal of the very idea of becoming immortal (1.15).

¹³ As the Platonic Diotima puts it: "*eros* is of the good, being one's own forever" (*Symposium* 205e7–206b8).

¹⁴ If death as such cannot be overcome, a state of happiness can perhaps be approximated by dulling one's awareness of death. J.-J. Rousseau was apparently tempted by this path: see the *Promenade du Rêveur Solitaire* (fifth promenade). For a discussion, Bruell (2007).

the resolve of the Greeks to do, within the limits of the possible, "everything that is customary for good men" that is stressed by Xenophon here (ANDRASIN AGATHOÏS: 4.2.23).¹⁵ The generals even agree to exchange their one and only guide—amid mortal dangers—to recover the bodies of the slain (4.2.23). Even and precisely in death, good men possess a worth that must be acknowledged by the living. The brave must be honored. And their ultimate sacrifice is honored partly by a smaller, yet not insignificant, sacrifice on the part of the living (4.2.23–24). What is thereby being honored is not just the serviceability of these men—some of whom died in vain—but their dedication. The living and the fallen alike reach for self-transcendence.

* * *

Let us return to our story. About two thousand troops march into the mountain toward the evening. They are led by the volunteers and by the second captive who acts as their guide. A heavy rain helps conceal this departure (4.2.1–2). To ensure that they escape the enemy's notice as much as possible, Xenophon leads the rearguard toward the visible pass, drawing his attention to himself. Meanwhile, the troops in question circle around and easily capture the hidden summit. They hold it overnight. At dawn they proceed silently along the path leading from the hidden summit to the visible pass that commands the main road. Their approach is concealed by a morning mist. When the two sides detect each other, the Greeks sound the trumpet, sing the war cry, and they attack. The Kardouchoi turn and flee. The pass is captured and the volunteers are reunited with the main army.

From the point of view of the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, the main event of the day involves Xenophon and the rearguard (4.2.9ff.). He had been marching on the second road along with the pack animals, positioning half his troops in front of them and half behind. He chances upon a hill that is occupied by the enemy. Since the hill commands the road, it is necessary either to dislodge the enemy or to get separated from the main army. The Greeks therefore charge the hill in straight columns, leaving a path for the enemy to escape. The column marches safely by the hill. A second hill is soon encountered that is likewise occupied; it seems best to attack this one also. Yet if the first hill is abandoned (Xenophon reflects) the enemy will perhaps recapture it and fall upon the baggage-train as it

¹⁵ Xenophon is silent about the duty of burying the dead as a duty of piety. Contrast the context of the burial of the dead at 6.4.9.

proceeds along. (The column stretches a long way along a narrow road.) Xenophon therefore leaves three captains to guard the hill: two of them are Athenians (Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs) and one is an Argive exile (Archagoras). Leading the other troops he seizes the second hill. But a further effort is still needed: the Greeks stand before a third hill, by far the steepest, which lies above the summit previously captured by the volunteers. To the Greeks' surprise, however, the enemy evacuates this position: he has gone off to attack the Hellenic rearguard. Xenophon (who does not yet realize this) ascends the third peak with his youngest men and he orders the rest to go on ahead and put down their weapons on the level ground.

At that moment, the captain Archagoras comes fleeing and says that they have been cut off from the first hill and that Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs have both been killed, along with the troops that did not leap down the rocks to reach the rearguard (4.2.17). Having accomplished this, the enemy is now gathering on a hill nearby. The next moment, Xenophon is conversing with the Kardouchoi about a truce and for the recovery of the dead. Meanwhile the Greek column marches by while the enemy is gathering in strength. Soon, the Kardouchoi break off all negotiation and make a stand. Xenophon evacuates the hill and descends slowly toward his troops. But the Kardouchoi roll down rocks from the summit. The leg of one soldier is shattered, and Xenophon's shield-bearer deserts him, taking his shield with him. Thankfully, Eurulochos of Lusias, an Arcadian hoplite, rushes up the hill and throws his shield in front of Xenophon and himself. The other troops reach the men on the level ground. The entire Greek army is finally reunited. That evening, the Greeks are lodged comfortably. The joy is palpable. The day had been hard (4.2.22).

The scene of the seizure of the hidden summit highlights the appeal of the noble even as it calls attention to its problematic character. If our spirit is buoyed by the gallant and successful action of Eurulochos, who probably saves Xenophon's life, the unhappy fate of the captains Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs gives us pause. Both men are killed while protecting the baggage train.¹⁶ The captain Archagoras, by contrast, throws himself down the rocks and he saves his skin. The fate of the three captains mirrors the fate of the Kardouchian father—who resisted his interrogator and was slaughtered—on the one hand, and of the second captive—who gave in and survived—on the other (4.3.23). The scene thus illustrates

¹⁶ The central character at 4.2.13 is "Amphikratēs, son of Amphidēmos, an Athenian." "Amphidēmos" means "for-the-sake-of-the-people" (AMPHI-DĒMOS).

the possible disjunction between the noble and the good.¹⁷ To be sure, Eurulochos shows that the noble and the good can be conjoined.¹⁸ But insofar as the Socratic King orders Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs to stand guard over the hill—and both men are killed—his rule falls short of conjoining these considerations for the benefit of the two captains and of some of his men.

To this conclusion it can be objected that it is wrong to suggest that the noble action of Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs was not good. It was good precisely because it was noble. It was intrinsically good—good-in-itself—if perhaps not good in an instrumental sense.¹⁹ Of course (the argument runs) the noble action of the two men caused their death. But what human action can guarantee success? To this line of argument, however, it can be countered that if the noble action of these men was, per hypothesis, intrinsically good, or good-in-itself, it must have been profitable for them—good for their souls, if in no other way. (Otherwise, it is hard to see how their action can be said to be *good*. For, we are assuming that it was not good merely for the army.) Yet precisely if the action of the two men was good in the sense of being somehow profitable for them, in what sense was it selfless? The selfless and the profitable are mutually exclusive notions. On the other hand, if the action was *not* selfless—if it was merely the (potentially) most profitable action that was possible under the circumstances—in what sense was it a *noble* action? We are once again hitting against the core dilemma we discussed in chapter two. It seems that it cannot be resolved on the terms hitherto considered.

¹⁷ The scene also illustrates the possible disjunction between the common good and the good of the individual. Moreover, it highlights a tension between the noble and the demands of humanity. For, the noble—that is, the noble understood as political courage—is inseparable, so to speak, from the infliction of harm. The volunteers are running risks for the sake of the Greek army. Their very success is bound to inflict harm upon the locals, however, including perhaps the daughter of the Kardouchian father. Indeed, without the slaughter of the father, there would have been no occasion for the volunteers to act courageously. Conversely, the courage of the father might have saved his daughter, but it would have done so at the cost of many Greek lives, perhaps even the destruction of the entire army (cf. 3.5.16). While the goal of courage need not be the infliction of harm, such harm follows closely in the wake of courage. The love of the noble is rooted in the longing for immortality, but it issues—paradoxically—in deeds that cause deaths. Another illustration of the problem is 4.7.1–14, esp. §13–14.

¹⁸ There is no doubt that Xenophon's sympathies lie with Eurulochos and his likes, not with Archagoras. Xenophon notes that Archagoras was an Argive "exile" (PHUGAS: 4.2.13) who saved himself by "flight" (PEPHEUGŌS: 4.2.17). He was in the habit of leaving the scene.

¹⁹ Consider what Socrates says about the good at *Memorabilia* 3.8. For the noble, consider *Symposium* c.5 and *Memorabilia* 3.8.

ii) *Necessity and the Noble: An Example from Piety*

Of the seven books of the *Anabasis*, book four is the only one from which the gods are, so to speak, absent. No oath is pronounced by any character at any point, and the book contains only rare references to sacrifices, prayers, divinations, omens, and the like. Moreover, a series of atmospheric events, including a heavy rain, a snow storm, and a morning mist are all described as natural occurrences. Yet these events, or the helpful ones among them, could have been interpreted as partial fulfillments of the omen of safety of Zeus Savior (3.2.9). Of course, the virtual absence of piety and the gods from book four is appropriate in one respect: in the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, these themes are treated in book three (in the context of the rule of the Socratic King at least). Yet in another respect, the absence of piety and the gods is surprising. As we have seen, the noble holds out a promise of happiness even as the attainment of happiness is rendered problematic, on the plane of courage, by the prospect of death in battle. Divine providence represents a possible solution to a dilemma illustrated vividly by the melancholy fate of Kēphisodōros and Amphikratēs.²⁰ Yet our expectation that piety and the gods will be major themes of book four is defeated: the gods essentially vanish from view as necessity comes to the fore.²¹

²⁰ Consider Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1117a29–1117b20, esp. b11–20. The problem is insoluble if we accept the assumption made at 1115a24–27.

²¹ In chapter 4.4, the Greeks conclude a truce with the governor of Armenia. According to the terms of that truce, the Armenian governor will do no injustice to the Greeks, who will be allowed to take whatever provisions they need from his country; in exchange, they will not burn local houses. Libations are poured to confirm these terms (4.4.6; for the significance of libations, cf. 4.3.13–14). Not long afterward, the Greeks transgress the truce. After a snowstorm, the companies of the army are quartered separately in a local village. There seems to be no danger in doing so since the Greeks see no enemy and the snow is thick. Yet the generals soon obtain intelligence that a hostile army is gathering somewhere in the hills (4.4.9). They collect their host again, fearing vulnerability. A group of soldiers, vexed at having to bivouac yet again, and perhaps also in a state of drunkenness, set fire to the houses. Will this transgression of the truce be punished by the gods? The very next night, an enormous amount of snow (CHIÓN APLETOS) is dumped upon the Greeks. It covers both weapons and people and hampers the baggage animals. The army is benumbed and slow to get up. The storm occurs unexpectedly: the weather had been clearing just previously (4.4.10–11). Xenophon comments as follows:

After [this snowfall, the generals] decided they had to go back to quartering in the villages, under separate roofs. Here, of course, the soldiers went with a great shout and with pleasure to their roofed quarters and provisions. But all those who from presumptuous sin (ATASTHALIA) had burned down their houses when they had left previously now suffered the punishment of being badly quartered. (4.4.14; translation by Ambler [2008], which I modified slightly) The sinners were punished by the necessary consequence of their own action.

The disappearance of piety and the gods is virtually complete in the first five chapters of book four, where necessity prevails (4.1–4.5).²² Yet it is precisely in that group of chapters, and in the central chapter, that the pattern of disappearance is spectacularly broken. At the river Kentritēs, Xenophon becomes a vessel of divine providence as he guides the Ten Thousand across the waters after the discovery of a ford harbingered by a

Let me add an observation about this episode. Wishing to know the truth about the stragglers' report that a hostile army is gathering somewhere in the hills, the Greeks dispatch a scouting party led by a certain DĒMOCRATĒS. This scout deserves our attention. The MSS. unanimously dub him a "TEMENITĒS" (4.4.15). Many scholars have wondered, however, about his actual place of origin. "TEMENITĒS" is an obscure word that does not refer to any obvious city. Some scholars have concluded (on the authority of Stephanus of Byzantium) that the word refers to the citizens of a minor city located somewhere in Phrygia, or perhaps to the citizens of an equally small place in Sicily (e.g., Dindorf). Yet it is not even clear that these hamlets actually existed. Others invoke Thucydides (6.75, 6.100) to conclude that "TEMENITĒS" must refer to an inhabitant of a particular district of Syracuse (e.g., Dakyns). But in that case, why not simply say that DĒMOCRATĒS is a Syracusan (cf. 1.2.9, 1.10.14)? Most scholars, however, have chosen to emend the unanimous MSS. By far the most popular proposal reads TĒMNITĒS instead of TEMENITĒS, which would make DĒMOCRATĒS a citizen Temnus, in the Asiatic Aeolids (e.g., Masqueray, Hude/Peters, Marchant, and Gemoll.) Another proposal, based on Strabo and Pausanias, reads TĒMENITĒS, which would make DĒMOCRATĒS a citizen of Temenum in the Argolid.

I fear that this abstruse scholarly controversy clarifies nothing except the dangers of historical knowledge about petty facts. But it does have the merit of calling attention to a puzzle which, if resolved properly, illuminates Xenophon's manner of writing about piety and the gods. The obscurity or nonexistence of any city whose citizens were known as "TEMENITĒS" should lead us to consider the possibility that Xenophon is *not* referring to the citizenship of DĒMOCRATĒS in this passage. Rather, he is describing his *character*: "TEMENITĒS" is a nickname. Observe that this so-called "TEMENITĒS" is mentioned in the same breath as the burning of the houses (4.4.14–15). "TEMENITĒS" is a Xenophic neologism to be read as TEMENOS-ITĒS: "he-who-is-rash-in-his-treatment-of-the-sacred-precincts." Xenophon is adumbrating, I believe, that DĒMOCRATĒS was among the soldiers who set fire to the houses protected by the truce: he did *not* treat them with the reverence due to consecrated ground. (TEMENOS, which means "consecrated ground" or "sacred precinct," occurs fairly often in Xenophon: e.g., *Education of Cyrus* 7.5.35, 8.3.1; *Hellenika* 6.5.27, 7.1.31; also *On Revenues* 4.19.) My interpretation of "TEMENITĒS" is confirmed by the following consideration: the deed of DĒMOCRATĒS, and the view of the divine which must have underlain it, unlocks the meaning of Xenophon's otherwise oddly pointed description of the man: HOŪTOS GAR EDOKEI KAI PROTERON POLLA EDE ALĒTHEŪSAI TOIAŪTA, TA ONTA TE HŌS ONTA KAI TA MĒ ONTA HŌS OUK ONTA (4.4.15). Regarding this last sentence, Flower (2012) observes that "the last part of [it] sounds odd" but suggests quite plausibly that the sentence is a version of the famous dictum of Protagoras: "Man is the measure of all things, of the things that are, that they are, and of the things that are not, that they are not" (p. 37). Yet the key question Flower eludes: What could have possessed Xenophon to compare the inconsequential scout DĒMOCRATĒS to the famous sophist Protagoras? If the parallel drawn by Flower is correct, the reason would have to be this: both believe that *man* is the measure of being.

²² Aside from the episode of the crossing of the Kentritēs, piety and the gods make a single appearance in the first five chapters, at 4.5.3–4. I offer the following explanation

dream (4.3). The episode depicts the workings of divine providence—the single most conspicuous illustration of the workings of divine providence during the entire march to the sea.²³ We must therefore explain how this episode illuminates the theme of book four: how the Socratic King endeavors to conjoin or reconcile the noble (courage) with safety and advantage. We will discover that this episode shows the kind of courage—nay, the kind of audacity—that successful rule requires under ANAGKĒ. But since I wish to convey Xenophon's thought with a light touch, let me simply tell the story of the crossing of the Kentritēs. I will add seven notes of my own.

* * *

The river Kentritēs is about two hundred feet wide. It marks the border between Kardouchia and Armenia. On their last night in Kardouchia, the Greeks bivouac comfortably in hillside villages, about two-thirds of a mile from the river. They are pleased to see the plain. For during their week-long march through Kardouchia, they suffered more evils than all they had suffered at the hands of the King and of Tissaphernēs (cf. 3.5.16). In the belief that they are rid of these troubles, they sleep pleasantly this night (4.3.2).

But at dawn the Greeks see horsemen across the river, fully armed as though to prevent the crossing, as well as infantry stationed on the high banks, above the horsemen, as though to prevent an invasion of Armenia. The Greeks attempt to cross at a favorable point. But the waters are more than breast-deep and the riverbed is rough with large slippery stones. Nor can they maintain their grip on the weapons when immersed. The current is too strong. And if they carry their weapons on their heads they leave themselves vulnerable. They must therefore retreat. But once they are encamped along the banks, they see a large band of armed Kardouchoi gathered in the hills where they themselves had been encamped the night before.

At that point, deep despondency seizes the Greeks. They see a river in front of them that is hardly passable, men who intend to prevent the crossing, and the Kardouchoi who will fall upon their rear if they attempt to cross. The rest of the day and the next night is spent in great perplexity.

of that single occurrence. Chap. 4.5 is divided into two well-marked moments: the worst of times (4.5.1–22) and the best of times (4.5.23–36). The first moment is introduced by a diviner (4.5.3–4), the second moment by a "hunter" (4.5.24). Piety and the gods gradually return to the fore after chapter five—the nadir of the Greeks' necessities—and especially after the scene atop Mount Ēchēs: 4.6.23, 4.6.27, 4.8.7, 4.8.16; also 4.8.25.

²³ Between the army's vow to offer sacrifices to the gods upon reaching a friendly country (3.2.9) and the actual performance of these sacrifices on the shores of the Black Sea (4.8.25).

But at this low ebb of their fortune, heaven intervenes. Much like what had happened when the generals were ensnared by Tissaphernēs—the other nadir of Greek despondency and perplexity—Xenophon has a dream.²⁴ In it, it seems to him that his feet are bound in fetters. But they spontaneously fall off so he is free to walk around or cross over (DIABAINŌ) as he wishes (4.3.8).²⁵ At daybreak, Xenophon imparts the contents of the dream to Cheirisophos, and he says that he is hopeful that all will be fine (KALOS: 4.3.8). Cheirisophos is pleased to hear of the dream. With the first gleam of daylight all the generals offer a sacrifice. On the first attempt the victims are propitious (KALA: 4.3.9). Order is then given to the army to prepare breakfast. The ensuing scene deserves to be quoted in full:

While Xenophon was having his breakfast, two youths ran up to him; for they all knew it was possible to go up to him as he was having breakfast or dinner or, even if he were sleeping, to wake him and tell him anything one had to say that related to the war. And on this occasion they said that they chanced to be collecting sticks for a fire, and then—on the opposite bank, among some rocks that came down right to the river itself—they caught sight of an old man, women, and young girls, putting, it appeared, bags of clothes in a cavernous rock. When they saw this, they said, it seemed safe to cross over, for it was not at this point accessible even to the enemy's horsemen. So, they said,²⁶ they stripped naked, keeping only their daggers and began to cross, intending to investigate. But going forward, they were across before they got their genitals wet. Once across, they took the clothes and came back again. (4.3.10–12)²⁷

Immediately upon hearing this story, Xenophon pours a libation and bids the youths fill the cup and pray to the gods—who have shown the dream and the ford—to bring to fulfillment the good things remaining (AGATHOS). Having poured the libation, Xenophon immediately takes the youths to Cheirisophos. Upon hearing their story, Cheirisophos pours a libation as well. After pouring the libation, they pass the word

²⁴ The other dream of Xenophon is at 3.1.11–12.

²⁵ Xenophon's second dream depicts a spontaneous liberation, whereas his first dream had depicted an imprisonment (3.1.11–12). The imprisonment was at the hands of Zeus the King. The word I translate as "spontaneously" is AUTOMATA. In keeping with this, the two youths "chanced to be" collecting sticks for a fire when they discovered the ford (TUGCHANŌ: 4.3.11).

²⁶ Consider the repeated use of "they said."

²⁷ Translation by Ambler (2008). I chose to modify it. The fastidious reader must compare 4.3.12 with 1.4.17 and 3.2.22. The use of the double adverb PROSTHEN...PRIN creates a studied ambiguity of epiphanic proportions.

along to the others to pack up. They themselves gather the generals to discuss how best (KALLISTA) to cross the river so as to defeat those in front and suffer no evil (KAKOS) from those at the back. It is decided that Cheirisophos will lead the way with half the troops; Xenophon will stay behind with the other half; the pack animals and the noncombatants will cross between the two divisions.

The crossing of the Kentritēs highlights the tactical skills and cool-headedness of Xenophon. If I were being less than fastidious, I would say that it illustrates his audacity as well. The ford is about half a mile away. The Greeks march with the river on their left, guided by the two youths. The Armenian cavalry keeps apace of them on the opposite bank. When they reach the ford, they put down their weapons. Cheirisophos first wreathes himself and strips down. He then picks up his arms and orders all to follow his example. Meanwhile, the enemy shoots his arrows and slingstones but is out of range. The Hellenic soothsayers slaughter victims to the river. The victims are propitious (KALA: 4.3.19). All the soldiers sing the paean and raise the war cry. All the women join in the screaming (SUNŌLOLUDZŌ), "for," Xenophon observes pointedly, "there were many concubines in the army" (4.3.19).²⁸ The dream of Xenophon and above all his response to the story of the two youths have spawned a fever pitch of confidence and enthusiasm. Cheirisophos steps into the waters. Xenophon takes his most nimble men and runs at full speed *back* toward a point of possible crossing. His feint is intended to suggest that he will intercept the enemy on the other side after fording there. When the Armenian horsemen see that Cheirisophos is easily crossing and that Xenophon is racing back, they fear being intercepted and flee at full speed. They race uphill and disappear into the mountain; close on their heels are their own infantry troops.

When Xenophon sees that the situation across the river is fine (KALOS), he races back to the army as quickly as possible. For the Kardouchoi are coming down from the hills and into the plain to attack the Hellenic rear. The baggage-train and the noncombatants are still crossing the river. Xenophon turns around to face the approaching enemy. Orders are given: the quarter-companies will be led leftward to deploy the phalanx; the captains and the heads of quarter-companies are to meet the Kardouchoi while the rear-leaders will stay along the river. The Kardouchoi now

²⁸ According to LSJ, SUNŌLOLUDZŌ ("to scream with," "to chant together") is *hapax legomena*. Presumably, it has the same double meaning as OLOLUDZŌ—joyous scream or painful scream. Of course, the women here are screaming with joy. They are grateful to the gods for the discovery of the ford. The scene occurs on the spot where other women had been sighted earlier (4.3.11).

advance more rapidly, seeing that the ranks of the Hellenes are sparse. Since the situation is safe on his side of the river, Cheirisophos sends the army's peltasts and light-armed troops back to Xenophon, ordering them to do whatever he bids. But as soon as Xenophon sees them starting to re-cross, he countermands Cheirisophos's order. They are to go into the water *only* when his rearguard starts to ford—as if they meant to re-cross on each side of the rearguard. They are also to keep their javelins and their bows at the ready. But they are *not* to advance far into the waters. As for those with him, Xenophon gives them their final orders: when the slings of the enemy begin to reach, they must sing the paean and take a run at them; when the enemy is put to flight and the trumpet sounds the charge, they must turn around and flee as fast as they can, crossing the river while keeping their place: "The best man will be the one who gets to the other side first" (ARISTOS [ANĒR]: 4.3.29). Courage sometimes means to be first in flight.

