

The Reception of Xenophon in Byzantium: The Macedonian Period

Inmaculada Pérez Martín

Ξενοφῶντα νεανιευόμενον μὲν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις
φιλῶ, γηράσκοντα δὲ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐπαινῶ.

Maximus of Tyre 16.5

THE STUDY of the reception of an author in Byzantium can shed light on particular periods of Byzantine culture, the nature of some of its own texts,¹ and the constitution of the corpus of ‘classical’ authors that has come down to us.² Accordingly, the Byzantine study of Xenophon³ will be treated here as an element of Macedonian culture, sharing some of its features and marked by its politics.

The subject can be addressed on different levels, the first and most traditional being the search for echoes of Xenophon in Byzantine writers. Nevertheless, in the case of a ‘textbook’ author such as Xenophon, omnipresent in glossaries and collections of proverbs, his presence in Byzantine texts is un-

¹ A. Kaldellis, “Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium,” in C. Barber and D. Jenkins (eds.), *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics* (Leiden/Boston 2009) 1–43, esp. 5, points out the absence of studies on “Byzantine classical scholarship as a cultural problem in its own right.” The present study is a way of approaching this from the viewpoint of the ancient text.

² A. Kaldellis, “The Byzantine Role in the Making of the Corpus of Classical Greek Historiography: A Preliminary Investigation,” *JHS* 132 (2012) 71–85.

³ Previous contributions include K. Münscher, *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1920); on the Byzantine side, R. Scott, “The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography,” in M. Mullett and R. Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition* (Birmingham 1981) 61–74.

questionable and unexciting. For the same reason, looking for traces of Xenophon is a risky operation and of questionable validity: the vocabulary and expressions supposedly derived from him are rarely entirely his, and parallels easily extend to contemporary rhetorical works, especially Isocrates.⁴

Second, Xenophon's reception can also be evaluated in terms of genre. All his works seem to have been preserved and they show he was a prolific author in many genres. His dialogues (*Memorabilia*, *Apologia*) were extensively read—the genre of dialogue had many imitators in Byzantium⁵—whereas his didactic treatises seem to have had little impact. This gap is difficult to understand, especially as Byzantium could easily and profitably have assimilated the knowledge contained in the latter works, as happened in the Renaissance. Somehow, these works failed to reach their potential readers, men like Kekaumenos in the eleventh century who remained on the margins of the culture of the capital, isolated on their provincial properties, like the ancient Athenian himself.⁶ By contrast, the influence of the *Agesilaus* and the much more widely read

⁴ D. R. Reinsch, "Zur Edieren von Texten: Über Zitate," in *Proceedings 21st Internat. Congr. Byzantine Studies I* (Hampshire/Burlington 2006) 299–309, esp. 300–301, offers examples of supposed quotes from ancient authors in Byzantine texts. I. Ševčenko, "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus," in J. Shepard and S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy* (Hampshire/Brookfield 1992) 167–195, referring to Moravcsik's edition of *De administrando imperio*, warned jokingly about the shadow of erudition which can be cast on a text by a critical apparatus unduly laden with classical reminiscences.

⁵ Xenophon's dialogues circulated much less than Plato's. It would not be until the fourteenth century that Theodoros Metochites (G. Müller, *Miscellanea philosophica et historica* [Leipzig 1821] 149–155) set down in writing his reflections on the *Memorabilia*. Av. Cameron is preparing the first full-length study of dialogue in Byzantium.

⁶ Ch. Roueché, "The Literary Background of Kekaumenos," in C. Holmes and J. Waring (eds.), *Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond* (Leiden/Boston 2002) 111–138. Only Xenophon's political treatises *Hiero* and *Poroï* were copied in Constantinople in the tenth century, as far as the surviving MSS. indicate (Vat. gr. 1335). There was no leading figure to recover and circulate them from a position of authority.