The Kardouchoi press the rearguard hard with their slings and bows. But the Greeks sing the paean and take a run at them. The Kardouchoi, ill-equipped for hand-to-hand combat, turn and flee. When the trumpet sounds the charge, the Kardouchoi redouble their speed. But the Greeks turn around and flee across the river as quickly as possible. Some Kardouchoi realize what is happening and run back toward the river, wounding a few soldiers. But most are still visibly fleeing when the Greeks are standing safely across the river. Some Greeks try to be manly, however (ANDRIDZOMAI: 4.3.34), and advance too far into the river. Some of these are wounded by the Kardouchoi as well.

The crossing of the Kentritēs is thus a remarkable success. The dream of Xenophon, the deed of the two youths, and the restored confidence of the army all made it possible. But without the astonishing audacity of Xenophon these causes would not have come together to produce this effect. It is in memory of that audacity that Xenophon renamed the river the "Kentritēs"—"The-River-That-Spurred-Audacity" (KENTRIDZŌ-ITĒS).²⁹ Yet there is another, less evident cause of Xenophon's success. In his final exhortation to the rearguard, Xenophon equates "the best man" with "the man who is first in flight" (4.3.29). He equates the noble with the good (understood as the useful or the safe). He exhorts on the basis of the moral utilitarianism of Socrates. To be sure, it would have been ill-advised and potentially disastrous for the soldiers to stand their ground and "try to be manly," as some soldiers in fact did. To run fast was critical. But Xenophon was a master orator. He could have exhorted his troops to

²⁹ KENTRIDZŌ means "to spur" or "to prick." It is used at *Education of Cyrus* 8.7.12, *Symposium* 8.24; also at *On Horsemanship* 11.6.

run fast without making the equation in question. A single exhortation admittedly cannot establish Xenophon's stance toward Socratic utilitarianism. In fact, book four of the *Anabasis* is conspicuous for *not* equating (for the most part) the noble with the good. The text remains close to the everyday moral perspective, where the noble is both distinct from the good and in some degree of tension with the good. Xenophon does not attempt to define (or to redefine) the noble as whatever is useful or necessary. For the noble cannot be adequately understood if it is readily conceived of as a mere means, or if it is summarily redefined as the useful or the necessary. The deepest appeal of the noble lies in the fact that it makes *demands* on us, calling for dedication and self-sacrifice, as we have seen. To understand the noble is thus, in part, to understand this appeal.

This said, Xenophon makes it clear that the noble cannot be understood apart from the good either. Courage becomes indistinguishable from recklessness unless we take into account the good, beyond courage itself, which courage somehow serves: the welfare of the army. The soldiers who were "trying to be manly" were not only risking their own lives needlessly, they were undermining the collective safety; they were standing their ground not least to avoid the *appearance* of fleeing before an enemy they had defeated once before. Xenophon's derogatory use of ANDRIDZOMAI indicates that he denies that such actions are genuinely courageous (4.3.34). More generally, he causes us to wonder whether an action that severs the link between the noble and the good can ever be genuinely noble. And yet the example of the soldiers who tried to be manly illustrates that courage is liable to drift in that direction. Precisely because courage stands in some degree of tension with the good—precisely because its deepest appeal is its nobility—courage is prone to cast away the good altogether and become mere unyieldingness, blind to circumstances or consequences. But Xenophon rejects this temptation. And though the present scene is insufficient to establish this conclusion, it is hardly a stretch to suggest that Xenophon's Socratic education underlies his rejection.³⁰

³⁰ Consider *Symposium* c. 5 and *Memorabilia* 3.8. The word KALOS is used seven times in the present chapter (4.3.8, §9, §14, §16, §19, §24, §25). AGATHOS is used only once, but in a prominent place (4.3.13). KAKOS ("bad") is also used once (4.3.14). The passage at 4.3.14 is interesting: the situation in the van of the army is judged by the standard of KALOS; the situation in the rear of the army (where Xenophon is stationed) is judged by the standard of AGATHOS (4.3.14). This observation is confirmed by 4.3.24–25 (2X), on the one hand, and by 4.3.29ff., on the other. Indeed, it is the light-armed troops who are sent from the van to the rear—once the situation in the van has become boringly safe (ASPHALOS: 4.3.27)—who will pursue the noble, "try to be manly," and get wounded (4.3.34).

iii) *Necessity and the Noble: Pointing toward the Philosophic Life*

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the epoch of belief, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.

The fortunes of the Ten Thousand reach their low ebb in the uplands of Armenia (4.5).³¹ After three desolate stages, they cross the Euphrates with waters reaching up to their navels. They are then compelled to march for four consecutive days through as much as six feet of snow with sandals and no winter clothing.³² Several pack animals and slaves perish, and upward of thirty soldiers. On the third day after crossing the Euphrates, a glacial northerly wind blows opposite them, parching everything on its path and freezing the men stiff. The night is spent burning fires. The first men to arrive at the day's station find much wood there. Yet none is left for the latecomers and the first group will not let them near the flame except in exchange for food. The men thus share with each other what little they have.

The next day is spent marching through deep snow. Several human beings suffer from hunger-faintness. Xenophon, who commands the rear-guard, encounters people lying on the ground and does not know what ails them. But someone with experience tells him that they are clearly suffering from hunger-faintness. "If they eat something, they'll get up" (4.5.8). Xenophon therefore scours the pack animals in search of food or drink. Whatever he finds he distributes to the afflicted: he takes care of the men. Meanwhile, Cheirisophos and the van reach a village around dusk. They catch a group of women and girls fetching water outside a stockade. Since darkness is setting in, they follow them inside. But all the

³¹ Ainsworth (1875) writes: "The knowledge which we now possess of the great elevation of these Armenian uplands explains the extreme severity of the winters, which has been the subject of much controversy; [...] The Hon. Mr. Curzon, who spent the winter of 1842-1843 at Arzrum, speaking of the intense cold experienced at that city, the present capital of Armenia, says, 'During great part of the year [sic], and naturally in the winter, the cold was so severe that any one standing still for even a very short time, was frozen to death. Dead frozen bodies were frequently brought into the city; and it is common in the summer, on the melting of the snow, to find numerous corpses of men and bodies of horses, who had perished in the preceding winter. So usual an event is this, that there is a custom, or law, in the mountains of Armenia, that every summer the villagers go out to the more dangerous passes and bury the dead whom they are sure to find.' [...] This will give some idea of what the Greeks had to suffer during a winter journey across the uplands of Armenia" (pp. 319-20).

³² Soldiers make rough boots for themselves from the hide of flayed oxen (4.5.14).

soldiers who fail to complete the day's march must bivouac overnight in the plain without food or fire. And some of them perish.

Xenophon paints a pitiful portrait of the hindmost portion of the column. He acknowledges that some men were left behind due to manifold necessities (4.5.15; §12). For, there were bands of enemies hanging on the heels of the marching army, snatching exhausted pack animals and fighting over the spoils. Among the abandoned soldiers were some who were suffering from snow blindness and others with toes rotted off by the cold. A group of exhausted soldiers had noticed a spot in a dell where a spring was melting the snow. They turned their steps thither, sat down, and refused to march. When Xenophon saw them, he begged them with every art and every device not to be left behind. In the end he got angry: "But they bid him slaughter them. For they said they could not march any more" (4.5.16). Moved by such pitiful distress, Xenophon thinks it best to attempt to scare off the pursuing enemy if he can, lest they attack the sick: for the first time in the *Anabasis*, a group of Hellenes has given up, defeated by the power of necessity. Xenophon succeeds in his feint. He reassures the soldiers that a rescue party will come for them the next day before resuming his own march. Soon, however, he stumbles upon scattered soldiers who are lying in the snow, all covered up, and without any guard being posted anywhere. Since the column is at rest in this way, further advance becomes impossible. Xenophon and the rearguard must bivouac without fire or dinner. The next morning they manage to reach Cheirisophos after rescuing their exhausted comrades.

If the Ten Thousand experience the worst of times during the first seven days they spend in the uplands of Armenia, the next seven days usher in the best of times. The companies of the army are quartered separately in villages that they discover near the first stockade. The troops regain their strength there. Local houses are underground structures where space is shared between humans and animals—goats, sheep, cattle, fowls, and their offspring. Also discovered there is an abundance of wheat, corn, beans, as well as large bowls of a strong but very pleasant barley wine. Needless to say, the starving Hellenes feast on these victuals. The morning after his arrival, Xenophon visits the scattered encampments. Everywhere he is offered meals of lamb, kid, piglets, veal, and fowl, along with loaves of wheat or barley bread. The soldiers are enjoying the barley wine and drinking to each other's health. Xenophon finds Cheirisophos and his men comfortably encamped, crowned with wreaths of dry grass and being served by Armenian children (4.5.33).³³

³³ Evidently, Cheirisophos had performed a sacrifice of thanksgiving, though Xenophon does not say this in so many words: piety and the gods are, so to speak, absent from

There, too, a feast is proceeding in an atmosphere of hearty comradeship. In the midst of harsh necessity the Ten Thousand experience a moment of well-earned comfort and joy.

The philosopher Leo Strauss has observed that the march in the uplands of Armenia is located at the center of the *Anabasis*: chapter five is the twenty-sixth of the fifty-one chapters of the work.³⁴ Chapter five is also near the center of book four, which is itself the central book of the work. What is the reason for this manifold centrality? Is it that chapter five is at the halfway point of the march? For, while the Greeks are hardly out of the woods yet, their situation will improve henceforth. Yet this reason does not explain why about half of chapter five describes the best of times. A better reason is pointed to by Strauss:

When we turn from the *Anabasis* to the *Education of Cyrus* (III 1.14 and 38–39), we find in the latter work and only there a kind of explanation of the distinction accorded to Armenia in the *Anabasis*. The son of the king of Armenia had a friend, a “sophist,” who suffered the fate of Socrates because the king of Armenia was envious of his son’s admiring that “sophist” more than his own father and therefore accused that “sophist” of “corrupting” his son.³⁵

A close reading of chapter five lends support to this interpretation. For the chapter in question contains several pointers to Socrates and “sophistry.” Xenophon says, for example, that the Armenian village where he and his troops were encamped had been captured with all its inhabitants inside, including the daughter of the village chief. She was a young bride wedded just a few days earlier: “But her husband had gone off to hunt hares and he was not caught in the village” (4.5.24). The remark is curious. Why does Xenophon pause to mention an anonymous hunter—who plays no role in the story—let alone his preference for hunting hares? One scholar evokes Xenophon’s love of hunting: “Here was a man, one feels, who

4.5.23–36. (Consider, e.g., the central placement of CHOIREIA at 4.5.31 and cf. 7.8.5: piglets are here but food on a table.) For his part, Xenophon expressed his gratitude in his own characteristic way. He had a rather old horse, he writes, which he gave to the village chief to fatten up and sacrifice because he heard that the animal was sacred to the Sun. He feared that the horse, maimed by the march, might actually die. To replace the horse, he took for himself one of the seventeen colts that he found in his village. These colts were being nourished (he says twice) “as a tribute for the King” (4.5.24, §34). The purpose of the tribute is indicated in the *Education of Cyrus* (8.3.12, §24).

³⁴ Regarding the authenticity of the division of the *Anabasis* into fifty-one chapters, see Appendix 2.

³⁵ Strauss (1983) p. 119.

was after Xenophon’s own heart.”³⁶ This suggestion is helpful provided we keep in mind that “hunting” is a frequent metaphor in Xenophon for “philosophy.” For Xenophon explicitly and repeatedly compares Socrates to a hunter (of good friends), and his “hunting” is once likened to the hunting of hares. The metaphor occurs not only in two of the Socratic writings—the *Memorabilia* and the *Symposium*—but also in the *Education of Cyrus* and in *On Hunting with Dogs*.³⁷ Moreover, the closing scene of the *Symposium* shows that, like the Armenian husband, Socrates preferred to be out “hunting” than at home with his wife. He was a “de facto bachelor.”³⁸ Chapter five lies at the exact center of the *Anabasis* because it beckons toward Socrates and the activity he embodies.³⁹

Yet this explanation of the centrality of chapter five of book four seems incomplete. After all, it would have been easy for a man endowed with Xenophon’s literary talents to choose any geographic location for the center of his work and to include *there* unobtrusive and fictional pointers to Socrates. For, let me be clear: there is no evidence that philosophy existed among the Armenians. If the unnamed hunter of hare was a real person, he was surely no Socrates. In other words, the center of the *Anabasis* was created by Xenophon’s artfulness; it was not foreordained by geographic or historical considerations. Why, then, does Armenia in particular deserve to be put at the center of the *Anabasis*?⁴⁰

³⁶ Lane Fox (2004) p. 188.

³⁷ *Memorabilia* 2.6.28ff., 3.11 as a whole (esp. §7–8); consider how Socrates speaks of his KUNODROMEÖ (“hunting with running dogs”) at *Symposium* 4.63; *Education of Cyrus* 3.1.38; “hunting” as a metaphor for “philosophy” is a major thread of the *Kunägetikos*. The central chapter of the treatise, for example, discusses how puppies should be reared for the hunt. Xenophon stresses that the best-endowed “puppies” should be held back for a while lest they hurt themselves through their very vigor (7.7–9). The metaphor in question also explains the otherwise enigmatic fact that the final chapter of the opusculum discusses and criticizes the sophistic education (chap. 13). Plato, too, uses “hunting” as a metaphor for philosophy: for example, *Laws* 822d3–824a22.

³⁸ Bartlett (1996c), p. 183.

³⁹ Indeed, the chapter does so in other ways as well: see Appendix 2. In addition to the evidence adduced in that Appendix, Xenophon stresses that the best of times last seven days (4.6.1). The number seven was endowed with symbolic meaning by the Pythagoreans: it was apparently the number of nature (cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1093a13ff.). Once we recall that Xenophon was somehow thinking of Pythagoras at the beginning of the *Anabasis* (1.4.2), we see that he allowed himself to relapse into a “philosophic” frame of mind, if only for a moment, amid the comfort and joy of Armenia.

⁴⁰ I thus disagree with Strauss on one point. The *Education of Cyrus* cannot explain “the distinction accorded to Armenia in the *Anabasis*.” It is rather the other way around: the historical work, the *Anabasis*, explains the fictional *Education of Cyrus*. It is because of what Armenia means to Xenophon—because of his experience of Armenian necessity—that a “sophist” is given a cameo in the fictional Armenia of the *Education of Cyrus*.

To discover the missing explanation, we must interpret the events of Armenia in light of the fact that book four is the book of both necessity and the noble. Book four points to the plane on which these two notions need to be considered. For, my analysis hitherto has been inadequate. I have been using the word "necessity" to mean "great difficulty" or "mortal danger." But of course, the primary meaning of necessity is not difficulty or mortal danger but "what is unchanging" or "permanent." The necessary is what *must* exist in the exact way that it does. The necessary is the eternal and the eternal is the necessary.⁴¹ Moreover, knowledge in the highest sense is knowledge of the necessary and thus the goal of philosophy, it seems, must be knowledge of necessity.⁴²

Chapter five of book four is at the exact center of the *Anabasis* because it points to the peak of the analysis of necessity and the noble. The brief moment of comfort and joy experienced by the Ten Thousand amid the manifold necessities of Armenia adumbrates the lasting contentedness that is possible amid the all-encompassing necessity—a possibility embodied by the nominal husband who would rather be out "hunting" than at home with his bride.⁴³ Moreover, the fact that this hunter makes a cameo at the heart of the book of the noble suggests that he embodies the highest form of nobility. The philosopher brings together in his own life the noble with the good.⁴⁴ He even achieves immortality insofar as this is possible for man. For if knowledge in the highest sense is knowledge of the necessary, and thus of the eternal, the philosopher can be said to partake of immortality insofar as he grasps, through thought, eternal being.⁴⁵ Chapter five is thus at the exact center of the *Anabasis* because it points toward the peak of the *logos* of the work.

⁴¹ Aristotle, *On Generation and Corruption* 337b33–338a3. The two senses of "necessity" are linked through the concept of perishing.

⁴² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1139b18–24. Cf. *Memorabilia* 1.1.11–16.

⁴³ Consider Grant (1871): "The greater part of the 'Cynegeticus' is devoted to the subject of hunting the hare; and it is perhaps a little disappointing, after all that Xenophon says about hunting in general as a preparation for war, to find such a very safe kind of sport made so prominent" (p. 164). This charming and justified complaint finds a partial explanation in the parallel between the hunting of hares and the Socratic "hunt." We must also be mindful of the connection between "safety" and "Socratism": *Memorabilia* 3.10.9–15. Unlike the two Cyruses, Xenophon had little interest in hunting wild beasts (*Anabasis* 1.9.6, *Education of Cyrus* 1.4.7–15).

⁴⁴ *Memorabilia* 1.6.14, 4.8.11.

⁴⁵ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1177b30–1178a8. We have seen that Xenophon links seriousness to the preoccupation with immortality (note 12). He also depicts Socrates becoming "most serious" when his "dancing" is the topic of discussion (MALA ESPOUDAKOTI TŌ PROSŌPŌ: *Symposium* 2.17). For "dancing" as a metaphor for "philosophy," see chapter six, pp. 222–29 and Appendix 1.—I must stress, however, that the *Anabasis* provides an insufficient basis to explore whether or how the preoccupation

2. The End of Necessity

Let us not dwell on these divine heights. Though the *Anabasis* points toward philosophy as the noblest and best life for man, it merely points in that direction. The primary aim of the book is to analyze the nobility and goodness of the *political* life. Let us repair, then, to the valley of courage. I have analyzed hitherto how the Socratic King conjoins or reconciles the noble (courage) with safety and advantage. This reconciliation—achieved under conditions of ANAGKĒ—has been less than perfect. Xenophon has been repeatedly compelled to choose between the noble and the safe course—once upon entering Kardouchia, again at the crossing of the Kentritēs, and finally in the snows of Armenia—and he has bowed repeatedly before necessity. Now consider how his rule changes when necessity ends or, at least, is no longer so exacting as to negate meaningful choice. Does Xenophon abide by the noble even at a significant cost to the good? Does he choose the good over the noble? Is he able to conjoin the noble with the good without sacrificing either? In the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, these issues are analyzed through a trio of episodes: the fight against the Chalubes (4.6), against the Taochoi (4.7), and against the Kolchoi (4.8).⁴⁶

i) Fighting Nobly against the Chalubes

After the Armenian respite, the Ten Thousand resume their march in the snow (4.6.1). Their guide keeps failing to lead them to any villages. On the third day, an angry Cheirisophos strikes him. But he neglects to tie him up. The guide runs away during the night (4.6.3). The Greeks have little choice but to follow the stream of a local river—the so-called "Phasis"⁴⁷—hoping that its waters will flow into the sea. Eventually, they resume their march inland. They encounter the Chalubes (and some of their allies), who occupy a mountain pass. Cheirisophos assembles the

with immortality remains operative in the philosophic life properly understood, to say nothing of whether philosophy has access to eternal being, if there be any such. In this connection, we have the good fortune that the best treatment of what a philosophic science is since Antiquity has been recently completed: *Aristotle As Teacher: His Introduction to a Philosophic Science*, by Christopher Bruell (St. Augustine's Press, forthcoming).

⁴⁶ These episodes are closely related. In each, Xenophon is seen to respond to the challenge of fighting nobly: 4.6.7 (... HOPŌS HŌS KALLISTA AGŌNIOUMETHA), 4.7.3 (EIS KALON HĒKETE), and 4.8.9 (... HOPŌS HŌS KALLISTA AGŌNIOUNTAI).

⁴⁷ The name "Phasis" has caused difficulties, as we saw in the introduction (p. 24). Xenophon is said to mistake the Araxes of Armenia (which he calls the "Phasis") for the well-known Phasis of Colchis (Masqueray [1930] p. 180, Baslez [1995] p. 81). Yet does he really? Even if he mistook the Araxes for the Phasis at the time of the march, Xenophon

generals and the captains to deliberate about how they might fight as nobly as possible (HOPŌS HŌS KALLISTA AGŌNIOUMETHA: 4.6.7). Should the Greeks attack right away, he asks, or wait until the next day? Kleanōr urges an immediate and frontal attack. But Xenophon proposes an alternative: the Greeks should try to "steal" the mountain:

This is my judgment (Xenophon says). If it is necessary to fight, we must prepare to fight with as much strength as possible. But if we wish to cross over as easily as possible, it seems to me we must consider how we might receive fewest wounds and lose as few bodies of our men as possible. Now, what we see of the mountain extends to more than sixty stadia, but men are nowhere visible guarding against us except along the road itself. Now, it is much better to try to steal a bit of the deserted mountain, by being unobserved, and to seize it by getting the jump, if we can, rather than to fight against strong places and men who are prepared for us. For it is much easier to march over steep ground without a battle than over level ground with enemies on this side and that [...]. To steal [the mountain] does not seem to me to be impossible, since it is possible to march at night, so as not to be seen, and it is possible to go far enough away so as not to permit any perception [of our movements]. And it seems to me that if we should pretend to attack here, we would find the rest of the mountain even more deserted, for our enemies would remain assembled here that much more. (4.6.10–13)

Xenophon ends with a jocular barb:

But why should I be the one to contribute thoughts on stealing? For I hear, Cheirisophos, that you Lacedaemonians, as many of you as are Peers, practice stealing from the time that you are boys, and it is not shameful but noble to steal anything and everything not prevented by law. And in order that you steal as quickly as possible and try to escape detection, it is therefore the law that you be whipped, if you get caught while you are stealing. Now, then, it is very much the critical moment for you to display your education and to be on guard, of course, that we do not get caught stealing some of the mountain, so we do not get a beating. (4.6.14–15)

would have known that this was an error at the time of writing the *Anabasis*: he refers to the "real" Phasis—the Phasis of Colchis—as a distinct body of water (5.6.36, 5.7.1, §5, §9). Why, then, does he preserve the mistake? To highlight the consequences of the loss of the guide? I am inclined to think that this is actually a case of renaming. The unaccented word "Phasis" (PHĀSIS) has the same spelling as the unaccented word for "accusation" (PHASIS). Xenophon has just accused Cheirisophos of mistreating and neglecting the guide, "the only disagreement between them during the march" (4.6.3). Xenophon is conveying his lingering annoyance with Cheirisophos, whose brutality and carelessness forced the army to meander for a while along "The-River-of-Accusation."

Cheirisophos replies in kind:

But I too hear that you Athenians are clever at stealing public funds, and this even though the danger is quite extreme for the thief; and, indeed, the best do it the most, if indeed the best among you are those considered worthy of ruling. So it is the time also for you to display your education. (4.6.16)⁴⁸

This playful exchange is revealing.⁴⁹ First, Xenophon invokes the Lacedaemonian law to convince Cheirisophos that stealing is noble and not shameful. Yet an important difference between the two men becomes visible. Cheirisophos is looking to fight "as nobly as possible" (HŌS KALLISTA).⁵⁰ Xenophon speaks of fighting "with as much strength as possible" (HŌS KRATISTA).⁵¹ Xenophon wishes to avoid all manner of fighting unless fighting is "necessary" (ANAGKĒ). He would prefer to cross over "as easily as possible" (HŌS RASTA). Specifically, he would like to "steal" the mountain, at least if stealing the mountain can produce a victory just as well as a frontal attack. Second, the exchange draws an oddly asymmetrical parallel between the Lacedaemonian education and the Athenian education. Cheirisophos (says Xenophon) will display his education (PAIDEIA) by showing off his skills as a thief. He was reared under a law that teaches that successful stealing is noble under certain circumstances.⁵² But how can Xenophon show off *his* education by displaying these same skills? Since the law in Athens teaches that stealing is shameful and unjust, will he not be displaying only the *failure* of that education?⁵³ Of course, this may be precisely Cheirisophos's point: he disdains the lowly and corrupt ways of the Athenians. But why does Xenophon, the author, draw attention to the effects of the Athenian education on himself? Or are we to recall here that Xenophon had received not just one but *two* educations? Paradoxical as it might sound, it may be that the tactic chosen for fighting the Chalubes will entail a display of the Socratic education of Xenophon.⁵⁴ Stated more generally, the three

⁴⁸ The translation of the entire passage 4.6.10–16 is by Ambler (2008).

⁴⁹ The jocularity signals the end of the rift between Cheirisophos and Xenophon. See note 47 above.

⁵⁰ Cf. 3.3.3, where the speaker is Cheirisophos.

⁵¹ To the same effect: 5.2.11. In the midst of mortal dangers, however, Xenophon recognizes the aptness of an exhortation to the lovers of the noble to fight or contend "as nobly as possible": 3.1.16 (cf. how he speaks to the army: 3.2.27).

⁵² Cf. *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 2.6–8. In fact, it was permitted to steal in Sparta only to relieve hunger.

⁵³ Cheirisophos remarks that in Athens "the danger is quite extreme for the thief" (4.6.16).

⁵⁴ Cf. *Education of Cyrus* 1.6.27–34.

episodes we are about to consider will be displaying the Socratic education in relation to the noble (courage).

The plan to steal the mountain is accepted. Xenophon volunteers to capture the part of the mountain that is not occupied by the Chalubes. He says that he has learned from some captives that the mountain is not inaccessible but that goats and cattle graze upon it. He adds that he hopes or expects (ELPIDZŌ) that the Chalubes will not hold their ground once they see the Greeks on a level with them: his offer of services is gallant but not especially steeped in perils. Nevertheless, Cheirisophos does not accept it. He has learned to value his colleague. Xenophon should remain with the rearguard, he says, and send others unless some volunteers show themselves. During the military operation proper, part of which takes place during the night, the deserted mountain and the pass are successively captured by volunteers. They encounter the kind of opposition that Xenophon had expected would not materialize. Xenophon himself is not mentioned in the episode (4.6.20–27). Before the final attack, Cheirisophos sacrifices to the gods. More sacrifices are performed in the wake of the attack, and a trophy is erected. The end of necessity returns piety and the gods to the fore (4.6.23, §27).

ii) *Fighting Nobly against the Taochoi*

The Ten Thousand now invade the land of the Taochoi. They soon run out of provisions (4.7.1–14). Nothing can be collected from the local territory because the Taochoi have sought refuge in strong places where they have carried all their possessions. Cheirisophos makes a frontal attack against one such place, as soon as he reaches it, but is held in check. The place is surrounded by a river, and a promontory jutting over the access road enables the defenders to roll and throw stones from above. Xenophon and the rearguard reach the place in the wake of the failed attack: "You have come at an opportune moment," Cheirisophos says to him. (Literally, Cheirisophos says "You have come for the noble"—EIS KALON HĒKETE: 4.7.3). Xenophon notices that about two-thirds of the access road is protected by large pine trees, planted at some distance from one another, behind which the men (ANDRES), he says, could easily take cover; from there the danger of assailing the place would be greatly reduced; for, in the first attack, the stones had crushed many a Greek's legs and ribs. Xenophon therefore suggests stationing a company of soldiers behind the trees. Cheirisophos objects that as soon as the soldiers approach the trees, the Taochoi will pelt them with stones. "But this is the very thing that is needed," Xenophon replies (4.7.7). For once

the Taochoi run out of stones, the place, otherwise weakly defended, will become an easy prey. Xenophon advocates "hiding" behind the trees in the wake of advocating "stealing" the mountain. He is not fond of frontal attacks.

A group of about seventy human beings thus take position behind the trees while the rest of the army looks on from a safe distance. The reader's attention is directed to a captain named Kallimachos—the "Noble-Fighter." Kallimachos is reluctant to follow Xenophon's safe tactic. Instead, he comes up with a profitable if risky maneuver: stepping away from his tree, he goads the enemy to aim his stones at him. Only he steps back before he is hit. Every time he does this, the Taochoi use up large amounts of stones. At that moment another captain, Agasias of Stumphalia, enters our field of vision. He is not hiding behind the trees but sees from afar what Kallimachos is doing. And he sees that the entire army is looking on (4.7.11). Fearing that he might not be the first to race into the place, Agasias spontaneously takes off by himself without calling on any of his comrades. He runs right past Kallimachos and darts for the place amid flying stones. But Kallimachos is not one to be outdone. He grabs Agasias's shield and the two run side by side. Then two more, Aristōnumos of Methudria and Burulochos of Lusia, enter the contest, and they, too, make a dash for the place. Xenophon comments as follows: "For all these contended for virtue, and they vied with one another. And competing in this way, they took the place; for once they ran in, not a single rock came down from above" (4.7.12).

The four captains in question thus benefit the army at a time of great need: a large amount of provisions is obtained. Xenophon stresses that the four are contending for virtue: they are preeminent examples of lovers of the noble (ARETĒ: 4.7.12). Indeed all four had distinguished themselves previously in book four. Three had been among the volunteers in the opening scene (4.1.26–27) and the fourth had saved Xenophon's life (4.2.20–21).⁵⁵ Yet the present episode marks an important advance in the *logos* of the *Anabasis*. It now seems that these four captains are *not* pursuing the noble for its own sake. Nor are they primarily concerned with the welfare of the army. Agasias evidently seeks to be seen by the entire army as the first to race into the place (4.7.11). It is less virtue than *superiority* in virtue—and the reputation and honors attendant upon superior virtue—that he seeks. And insofar as the others are in rivalry with him, they appear to be seeking the same things as well.

⁵⁵ One man repeated his exploits in the victory over the Chalubes (Aristōnumos: 4.6.20).

Are we to conclude that the lovers of the noble are but lovers of their own good? Is a genuinely selfless action impossible? But isn't this to forget about the noble sacrifice of the Kardouchian father? Nor should we forget that the noble actions of the four, if perhaps not selfless, evince strength of soul, which few have and many admire.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, the issue of the motivation underlying noble action remains as a gray cloud on our horizon. Consider the scene once the four captains enter the place of the Taochoi:

Here, then, was a terrible sight. Throwing their children down from the cliff, the women then would throw themselves down afterwards, and the men were doing likewise. Then Aeneas the Stumphalian captain saw that someone with a beautiful robe was running to throw himself down, and he seized him in order to stop him; but [the Taochian] dragged Aeneas along, and both went tumbling down the rocks and were killed. (4.7.13–14)⁵⁷

In trying to stop the Taochian, what was Aeneas after? Was he seeking to save the life of a stranger or to steal his beautiful robe (KALOS)? Was he high-minded or low-minded? By leaving this question unanswered, Xenophon causes us to wonder about the motivation of the lovers of KALOS.⁵⁸

* * *

Xenophon plays a secondary role in the attack against the Taochoi. While he devises the successful tactic and joins the soldiers who are stationed behind the trees, he looks on as the four compete with one another.⁵⁹ His courage remains within certain limits, we might say. He does not expose himself for the sake of being the first to race into the place or to gain a reputation for superior courage or the honors attendant upon it. But what are the limits of his courage? Heretofore, Xenophon has occasionally set aside the noble or disregarded the welfare of individuals to secure the common good. But when is he ready to set aside or sacrifice his own

⁵⁶ However, Agasias's courage is rooted in a certain kind of fear: he is "afraid that he himself may not be the first to race into the place" (4.7.11). The stones of the Taochoi scare him less than the failure to obtain the superiority in question. On the other hand, Xenophon indicates that daring (TOLMAO) is sometimes displayed in actions where few look for it (4.4.12). This last scene proves that Xenophon does *not* eschew frontal attacks because he is soft. He is as tough as they come.

⁵⁷ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

⁵⁸ The *Memorabilia* analyzes the character of the longing of "those who long for noble things" (3.1.1; generally 3.1–3.7). See also *Memorabilia* 1.1.8 and 3.8.4–7.

⁵⁹ It is not entirely clear that he himself is hiding behind the trees: cf. 4.7.6–8.

welfare for the sake of the army? How does he conceive of the relation between his good and the potentially divergent good of those he rules? With the end of necessity, such questions will gain in importance since the mortal dangers, which have hitherto constituted a common good, or something like a common good, are rapidly disappearing. We shall be returning to these questions.

iii) *Fighting Nobly against the Kolchoi*

The lawless deeds of godless men are sanctioned by madness.

Ascribed to F. Dostoevsky

The necessities of the Ten Thousand come to an "official" end on Mount Êchēs. There they behold the Black Sea in the distance. During the last leg of the march, they are guided by a local who, for reasons of his own, promises to lead them in five days to a place where they will see their long-awaited objective. "And if I do not," he announces, "I am prepared to die" (4.7.20). The man keeps his word. On the fifth day, the Ten Thousand reach Mount Êchēs and climb it. The van of the host crests the summit and soldiers begin to scream for joy—The Sea! The Sea! Soon, the whole column is running for the peak. The Ten Thousand contemplate what they have long yearned for. They embrace each other, the generals and the captains as well, and they cry. A stone cairn is erected.⁶⁰ The Ten Thousand have come home. Their ordeal is over.⁶¹

But not yet. They must first reach the shores of the Black Sea. This requires an invasion of the territory of the Kolchoi, a hostile and warlike tribe.⁶²

As they approach a great but accessible mountain, the Ten Thousand see on it the Kolchoi drawn up for battle. At first, they deploy their

⁶⁰ Remnants of this cairn have apparently survived down to our own day. See the picture in Waterfield (2006) p. 153.

⁶¹ Note the central placement of "walking sticks" at 4.7.26. The troops assume that their march is over.

⁶² Before the Greeks reach the Kolchoi, they encounter a tribe called the Macrōnians (4.8.1–8). A peltast in the army who claims to have been enslaved in Athens—where he apparently learned dialectics—is able to converse with the Macrōnians. The encounter shows that Xenophon prefers to deal with non-Hellenes on the basis of peace and friendship whenever possible. Is there a link between this preference and his Socratic education? The episode centers on a "conversation" (DIALEGESTHAI) between Xenophon and the Macrōnians ("The-People-of-the-Long-Heads"), which begins with a "What is . . . ?" —or rather, with a "Who are . . . ?"—question (TINES EISIN: 4.8.4). However that may be, the episode illuminates a later speech of Xenophon (5.5.13–23, esp. §18: see chapter five, p. 207, note 78).

phalanx. But then it seems best to the generals to deliberate in order that they might fight as nobly as possible (4.8.9). Once again, Xenophon comes up with the successful tactic.⁶³ He argues that the phalanx is ill-adapted to the terrain: the Ten Thousand shall be marching uphill and find it easy in places, impassable in others. The phalanx will therefore be dislocated and thrown into confusion before it makes contact with the enemy. Besides, if the phalanx is drawn up in depth, the line of the enemy will extend beyond it; if it is drawn up to a shallow depth, it might well be cut down. Thus the companies should be arranged in columns, spacing them so that the outer ones will be outside the wings of the enemy. With this arrangement, the best troops will advance first, and each company will pick its way wherever the ground is easiest. Nor will it be easy for the enemy to force his way into the intervening gap since companies will be on each side of him. And if a company is hard pressed, the one next to it shall help it.

The proposal is accepted. The companies are arranged into columns. Going along the line from right to left, Xenophon delivers an exhortation: "Men," he says, "these whom you see are the only ones who are still preventing you from being where you have long been hastening. If we are somehow able, we must eat them raw" (4.8.14).

The Ten Thousand begin their ascension of the mountain after a prayer and a paean. The Kolchoi extend their phalanx toward the right and toward the left so as not to be outflanked. But as they run in both these directions, their center becomes hollow and vulnerable. Soon, they turn and flee. Their defeat is accompanied by little apparent slaughter: the Kolchoi are not "eaten raw." Nevertheless, it is disturbing to hear Xenophon use such cruel language.⁶⁴ Does the imperative of defeating the Kolchoi justify any and all methods of combat? For a moment, the Socratic King is guided solely by the good, understood as victory at all costs. Yet an epilogue casts this scene in its proper light. Right after the victory over the Kolchoi, the Greeks encamp in many local villages where they find abundant supplies. But an incident occurs:

In other respects, there was nothing which amazed [the Greeks]. But the beehives were numerous there, and all of the soldiers who ate of the honeycombs lost their wits, vomited, and had diarrhea, and none was able to

⁶³ Xenophon's is the only voice heard at this assembly: his prestige has been growing with every new success. Compare the assembly described at 4.6.7–16 (to say nothing of 3.3.11ff.).

⁶⁴ On the brutality implied by the phrase "to eat men raw," see *Hellenika* 3.3.6. LSJ's entry for ὄμος ("raw") reads: "to eat one raw, prov. of savage cruelty." See also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1148b19ff.

stand upright; but those who had eaten only a little resembled the exceedingly drunk, and those who had eaten a lot resembled madmen, while still others even resembled the dying. Many were lying there as though there had been a rout, and there was great despondency. (4.8.20–21)⁶⁵

The effects of the poisoned honey lasts three or four days. Eventually, all recover their wits. Was this divine punishment? Were the Greeks sanctioned for their readiness to heed Xenophon's cruel exhortation? After all, they *did* "eat these raw"—not the Kolchoi, of course, but the honeycombs.⁶⁶ Hence they suffered "as though there had been a rout." Or was this merely poetic justice? Xenophon does not mention the gods in this passage but they are unmistakably hinted at.⁶⁷ The episode eases the reader's mind, or is meant to ease our mind: the Ten Thousand were punished for losing sight of the noble. It also intimates what is at stake in the question of the gods.

* * *

The Ten Thousand reach the Black Sea at Trapezonte, an inhabited Greek city and a colony of the Sinopeans. Here they remain about thirty days. They prepare the thank-offerings they had vowed to sacrifice upon first reaching a friendly country (3.2.9). The sacrifices are offered "to Zeus Savior, Hēraklēs Leader and the other gods" (4.8.25). The mention of Hēraklēs Leader at the center is noteworthy. This god or deified hero had not been named in the original vow (3.2.9). In keeping with this addition, the generals of the army receive no special thanks from the troops. Instead, the troops elect a Spartan named Drakontion to the honorific post of organizer of the foot race and president of the games.⁶⁸ True to his

⁶⁵ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

⁶⁶ Consider the precise wording of Xenophon's exhortation at 4.8.14: "Men, *these* [HOUTOI] whom you see are the only ones who still prevent you from being where you have long been hastening. If we are somehow able, we must eat *these* [TOUTOUS] raw." Oddly enough—or not so oddly—he never actually names the Kolchoi.

⁶⁷ The central group of the afflicted suffers from "madness" (MAINOMAI: 4.8.20). The gods are thought to make human beings mad, not least the goddess ATĒ: cf. *Anabasis* 3.3.6 and pp. 23–4, 99, 101–02, 144, note 85. At *Education of Cyrus* 8.3.27–30, the man described as "mad" is Pheraulas (§30). He is conveying an order from Cyrus—the Godlike King. In the *Anabasis*, the recovery of the soldiers' wits (ANAPHRONEŌ) signals the end of their punishment (4.8.21).

⁶⁸ Drakontion is mentioned here for the first time. A rough and undistinguished character, he had been exiled from Sparta as a boy for involuntarily killing a lad with a dagger. To preside over games honoring the gods and the god's saving leadership, the Ten Thousand elect, not their deserving generals, but a man polluted by a serious crime! A prelude of things to come.

name, "Little Drako" lays down a severe law: a rough patch of ground is selected for the venue of the wrestling competition so that those who are thrown, he says, "will feel the pain rather more" (4.8.26).⁶⁹ The games are a splendid success. Many join in the competitions of racing, boxing, and pancratium.⁷⁰ Since the spectators are the companions of those participating, there is much emulation. A horserace is even organized down a hill:

[The] riders had to ride down the steep bank, turn [the horses] around in the sea, and lead them back up to the altar. Many of them rolled over on the way down, while on the way back up, against the steeply inclined hill, the horses made their way at barely a walking pace. Then there was much shouting, laughter, and cheering. (4.8.28)⁷¹

These games were a beautiful sight.⁷² They conclude fittingly the book of KALOS.

⁶⁹ On Drako, see *Oikonomikos* 14.4–5.

⁷⁰ Note the central placement of "boxing" (4.8.27). Amid the camaraderie and emulation scores were being settled *mano a mano*.

⁷¹ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

⁷² Only the games are praised as beautiful (KALOS), not the sacrifice honoring the leadership of Hēraklēs (4.8.27).

"THE SOCRATIC KING" (CONTD.)

CHAPTER 5

JUSTICE (BOOK FIVE OF THE *ANABASIS*)

The end of the mortal dangers recasts the dynamics of the army and brings to the fore the question of justice. It is common among interpreters of the *Anabasis* to describe the Ten Thousand as a "city on the march"—a roving democracy of soldiers-citizens who deliberate about shared problems and emerging threats.¹ But this description, though accurate to a point, is somewhat misleading. In the first place, it is applicable only to the portion of the retreat that *follows* the arrival at Trapezonte (4.8.22). No assemblies of soldiers are held during the march from the river Zapatan (3.3.6) to the Greek city in question.² Moreover, the Ten Thousand never transform themselves into a city. To mention here only two areas where they clearly fall short: there are no families in this "city"—though there are women and children among the captives—and the Ten Thousand never settle on any portion of territory (5.3.1). When they are presented with the possibility of staying in Asia to found a city there, they reject it overwhelmingly because they want to return home to their loved ones (6.4.8). It is therefore better to say that book five describes an attempt to *transform* the army into a city. And this attempt fails. Thus while book five marks the high point of Xenophon's rule—he is the *de facto* King of the Ten Thousand throughout—it also marks the

¹ The best-known proponent of this view is Nussbaum (1967) but there have been several others: e.g. Hornblower (2004). For a useful critique: Lee (2007) p. 9. It has been claimed that, at their best, the Ten Thousand represent "an ideal Xenophonic community or a utopia": Dillery (1995) p. 63.

² The assemblies depicted always involve the generals or, sometimes, the generals and the captains: 3.3.11–19, 3.5.7–12, 3.5.14–17, 4.1.12–13, 4.1.18–28, 4.3.10–15, 4.4.22, 4.6.6–21, 4.7.3–7, 4.8.9–14.

limit of this ascent. Xenophon never becomes a founder.³ Nor does he rise to the rank of lawgiver.