Cyropaedia as paradigms of encomium has been recognized since antiquity.⁷ As for the *Hellenica*, we now have only manuscripts from the Palaiologan period, in which that text usually follows Thucydides,⁸ but middle Byzantium knew of its existence, not only because Xenophon was repeatedly mentioned in ancient and late antique sources as the author of Athenian historiography along with other Attic authors,⁹ but also because of his presence in glossaries and grammars. Byzantine writers could have taken from the *Hellenica* military information or moral examples,¹⁰ but they did not. That it is preserved in only a few copies and that its protagonists were generally unknown shows that its circulation in Byzantium was limited and that Byzantine chroniclers and historians neither saw it as a role model nor felt particularly curious about the history of the Greek cities.¹¹ The privileged place that the *History of the Peloponnesian War* and the *Hellenica* occupy in our canon is not the same as that which they occupied in that of middle Byzantium. The same applies to a work as idiosyncratic

⁷ D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford/New York 1981) xv and 117. Elsewhere, Menander (p. 345) puts forward as a model of the description of a peninsula the one that Xenophon made of Attica in *Poroi*, and, concerning the acts of war that should adorn the *basilikos logos* (p. 373), says that οἶα πολλὰ παρὰ τοῖς συγγραφεύσιν, ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ, παρὰ Θουκυδίδῃ πάλιν ἐν τοῖς Πελοποννησιακοῖς, καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ ἐν τοῖς Φιλιππικοῖς καὶ Ξενοφῶντι ἐν τῇ Ἀναβάσει καὶ τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς βιβλίοις. On the *Agesilaus* and *Cyropaedia* as biographies see T. Hägg, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge/New York 2012) 41–66.

⁸ The title of the *Hellenica* in some manuscripts and book inventories is *Paraleipomena* or Παραλειπόμενα Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας. See O. Riemann, “Collation de deux manuscrits des Helléniques et spécimen d’édition critique,” *BCH* 2 (1878) 133–161, and L. Canfora, “L’Esordio delle Elleniche,” in *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence 1983) 61–74.

⁹ Diod. 15.76, Hermogenes Rhet. *De ideis* 1.1, Socr. *HE* 3.23.13, Malalas 188.

¹⁰ J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1970) 9.

¹¹ E. Jeffreys, “The Attitudes of Byzantine Chroniclers towards Ancient History,” *Byzantion* 49 (1979) 199–238.

as the *Anabasis*, to which modern writers and artists have turned time and time again in order to explore the consequences of armed conflict,¹² but which had far less influence in Byzantium than the *Cyropaedia*.

Third, we can focus on the reception of Xenophon as a character and conclude from his presence in collections of maxims and *apophthegmata* as well as in ancient and Byzantine biographies such as the *Lexicon* of Photios and the *Souda* that he was known to the average reader, albeit not entirely accurately. He was known as “Socratic Xenophon,” which can be explained not so much as a way of distinguishing him from Xenophon of Ephesus but as a synopsis of the expression that the *Souda* uses for him (s.vv. Γρύλλος and Ξενοφῶν): Ἀθηναῖος, φιλόσοφος Σωκρατικός (“Athenian, a Socratic philosopher”).

1. *Xenophon in the Chronicle of Georgios Synkellos*

We do not know how many manuscripts of Xenophon were preserved or were accessible in seventh- and eighth-century Constantinople, and we have no record that his works were read in the decades after the reign of Herakleios,¹³ but they were no doubt there, waiting to win back the interest of readers. The partial and hasty relocation of books caused by the Arab conquest of the Middle East would not have favored the survival of ancient historiography, for when the time came to pack up and get as far away as possible, Christian texts were probably preferred. From the movements of books that took place before A.D. 800, only one known example concerns historiography: the sources used by Georgios Synkellos to

¹² E.g., by reporters in the American Civil War: see T. Rood, *American Anabasis: Xenophon and the Idea of America from the Mexican War to Iraq* (London 2010).

¹³ Chorikios of Gaza and Theophylaktos Simokattes had certainly read Xenophon: E. de Vries-van der Velden, “Exempla aus der griechischen Geschichte in Byzanz,” in C. Sode and S. Takács (eds.), *Novum millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck* (Aldershot 2001) 425–438, esp. 427–428; M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian: Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare* (Oxford 1988) 353.

compose his *Chronicle*, which, according to the interpretation advocated by Mango and now widely accepted, formed part of the materials he handed over to Theophanes before his death (814), so that the latter could finish the work.¹⁴

The *Chronicle* of Synkellos, the *Short History* of Patriarch Nikephoros, and the *Parastaseis Syntomai Chronikai* are the three works that led Ihor Ševčenko to seek the beginnings of Byzantine humanism in the search for the past,¹⁵ and it is reasonable to relate this interest in history to the cultural recovery that marked the end of the eighth century, led by a brilliant generation of ecclesiastical and imperial officials trained during the first Iconoclasm. But an interest in the past does not mean an interest in reading classical historiography. At the beginning of his work, the first great Byzantine chronicle and written as a continuation of that of Synkellos, Theophanes mentions the great number of sources read by Synkellos in order to compose his work;¹⁶ indeed, the number of pagan Greek historians in Synkellos' book is remarkable.¹⁷ But no scholar of his sources believes that he knew all those authors at first hand. Only William Adler, in his recent English translation of Synkellos, has argued in favor of extensive reading by the chronicler, who might have read Dexippos, Porphyry, Diodoros Siculus, and Agathias directly.¹⁸

¹⁴ The Syriac origin of some of the chronicles used by Synkellos suggests that he had brought them from Palestine (where he had been a monk in Hagios Chariton, Souka) to Constantinople after 784: C. Mango, "Greek Culture in Palestine after the Arab Conquest," in G. Cavallo et al. (eds.), *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio* (Spoleto 1991) 149–160.

¹⁵ I. Ševčenko, "The Search for the Past in Byzantium around the Year 800," *DOP* 46 (1992) 279–293.

¹⁶ Theoph. 3 de Boor: πολλοὺς τε χρονογράφους καὶ ιστοριογράφους ἀναγνοὺς καὶ ἀκριβῶς τούτους διερευνησάμενος.

¹⁷ W. Adler, *Time Immemorial. Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington 1989) 132–172, on the sources of Synkellos.

¹⁸ W. Adler and P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos* (Oxford/New York 2002) lxi and lxxv.

Synkellos mentions Xenophon—specifically the *Anabasis*—twice. The first time is in a long paragraph that follows a quotation from Eusebius' *Chronicle* about the eleventh king of the Persians, Artaxerxes.¹⁹ He gives a hasty and inaccurate summary of the *Anabasis* (but not of the Persian civil war) for which we have found no intermediate sources beyond the original text itself. Such a summary was unlikely to be found in Eusebius, nor is it to be found in the short biography of Xenophon in Diogenes Laertios (2.48–59), which gives only brief details about the expedition. For his part, Diodoros (14.19–37), despite recounting in some detail the Expedition of the Ten Thousand, does not mention the patronymic of Artaxerxes, nor the Thracian king Seuthes. Mosshammer's edition of Synkellos points to Justin's *epitome* of Pompeius Trogus as a source: in the paragraph devoted to the civil war between Artaxerxes and Cyrus the Younger, Justin mentions the participation of Spartan mercenaries on the side of Cyrus, and how they returned home after his death.²⁰ But unlike Synkellos,

¹⁹ 306.25–307.11 Mosshammer: ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ Μνήμονος Κύρος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Δαρείου τοῦ Νόθου παῖς καὶ Παρυσάτιδος, οἰκῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ἐπιστρατεύει κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας μετὰ πλήθους Ἑλληνικοῦ στρατοπέδου, συνόντος αὐτῷ Ξενοφῶντος ἱστορικοῦ τοῦ γράψαντος τὴν ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ. πολέμου δὲ συστάντος ὑπὲρ τὸν Τίγγριν ποταμὸν σταδίοις τξ' κατὰ τὸν Ξενοφῶντα [*Anab.* 1.7], πίπτει μὲν τρωθεὶς ὁ Κύρος, κρατοῦσι δὲ τῶν Περσῶν Ἕλληνας. Ἀρταξέρξης δὲ μηδ' ὄπλοις κρατεῖν Ἑλλήνων ἰσχύων μηδ' ἀταράχως ἐπανελθεῖν πείθων, παρασπονδήσας δόλῳ τοὺς στρατηγούς διὰ Τησαφέρνους ἀνεῖλε [2.6]. Ξενοφῶν δὲ τοὺς Ἕλληνας παραλαβὼν, ἀπαχθεὶς εἰς Ἑλλάδα διέσωσε διὰ μαχίμων ἔθνων ἐπὶ τὸν Εὐξείνιον πόντον ἐπανελθὼν εἰς Βυζάντιον [7.1], κάκειθεν ἐλθὼν εἰς Θράκην, Σεύθη τῷ Θρακῶν βασιλεὶ παραδούς, Λακεδαιμονίους συμμαχῆσοντας Θίβρωνι παρέπεμψε διαβιβάσας εἰς Πέργαμον ναυαρχοῦντι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων [7.6].