The emergence of the question of justice is thus coeval with the birth pangs of politics, or of political life. In the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, book five explores how the Socratic King endeavors to reconcile justice with safety and advantage, just as the two previous books analyzed piety (book three) and courage (book four) from the same standpoint. But book five introduces a new complexity. Piety and courage pertained primarily to the internal operations of the army. By contrast, justice has an external component as well, imposing obligations on the Ten Thousand in their dealings with outsiders. But what are these obligations? They are mainly defined by unwritten laws that Xenophon calls the "Hellenic laws" (HELLĒNIKOI NOMOI: 5.4.34). For, despite some appearance to the contrary, the Ten Thousand do *not* hold that they are at liberty to treat outsiders—whether they be Hellenes or non-Hellenes—however they please. The Ten Thousand eschew a war of choice against a non-Hellenic tribe, for example, when the gods signal their disapproval. They do this even though they would like to plunder their territory (5.5.1–3). To be sure, the obligations defined by the Hellenic laws are much more elaborate and extensive when the Ten Thousand encounter fellow Hellenes. And the Ten Thousand often honor the Hellenic laws in the breach. Nevertheless, obligations of some sort exist in all cases.⁴

1. Justice, Private Interest, and the Common Good

Before we can consider the Hellenic laws we must examine the question that the Ten Thousand are faced with as soon as they reach the sea: Who

³ Founders of cities among the Greeks were greatly honored in their lifetime and revered as heroes after their deaths: consider the case of Brasidas in Thucydides (5.11.1) as well as Herodotus 1.168. Generally, see De Coulanges (1900) book three, c. 5. To become a founder was to become a quasi-divine being.

⁴ Here it could be objected that Xenophon makes no effort to stop the plundering raids against the non-Hellenes in his opening speech (5.1.5–14). He seems to regard unlimited acquisitiveness as morally permissible in that case. But the reason for Xenophon's attitude is probably that significant restrictions on such raids would have been futile. As it is, the modest restrictions he *does* impose are disregarded (cf. 5.1.8–9 with 5.7.14). Observe also that in his opening speech, Xenophon distinguishes sharply between "getting provisions" and "going to plunder" (5.1.6–8). Getting provisions is necessary and thus just—or at least not unjust—but going to plunder is more questionable morally. Above all, note that Xenophon remarks that the local enemies of the Ten Thousand are "*justly* (DIKAIŌS) plotting against [the army], for we have *their things* (TA EKAINŌN)" (5.1.9, my emphasis). The word "justice" (DIKAIOS) occurs twice in chapter one (5.1.9, §15). Each time the Ten Thousand are on the wrong side of justice.

shall rule the army? The question of justice obtrudes at the beginning of book five as the question of distributive justice. The troops answer that question by deed, and they answer it in their own favor. Book five opens with a general assembly of the army, the first such assembly to occur since book three. At issue is how to complete the journey back to Greece. The first speaker is a private who declares that he is tired of packing up, walking, running, bearing weapons, marching in order, standing guard, and fighting. Henceforth (he proclaims) "I desire to put an end to these toils and, since we have the sea, to sail the rest of the way and arrive in Greece stretched out like Odysseus" (5.1.2).⁵ The assembly clamors that he speaks well. Someone else says the same thing, and then all those present say it as well. The general Cheirisophos therefore proposes to get ships from the Lacedaemonian admiral Anaxibios, a friend of his who holds a command in the Pontos. The army should await his return. "I shall come back quickly," he says (5.1.4). The soldiers are pleased by this offer and vote that Cheirisophos should sail out as quickly as possible. Xenophon then speaks up and he, too, submits five proposals for the approval of the soldiers, explaining what they should do while they await Cheirisophos's return (5.1.5).⁶ The shift of authority in the army is thus unmistakable: the generals are now expected to minister to the wishes or the decisions of the troops. The shift is also instructive. During the retreat, the generals showed themselves to be both able and prudent. Yet as soon as the sea is reached, their authority is curtailed.⁷ The beginning of book five illustrates the weakness of virtue as a title to rule. Short of mortal perils, virtue is largely impotent to rule in its own name and by dint of its intrinsic authority. Virtue requires the support of consent even as it risks being undercut by the demagoguery of lesser men or the foolishness of the crowd.⁸

⁵ The soldier is referring to the moment in the *Odyssey* when Odysseus is about to reach Ithaca (13.70ff). Of course, Odysseus's ordeal is far from over. He will suffer much in Hellenic land.

⁶ Each of the five proposals is adopted by a vote of the majority ("EDOXE TAŪTA") except for the third and central one (5.1.9). At the end of his speech, Xenophon proposes to order the coastal cities to fix the roads so that the army will march more easily if need be. But the soldiers will not hear of a journey by land. So intense is their hostility to this merely precautionary measure that Xenophon does not even put the proposal to a vote. Success has inflated the soldiers' hopes: they have become immoderate (APHROSUNĒ: 5.1.14).

⁷ Of course, the soldiers had implicitly consented to the rule of the generals, many of whom were elected (3.2.47).

⁸ Few of the gallant men who found themselves at the forefront of the action in book four play a significant role in book five. When the dangers recede, less distinguished men come to prominence. The opening of book five brings to mind the British election of 1945.

This conclusion is eminently applicable here, where the ruled are armed to the teeth, roughly equal to one another, and much more numerous than their rulers. Yet none of the foregoing is to deny that book five is *the* book of the kingship of Xenophon.⁹ For the superior abilities and prudence of Xenophon are felt at all times behind the decisions of the soldiers. And he sometimes corrects their errors (e.g., 5.1.13–14 cf. 5.3.1). Besides, military authority is exercised by him and by the generals, not by the soldiers.

Aside from the Hellenic laws, justice will now be defined by the assembly: laws or decrees are adopted by majority votes (“*EDOXE TAŪTA*”). Yet the new situation heralds new difficulties. In the first place, it is unclear who will enforce the law against the soldiers who break it.¹⁰ The authority of the generals has begun to ebb, as we just saw.¹¹ Indeed, the Ten Thousand will prove to be remarkably reluctant to obey their own laws or decrees.¹² The cause of this reluctance is easy to discern: the army is no longer held together by mortal dangers.¹³ But the first chapter indicates this cause more precisely. Xenophon proposes to the soldiers to collect as many ships as possible while they await the return of Cheirisophos. This way, the Greeks may be able to have enough ships to sail with even if Cheirisophos’s mission should fail. The proposal is approved by the assembly (5.1.11). The Greeks therefore borrow some warships from the people of Trapezonte in a bid to commandeer merchantmen they see sailing by along the coast. A warship of fifty oars is entrusted to a certain Dexippos, a Laconian perioikos. Dexippos neglects to collect any ships, however; instead, he sails out of the Pontos and steals the warship. Dexippos transgresses the army’s decree and serves his own good. The specific cause of the soldiers’ lawlessness is private interest (5.1.15). The arrival at the sea returns to the fore the perennial political tension—a tension muted during the mortal dangers—between self-interest and the common good. Since the Ten Thousand are a community

⁹ The *primus inter pares* Cheirisophos leaves the army at the beginning of book five and returns at the beginning of book six. He is replaced by Xenophon.

¹⁰ The votes are not unanimous: 5.1.7, §8, §11, §12; cf. however the vote at 5.6.33–34.

¹¹ A market manager barely escapes a stoning when he tries to enforce strictly the law of the market: 5.7.13–33.

¹² On the lawlessness of the soldiers, cf. 5.1.8 and 5.6.33–34 with 5.7.13–33, esp. §14–15 and §31–33.

¹³ Even the “laws” that are proclaimed by the assembly can be of dubious justice. Since the Ten Thousand have gone many months without receiving a wage, they are eager to make up for lost time: for example: 6.2.9–12. Of course, individual actions can be unjust as well. The first soldier to speak at the assembly is named “Leôn”—“The Lion”—and Xenophon warns the troops that they might be “hunted” by the local enemy (THERAO: 5.1.9).

of mercenaries, their love of the “city,” never nourished by civic discipline, is too tepid to counteract the powerful operation of self-love. Indeed, the authority of the generals is beginning to ebb not least because the troops distrust their motives. The common good has been rooted in a shared need for safety, and since the passing of the mortal dangers has weakened this good, the troops begin to suspect their generals of pursuing their private interest at their expense. The law *does* retain its appeal for the high-minded, however. An Athenian captain named Polukratēs, for example, is put in charge of a warship of thirty oars, and *he* conducts to harbor as many ships as he captures (5.1.16).¹⁴

* * *

The first military operation of book five is a provisioning party launched against the “Drilai,” a tribe otherwise unknown, at least under that name (5.2). In his opening speech, Xenophon had proposed to use provisioning parties (PRONOMAI) to supply the army from hostile territory. The proposal was approved (5.1.6–7). To grasp the significance of the provisioning party we now witness for the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, it is imperative to keep in mind that it is a *public* expedition: the aim is to get provisions for the army (as opposed to booty for individuals).¹⁵ The scene thus illustrates how the Greeks attend to “the common” after reaching the sea (TO KOINON: 5.1.12).¹⁶ It illustrates, moreover, how the Socratic King endeavors to reconcile justice with the good.

The provisioning party is set in motion when the supplies from the nearby country have been used up (5.2.1). Xenophon takes some Trapezontians as guides and he leads half the army against the Drilai, the most warlike tribe of the Pontos. (He leaves the other half to guard the camp.) When the foragers reach the difficult uplands where the warlike Drilai live, they find that the earth has been scorched.¹⁷ No provisions are to be found anywhere. The locals have streamed into their metropolis—a fortress protected by an extremely deep ravine, difficult access roads, and

¹⁴ Flower (2012) suggests that “the contrasting behavior [of Polukratēs and Dexippos] signals the breakdown of the Athenian-Spartan cooperation that was so delicately forged by Xenophon and Cheirisophos in book 4” (p. 199).

¹⁵ For the distinction between getting *provisions* (PORIDZESTHAI TA EPITĒDEIA) and getting *booty* (EKPOREUESTHAI EPI LEIAN) see 5.1.6–8 and note 4.

¹⁶ The adjective “common” (KOINOS) and its cognates occur more frequently in book five than in any other book: 5.1.12, 5.4.15, 5.6.27 (2X), 5.7.17, 5.7.18.

¹⁷ The provisioning party is an “ascent” both geographically and politically. For it is Xenophon’s first command in the absence of Cheirisophos. Yet it is the word KATABASIS (“descent”), not ANABASIS, that is used four times in the chapter: Xenophon ascends but the army descends (5.2.6, §26, §28, §30). Note that the Trapezontians decline to

by a ditch and a palisade on top of the earthwork with wooden towers. The peltasts and the spearmen who accompany Xenophon run ahead of the hoplites. They allow themselves to become separated from the heavy infantry. Right away they cross the ravine and attack the place. (They see many sheep and other property there.) Despite their numbers—over two thousand strong—they fail to take the fortress. They attempt a retreat. But since the descent from the place is difficult and the enemy is making sallies, they are unable to get away. Hemmed in, they call on Xenophon for help. He soon reaches the scene and crosses the ravine to see whether he should organize an evacuation of the light-armed troops or get the hoplites across on the assumption that the fortress can be taken. It seems that an evacuation will cost many lives. However, the captains who accompany him suppose that the fortress is pregnable. Xenophon agrees to the attack, trusting in the sacrifices: "For the soothsayers were of the opinion that though there would be a battle, the end (TELOS) of the excursion would be noble" (5.2.9).

The hoplites are gotten across the ravine. Xenophon orders his captains to set their companies in whatever order they suppose it will fight most effectively. For, the captains who at all times had been competing with one another over manly goodness (ANDRAGATHIA) were positioned near one another (5.2.11 cf. 4.1.26–28, 4.7.8–12). Then the contingents of light-armed troops are given the order to prepare their javelins, arrows, and stones.¹⁸ When all the preparations are complete, "the captains, the under-troops and those deeming themselves no worse than them" were looking at each other at a glance, "for the agitation was uniform."¹⁹ Despite this uncharacteristic unsteadiness, the Greeks sing

lead the Greeks to places where provisions can be obtained easily because "these [people] were their friends" (5.2.2). The Trapezontians lead the Greeks eagerly instead against the warlike Drilai, at whose hands they had suffered harm, and who dwell in a difficult and mountainous region. The Trapezontians are better friends to the local barbarians than to a Greek army: the Hellenic law—which decrees an obligation of mutual benevolence among Hellenes (5.5.7–12; 5.5.20–22)—is honored in the breach.

¹⁸ Tellingly, Xenophon sends around reliable assistants to ensure that this order to the light-armed troops is carried out (5.2.12).

¹⁹ I read *MONOEIDĒS GAR DIA TO CHŌRION HĒ TARAXIS ĒN*, with the best MSS. CBA, instead of *MĒNOEIDĒS GAR DIA TO CHŌRION HĒ TAXIS ĒN*, as most modern editors would have it (5.2.13). The point here is not that "the formation" (TAXIS) of the Greeks is "crescent-shaped" (MĒNOEIDĒS) but that the "agitation" (TARAXIS) in the ranks is rampant or "uniform" (MONOEIDĒS). The text of chapter 5.2 has been marred by incautious emendations and by undue reliance on the inferior MSS. FM. The reader must keep in mind that chapter 5.2 depicts the *decline* of the army, both martial and otherwise. Hence, only a single Greek captain is seen to escalate the palisade (Agasias of Stumphalia) and he must "drag" another (HELKŌ: 5.2.15 [in the best MSS. CBAE] cf. 4.7.8–14). I also accept the authenticity of the admittedly unattested "HUPOLOCHOS,"

the paean and sound the trumpet. They also raise the war cry to Enualios ("The-Warlike"). The hoplites start their run and the light-armed troops unleash a hail of missiles, arrows, and stones, some even using fire. Under the weight of the onslaught the enemy abandons the palisade and the wooden towers. The place appears to be taken. Victory is momentarily secured by the characteristic gallantry of Agasias (5.2.15).

But the battle is far from over. Only the first phase of it is. The Greek peltasts and the light-armed troops rush into the fortress and plunder whatever they can. Xenophon stands at the gates and tries to keep as many of the hoplites out as he can. For, other enemies are visible who are occupying some strong heights. The next moment, a shout arises from within. The Greeks who are inside take to flight. Some are clutching what they have snatched; soon others come out who are wounded. There is much jostling at the gates. The men who are rushing out report that there is a citadel inside and many enemies as well, and that those have sallied forth and are pelting the people who are inside:

At that point [Xenophon] orders the herald Tolmidēs to announce that anyone who wants to snatch something is to go inside. And many go inside, and those pushing to get in [i.e. mostly the Greek hoplites] win the victory over those rushing out [i.e. mostly the Greek light-armed troops] and they shut the enemies again inside the citadel. And everything lying outside of the citadel was plundered and the Greeks carried it away. (5.2.18–19)

The second phase of the battle thus ends in another Greek success. This time, however, success is achieved not through the virtue of a few good men but through the thirst for plunder of many of the hoplites. What is the significance of this? Once the herald Tolmidēs announces that "anyone who wants to snatch something (TI LAMBANEIN) is to go inside," the provisioning party becomes a plundering raid. The character of the expedition is transformed. All will be permitted to keep what they can

which I believe is a playful neologism: the "under-troops" (HOI HUPOLOCHOI) are "the-troops-that-hide," that is, "the cowards" (5.2.13, in the best MSS.). Thus the sentence "those deeming themselves no worse than [these under-troops]" has been, I think, misconstrued; it is emphatically *not* a term of praise (5.2.13). In keeping with this interpretation, observe the presence of the herald Tolmidēs in the episode (5.2.18). Tolmidēs—"The-Son-of-Daring"—makes three appearances in the *Anabasis*. Each time the Greeks are scared (see also 2.2.19–21, 3.1.46). Generally, the best MSS. CBAE have preserved the authentic readings of important passages: we should read SATHROUS (to cull "unsound [troops]") instead of STAUROUS (to remove a "palisade") at 5.2.21 and APOTHARREIN ("to regain confidence") instead of APOCHOREIN ("to retreat") at 5.2.22. The few good men "regain their confidence" after the "unsound troops" have been culled.

get their hands on. In other words, the public aim has been jettisoned: the Greeks act as a collection of greedy individuals whose ability to attend to "the common" is decaying along with their discipline and martial spirit.²⁰ Even though a large booty is eventually exacted from the Drilai, the army *qua* army gets nothing.²¹ The cause of the Greek success in the second phase of the battle is thus clear: it is Xenophon's substitution of "plundering" for "provisioning." The Socratic King collapses a distinction he had himself insisted upon.²² He is able to secure the common good but at a cost to justice. And the common good itself is reduced to a collection of private interests. Given the state of discipline and martial spirit, success could probably not have been achieved in any other way. But the cost is clear.

The third and final phase of the battle brings out the full impact of the march of the Ten Thousand on the local populations of the Pontos:

The hoplites halted under arms, some about the palisade, others along the road leading up to the [inner] citadel. Xenophon and his captains were examining whether it was possible to take the citadel; in that case their safety would be safe. Otherwise, their retreat seemed exceedingly difficult. But as they examined it, the fortress seemed altogether impossible to take. They then began preparing their retreat, and each group began culling the unsound troops by their side. And they sent back those people who were useless, those carrying burdens, and also the bulk of the hoplites, while each of the captains kept the troops he trusted. When they began to regain confidence, many [of the enemies] rushed out against them armed with wicker shields, spears, greaves, and Paphlagonian helmets. Others went up on the houses on both sides of the road that led to the citadel, so it was not even safe to pursue by the gates that led toward the citadel. For from above, they were throwing large logs at [the Greeks], so both remaining and retreating were difficult. And it was frightening that night was coming on.

As they were fighting and were at a loss [as to what to do], some one of the gods granted them the means to safety. For suddenly one of the houses on the right flared up, since someone had set fire to it; and when it caved

²⁰ Note the central placement of "those carrying loads [of booty]" among the unsound troops that must be culled (5.2.21).

²¹ Consider the final sentence of the episode: "The next day [i.e., the day after the attack on the Drilai] the Greeks went away to get provisions" (5.2.28, *APÉESAN... ES TA EPITÉDEIA*, MSS. CBAE, my emphasis). Modern editors uniformly reject the preposition "ES" ("[to go] to [get provisions]") on the grounds that it makes no sense: Why would the Greeks need to go to get provisions since they have already gotten provisions from the Drilai? The answer is that they have *not*. Individual soldiers got booty (*LEIA*), but the army *qua* army got no provisions (*EPITÉDEIA*). The admittedly surprising *ES*, found *only* in the best MSS., is authentic. It reflects the central lesson of the chapter.

²² 5.1.6–8. See note 4.

in, they fled from the houses on the right. When Xenophon learned this from chance, he ordered them to set fire also to the houses on the left, which were wood, so that these too were soon on fire. They fled, then, also from these houses. The only troops still troubling them were those directly in front, and it was clear that they would attack on their retreat and descent. Here, then, he passed the word to all those who were out of bowshot to bring logs into the area between themselves and the enemy. As soon as there were enough, they set fire to them; they were setting fire also to the houses beside the palisade itself, so the enemy might be occupied with this too.

Thus they barely got away from the fortress, by putting fire in the area between themselves and the enemy. And the entire city was burned down, houses, towers, palisades, and everything else but the citadel. (5.2.19–27)²³

In the first phase of the battle, success was achieved through virtue or manly goodness, and in the second phase, through liberated greed. But without the ability of Xenophon to learn from chance (or was it from "some one of the gods"?) the few good men who were accompanying him until the end would have been destroyed (*MANTHANŌ*: 5.2.25). The Socratic King saved the virtuous by destroying the city of the Drilai.

Let us leave this melancholy scene and consider the end of the expedition. For the soothsayers had predicted (as we recall) that "the end would be noble" (*TELOS*: 5.2.9):

On the next day, the Greeks went away to get provisions. Since they were fearful of the descent to Trapezonte, for it was steep and narrow, they set a feigned ambush. A man born in Mysos, and named Mysos, took ten Cretans and waited in an overgrown place, and he pretended to be trying to avoid detection by the enemy. Their shields, however, being of bronze, would now and again shine through. So on seeing this, the enemy was frightened as if it were an ambush. Meanwhile, the army was making its descent. When it seemed they had come down far enough, a signal was given to the Mysian to flee headlong; so he stood up and took to flight, as did those with him. The others, the Cretans—for they later said that they were being overtaken on the run—plunged from the road and into the woods and were saved by rolling down the vale. As he fled along the road, the Mysian shouted out for help. They did help him, and they picked him up, wounded. And then those who helped him themselves began to retreat at a walking pace, even while being hit, and some of the Cretans shot their bows in response. It was in this way that they all returned safely to the camp. (5.2.28–32)²⁴

²³ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

²⁴ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

"A man born in Mysos and named Mysos" lies in ambush at the head of Ten Cretans. To understand this funny scene, recall that the Greeks despised the people of Mysos for their cowardice and unmartial character, which was proverbial among them. Yet our Mysian—a superlative Mysian, as it were²⁵—behaves like a hero compared to the Ten Cretans who save their skins by plunging headlong into the woods.²⁶ To be fair, the Cretans were being overtaken on the run—or so they said. But of course, Cretan mendacity was proverbial.²⁷

It would be difficult to convey more gracefully the martial decline of the Ten Thousand. That they "all returned safely to the camp" is surely the most that could be said in praise of a thoroughly unedifying day (5.2.32). Recalling the less than noble TELOS of the excursion—and the fact that the Greek hoplites "won the victory" (NIKŌSI) over *their own* light-armed troops in the decisive moment of the second and central phase of the battle—Xenophon renames the enemy of the host (5.2.18). The etymology of the name "Drilai" suggests "The-Troops-[hiding-in]-the-Woods" (DRIOS-ILĒ).²⁸ The Ten Thousand have become their own worst enemies.

2. Hellenic Laws, Mossunoikoi Laws, and Nature

"That is true," Sansón replied, "but it is one thing to write as a poet and another to write as a historian: the poet can narrate or sing events not as they were but as they should have been, and the historian must write about them not as they should have been but as they were, without adding or subtracting anything from the truth."

Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, Part II, c. 3.

In view of the reluctance of the Ten Thousand to obey their own laws or decrees, and given their strong attraction to plundering, the Hellenic laws become increasingly important as a source of moral limits as well as

²⁵ According to Dillery (1998), "The name [of the superlative Mysian], if authentic, would be rare [...]" (p. 399, note 7). Indeed.