²⁰ 5.11: *Lacedaemonii memores Atheniensi bello enixa se eius opera adiutos, velut ignorantes, contra quem bellum pararetur, discernunt auxilia Cyro mittenda [...] in eo proelio decem milia Graecorum in auxilio Cyri fuere, quae et in cornu, in quo steterant, vicerunt et post mortem Cyri neque armis a tanto exercitu vinci neque dolo capi potuerunt; revertentesque inter tot indomitas nationes et barbaras gentes per tanta itineris spatia uirtute se usque terminos patriae defenderunt.*

Justin does not mention the journey of the Ten Thousand, nor the fact that Xenophon took part in it and later recounted the story. Therefore, Synkellos likely used Xenophon directly.

Synkellos' second mention of Xenophon, a little later in the chronicle, is part of a collection of reports. This is a double mention, of which the first part (310.3) is taken from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius: Κύρου Πέρσου ἀνάβασις, ἣν ἱστορεῖ Ξενοφῶν ὁ Γρύλλου.²¹ The second part (about the Persian civil war: 310.11–13), suggests that Cyrus led the Greek army from Greece: καὶ Κῦρος ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀρταξέρξην ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνελθὼν ἀναίρειται, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ξενοφῶν τὴν ἀνάβασιν, ὃς ἠγήσατο τῶν μυρίων ἐν τῇ καθόδῳ. In this case it does not seem that the information was taken from Eusebius and, indeed, the repetition of the quotation suggests a combination in one sentence of several sources that summarize the *Anabasis*.

2. *Xenophon in Photios' Bibliotheke*

Only as we move towards the end of Iconoclasm can we be certain that Xenophon had a Byzantine audience. In Photios' *Bibliotheke*, the mention of Xenophon as a member of the "rhetorical chorus of nine" is certainly only a platitude.²² What is most telling is that neither our author nor Thucydides merited a comment or a summary of their works in the *Bibliotheke*, which largely omits the classical Greek wars, although Photios seems to have planned the inclusion of historical summaries of them to create an overall picture of the past.²³ These absences have frequently been discussed, and in general there is a reluctance to believe that the *History of the Peloponnesian War* remained outside the canon of studied ancient texts. The reason for their

²¹ 117h Helm: *Cyri regis ascensus, de quo scribit Xenophon*.

²² Cod. 158 (101b): "Thucydides, Xenophon, Aeschines the Socratic, Critias, Antisthenes, Aristophanes with his own chorus, the sweet Sophocles and Euripides the Wise." Cf. J. Schamp, *Les "Vies" des dix orateurs attiques* (Fribourg 2000) 163–164.

²³ D. Mendels, "Greek and Roman History in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius," *Byzantion* 56 (1986) 196–206.

omission could be that these works were school-texts, read by Photios and his brother Tarasios in their youth. Moreover, the absence of the *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis* may also be explained by a desire to avoid overlapping narratives, as Ktesias was the author chosen by Photios to provide information about Persian history (cod. 72, dedicated to that topic, is a proper précis). Ktesias was a direct competitor of Xenophon in narrating the exploits of Cyrus the Elder, and he was literally his opponent when the armies of Cyrus the Younger and Artaxerxes met in Cunaxa (401 B.C.), as he was on the side of Artaxerxes, whose wounds he dressed. Photios introduces the comparison with Xenophon, but he does not set out the points of disagreement between the two historians.²⁴

Works of history receive special mention in Photios' dedicatory letter to Tarasios, as if they were a special group of readings (I 1–2 Henry): "It will not be difficult, if you so wish, to regroup on the one hand those (codices) of a historical nature and on the other those belonging to this or any other issue." Moreover, the examination to which Hägg has subjected the hagiographical codices proves that the search for information about the past was the main reason why Photios read saint's lives, especially of preeminent ecclesiastical figures.²⁵ Photios, like Constantine VII later, was aware of the lack of information about the recent history of the empire, and his interest in history was not limited to the Roman past. For example, he devoted a separate codex (66) to the *Short History* of the patriarch Nikephoros.²⁶

²⁴ Cod. 72 (36a): φησὶ δὲ αὐτὸν τῶν πλείονων ἃ ἱστορεῖ αὐτόπτην γενόμενον, ἢ παρ' αὐτῶν Περσῶν, ἔνθα τὸ ὄραν μὴ ἐνεχώρει, αὐτήκοον καταστάντα· οὕτω τὴν ἱστορίαν συγγράψαι. οὐχ Ἡροδότῳ δὲ μόνῳ τάναντία ἱστορεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς Ξενοφῶντα τὸν Γρύλλου ἐπ' ἐνίων διαφωνεῖ.

²⁵ T. Hägg, "Photios as a Reader of Hagiography: Selection and Criticism," *DOP* 53 (1999) 43–58.

²⁶ Pace A. Markopoulos, "Roman Antiquarianism: Aspects of the Roman Past in the Middle Byzantine Period," in *Proceedings* I 277–298, esp. 283, who reduces Photios' interest in history to a "discreet approach to Roman

The *Bibliothēke* contains some interesting notes on Xenophon, albeit of dubious historicity. In the extensive cod. 243 on Himerios, Xenophon illustrates the effect that even a few words can have on the spirit: conversations with Socrates gave him the strength to fight.²⁷ This sort of information usually comes from collections of anecdotes such as those used by Diogenes Laertios, and gnomological collections that fancifully made Xenophon into a comrade-in-arms of Socrates.²⁸ Another piece of biographical information is found in cod. 260 on Isocrates, that Xenophon, Theopompos, and Ephoros were students (ἀκροαταί) of Isocrates,²⁹ who encouraged them to write history by assigning topics according to their skills and preferences. The inclusion of Xenophon among Isocrates' disciples was not found by Photios in Ps.-Plutarch³⁰ or Diogenes Laertios, nor do the other sources mentioned by Photios (Caecilius of Caleacte and Dionysios of Halikarnassos) provide this piece of information. Nevertheless, Schamp has convincingly suggested that the inclusion of Xenophon could

history." N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*² (London/Cambridge [Mass.] 1996) 100–101, has seen in the *Bibliothēke* a particular interest in the Orient; A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature, 650–850* (Athens 1999) 14–15, has added to this bias a concern for the nature of imperial power.

²⁷ *Bibl.* 372b: ὁ τε Ξενοφῶν ἐστρατεύετο· καὶ γὰρ καὶ δόρυ μετὰ Σωκράτην Ξενοφῶν ἤνεγκε. In this case the information came from Himerios (16) and was not supplied by Photios.

²⁸ See below on the gnomologia.

²⁹ *Bibl.* 486b: γεγόνασι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀκροαταὶ καὶ Ξενοφῶν ὁ Γρύλλου καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χίος καὶ Ἐφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος, οἷς καὶ ταῖς ἱστορικαῖς συγγραφαῖς προὔτρέγατο χρῆσασθαι, πρὸς τὴν ἐκάστου φύσιν ἀναλόγως καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις τῆς ἱστορίας αὐτοῖς διανεμιόμενος. F. Gisinger, "Xenophon," *RE* 18A (1967) 1569–2052, esp. 1573, gives no credence to Photios' information, while A. Roquette, *Xenophontis vita* (Kaliningrad 1884) 15, and E. Delebecque, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* (Paris 1957) 362–363, simply mention it.