²⁶ The Mysian is pointedly described as a "real man" (ANĒR: 5.2.29). Not every Mysian is so lucky: 6.1.9–13.

²⁷ The Cretans in the army were outstanding runners: 4.8.271

²⁸ The word "troops" (ILĒ; nominative plural "ILAI") occurs at 1.2.16; see also *Education of Cyrus* 6.2.36 and *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* 2.11. To my knowledge, the rare word DRIOS ("wood," "thicket") does not occur in Xenophon, but consider Homer's *Odyssey* 14.353 or Hesiod's *Works and Days* 530 in light of the repeated mention by Xenophon of "overgrown place" (LASIŌ CHŌRIŌ: 5.2.29) or "woods" (HULĒN: §31). The real name of the "Drilai" was probably the Sanni: Dindorf (1855) p. 221, note 1; Chambry (1967) p. 492, note 102.

of internal unity for the army. For although the host is becoming evermore fragmented by private interest—and by ethnic differences²⁹—the Greeks share a common Hellenic heritage and are, as such, held together by an array of ethical conceptions and sensibilities.³⁰

A substantial portion of the remainder of book five analyzes how the Socratic King endeavors to conjoin or reconcile the Hellenic laws with safety and advantage. I will consider this issue in the next section (section three). To prepare my analysis, I must follow Xenophon as he "digresses." The function of the next two chapters of the *Anabasis* for the *logos* of the work is to clarify what the Hellenic laws are (5.3–5.4). Xenophon sketches the obligations defined by these laws and he analyzes the relation they bear to nature (PHUSIS). For if the Hellenic laws are purely conventional, the obligations that they define will be correspondingly demoted. The structure of the next two chapters is therefore as follows: chapter 5.3 sketches the Hellenic laws in the famous "digression" on Skilloūs; the almost equally famous chapter 5.4 sketches the laws and customs of the "Mossunoikoi," a tribe that was, according to those who took part in the campaign, "the most barbaric people they had passed through" and "the furthest removed from Hellenic laws" (5.4.34). The diptych 5.3–5.4 is thus a study in contrast: from Hellenism at its peak we are cast into a pit of barbarity. Yet the careful reader soon discovers that the Hellenic laws and the laws of the Mossunoikoi are not simply opposed. They share more than first meets the eyes. Moreover, insofar as these two sets of laws *do* stand at the opposite ends of the spectrum of political and moral excellence, their separation is not always a tribute to the greater glory of the Hellenic laws. This will become clear as we proceed. Once I complete my analysis of the Hellenic laws (section two), I shall return to the analysis of the guiding thread of book five: how does the Socratic King endeavor to conjoin or reconcile justice with safety and advantage (sections three and four)?

★ ★ ★

The Greeks decide to leave Trapezonte when Cheirisophos is late in returning from his mission, when the ships they have collected prove to be too few, and when it is no longer possible to get provisions locally. The sick and the old are allowed to board the available ships (along with

²⁹ Cf. the festival and athletic contest described at 5.5.5 with the ones described at 4.8.25–28.

³⁰ The increased prominence of the Hellenic laws is accompanied by heightened prominence for soothsayers and sacrifices: 5.2.9, 5.4.22, 5.5.2–3, 5.5.5–6, 5.6.16–18 and §28–29, 5.7.35.

the women and children) but the rest must march. The roads have been rebuilt.³¹ On the third day they reach Kerasoūs, a coastal city and a colony of Hellenic Sinope. There they stay ten days and perform a review under arms and a counting of the troops. There are eight thousand six hundred men: "These were saved," Xenophon declares, rather pointedly (5.3.3).³²

The remainder of chapter three is the excursus on Skilloūs (5.3.4–13). The occasion for the passage is as follows: Xenophon had been entrusted with a substantial sum of money at Kerasoūs and he must now explain what he did with it.³³ During their stay in that city, the Ten Thousand divvy up the money raised by the sale of the captives and they select the tithe of Apollo and of Ephesian Artemis. The tithe is then entrusted to the generals—each taking a share of the sacred money. But what did Xenophon do with *his* share?

Xenophon tells us that with the portion of the sacred money that belonged to Apollo he made a votive offering. He set up the offering in the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi and inscribed it with his own name and that of Proxenos, who had been his guest-friend (XENOS: 5.3.5). Xenophon then dedicated the (apparently larger) portion of Artemis some years later, after his return to Greece. He used the money to purchase an estate at Skilloūs in the vicinity of Olympia. The god indicated the exact

³¹ 5.3.1 cf. 5.1.13–14.

³² This declaration of salvation is oddly premature. The single greatest defeat suffered by the Ten Thousand—no fewer than five hundred men are killed—occurs not long after it (6.4.23–27; cf. also 5.6.12–13, 5.6.32–33, 6.1.29, 6.3.1–9, 6.3.17, 7.2.5–6.). Is Xenophon applying here a purely formal criterion of "salvation": since the Ten Thousand have reached the sea, they can be said to have been "saved" even though they will continue to lose men? Yet if we accept this explanation, why then does Xenophon not declare the Greeks "saved" at Trapezonte, where the army reaches the sea for the first time? Xenophon's declaration of salvation is either oddly premature or else strangely belated. To see what is being suggested by this "error," observe the following facts: (1) The Greeks reach in succession three Hellenic and coastal cities; all three cities are colonies of the same metropolis (Sinope). (2) The army performs sacrifices of thanksgiving at the first of these cities (Trapezonte: 4.8.25) and again at the third (Kotuōra: 5.5.5) but not at the second and centrally located Kerasoūs; these sacrifices make clear that the troops believe they owe their salvation to the gods. (3) Instead of sacrifices of thanksgiving, the centrally located Kerasoūs witnesses a review under arms (5.3.3). (4) It is at Kerasoūs that Xenophon declares in *his own name* that the Greeks have been saved. The "error" adumbrates a claim about cause.

³³ Chapter 5.3 also contains, I believe, a sketch of the main periods of Xenophon's life after the *Anabasis*. The order of his presentation suggests the following sequence: (1) Xenophon briefly returns to Greece after the *Anabasis* and he deposits Apollo's votive offering in the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi: he is not yet an exile. (We leave Xenophon at the end of the *Anabasis* preparing for a return home: 7.7.57); (2) Xenophon travels back to Asia when he experiences the hostility of the Athenians, who view him as a friend of

location. Watering the land was the river Selinoūs, Xenophon observes, and in Ephesus, too, there was a river called Selinoūs next to the temple of Artemis, and both rivers had fishes and mussels.³⁴ The estate of Skilloūs was rich in all the animals of the hunt. A part of the sacred money was employed to build an altar and a temple. Afterward Xenophon always sacrificed to the goddess a tithe of the fruits of the season from the field. All the citizens and the neighbors—men and women—would participate in the festival:

For those who tented there the goddess provided barley meal, loaves of bread, wine, sweets, and a portion of the sacrifices from the sacred herd, as also of those animals hunted in the chase. For both Xenophon's sons³⁵ and those of the other citizens used to hold a hunt for the festival, and the men who wished would join the hunt with them. Boars, gazelles, and deer were captured from the sacred precinct itself, as well as from [Mount] Pholoe. The place is on the road which people travel coming from Lacedaemon to Olympia, about twenty stadia from the temple of Zeus in Olympia. In the sacred precinct are both a meadow and hills full of trees, sufficient to nourish pigs, goats, cattle, and horses, so that even the baggage animals of those that come to the festival have their feast. Around the temple itself a grove of cultivated trees was planted, as many as yield sweet fruits in season. The temple is like the one in Ephesus, though as small is to large, and its statue is like the one in Ephesus, though as cypress wood is to gold. And a marker with the following inscription stands beside the temple: THIS PLACE IS SACRED TO ARTEMIS. THE ONE WHO HOLDS IT AND GATHERS IN ITS FRUITS MUST OFFER EVERY YEAR

the recent enemy of the city (Cyrus) and a Socratic. (Socrates had been executed by the Athenians in 399 BC only a few weeks or months before the end of the *Anabasis*. That Xenophon did not witness the trial, however, is proved by *Apology of Socrates to the Jurors* §1 and *Memorabilia* 1.1.1); (3) Xenophon rejoins the remnants of Cyrus's army and campaigns in Asia with Thibron, Derkulidas, and Agesilaos (cf. *Hellenika* 3.2.7); (4) Xenophon makes his second and definitive return to Greece, fighting on the Spartan side and against the Athenians at Korōneia (394 BC); (5) Xenophon is exiled by the Athenians and settled by the Spartans at Skilloūs. The above sequence of events suggests that Xenophon was exiled for fighting against the Athenians at Korōneia, *not* for befriending Cyrus. (Read also 5.3.7 together with 5.3.6: Xenophon's being saved from "danger" [KINDUNEUŌ] somehow produces both "escape" and "exile" [PHEUGO].) Cf. Flower (2012) p. 24. For a survey of various views held about the vexed question of the epoch and cause of Xenophon's exile, see Tuplin (1987).

³⁴ According to the best MS. C, the names of the two rivers were not quite identical: the river in Skilloūs was called "Elinous," and the river in Ephesus, the "Selinoūs."

³⁵ Since the adolescent sons of Xenophon are (in this passage) old enough to hunt, it is clear that it sketches a vision into the far future. At the time of the *Anabasis* Xenophon has no children (7.6.34). This fact proves, I believe, that the *Anabasis* was published years or, rather, two or three decades after the end of the expedition.

THE TITHE IN SACRIFICE. FROM THE SURPLUS HE MUST REPAIR THE TEMPLE. IF ANYONE DOES NOT DO THESE THINGS, THE GODDESS WILL TAKE CARE OF IT. (5.3.9–13)³⁶

Scholars have long been puzzled by this attractive scene of pastoral serenity and pious reverence. Why (it is asked) does Xenophon digress in this way and at such length? But the inability to account for the scene has stemmed from a failure to attend to the *logos* of the *Anabasis*. As I have already indicated, the purpose of the scene is to sketch the Hellenic laws. (To be more precise, the most important purpose of the scene is to sketch the Hellenic laws. Its most evident purpose is apologetic.³⁷) Let us consider the obligations that are defined by the Hellenic laws and, more generally, the activities or way(s) of life that they praise as noble.

Piety is at the heart of the pastoral way of the life in question. Xenophon secures the guidance of Apollo to determine where he should

³⁶ Translation by Ambler (2008).

³⁷ Xenophon must explain what he did with the sacred money. For in dedicating the sums in question, he was carrying out his final duty as ruler of the Ten Thousand. The passage is thus a defense against a serious (if implicit) charge of embezzlement. And it is worth noting that the passage illustrates how Xenophon reconciles the noble with the good (*Memorabilia* 3.8; *Symposium* c. 5). But the passage is apologetic in a second sense as well. Xenophon admits in chapter 5.3, for the first time in the *Anabasis*, that he was exiled by the Athenians in the wake of his return from Asia (5.3.7). The attractive picture he draws of the Hellenic laws—and of his own dedication to these laws—is thus intended to soften the impact of his admission. Xenophon may have been a bad Athenian—so, at least, the Athenians thought—but his dedication to Hellenism was unimpeachable. The attractive scene of chapter 5.3 interrupts a long sequence of melancholy episodes in book five. Consider in particular 5.7.13–35, an episode which actually occurs at Kerasos. But Xenophon makes no mention of it in chapter 5.3 because he does not wish to mar “[a]n idealized scene of Greek piety and *xenia*,” as Dillery nicely puts it (1998, p. 403, note 18).—Masqueray (1930) notes that the reference to Mount Pholoë at 5.3.10 has been thought to be erroneous because this mountain is rather too distant from Skillois to be a good hunting ground (Vol. 2, p. 184, note to p. 59). But the critique overlooks that Mount Pholoë was the residence of Pholos, a wise centaur who became unfortunate because he shared with a guest the wine that had belonged to the centaurs in common. And of course, Pholos was the son of Silene. That Xenophon is liable to think of himself as a wise centaur is also indicated by the *Kunagetikos*. That work opens with a discussion of how Cheirōn received the gift of “hunting” from the gods because of his justice and became a teacher of it and of other noble things. Cheirōn had many pupils who became outstanding for their virtue, including Achilles, Odysseus and, above all, Palamedēs, who surpassed his contemporaries in wisdom (1.1–2, §11 cf. *Memorabilia* 4.2.33). But it is of course Xenophon who teaches hunting in the *Kunagetikos*. Toward the end of the work, he discusses his own educational intention and method (chap. 13). He has written his works, he tells us, with the aim of making the young “wise and good” (13.7). Consider in this connection Machiavelli’s discussion of Cheirōn in the *Prince* (chap. 18).

buy an estate. The land is sacred because it belongs to Artemis (HIEROS: 5.3.10).³⁸ And the goddess is to be thanked for the fertility of the land, which is well stocked with game as well. From the bounties of the earth and from the sacred herd Xenophon selects an annual tithe and he maintains a temple and an altar. The generosity of Artemis carries with it an obligation of gratitude. This generosity makes possible Xenophon’s own generosity. For the tithe and the sacrifices are offered up during plentiful festivals. Both men and women are participants in the festivals, though the natural differences between the sexes are preserved or magnified in accordance with the Hellenic law that praises outdoor work for men and indoor work for women.³⁹ In particular, the hunt is the exclusive preserve of men.⁴⁰ For in addition to procuring fresh game, hunting strengthens both body and soul in preparation for war. Hunting is training in virtue. The Hellenic laws thus contribute to the inculcation of vigor and manliness without which the republican way of life characteristic of Hellas could not long endure.⁴¹ Appropriately enough, chapter three makes mention of the Olympic Games, which were both a stimulus for, and a display of, some of the educational fruits of the Hellenic laws: vigor, manliness, love of competition, and reverence toward the gods (5.3.7).⁴² Insofar as the athletes competed naked at these Games—that is, free of the convention of clothes—they embodied the claim of the Hellenic laws to praise or decree a way of life that is wholly in accord with nature. Finally, Xenophon’s votive offering to Apollo reminds us of the institution of the *xenia*, and of the Hellenic law requiring cities to maintain a treasury at Delphi (THĒSAUROS). Large sums of money were dedicated to the deity there. For gratitude was expected not only of individuals but of cities as well (5.3.5). And if this obligation was skirted, “the god would take care of it.”

There is no good reason to doubt that Xenophon was attracted to the pastoral way of life sketched in chapter 5.3 and that he lived that life to a not insignificant extent. Hunting, for one, was much to the taste of the

³⁸ The adjective HIEROS (and cognates) occurs six times in this short chapter.

³⁹ This law praises as noble a rather precise division of labor between husband and wife: *Oikonomikos* c. 7, especially §30.

⁴⁰ This is so even though the patron saint of the hunt is a female, the goddess Artemis. Consider also the last line of the *Kunagetikos*. It somehow reflects, I believe, Xenophon’s view that the highest form of “hunting” is less than manly.

⁴¹ *Kunagetikos*, c. 1, 12–13 and *passim*; *Education of Cyrus* 1.2.10–11. Yet the hunt described in *Anabasis* 5.3 is largely of harmless animals—“boars, gazelles, and deer.” Cf. chapter four, p. 170, note 43.

⁴² Nor is it a coincidence that Xenophon declares the Greeks to be “saved” in the chapter where he sketches the Hellenic laws: he thereby intimates the contribution of these laws to that outcome.

author of the *Kunēgetikos* ("On Hunting with Dogs").⁴³ Yet this fact does not prove that Xenophon was a votary of the Hellenic laws. After all, the obligations defined by the Hellenic laws and the activities or way(s) of life that they praise as noble either belong to piety⁴⁴ or are supported by piety.⁴⁵ And we have seen in chapter three that the piety of Xenophon was not above suspicion. Moreover, chapter 5.3 makes no mention of the activities that we know from Xenophon's own corpus occupied his mature years: philosophic reflection and writing.⁴⁶ The vision of Skilloūs is an account of Xenophon's later years that owes much to art. To discover

⁴³ It is also noteworthy that in this passage—the only passage where Xenophon discusses his life after the *Anabasis*—he stresses its *private* character. He says nothing about any further political involvement, though many scenes of the *Hellenika* suggest that he campaigned in Asia after the *Anabasis*. Xenophon never names himself as a political actor in the *Hellenika* (though I believe he is alluding to himself at 3.2.7). The main reason for his silence, I believe, is this: Xenophon wants his readers to assess his stance toward the political life on the basis of the *Anabasis*, not the *Hellenika*. For, the political involvement of Xenophon after the *Anabasis* was, to a significant extent at least, accidental or involuntary. He could not go home because of his exile. His later political involvement—such as it was—arose from the fact that the life of the stranger everywhere is not viable (*Memorabilia* 2.1). I would add that it is probably not an accident that Xenophon does not mention himself by name in a book dedicated to "Hellenic Things": he is apparently not a "Hellene" in the most important respects. In this connection, note that Xenophon consistently calls the Ten Thousand "the Hellenes" (HOI HELLĒNES) in the *Anabasis* but rarely calls them by that name in the *Hellenika*. Instead, he uses such formulations as "the Cyreans" or "the Cyrean army" (3.1.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.18, 3.4.20, see also 6.1.12; cf. 3.1.2). Xenophon goes so far as to describe the Cyreans once as a "foreign" (XENIKOS) contingent (4.3.15 and §18; that this "foreign" contingent is indeed the Cyrean army is proved by 3.4.20). What does this pattern mean? To answer this question would require that we explain what being a "Hellene" means in the context of the "Hellenic Things."

⁴⁴ For example, sacrifices, prayers, Delphic deposits, divinations, and annual festivals.

⁴⁵ For example, the works of farming, the *xenia*, republican freedom, and the division of labor between husband and wife. On the importance of divine support for the marital division of labor praised as noble by the Hellenic law, see *Oikonomikos* c. 7 and Bruell (1984) pp. 289–94. According to Ischomachos, certain tasks by nature are more capable of being carried out by men and certain others by women. These tasks are praised by the law as well. There is "perhaps" divine punishment for the failure to perform these tasks, or for a man to perform a woman's tasks (7.30–31). But (we must ask) if nature is simply supportive of this division of labor, why are both praise and punishment needed? The goodness of the division of labor praised by the law is not beyond question, especially for the wife.

⁴⁶ Interestingly, chapter 5.3 is the only chapter of the *Anabasis* to contain a quotation from a writing (GRAMMATA), albeit only from an inscription (5.3.13 cf. 7.5.14). And of course, the chapter stresses Xenophon's "hunting." Other features of the vision of Skilloūs tend to reinforce our doubts about Xenophon's dedication to the Hellenic laws. Consider Hirsch (1985): "One concrete example of the way in which Xenophon was influenced by Persian practices which he learned about on the *Anabasis* is the hunting park which he built on his estate at Scillius after his return from Greece. His description of this park in

how Xenophon assessed the Hellenic laws, we must consider the laws and customs of the Mossunoikoi (5.4).

* * *

The "Mossunoikoi" are so named because they inhabit wooden houses or towers (MOSSUN-OÏKOS). They are indoor dwellers. Since the men of the tribe stay indoors no less than the women, their complexion is just as pale (5.4.33).⁴⁷ The men do not hunt. The Mossunoikoi feed on grain and especially on nuts, which they bake into loaves. They keep to the vegetarianism of early times.⁴⁸ Though they live in cities and are not nomadic, they are ruled by primitive kings and have little knowledge of the technical arts.⁴⁹ They mutilate the bodies of the enemies they kill so as to prevent proper burial (5.4.17 cf. 5.3.5). The military orders of the Mossunoikoi mirror their unmanly habits. Soldiers are compared to "choral dancers" who "sing in rhythm" as they march (5.4.12, §14). The troops are decked out with leather helmets that look very much like tiaras, with a tuft of hair in the middle, and the shields have the shape of ivy leaves (5.4.12–13). The soldiers resemble Bacchic dancers.⁵⁰ Their breastplates have the thickness of linen bags made for bedclothes and the spears are so long that a man can barely carry one (!) (5.4.13, §25). The Mossunoikoi soldiers are more at home onstage than in the field. Not surprisingly, these dancing soldiers are soundly defeated when the Ten Thousand put their mind to it.⁵¹

the *Anabasis* (5.3.7–13) is reminiscent of the Persian paradises described elsewhere [...] (p. 153, note 11). Along the same lines is Dillery (1998): "Artemis Ephesia is otherwise never found in mainland Greece" (p. 404, note 19).

⁴⁷ Brulé (1995) rightly observes that "tout le passage sur les Mossynèques abonde en traits caractéristiques du féminin pour les Grecs" (p. 18). The observation is confirmed by *Hellenika* 3.4.19 and *Agessilaos* 1.28.

⁴⁸ As I indicate in the text, the reference to "dolphin" at 5.4.28 is of religious, not of dietary, significance.

⁴⁹ Consider the description of their canoes: 5.4.11–12.

⁵⁰ The Greek word for "ivy" is KISSOS or KITTOS: cf. Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousai* 988; Euripides, *Bakchai* 81.

⁵¹ The military clash between the Ten Thousand and the Mossunoikoi can be briefly summarized. The Greeks reach the border of the Mossunoikoi's territory and ask for permission to traverse it as friends. They are rebuffed. The Mossunoikoi put their trust in their fortresses. The Greeks therefore conclude an alliance with the Mossunoikoi who dwell on the far side (the western side) and who are the enemies of the nearer Mossunoikoi. With their help, the Greeks defeat the latter, though not without difficulties. They suffer their first defeat of the campaign when scores of undisciplined soldiers are routed during a hapless plundering raid (5.4.16). The Greeks launch a second, more orderly attack, which is successful (5.4.22–26). The capture of the metropolis of the Mossunoikoi signals their

The children of the prosperous Mossunoikoi are kept in a state of lazy idleness. Unlike the boys in Hellas—who are exercised by the hunt (5.3.10), to say nothing of gymnasia and athletic contests (cf. 5.3.7)—the children of the prosperous Mossunoikoi, both boys and girls, are fattened up indoors on a regimen of boiled nuts (5.4.32). They are described as “exceedingly tender and white, and almost as wide as they are long; their backs are painted with many colors and the front parts of their bodies are tattooed all over with flowers” (5.4.32). Yet although they are undeniably barbaric, the Mossunoikoi do not live in a “state of nature.” They, too, have laws. They try to have intercourse with the concubines of the Greeks in the open, for example, “for this was their law” (NOMOS: 5.4.33). Generally, the Mossunoikoi do when they are in a crowd what others do in private, and they do when alone what people do when they are with others. They talk to themselves, laugh at themselves and dance—again dancing!—stopping wherever they chance to be, as if to make a display to others (5.4.34). Finally, there is not a single mention of the gods or of piety in the sketch of the laws and customs of the Mossunoikoi, a striking contrast with the vision of Skilloūs. It is as if the barbaric Mossunoikoi are somehow “enlightened.” Of course, the Ten Thousand do not view them that way. “Those who took part in the campaign” said that the Mossunoikoi were “the most barbaric people they had passed through” (5.4.34).

The description of the Mossunoikoi bears directly on Xenophon’s assessment of the Hellenic laws. Let us begin at the beginning. Why does Xenophon fail to endorse in his own name the unfavourable judgment of the Mossunoikoi expressed by “those who took part in the campaign” (HOI STRATEUSAMENOI: 5.4.34)?⁵² Is he more sympathetic to the barbarians than the troops? He indicates that the Mossunoikoi resemble the Greek in some respects. When the places of the Mossunoikoi are plundered, for example, the Greeks discover jars of dolphin blubber, a substance used by the Mossunoikoi, Xenophon emphasizes, “just as the Greeks use olive oil” (5.4.28). But the Greeks use olive oil to rub their bodies during and after workouts. Are the Mossunoikoi less unmanly or physically inactive than it appears? It seems so. They may even be

total defeat. The Greeks launch the second attack after sacrificing and receiving favourable omens (5.4.22). To prevent any flight of the troops, “the sharpest of the hoplites” (TOUS TOMŌTATOUS TŌN HOPLITŌN) are positioned (probably by Xenophon) a short distance behind the columns (5.4.22). This evocative reading, recalling the sharpness of the blade, is found only in the best MSS. It is rejected by most modern editors, who fail to take due notice of *Education of Cyrus* 3.2.5–6, 3.3.41–42, 7.1.34, and, above all, of 6.3.26–27.

⁵² Compare how Xenophon expresses himself, for example, at 4.7.15.

enjoying a measure of political freedom, for the smell of the olive was associated with the labors and practices of freedom among Greeks.⁵³

The point of similarity just mentioned, though admittedly minor, invites a search for weightier ones. In our search, we soon encounter Xenophon’s enigmatic description of the ancestral bread of the Mossunoikoi (5.4.27). The Greeks discover in the houses of the Mossunoikoi, alongside the dolphin blubber, “magazines of loaves, pile upon pile, which the Mossunoikoi said were their ancestral magazines” (5.4.27). But what exactly are “ancestral magazines” of bread? Were these loaves handed down from generation to generation like edible heirloom? But isn’t bread perishable? (To highlight the difficulty, Xenophon speaks in the next sentence of “slices of pickled dolphin.” No preservatives are mentioned in connection with the bread.⁵⁴) In fact, the difficulty is so obvious and intractable that editors emend the unanimous MSS.⁵⁵ I suggest a better solution: the intention of Xenophon in describing this bread is precisely to adumbrate that “pile upon pile” of it was being wasted.

To grasp the import of my suggestion, observe that the word I have just translated as “magazine” (THĒSAUROS) is the same word I translated (in the excursus on Skilloūs) as “treasury” (THĒSAUROS)—the very word used in the phrase, “the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi” (5.3.5).⁵⁶ Observe also that the adjective “Delphic” and the noun “dolphin” can have identical spellings (DELPHIS) and Xenophon uses the noun “dolphin” twice in the same breath with which he mentions the “treasury of

⁵³ *Symposium* 2.1–6.

⁵⁴ Amigues (1995) is puzzled by the bread’s unexplained “conservation exceptionnelle,” probably due in part, she surmises amusingly, “à la qualité de la farine” (p. 73). Masqueray (1930) thinks that the bread is a kind of “biscuit des soldats.” But even the “biscuit des soldats” eventually rots (Vol. 2, p. 64, note 1).

⁵⁵ The unanimous MSS. for 5.4.27 read THĒSAUROS...ARTŌN...PATRIOUS (“ancestral magazines of bread”), but Hude/Peters, Marchant, Couvreur, and Brownson/Dillery emend the text to THĒSAUROS...ARTŌN...PERUSINŌN (“magazines of last year’s bread”). The reading of the MSS. is preserved by Masqueray, Dindorf, and Gemoll.

⁵⁶ The word THĒSAUROS is used only these two times in the *Anabasis*. Elsewhere, Xenophon uses the word TAMIEION, not THĒSAUROS, to speak of a “magazine” or “storehouse” (*Hellenika* 5.4.6, *Memorabilia* 1.5.2; see also *On Horsemanship* 4.1). What Xenophon regards as genuine “THĒSAUROI” is indicated at *Memorabilia* 1.6.14, 4.2.9. In the *Education of Cyrus*, the word THĒSAUROS is used no fewer than nine times. Five of these occurrences are concentrated in a single brief scene between Cyrus and Croesus (8.2.15–23). In that scene, Cyrus boasts to the deposed ruler of Lydia: “Do you see, Croesus, that I too have treasures (THĒSAUROI)?” (8.2.19, my emphasis). The THĒSAUROI of Cyrus turn out to be his friends, who are ready to dedicate vast amounts of gold to his service. To grasp the overtones of the adverb “too” (KAI), we must appreciate

bread" of the Mossunoikoi (5.4.28). (The Delphic god was represented as a dolphin because of this etymological closeness.) The point adumbrated by Xenophon is therefore clear: the ancestral treasuries of bread served, among the Mossunoikoi, a function analogous to that of the Delphic treasuries among the Greeks. The ancestral loaves were offerings of the barbarians to their gods, just like the Delphic treasures were offerings of the Greek to *their* gods. In each case the offerings had the same usefulness. The chapter of the Mossunoikoi is thus not silent about the gods or about piety after all, though the reference to the matter is obviously inexplicit. There was, among the Mossunoikoi, both more freedom and more piety than first appears. Xenophon's description of the Mossunoikoi, insofar as he presents them as "enlightened," is a caricature.

To this line of analysis, it will be objected that Xenophon defends the inviolability of the Delphic treasuries in the *Hellenika* and elsewhere too. But how could he have defended these treasuries if he viewed them critically? Besides, if Xenophon really intended to draw the mischievous comparison just sketched, why leave it so inconspicuous?

Readers of Xenophon must concede that the Delphic treasuries are defended in several places in his corpus.⁵⁷ These defenses throw the full weight of Xenophon's authority behind the Hellenic law that praises or demands such deposits. Nevertheless, to claim that Xenophon is "a deeply religious supporter of Delphi," as one scholar put it recently, is to fail to appreciate the perspective from which these deposits are defended or justified.⁵⁸ In chapter three, I argued that Xenophon develops his critique of piety esoterically because of what he views as the prerequisites and implications of a politics of virtue. Since Xenophon is a defender of the politics of virtue, he sees it as his responsibility to defend and justify, occasionally to correct, and in any case not to attack openly the core of

that Cyrus is not only comparing his THĒSAUROI to those of the once fabulously rich Croesus (7.2.14, 7.3.1). Above all, he is comparing them to the THĒSAUROI of Delphic Apollo. (Croesus makes a cameo in this scene because of his own entanglements with Apollo: 7.2.15–28). Like Apollo, Cyrus has "friends" who dedicate vast amounts of gold to his service. He is a Godlike King.

⁵⁷ Consider the story of Jason of Thessaly (*Hellenika* 6.4.27–32). Jason was suspected of planning to seize the Delphic THĒSAUROI. The inhabitants of Delphi were concerned: "It is said that when the Delphians asked the oracle what should be done if [Jason] took the money of the god, the reply was: 'The god will take care of it'" (6.4.30). In the next sentence Jason is murdered (6.4.31–32).—Xenophon also praises Agesilaos in the panegyric bearing his name for setting up a large votive offering at Delphi (1.34, but cf. *Hellenika* 4.3.21–23, especially what immediately follows the offering). It is only fair to note, however, that Xenophon himself deposited only the (smaller?) portion of Apollo in the treasury of the Athenians. In the same vein, consider *Hiero* 11.13.

⁵⁸ Thomas (2009) p. xvii.

the piety and of the pious practices upon which this politics partly rests. The diptych Skilloūs–Mossunoikoi provides a remarkable illustration of this aspect of his manner of writing. Xenophon eschews open criticism of the Delphic treasuries—nay, he paints himself as paying homage to them (5.3.5)—though he adumbrates a critique of the institution as well. He is content to whisper that once we abstract from the political and moral usefulness of the institution—and this civilizing usefulness is undeniable—the treasuries amount to a vast waste of resources. And it is a waste that connects Hellas to a most barbaric tribe. Xenophon *does* whisper these truths, however, because he is above all a philosopher.

The last remark points to the most important reason why Xenophon chose to present the Mossunoikoi as enlightened, though they obviously were not: "the Mossunoikoi" are stand-ins for "the Socratics." This suggestion will perhaps strike the reader as odd or fanciful. But take a moment to review the depiction of Socrates and his followers in Aristophanes's *Clouds* along with some passages of Xenophon's Socratic writings. The similarities between the Mossunoikoi and the Socratics are many and striking: the Mossunoikoi spend most of their time indoors and are exceedingly pale (cf. *Clouds* 92–104, 120, 186, 194–99, 718, 1112, 1171 and *passim*); they are unmanly and (apparently) shun the gymnasias (cf. *Clouds* 670ff., esp. 678–79, 417, 836); they are great lovers of the heights or of summits (AKRA), for their cities and for their towers, imitating in this Socrates, who investigates the things aloft from high-hanging baskets (cf. *Clouds* 223–38, 868–69); like Socrates, they argue with themselves and "dance alone" (cf. *Symposium* 2.15–20); the king of the Mossunoikoi even meets a fate identical to that which threatens Socrates, "king" of the Socratics, at the end of the *Clouds* (cf. *Anabasis* 5.4.26 with *Clouds* 1478–end). The barbaric Mossunoikoi and the enlightened Socratics are somehow interchangeable.

But what is the meaning of this preposterous comparison? What can the Mossunoikoi and the Socratics possibly "share"?

The diptych Skilloūs–Mossunoikoi—and the comparison between the Hellenic laws and the Mossunoikoi laws that it contains—is an analysis of the relation between law and nature, between NOMOS and PHUSIS.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ The word "law" (NOMOS) occurs three times in the chapter on the Mossunoikoi (5.4.17, §33, §34). This is more than in any other chapter except for 7.3 (six occurrences). And while the word "nature" (PHUSIS) does not occur in our diptych—it does not occur in the *Anabasis*—two of the three words formed on a PHUSIS-root that *do* occur in the work occur in our diptych. These words are "to plant" (PHUTEUŌ: 5.3.12) and "natural separation" or "natural division" (DIAPHUĒ: 5.4.29). The third word is "to grow" or "to bring forth by nature" (PHUŌ), used at 1.4.10. About this word, see notes 61 and 62, below.

This relation is complex because human nature does not exist in a state of "purity" anywhere. Nature is always shaped and moulded by law. To that extent, "law is natural to man or law belongs to man's nature."⁶⁰ This does not mean that the distinction between NOMOS and PHUSIS is unimportant, or that it can be dispensed with. Nor does it mean that all laws are equal. While some laws develop and in a sense perfect human nature, others distort and debase it. The Hellenic laws, for example, are genuinely superior—superior by nature—to the laws of the Mossunoikoi insofar as they inculcate a greater capacity for political virtue and for freedom. The Mossunoikoi are not greatly capable of either. This is one thing they have in common with the Socratics. However splendidly a man like Xenophon was able to combine political virtue with philosophic virtue, a perennial tension exists between their respective demands. The depiction of the Mossunoikoi reminds us that a community of philosophic "dancers" would not be marked by particularly high levels of political virtue in particular.

Of course, the Hellenic laws are not simply natural, nor are they simply in accordance with nature. Comparing the Delphic THESAURI to large heaps of spoiling bread made that clear. In fact, the Mossunoikoi laws are *more* in accordance with nature than the Hellenic laws insofar as they leave more freedom for—or rather, insofar as they require as a matter of "obligation"—the gratification of such natural desires as the sexual desire. The Mossunoikoi exhibit little or no "separation" from nature.⁶¹ Nevertheless, from the point of view of education—the standpoint which concerns me above all in this study—it is precisely the "enslavement" of nature characteristic of the Hellenic laws (and of other similar laws) that marks them as superior to the laws of the Mossunoikoi, and therefore also and in a higher sense more in accordance with nature.⁶² For the primary

⁶⁰ Strauss (1983) p. 123.

⁶¹ Consider the suggestive description of the nuts eaten by the Mossunoikoi—"OUK ECHONTA DIAPHUEN OUDEMIAN" (5.4.29, my emphasis). See note 59, above.

⁶² Consider Xenophon's suggestive use of the word "to plant" (PHUTEUŌ) at 5.3.12. The root of PHUTEUŌ is of course PHUSIS, the only occurrence of "nature" in the chapter on the Hellenic laws (5.3). Yet PHUTEUŌ points *away* from nature as well as toward it. It calls attention to the role of convention, or rather of cultivation, in the production of otherwise stunted natural fruits. The use of PHUTEUŌ thus adumbrates the contribution of the Hellenic laws to education, a contribution which presupposes an initial curbing, ordering, and shaping of nature. Of course, the Hellenic laws do not suffice to yield the most perfectly formed fruits of nature. In this connection, consider that Xenophon chooses to use the word "to grow" or "to bring forth by nature" *only* in a parallel passage (PHUŌ: 1.4.10) and *not* in chapter 5.3. Manifestly, he did not wish to speak of what nature "grows" or "brings forth" when he spoke of the fruits of the Hellenic laws. The reason for this refusal is not only that these fruits are the result of cultivation. It

deficiency of the Mossunoikoi laws is that they place hardly any restrictions on nature.⁶³ They permit or require untrammelled and public sexual intercourse, for example, fostering both promiscuity and shamelessness.⁶⁴ The reader is left to imagine the effects on the family.⁶⁵ Most importantly, the unblushing and unrestricted hedonism permitted or required by the Mossunoikoi laws is but the reverse side of a relative indifference to the noble. These laws teach that one must surrender to the promptings of nature, as a matter of "obligation" even. The Mossunoikoi laws hardly look beyond gratification at all.⁶⁶ Yet the attainment of the end of our nature requires that nature first be "enslaved" by law. The raw natural impulses must be curbed, ordered, and shaped, first of all in children. Beyond this, human nature must be made to experience the uplifting and invigorating appeal of the noble. In time, if a Socratic education intervenes and is successful, human nature turns to philosophy, *the end of nature*.

Thus the serious meaning behind the funny⁶⁷ comparison between the Mossunoikoi and the Socratics is this: both groups live "free" from the restraints of law and "in accordance with nature."⁶⁸ I hasten to add that the parallel is not exact: the natural life among the Mossunoikoi, though foreshadowing the Socratic equation of the noble with the good, crudely equates the good with bodily pleasure. The continent and ascetic Socratics do not fall into that trap. Yet they, too, seek something pleasurable—knowledge. Moreover, the character and scope of their pleasurable quest for knowledge is shaped by a critique of law-based nobility, a critique in

is also that they are enmeshed in law. From the standpoint of nature, these fruits remain immature. The distinction between planting and growing is central to Homer's account of the "state of nature." According to the poet, the "arrogant and lawless" Cyclops "plant (PHUTEUŌ) nothing with their hands, nor plow; but all things grow (PHUŌ) for them without planting or plowing" (*Odyssey* 9.105–115).

⁶³ Consider the eating habits of the children of the Mossunoikoi: 5.4.32.

⁶⁴ On the Socratics and shame, see *Clouds* 445ff., 1236 and *passim*.

⁶⁵ Though Xenophon does not say this explicitly, his description suggests that the Mossunoikoi offered up their children in exchange for sexual intercourse with the concubines of the Greeks. Neither marital fidelity nor, we can surmise, the prohibition against incest were of special concern to them (5.4.32–33). On the issue of incest, see *Clouds* 1369–76, 1439–51.

⁶⁶ Admittedly, the western Mossunoikoi accuse their eastern tribesmen of injustice or "getting more than their share" (PLEONEKTEIN: 5.4.15). The notion of obligation is not unknown to the Mossunoikoi. The description of Xenophon is a caricature, but precisely as a caricature it exaggerates a genuine tendency.

⁶⁷ The definitive commentary on the "Mossunoikoi" is the remark that they would laugh at themselves alone (5.4.34). Xenophon is thinking of himself.

⁶⁸ Both groups could also be said to be walking embodiments of "pure" *eros*. This characterization is merely adumbrated here, however, because *eros* is essentially absent from the *Anabasis*. See pp. 299–300.

which the Mossunoikoi "share."⁶⁹ Socrates and the Socratics stand at the end of the educational road. The Mossunoikoi stand at the beginning of it—or rather, they stand at a crude or debased version of the beginning. And a crucial way-station along the educational road are the Hellenic laws (or some such equivalent). From a political and moral standpoint, the Hellenic laws *are* the peak. Moreover, since the Hellenic laws impose obligations—they do not equate the noble with the good—they must be buttressed by piety. The laws of the Mossunoikoi permit or require self-gratification and do away with shame; they have little need of the gods. The surface silence about the gods in chapter 5.4 adumbrates this fact. The Mossunoikoi resemble the Socratics "philosophically." We might even say that their laws foreshadow the political hedonism of the Enlightenment.

3. Hellenic Laws, Founding a City, and the Good

We now return to the analysis of the guiding issue of book five: How does the Socratic King endeavor to conjoin or reconcile justice with safety and advantage? Meanwhile we will have gained a deeper understanding of the Hellenic laws and of Xenophon's assessment of them.⁷⁰ Indeed, the guiding issue was quietly treated even in the diptych 5.3–5.4.⁷¹

* * *

The Ten Thousand reach Kotuōra, a Hellenic city and a colony of Sinope, after traversing the territory of the Mossunoikoi (and of other tribes). They remain there for forty-five days (5.5.5). Once again they perform public sacrifices and they organize processions and athletic games. The arrival at Kotuōra marks the end of the retreat by land. Henceforth the

⁶⁹ For the Socratic equation of the noble with the good, see *Memorabilia* 3.8; *Symposium* c.5. On the notion of law-based nobility, see *Memorabilia* 3.3.1; on the relation between the noble and pleasure, see *Memorabilia* 3.8.8–10.

⁷⁰ It is remarkable that, despite his quiet critique of the Hellenic laws, the first thing Xenophon allows us to witness after his account of these laws (5.3–5.4) is that they *can* be effective in curbing plundering (5.5.1–3). In the scene in question, Xenophon bows to the judgment of the soothsayers, though he suspects that they have been bribed. Consider how he uses the phrase "showed the judgment" (APODEIKNUMI GNÖMĒN) at 5.5.3; the same phrase is used in the next chapter to refer to the (egregious lack of) judgment of the general Timasiōn, who had most likely been bribed (5.6.37, 5.6.21). (The sum of money mentioned at 5.6.18 is half again as large as the sum mentioned at 1.7.18 in the best MSS. CBA. To accuse soothsayers of taking bribes was, of course, not unheard of: e.g., 6.4.14; *Education of Cyrus* 1.6.2).

⁷¹ The issue was treated in chapter 5.4: Xenophon offers the Western Mossunoikoi his help in avenging the wrongs they suffered at the hands of their Eastern counterparts—if

Ten Thousand will travel by sea. They take some of their provisions from Paphlagonia and some from the land of the Hellenic Kotuōritans. (The latter do not open a market for them.) The Kotuōritans also refuse to receive the sick or the wounded inside their walls. After a while, the city of Sinope dispatches ambassadors to Kotuōra. The Sinopeans fear for their colony, which pays them a tribute, as well as for the land which is being plundered, as they hear. The Sinopean ambassadors address the Ten Thousand through Hecatōnumos, a man believed to be a clever speaker:

Men and soldiers, the city of the Sinopeans sent us both to praise you, because you, being Greeks, are victorious over barbarians and, secondly, to join with you in pleasant rejoicing, because you have gotten here safely, having made it through many and dangerous challenges, as we hear. We think we deserve, since we ourselves are Greeks, to experience some good at your hands, since you are Greeks, and nothing harmful, for we have never begun to do you any harm. These Kotuōritans are our colonists, and we gave this country over to them, after we took it from barbarians. Therefore they pay us an assigned tribute, as do those of Kerasōis and Trapezonte as well, so that whatever harm you do to these, the city of the Sinopeans believes it suffers. Now we hear that after entering into their city by violence, some of you are lodging in their houses, and that you are taking whatever you want from their lands by violence, without persuading anyone to allow it. These things, then, we do not deserve. If you keep doing them, it will be necessary for us to make friends with Korulas [the non-Hellenic ruler of Paphlagonia] and with the Paphlagonians and anyone else we can. (5.5.8–12)⁷²

The Ten Thousand thus stand accused of committing injustice: they have transgressed the Hellenic law. For Hellenes deserve (AXIOŌ)⁷³ to experience some good at the hands of fellow Hellenes and no harm. And since the Ten Thousand have allegedly used violence, the charge amounts to an accusation of hubris (cf. 5.5.16). The Socratic King rises from his seat, in the plenitude of his authority and power, and he answers the charge "on behalf of the soldiers" (5.5.13).⁷⁴ His apology turns the tables on Hecatōnumos. It is the Kotuōritans (and the Sinopeans), he pleads, who have transgressed the Hellenic law. For if the Kotuōritans have perhaps never harmed the army, they have not done it any good either: no markets were opened,

they suffered any—and in the future to have them as their subjects (5.4.6). The wrong is corrected in a manner by the Greeks (5.4.15 cf. 5.4.30). The issue in question was treated in chapter 5.3 as well: consider note 37 above.