³⁰ *Vitae decem oratorum* 837C: ἐμαθήτευσε δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χίος καὶ Ἐφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγωδοῦμενα συγγράψας καὶ Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασηλίτης ὁ τὰς τραγωδίας ὕστερον γράψας.

have originated from cod. 176 on Theopompos, where Isocrates' school reappears with a wording that might imply the inclusion of Xenophon as the author of a *Hellenica*.³¹

For modern students of the *Bibliothèque*, the most valuable elements of the text (besides the careful summary of so much reading) are the comparison of sources and Photios' own judgments on the veracity of each witness, reflecting his rigorous approach to their works. The *Bibliothèque* sparked interest, at least among students and colleagues, in many works that had long ceased to be read, and of which they would now discover new virtues.³² These works were not necessarily those that carried the most weight in the *Bibliothèque*, as shown by the long codex of Ktesias, whose history did not survive the catastrophe of 1204 and was not read by Palaiologan scholars. But the impetus given to the circulation of texts has to be kept in perspective. It was not so much that the *Bibliothèque* was considered a guide for reading based on the circulation of the work during

³¹ *Bibl.* 121a: καὶ τὰς ἱστορικὰς δὲ ὑποθέσεις τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτοῖς προβαλεῖν, τὰς μὲν ἄνω τῶν χρόνων Ἐφόρω, Θεοπόμπω δὲ τὰς μετὰ Θουκυδίδην Ἑλληνικὰς; Schamp, *Les "Vies"* 191–192. Henry, *Bibl.* VIII 44 n.5, explains the inclusion of Xenophon as a gloss introduced into the text of Ps.-Plutarch or of Photios.

³² Patriarch Nikolaos I, one of Photios' pupils, sent the emperor Romanos I Lekapenos a consolatory letter (*Ep.* 152) on the death of his wife Theodora (922), in which he includes a brief anthology of examples of similar losses. Somewhat absurdly, the examples refer to the attitude of parents to the loss of their children, which was not the point. Nikolaos avoids any mention of the prophet David, since Romanos already knew him, but he does put forward as an example of acceptance the Roman general Aemilius, who lost two sons. R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink, *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters* (Washington 1973), indicate that the source is Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 35, but Nikolaos, who points out that this Roman lived before the Christian era, adds a famous aphorism, sometimes attributed to Perikles and sometimes to Xenophon: when he learned of the death of his son, he uttered the phrase "I knew that I had begotten him mortal" (quoted by Diog. Laert. 2.48.5, Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* 119A). This gives the impression that Nikolaos had not read Plutarch, or at least did not take the information directly from the *Vitae*.

its author's lifetime (which was private and limited), but that Photios, an aristocratic and well-connected official even before he was placed on the patriarchal throne by the Caesar Bardas, had an influential audience consisting of other imperial and ecclesiastical officials, augmented by his disciples and followers, among whom were members of the imperial family and the emperor himself.

3. *Xenophon at the court of Leo VI: Arethas and Leo Choirosphaktes*

According to the *Vita Basilii*, Basil I liked listening to “historical narratives, political advice, moral teachings, and patristic and spiritual admonitions and counselings,” and examined the lives and habits of generals and emperors, and how they managed their affairs and led their battles, in order to learn from them.³³ Such statements usually provoke scepticism, and some have expressed the view that in this passage Constantine VII was reflecting his own interest in history onto the figure of his grandfather.³⁴ Still, Photios' influence at the Macedonian court had brought new life to the study of the past.³⁵

³³ I. Ševčenko, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii Imperatoris amplectitur* (Berlin/New York 2011) 72.6–14.

³⁴ P. J. Alexander, “Secular Biography at Byzantium,” *Speculum* 15 (1940) 194–209, esp. 195.