⁷² Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

⁷³ AXIOŌ is used twice by Hecatōnumos.

⁷⁴ The phrase "on behalf of the soldiers" points to the fact that the authority and power of Xenophon have now reached their zenith. They are about to be shattered in the wake of his

no gifts of hospitality were sent, and the sick were not received inside the walls. Xenophon then recounts the dealings the Ten Thousand had with the Trapezontians to prove that *they* have abided by the Hellenic law in the past. They are models of Hellenic justice. He contrasts the friendly reception of the Trapezontians with the unfriendly reception of the Kotuōritans, who have only themselves to blame if something was taken from their land. It was taken out of necessity. Nor did the Ten Thousand enter Kotuōra violently. They merely walked in where the place was accessible and settled their sick and wounded inside the houses. For these men, being Greeks, deserved (AXIOŌ) as much.⁷⁵ Finally, if the Sinopeans think it best to make Korulas their friend against the Ten Thousand—as Hecatōnumos threatens to do—the latter will wage war on them all. The Ten Thousand may even befriend Korulas by gratifying his desire to acquire Sinope and its fortresses along the sea (5.5.23).

This forceful apology of Xenophon apparently persuades the Sinopean ambassadors that the army has acted justly.⁷⁶ At any rate, the ambassadors are visibly very angry with Hecatōnumos for what he has said (5.5.24). Xenophon has defended the army while remaining on the plane of the Hellenic law. For, he has stressed the army's observance of this law. Toward the center of his apology, however, he beckons in a different direction:

Wherever we may arrive and do not have a market, whether it is a barbarian land or a Greek one, we take our provisions—not out of hubris, but out of necessity. Even though the Kardouchoi, the Taochoi, and Chaldeans were not subjects of the King, and though they were also very frightening, we nevertheless took them on as enemies, because it was necessary to take our provisions, since they did not provide a market. Since the Macrōnians, however, even though they were barbarians, provided us such a market as they could, we both believed them to be friends and did not take by violence anything that belonged to them. But as for the

failed attempt to found a city in Asia (5.6). This attempt will spawn accusations (5.7) and a charge of hubris (5.8). Since chapter 5.5 marks the zenith of the authority and power of the Socratic King, it is appropriately the eighteenth of the thirty-five chapters of Part III.

⁷⁵ Xenophon also says that the Ten Thousand are now guarding the gates to protect their comrades from the “harmoni” of the Sinopeans, a word he uses twice (5.5.19–20). “Harmoni” were Spartan imperial governors, often oppressive and corrupt. The barb is clear: the Sinopeans are small-time imperialists with no regard for Hellenic freedom.

⁷⁶ Compare 5.5.14–15 with 5.2.2 and note 17. Xenophon surely idealizes the Ten Thousand's relations with the Trapezontians. Moreover, while he discusses this relation at length, he is silent about how the Ten Thousand dealt with the Kerasōtians. (Hecatōnumos had mentioned Kerasōt in the central position at 5.5.10). The reason for the silence is obvious: 5.7.13–35. To hear Xenophon tell his story, the Ten Thousand never plunder when they have a market where they can buy provisions. He uses the word “provisions” (EPITĒDEIA) three times and “booty” (LEIA) not once.

Kotuōritans, whom you declare to be yours, if we took anything of theirs, they themselves are the causes; for they did not deal with us as friends, but locking their gates, they neither received us inside nor sent a market to us outside. (5.5.16–19)⁷⁷

What begins as a remark of Xenophon about hubris and the necessity to take provisions becomes an explanation of what a “friend” is (PHILOS). According to him, the Ten Thousand regard as “friends” all those who help them. The “friend” is not defined by his Hellenic ethnicity—to say nothing of more exalted considerations—but by his serviceability. The example of the Macrōnians, at once friends and barbarians, indicates this.⁷⁸ The implications of this definition are obvious: the Hellenic Kotuōritans and the Hellenic Sinopeans risk becoming the enemies of the Ten Thousand if they refuse to help. It thus seems that the principle underlying Xenophon's rule is not the Hellenic law as such, but a maxim that can be stated as follows: requite the benefit and pay back the harm (cf. 5.5.21). This maxim is not coterminous with the Hellenic law—though the two principles will overlap—since the maxim takes its bearing by the good of the army. Hellenes *qua* Hellenes have no claim to the consideration of the Socratic King.

Having thus beckoned beyond the Hellenic law and toward the plane of the good of the army, Xenophon concludes by returning to the plane of the Hellenic law. But he does not simply return to it. He replies to the threat of Hecatōnumos with a threat of his own. More precisely, Xenophon restates the threat of Hecatōnumos, whom he credits with having threatened to fight the Ten Thousand *willfully*.⁷⁹ And it is *that* threat that Xenophon answers in kind. For after saying that the Ten Thousand will wage war on all their opponents all together if necessary, he adds pointedly, as we just saw:

If it seems good to us, we will make the Paphlagonian (i.e. Korulas) a friend. For we hear that he desires your city and your fortresses along the

⁷⁷ Translation by Ambler (2008). I modified it slightly.

⁷⁸ The Macrōnians are mentioned at the exact center of the speech (5.5.18). According to the description of book four, the Macrōnians exchanged pledges with the Ten Thousand, calling upon the gods as witnesses in a rather elaborate ceremony (4.8.7). Because of these pledges, and as a result of them, the non-Hellenic Macrōnians became the friends of the Ten Thousand. Only *then* did they proceed to open a market for them (4.8.8). According to Xenophon, however, the Macrōnians became the friends of the Ten Thousand *because* they opened a market for them and as a result of *that* act.

⁷⁹ Hecatōnumos had indicated that the Sinopeans might be compelled by necessity (ANAGKĒ) to fight the Ten Thousand (5.5.12). Xenophon ascribes to him the threat that they might fight the Ten Thousand “if it seems good to you” (ĒN HUMĪN DOKĒ: 5.5.22).

sea. We will attempt to become his friends by bringing about for him what he desires. (5.5.23)

Xenophon threatens to help a barbarian regain control of the coastline now in the possession of Hellenic Sinope (cf. 5.5.1). He might disregard Hellenic friendship. But of course, self-defense against a willful aggressor is just or lawful, as Hecatōnumos himself has conceded (5.5.9, §12).⁸⁰

That the rule of the Socratic King is guided by the good of the army rather than by the Hellenic law must be properly understood. Xenophon's perorating threat is intended to prompt the Sinopeans and the Kotuōritans to act in a more friendly fashion: that is, to bring about their compliance with the Hellenic law. And the threat works. Following Xenophon's apology, one of the Sinopean ambassadors declares that they have not come to wage war on the Ten Thousand but to show that they are their friends.⁸¹ He says that there will be gifts of hospitality for the Ten Thousand if they come to Sinope, adding that meanwhile they will order the people of Kotuōra to give them what they can: "For we see that everything you say is true" (5.5.24). Gifts of hospitality are duly sent to the army. The generals of the Greeks host (EXENIDZON) the Sinopean ambassadors, who are also Greeks. The two groups discuss in a friendly manner (PHILIKA) subjects of shared interest or need, including how to complete the journey back to Greece. The peroration of Xenophon has benefited the army. It has brought about compliance with the Hellenic law. The Socratic King has reconciled the noble with the good.

* * *

"This was the end of that day" (TELOS: 5.6.1). The next day the Greek generals gather the soldiers. It seems best to call on the Sinopeans and deliberate with them about the rest of the journey. For, if the army decides to travel by foot, it seems that the Sinopeans will be useful because they have experience of Paphlagonia. And if the army decides to sail, the Sinopeans, who alone seem⁸² capable of providing enough ships, will also be needed. The generals begin the deliberations by saying that "they deserve (AXIOŌ) to get from the Sinopeans, as Greeks to Greeks, a noble

⁸⁰ But note that while Xenophon uses the word ANAGKĒ three times in his apology, he threatens to make Korulas a friend "ANDE DOKĒ HĒMĪN" (5.5.23).

⁸¹ Hecatōnumos, who was reputed to be clever at speaking, uses the word "friend" (PHILOS) only once in his speech—to threaten the Ten Thousand to "make Korulas a friend." Xenophon uses "friend" five times and "friendship" once (PHILIA).

⁸² The verb "to seem" (DOKEIN) occurs five times in the opening paragraph of 5.6.

reception (KALŌS),⁸³ first by being shown goodwill and by being given the noblest advice" (TA KALLISTA SUMBOULEUEIN: 5.6.2).⁸⁴ The generals thus appeal to the Hellenic law just considered, or to an aspect of this law, as they seek advice from the Sinopeans. For as we saw in chapter two, the giver of noble advice must consider the interest of the advisee, even at significant cost to himself. The name of Xenophon is not mentioned in this scene (5.6.1–11). No threats are uttered.

Once again, Hecatōnumos speaks on behalf of the Sinopeans. He begins with an apology for his speech of the previous day, claiming that what he had meant was *not* that the Sinopeans would wage war on the Greeks but that "while it was possible to be friends with the barbarians, [the Sinopeans] would choose the Greeks" (5.6.3). When they bid Hecatōnumos give his advice, he opens with a prayer:

If I advise the things that seem best to me, may good things come to me, and if not, the opposite. For I seem to be presented with the task of giving what is called "sacred counsel." For if I manifestly advise well now, many will praise me; but if I advise badly, many will call down curses upon me. (5.6.4)

This grandiloquent prayer reminds us that the Hellenic law that requires the giving of noble advice creates a duty enforced by the gods. But does Hecatōnumos believe in the existence of avenging gods? We do not know. (It is noteworthy that he speaks of advising "what seems best to me," not [as the generals had requested] "what is noblest.") Hecatōnumos advises the Ten Thousand to travel by sea. This is his advice even though (as he stresses) the Sinopeans will have greater troubles if the advice is accepted. For, if the Ten Thousand travel by sea, the Sinopeans will have to provide the ships whereas if they set out by land, they themselves will have to do the fighting. But does Hecatōnumos set aside the interest of Sinope, as well as his own private interest, to consider the interest of the Ten Thousand? In the audience, some suspect that he is motivated by his friendship for Korulas, his public guest-friend or proxenos; others, that Hecatōnumos expects to receive gifts for his advice; yet others, that he speaks out of fear that the Ten Thousand will ravage the country of the Sinopeans.⁸⁵ Despite these suspicions, the soldiers vote to make the journey by sea. They are weary of marching.

⁸³ The phrase "KALŌS DECHESTHAI" (5.6.2) refers back to 5.5.24 and context.

⁸⁴ The inferior MSS. FM have "the best advice" instead of "the noblest advice" at 5.6.2.

⁸⁵ Of the three grounds of suspicion, the most serious is of course the second and central one (5.6.11).

How well did Hecatōnumos fulfill his task of giving "sacred counsel"? His speech expatiates upon the many military and geographic obstacles that the Ten Thousand will encounter if they set out by land. These obstacles are so numerous and of such magnitude that (he says) "I believe that the march is not difficult but altogether impossible for you" (5.6.10). Is this report truthful? The Ten Thousand have few means to find out how things really stand (cf. 5.6.7). But they will discover the truth as they sail westward along the coast. Suffice it to observe here that Hecatōnumos exaggerates almost comically the difficulty of crossing the several rivulets that flow into the sea along the littoral: he is indeed "The-Man-Of-The-Hundred-Pretences."⁸⁶ In book five, Hecatōnumos is the first man to invoke "Hellas" as a pretext for self-interested goals. Despite the threat of divine punishment, and in the absence of human threat, the Hellenic law is honored in the breach. "Hellas" has become a fig leaf for a scoundrel.

* * *

We have seen that the tension between private interest and the common good reasserts itself once the army reaches the sea. This tension will now reach a fever pitch in the wake of Xenophon's attempt to found a city in Asia. For, as he awaits the arrival of the ships of the Sinopeans, Xenophon thinks of transforming the army into a city: "It seemed to [him] noble to increase the territory and power of Hellas," he writes; given the soldiers' hard-earned experience and numbers, as well as the numbers of those dwelling in the Pontos, he thought that "this city would become great" (5.6.15–16). Xenophon thus begins to offer sacrifices for this before speaking to any one of the soldiers. He calls to his side Silanos of Ambracia, formerly the soothsayer of Cyrus. Silanos, however, leaks word to the soldiers that Xenophon wishes to remain in Asia to found a city and gain "a name and power for himself" (5.6.17). In thus leaking the plan, Silanos is motivated by private interest: he wishes to arrive in Hellas as quickly as possible because he has kept safe a large sum of money he received from

⁸⁶ HECATON-ONOMA. The man claims that the Greeks will need to cross *four* rivers to reach Sinope. But the river Parthenios, which he claims is "uncrossable" (ABATOS), is situated *west* of Sinope (cf. 6.2.1). Note also the absence of OIDA ("I know") at 5.6.9, and compare 5.6.7 and 5.6.8: Hecatōnumos does not claim to know what he reports about the rivers along the littoral. He even dubs one of these rivulets "the Tigris," an amusing reading found in the best MSS. (see the apparatus of Hude/Peters and Dindorf for 5.6.9). When the Greeks actually see the river for themselves, it is demoted to the rank of "little tiger" (TIGRIOS: 6.2.1). The unusual spelling of Tigris at 5.6.9—TIGREN instead of TIGRĒTA—is also used by Herodotus (e.g., 1.189, 1.193).

Cyrus after making an accurate prediction (5.6.18 cf. 1.7.18). When the soldiers get wind of Xenophon's plan, some think it best to remain in Asia but most do not: they are not willing to bid farewell to Hellas. (We learn later that many soldiers had livelihoods and families back home [6.4.7–8]. These considerations are not mentioned here, however, because the focus of the *logos* is on the attachment to *Hellas*.) The widespread opposition of the soldiers creates an opening for other rulers who outline alternative plans for the army. Timasiōn the Dardanian, for example, tells the assembled soldiers that "they should not consider remaining [in Asia] nor esteem anything more highly than Hellas" (5.6.22). Timasiōn offers to lead the soldiers to the Troad and promises various spoils and a monthly wage. He is apparently intent on seizing the tyranny of his native city on the strength of the soldiers: his attachment to Hellas, genuine or feigned, does not conceal extensive political ambitions. A second ruler, Thōrax the Boeotian, also argues in the assembly against remaining in Asia in the name of Hellas and he, too, promises a wage. His ambition is equally evident (5.6.25–26).

Is Xenophon motivated by ambition when he considers founding a city in Asia? We have seen that he depicts himself as a ruler committed to the noble task of increasing the territory and power of Hellas. He does not admit to any private ambition for "name and power."⁸⁷ But should we accept this self-presentation at face value? After all, the very readiness to remain in Asia casts something of a shadow over his attachment to Hellas. Xenophon's self-presentation appears to be designed to offset the impression left by that readiness. It seems better to assume, in other words, and more in keeping with common sense, that Xenophon is motivated by a measure of ambition, at least, when he considers founding a city in Asia: increasing "the territory and power of Hellas" does not exhaust his concerns.⁸⁸ To this line of argument, it will perhaps be objected that Xenophon does acknowledge openly his ambition for the "monarchy" of the Ten Thousand later in the *Anabasis* (6.1.20–21, §31). Why, then, is he coy about his ambition to found a city? Yet the objection overlooks that founding a city among the barbarians is a much more delicate or ambiguous ambition than exercising the monarchy of the Ten Thousand. For, let us be clear about his goal: Xenophon means to seize

⁸⁷ Xenophon claims to have been "slandered" (DIABALLEIN) by Silanos (5.6.29). But he was "slandered" only if we put words in Silanos's mouth. See chapter one, p. 43, note 10. Consider also the report of Timasiōn, who was privy to Xenophon's plan and who uses (in reporting that plan) the verbs "to wish" (BOULOIMAI) and "to will" (ETHELŌ) respectively thrice and twice (5.6.20).

⁸⁸ Recall that Xenophon had threatened to help *reduce* the territory and power of Hellas in the episode of the Kotuōritans (5.5.22–23).

an *existing* barbaric city and to colonize it.⁸⁹ He is contemplating some kind of "mixing" of Hellenism and barbarism. The projected founding would entail an ethical separation from Hellas, not just a geographic one (5.6.20, §30). Yet the readiness of Xenophon to jettison (or improve upon) the Hellenic laws is not altogether surprising: he is a sympathizer of the "Mossunoikoi," after all, and the "Mossunoikoi" were "barbarians."⁹⁰

Xenophon keeps silent in the assembly while he is being publicly (though only implicitly) accused by Timasiōn and Thōrax of esteeming some things more highly than Hellas (5.6.27). When a pair of other speakers accuse him explicitly of persuading in private, and of sacrificing in private, instead of bringing these issues to the assembly for open consideration, Xenophon is compelled to defend himself: "I do sacrifice, men, as you see," he begins, "as much as I can both on your behalf and on my own in order that I may chance to say (LEGEIN), think (NOEIN), and do (PRATTEIN) the sort of things that are going to be most noble and best both for you and for me" (5.6.28). (In other words, there is no tension between Xenophon's private interest and the interests of the soldiers, contrary to what Silanos has suggested.) "I was just now sacrificing about this very thing," Xenophon continues, "whether it would be better to begin to speak (LEGEIN) to you and to act (PRATTEIN) about these things, or not even to lay hold of the matter at all" (5.6.28).⁹¹ Xenophon claims to have learned the most important point from Silanos already: the sacrifices are propitious for "the matter" (TO PRĀGMA). He does not spell out what "the matter" is anywhere in his speech however—that is, what he has been "thinking" (NOEIN) about. The closest he comes to stating his

⁸⁹ Xenophon says publicly that he had intended to seize an existing city of the Pontos (5.6.30). This is confirmed by those who report his private words: TĒS...CHŌRAS OIKOUMENĒS...HOPOIAN BOULĒSTHE KATASCHEIN, "to seize an *inhabited* territory, wherever you wish" (5.6.20, my emphasis). In the best MSS., the verb KATOIKEŌ occurs at 5.6.15, *not* KATOIKIDZŌ, accepted by modern editors but found only in the inferior MSS. The meaning of these two verbs appears to overlap, but KATOIKIDZŌ appears to mean primarily "to found" a new city whereas KATOIKEŌ appears to mean primarily "to inhabit or colonize" an existing place (consider Aristotle, *Politics* 1266a40–1266b5, as well as the use of OIKIDZŌ at 6.6.3, where a new city is being contemplated.) Even if the Ten Thousand were to found an altogether new city, they would have to find wives among the locals, with predictable results: cf. 3.2.25 with *Genesis* 31.19ff. See also Herodotus 1.146.2.

⁹⁰ Xenophon uses the word "the matter" (TO PRĀGMA) to refer to his project to found a city among the barbarians (5.6.28). He then uses the same word with great frequency to refer to a series of *transgressions* of the Hellenic laws: 5.7.12, 5.7.18, 5.7.20, 5.7.22, 5.7.23, 5.8.7.

⁹¹ Strauss (1983) comments: "This means in plain English that [Xenophon] did not consult the sacrifices regarding the advisability of *thinking* about founding a city" (p. 125, my emphasis).

thought is to acknowledge that he had intended to seize an existing city to relieve the poverty of the soldiers, who could then sail home if they wished, leaving the rest of the army to follow at a later point. But the plan to *remain* in Asia is never acknowledged publicly (5.6.30 cf. 5.6.20).

Xenophon goes on to state that he has had a change of mind: since the local cities are sending transport ships, and since Timasiōn and Thōrax are promising a wage, "it seems to me noble to arrive safe where we wish to go, and to receive a wage for our very difficulties, and I myself give up that thought (DIANOIA), and I say to those who used to come to me saying that we ought to undertake it that they need to give it up as well" (5.6.31). Xenophon gives up his "thought" almost as soon as he conceives it. This is the result not of irresolution but of superior prudence: the projected founding threatens the unity and, therefore, the safety and well-being of the army (5.6.32).⁹² For, if the power of the Ten Thousand is scattered, they will lose their ability to get provisions and "you will not depart from [Asia] rejoicing" (5.6.32). Xenophon is attracted to rarefied political prospects but never loses sight of the more prosaic components of the good. At no point is his survey of the political landscape dulled or dazzled by such prospects, and he accepts their loss with dignity and self-composure.⁹³ It would be excessive to claim, however, that he was not a bit disappointed.⁹⁴ To found a city would have been a signal achievement—the peak of his political anabasis. Yet the good fortune of human beings is envied by the gods.⁹⁵ Was the ascent of Xenophon thwarted by heaven?

Timasiōn and Thōrax had promised a wage to the soldiers on the strength of a secret promise by the Sinopeans and the Hērakleōtans to send them funds. Yet once it becomes known that the army has decided to go back to Hellas and that Xenophon himself has put the proposal to

⁹² Xenophon had to abandon his ambition for another reason as well: the requisite ships would not have been sent by the Sinopeans and the Hērakleōtans had he declared his intentions and abided by them. They did not wish for the Ten Thousand to remain permanently in Asia.

⁹³ Xenophon leverages the loss of his prospects to shore up the unity of the army (5.6.33–34). He gets the army to decree that it will be a crime (ADIKOS) for individuals to leave before the entire host is safe. The Ten Thousand do not form a liberal community existing solely for the sake of the all-important individual. The removal of any individual weakens the whole. The reader should also compare 5.6.12–14 with 5.6.32–33: either the Greeks will become slaves in Asia (if they allow their power to be splintered) or they must be slaves to the law (to preserve their power): slavery is a political inevitability (cf. *Memorabilia* 2.1).

⁹⁴ Cf. 5.6.28: "[TA] KALLISTA KAI ARISTA" with 5.6.31: "KALON MOI DOKEI EINAI." To give up the project to found a city is to abandon "the best things" (my emphasis). In keeping with this, Xenophon is compelled (ĒNAGKASTHĒ) to make the speech in which he gives up his project (5.6.27).

⁹⁵ Herodotus 8.109, Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 982b32. Cf. *Memorabilia* 3.9.8

a vote, the cities send the ships but not the money.⁹⁶ They no longer fear a permanent settlement of the host in Asia. Timasiōn and Thōrax, unable to fulfill their promise to the soldiers, become terrified of them. They impart their secret dealings to the other generals. (A general named Neōn is not informed, however.⁹⁷) And they go to Xenophon and confess that they regret what has happened. Since the ships have arrived, they say, it seems best to them to sail eastward and seize the land of the Phasians. They rally Xenophon's plan belatedly. Yet Xenophon refuses to speak to the army: "But if you wish," he says, "you gather the army and speak to it" (5.6.37). Timasiōn then "shows the judgment" *not* to call an assembly, but that each general should first attempt to persuade his own captains (5.6.37). And they go and do these things.

The attempt to persuade the captains secretly was bound to be leaked to the soldiers. When it becomes known by them, Neōn immediately accuses Xenophon of persuading the other generals and of having it in mind to lead the soldiers back to the Phasis after deceiving them (5.7.1). Of course, the accusation is false. Yet it has every appearance of being true. Xenophon has just admitted publicly that he once wished to sail into the Phasis. When Xenophon notices angry gatherings of soldiers, he immediately calls together an assembly and states that he hears that "someone is slandering me" (5.7.5). "Hear me, before the gods," Xenophon exclaims, "and if I appear to have manifestly done an injustice I must not leave this place before I pay the penalty. On the other hand, if the injustice is being manifestly done by those who slander me, you need to deal with them as they deserve" (5.7.5). Xenophon speaks as if he is about to turn the assembly into a court of law assembled for the purpose of trying the generals. Yet he defends himself in the sequel without accusing the generals, as he himself stresses (5.7.4).

Xenophon demonstrates with the greatest of ease the foolishness of supposing that he, a single man, might be able to deceive thousands of soldiers and lead them against their will into the Phasis. He would literally have to convince them that the sun rises where it sets and sets where it rises. And if he did lead them eastward, he could not possibly escape punishment when these armed men reached destination and realized that they had been deceived. In reality (Xenophon says) he is being slandered by men who are foolish and by the envious, because he is honored by the soldiers. Yet this envy is not just, he insists, and he explains why. Yet Xenophon never accuses the generals, as I just noted, nor does he identify Neōn as the author of the slander. Why not? After all, the

⁹⁶ Cf. 5.6.35: Apparently, only the Hērakleōtans were false to their promise.

⁹⁷ The name "Neōn" and his city of origin are variously spelled in the MSS. I suspect that he was originally renamed "The-One-Who-Remains-Blameless" (MENŌNOS ASINĒOS: see the *apparata* of Masqueray and Dindorf for 5.6.36).

generals *had been* plotting secretly against the soldiers, and Neōn, though an unwitting slanderer, was evidently ill-intentioned toward Xenophon. Why not accuse them all publicly? The answer, I believe, is that an accusation would have shattered the soldiers' remaining confidence in their rulers. Though the generals had been deceptive, a public accusation was sure to elicit counteraccusations. And since the plot could not be established by indisputable evidence, any "trial" would have turned into a bout of mudslinging. A generalized loss of confidence would have been the inevitable result at a time when the troops were already inclined to act as "self-appointed generals" (5.6.29). Xenophon was attempting to stave off a descent into chaos.

Is my reading too sympathetic to Xenophon? After all, his refusal to accuse the generals publicly had the effect of shoring up the authority of a group of rulers among whom he was preeminent. Was Xenophon perhaps more concerned with the continuation of his own rule than with the good of the army? The second half of his speech allays this suspicion in a striking manner.

Upon concluding his defense against the slander,⁹⁸ Xenophon says that when the soldiers have had their fill of these things, they should not depart before he tells them the kind of matter he sees developing in the army. If it continues, he says, this matter will turn them all into "the worst and most shameful men in the eyes of gods and human beings and of their enemies" (5.7.12).⁹⁹ Xenophon turns his defense into an attack.¹⁰⁰ The second half of his speech details a series of lawless actions perpetrated by various groups of soldiers. These actions include (among others) a thuggish night attack on a small and friendly village; a stoning to death of three elderly heralds who had come to the army for a peaceful parley; an attack and subsequent drowning of Hellenic envoys; a hunting down of a market manager pursued "like a wild boar or a deer" (5.7.24). These actions were not only transgressions of the army's own laws or decrees.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Though Xenophon's defense is completely successful, it does not answer every part of the original slander. That slander was twofold: (1) Xenophon has *persuaded* the other generals; (2) Xenophon has it in mind to lead the soldiers back to the Phasis after *deceiving* them (5.7.1). Xenophon defends himself only against the charge of deception. Having done so, he "forgets" about the charge of persuasion, makes a deliberate pause and, in a deft rhetorical move, offers to gratify the curiosity of the soldiers—a curiosity he has himself kindled—thus enabling himself to move on seamlessly (5.7.12). Xenophon cannot easily address the charge of persuasion without exposing the duplicitous part played in the affair by Timasiōn and the other generals.

⁹⁹ With the best MSS., I omit the word "friends" at 5.7.12: the Ten Thousand have become incapable of friendship with anyone.

¹⁰⁰ Strauss (1983) pp. 126–27.

¹⁰¹ In his speech, Xenophon refers to the assembly of the Ten Thousand as "TO KOINON" (5.7.17, §18). But in his narrative, he refers to it as the "AGORA" (5.7.3, 2X).

They were breaches of hallowed Hellenic laws. And they were so numerous and extensive that it will be thought proper to purify the army following Xenophon's speech (5.7.35). Yet here again, the speech is remarkable for what it *omits*: Xenophon makes no call to put on trial the soldiers who were involved in these incidents. The omission is especially noteworthy given that he had made just such a call in the preceding chapter (5.6.33–34). And even in the present speech, Xenophon deplores that an alleged wrongdoer has perhaps gotten off “without a trial” (AKRITOS: 5.7.29; see also 5.7.28). Yet he ends his speech with a modest suggestion: “consider putting some stop to these [lawless actions]” (SKOPEÏTE PAÛLAN TINA AUTŌN: 5.7.32). Why not propose trials? The answer, I believe, is that the culprits were simply too numerous to be tried safely.

Let me spell out this suggestion. The good of the army and the demands of (punitive) justice are irreconcilable in this case. The military power of the Ten Thousand must be preserved if they are to be able to secure the provisions they need and ward off hostile threats. Yet they will destroy their power if they turn on each other and begin to execute one another judicially (cf. 5.7.32 *in fine*). Capital trials on a large scale—assuming such trials could be organized at all—would have led to the downright implosion of the army at a time when lawlessness had multiplied the enemies of the Ten Thousand even among the Hellenes (cf. 5.7.30). The Ten Thousand could not afford to thin their ranks in this way.

Should Xenophon have sought to punish the transgressions of the Hellenic laws despite the risks involved? *Fiat justitia, et pereat mundus*. Yet by attempting to try the culprits, Xenophon would have shattered the common good, as we just saw. And isn't the common good a crucial meaning of justice? Does an action that destroys the common good deserve to be called a just action? To attain justice entire is impossible in this case because justice is at odds with itself. *Fiat justitia* expresses a contradictory imperative. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that justice entire requires divine providence. Only a god at once powerful, just, and willing to fight on behalf of the Ten Thousand could enable them to try the culprits without shattering the common good. Yet according to Xenophon, *no one* is fighting on behalf of the Ten Thousand.¹⁰² The Socratic King must ensure that they can carry out this task for themselves.

What is happening to the AGORA of the Ten Thousand is illustrated by the utter inability of the market managers—the “AGORANOMOI”—to apply the law. The Ten Thousand have become an “AGORA” without a “NOMOS” (5.7.2, 5.7.24–25).

¹⁰² That Zeus does not rule or fight on behalf of the Greeks, and that he remains passive in the face of injustice and fails to support the just, is suggested repeatedly: 5.7.22, 5.7.32, 5.8.6 and, above all, 5.8.21. The passage on envy (PHTHONOS: 5.7.10–12), located as it were in the middle of the two parts of Xenophon's apology, is also important here. This

The assembly's reaction to Xenophon's speech is remarkable. All rise to their feet and say that the men who began the lawlessness must pay the penalty. In the future, to begin lawlessness will no longer be permitted and those who make a beginning of it shall be punished with death. The generals shall put all these men on trial. There shall also be trials for any wrong committed since the time of Cyrus's death. The captains are made jurors. Yet this is the first and the last we hear of soldiers being put on trial. The chapter ends on an exhortation of Xenophon, who, supported by the soothsayers, urges the assembly to purify the army. “And the purification took place” (5.7.35). Only the purification. The army was cleansed of its sins in a manner that was consistent with its safety. While the Ten Thousand—many of whom had committed serious crimes—hankered for punitive justice, Xenophon—who had committed no crime—felt no such hankering.

4. Justice and the Good

The soldiers now gratify their suspicions of, and their animosities toward, their generals. The assembly resolves that all the generals shall undergo a trial for their past conduct. Three generals are fined for breaches of duty. Xenophon himself is accused of having struck men without necessity, that is, he is charged with hubris (5.8.1).¹⁰³ (It is crucial to recall here that Socrates was accused by the Athenians of making his pupils hubristic. The accusation reflected a charge leveled in Aristophanes's *Clouds*.¹⁰⁴) Xenophon faces his accusers. He asks the first one to say where

passage must be read on two levels. First, it is a reply to Neōn and the others who slander Xenophon partly out of envy. But we must also think of divine envy. The passage calls to mind a notion familiar to Greek piety: the gods are envious of the good fortune of human beings. We are meant to consider that Xenophon's ascent was perhaps thwarted by heaven. He is replying to this putative envy, too, I believe, when he describes it as unjust: “Whom among them do I hinder from speaking with a view to some good among you, if anyone is able, or from fighting on our behalf and his own if he is willing, or from being wakeful about our safety, if he cares to be?” (5.7.10, my emphasis; I follow the best MSS.; see also Strauss [1983], p. 126). Xenophon is even willing to cede his place to the envious deity: “Let him rule, I yield. Only let it be clear that he is doing us some good.” (In support of my interpretation, observe how Xenophon begins his speech with an ostentatious reference to the gods: “Hear me, then, before the gods...” [PROS THEŌN: 5.7.5, my emphasis]; the speech is delivered within the hearing of the gods and is in a way addressed to them.) Xenophon's view of divine envy is well captured by a somewhat mischievous remark of Aristotle: *Metaphysics* 983a2–4 and context. That a Godlike King can be superior to the gods from the point of view of envy is suggested by *Education of Cyrus* 2.3.12.

¹⁰³ The accusation is a GRAPHĒ HUBREŌS. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1402a1–3.

¹⁰⁴ *Clouds* 1298, 1505. Kritias and, especially, Alcibiades later provided real-life illustrations of the problem: *Memorabilia* 1.2.12–48 (as well as 1.2.9–11).

he received the blows. The incident had occurred in the mountains of Armenia, when the army was marching through deep snow and the soldiers were hungry and dying of cold and exhaustion. Xenophon had compelled the man now accusing him to carry a soldier who was too weak to march. Xenophon had then encountered the same man again, a bit later, as he was digging a grave and about to bury the soldier in question. Xenophon had stopped and praised the digger for his act of piety—until he observed that the “dead” soldier could move his leg! “And so I beat you,” Xenophon admits, “you are telling the truth, since you seemed to me like someone who knew that the man was alive.” “So what?” the accuser retorts, “Did he die any less after I showed him to you?” “We all will die,” Xenophon shoots back, “must we on this account be buried alive” (5.8.10–11)? At that point the assembled soldiers cry out that the accuser was struck with too few blows. Thereupon Xenophon bids the other accusers say why each of them was beaten. But no one is willing to stand up and accuse Xenophon anymore. He therefore goes on the offensive once again: “I agree, men, that I did beat men” (5.8.13). His apology purports to justify these beatings.

Xenophon makes clear that he used his fists in three different kinds of cases. First, he would strike soldiers who were content to be saved by the army’s orderliness and discipline while they themselves left the ranks to snatch plunder and get more for themselves. “And if all of us had done this, we would all have been destroyed” (5.8.13). The common good uniting the Ten Thousand is at all times an imperfect good, and free riders must be kept from exploiting this imperfection. Second, Xenophon used his fists to compel individuals, who were going soft and abandoning themselves to the enemy, to get up (5.8.14–15). These incidents occurred during the Armenian winter. Xenophon had sat down once in a bad storm waiting a long time for others who were packing up. Afterward he learned that he could hardly stand up and stretch his legs. Having gained this experience in his own case, he would drive away anyone he saw sitting in the snow and being lazy. The third kind of cases involved lackadaisical individuals who fell behind and hindered the forward march of the army (5.8.16–17).

“My argument is simple,” Xenophon says. “If I punished anyone for the good, I deserve to suffer the same penalty as parents do who punish their sons, and as teachers do who punish their pupils. And doctors, too, burn and cut for the good” (5.8.18). Xenophon deserves to be honored like a father or a teacher, and rewarded like a doctor. But what does it mean to say that he beat the soldiers “for the good” (EPI AGATHŌ)? It means that he beat the soldiers for the good of the army—think of the first kind of cases—though these beatings were obviously *not* good for

the free riders themselves. In the third kind of cases, too—stragglers hindering the march of the host—the beatings were good for the army and (unlike the first kind of cases) perhaps even for the stragglers themselves: “I struck them with my fists so that they would not be struck by the spear of the enemies” (5.8.16). The most interesting and revealing kind of cases, however, is the second and central kind. Xenophon beat soldiers in order to get them to stand up. He knew¹⁰⁵ that in the dead of winter, sitting idly on the frozen ground would cause “curdling of the blood and rotting away of one’s toes” (5.8.15). Xenophon beat soldiers for their own good. Just like a doctor whose treatment, though painful, is of benefit to the patient, Xenophon is guided not by the law but by the good—by his *knowledge* of the good. He justifies his beatings of the soldiers and to the soldiers much like Pheidippidēs justifies his beating of his father to Strepsiadēs: the knower can justly beat the nonknower for his own good.¹⁰⁶ Like a consummate Socratic, Xenophon looks down on bad or harmful laws.¹⁰⁷ In the *logos* of the *Anabasis*, book five ends like book four and book three, pointing to the primacy of the good of the army.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Xenophon uses the word KATEMATHON (“I knew” or “I learned”) at 5.8.14, as well as the phrase (in reference to the soldiers) KAI HUMEIS ISTE (“you too know”) at 5.8.15.

¹⁰⁶ *Clouds* 1321–1438; cf. *Memorabilia* 1.2.49–50.

¹⁰⁷ *Clouds* 1400; *Memorabilia* 1.2.9–11. To be sure, Xenophon’s defense is much more persuasive than Pheidippidēs’s. In the first place, he casts himself, in his relation to the army, in the role of the benevolent father rather than that of the ungrateful son. Besides, the benefits Xenophon conferred upon the soldiers were manifest and tangible (if also painful), whereas the “benefits” conferred upon Strepsiadēs were dubious at best. Hence, Xenophon can persuasively appeal to the common opinion, which belongs to ordinary morality, that a law must be good in order to be a law; otherwise, it is perhaps neither a law nor binding (cf. Alcibiades’s refutation of Pericles’s view of law at *Memorabilia* 1.2.42.) Moreover, Xenophon reminds his audience that the Armenian winter was exceedingly difficult and unforgiving (5.8.20). Under normal circumstances—when the Ten Thousand enjoy “fair weather”—Xenophon, too, abides by the law that prohibits beatings (5.8.19). Yet it is noteworthy that Xenophon does not invoke ANAGKĒ to justify or excuse himself (cf. his defense at 5.5.16, §17; also §22). The harsh Armenian winter was *not* his justification. Rather, it helped illuminate the principle underlying his habitual observance of the law.

¹⁰⁸ Book four and book five share a deeper similarity. The purpose of chapter 5.8 is identical to the purpose of chapter 4.8 (i.e., the episode of the Kolchoi). Both these books culminate in scenes that adumbrate the primacy of the good (of the army), and both link this primacy to the question of the gods. Note what Xenophon says to the soldiers at the end of chapter 5.8:

You have also judged that I struck [the bad soldiers] justly: you were there with swords, not pebbles, and it was possible for you to come to their aid if you wished. But, by Zeus, you did not come to their aid, nor did you assist me in striking whoever was out of order. You therefore gave license to the bad among them, since you allowed them to be insolent. (5.8.21, my emphasis)

To complete his defense, Xenophon argues that the soldiers themselves have judged that his beatings were just.¹⁰⁹ For, they were present when the beatings took place and could have come to the aid of the soldiers who were being struck. But they did not. Nor did they assist Xenophon in striking whoever was disorderly. They therefore gave license to the bad among the soldiers and allowed them to be hubristic.¹¹⁰

Xenophon ends his apology by once again turning the tables on the soldiers. For it is the soldiers who deserve to be put on trial for hubris (he implies) insofar as to indict a benefactor for his very benefaction is hubris.¹¹¹ It is also a form of ingratitude:

But I am amazed that if I am hateful to anyone among you, you recall it and do not stay silent, but if for anyone I lightened the burden of winter, or kept an enemy away, or joined in providing something for one who was weak or at a loss, no one recalls it; nor if I praised someone who acted nobly or if I honored as well as I was able anyone who was good, you recall nothing of it. And yet it is noble, just, pious, and more pleasant to recall the good things more than the bad.

Then they got up and began recalling them, and all ended well. (5.8.25–26)¹¹²

The book of justice—which has featured more than one melancholy episode of wrongdoing—ends attractively with the soldiers expressing their gratitude to Xenophon.

The soldiers stood by while Xenophon beat the bad soldiers. They thereby granted the justice of his beatings. The inaction of the soldiers mirrored the inaction of the bystander-in-chief. For the oath of Xenophon is meant to suggest what was also suggested by the epilogue to the fight with the Kolchoi: Zeus concedes, by his inaction, that deeds that are lawless but good are just or not unjust. More generally, Zeus alone can anchor an obligation to a law that is bad or harmful.

¹⁰⁹ Xenophon never quite says that his beatings were just. He even almost acknowledges that some of his beatings were “contrary to what is just” (5.8.17). And although he goes on to insist that the soldiers, by their inaction, have conceded the justice of the beatings, he does not quite claim as much in his own name (5.8.21).

¹¹⁰ Xenophon gives the example of the boxer Boiskos, whom he was apparently unable to curb with his fists.

¹¹¹ Addressing the Ten Thousand, Xenophon repeatedly uses the contrafactual formula “if you are moderate” (5.8.24). Moderation (SÖPHROSUNĒ) is the opposite of hubris (e.g., *Memorabilia* 1.2.19ff., 3.10.5). To be ungrateful toward a parent is a form of immoderation, and Xenophon compares himself to a father (*Memorabilia* 2.2.13–14). For the deeper meaning of the comparison to the father, see chapter three, pp. 122, note 36.

¹¹² Translation by Ambler (2008).

“THE SOCRATIC KING” (CONTD.)

CHAPTER 6

GRATITUDE (BOOK SIX OF THE *ANABASIS*)

The closing words of Xenophon in book five provide a most perfect transition to book six, the book of gratitude. Xenophon will now analyze how he conjoins or reconciles, as a ruler, the demands of gratitude with the exigencies of safety and advantage. Thus we continue to follow the plan of Part III: piety (book three), courage (book four), justice (book five), gratitude (book six), and the love of the soldier (book seven). Yet book five and book six are more closely connected than any of the earlier or later books. In the introduction, I noted that each of the books of the *Anabasis* (after book one) begins with a summary of the preceding *logos*. No such summary is affixed to book six. The transition between book five and book six is seamless.¹ Xenophon thus brings it about that these two books constitute a single stage or moment in the *logos* of Part III, itself the most important stage of the *logos* of the *Anabasis*. What gives this pair of books their stage unity? They are united by their themes. Though justice (book five) and gratitude (book six) are distinguishable virtues, they are not fully separable: gratitude is a part of justice.² The analysis of gratitude thus continues the analysis of justice.³ More precisely, book six analyzes

¹ Book five and book six are even connected syntactically by a “MEN...DE” clause: the last line of book five begins with “EK TOUTOU MEN”; the first line of book six begins with “EK TOUTOU DE.” See the useful discussion of Höeg (1950) p. 164.

² In a conversation with the admittedly limited Hippias, Socrates suggests that it is both just and lawful everywhere to do good to those who have treated one well: *Memorabilia* 4.4.24 (and context). See also *Symposium* 4.2–3.

³ The theme of justice remains conspicuous at the beginning of book six: 6.1.1 (read together with 6.1.2–3). The “most just men” mentioned at 6.1.3 seem to be those who live from the market (AGORA) as opposed to those who go out for plunder (6.1.1). The purpose of inviting these most just men to dinner is thus to honor and encourage what they