³⁵ On the influence of Photios at the court see Th. Antonopoulou, *The Homilies of the Emperor Leo VI* (Leiden/New York 1997) 272. The oldest surviving Byzantine historical codex (*Wake* 5, Christ Church, Oxford, with the chronicles of Synkellos, Nikephoros, and Theophanes) may date from this time: N. G. Wilson, “A Manuscript of Theophanes in Oxford,” *DOP* 26 (1972) 357–360, and *Mediaeval Greek Bookhands* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1973) no. 17. In his *Vita* of the empress Theophano, Nikephoros Gregoras alludes to the cultural activity sponsored in the palace by Leo VI and his wife: E. Kurtz, “Zwei griechische Texte über die Hl. Theophano,” *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg* VIII 3.2 (1898) 25–45, at 40.27–30. This can give rise to the suspicion that Gregoras was transposing the situation of fourteenth-century Constantinople to the Macedonian era. The colophon at the end of Marc. gr. 538 (a Catena on Job) says that the MS. was copied in 905 ἐπὶ τῆς θεοσυνεργήτου βασιλείας Λέοντος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, which may imply that it was also commissioned at the court. The same can be observed in the Bodleian Plato *Clarke* 39, copied by John the

One of the most significant ways by which Photios could leave his mark on the court was by tutoring the children of the emperor.³⁶ We have evidence that Leo VI studied military works and history as one of his duties.³⁷ Markopoulos has pointed out the influence of the *Cyropaedia* on Leo VI's funeral oration for his father,³⁸ and we know that the emperor possessed a manuscript of the *Anabasis*, since a copy of it from 1320 survives (Par. gr. 1640), also containing the *Cyropaedia*.³⁹ On f. 123^v, between the end of *Cyropaedia* (f. 123) and the beginning of *Anabasis* (f. 124), the copyist has included a poem in iambic meter addressed to Leo VI.⁴⁰ This suggests that a codex of the

Calligrapher on commission by Arethas in 895, βασιλείας Λέοντος τοῦ φιλοχρίστου υἱοῦ Βασιλείου τοῦ ἀειμνήστου.

³⁶ We know thanks to Theoph. Cont. 276–277 that Photios was Leo VI's teacher, though Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature* 54, does not take this at face value. Symeon Logothetes 133.1 (ed. Wahlgren) confirms that Photios was the teacher of Leo's brother Stephanos.

³⁷ This was the recommendation of the *Parnetic Chapters*, a “mirror of princes,” supposedly addressed by Basil to his son Leo, and possibly composed by Photios in 880–883: A. Markopoulos, “Autour des Chapitres parénétiqes de Basile I^{er},” in *EYΨYXIA. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler* (Paris 1998) 469–479, esp. 471.

³⁸ A. Markopoulos, “Ἀποσημειώσεις στὸν Λέοντα ΣΤ' τὸν Σοφὸ,” in *Θυμίαμα στη μνήμη της Λασκαρίνας Μπούρα* I (Athens 1994) 193–201, esp. 195–197; M. Vinson, “Rhetoric and Writing Strategies in the Ninth Century,” in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Aldershot 2003) 9–22, at 17–18, on the basis of the comparison of Basil and Herakles, has insisted that the model followed by Leo is that of the *epitaphios logos* of Menander. P. Magdalino, “The Non-Judicial Legislation of the Emperor Leo VI,” in Sp. Troianos (ed.), *Analecta Atheniensi ad ius byzantinum spectantia* I (Athens 1998) 169–182, has drawn attention to Justinian's legislation as a model for Leo's *Novellae*. On the use of ancient statuary in palace decoration, P. Magdalino, “The Bath of Leo the Wise and the ‘Macedonian Renaissance’ Revisited,” *DOP* 42 (1988) 97–118, esp. 113.

³⁹ P. Géhin et al., *Les manuscrits grecs datés des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles conservés dans les bibliothèques publiques de France* I (Turnhout 2005) 51–53, nr. 19, pl. 46–49. A. Markopoulos, in *Θυμίαμα* 197, believes that the original codex of Xenophon would have contained both works.

⁴⁰ The poem has been republished and studied by A. Markopoulos, in

Anabasis, the original of that copied in 1320, was presented or given to the emperor.⁴¹ The content and position of the poem lead us to believe that the gift included a copy of the *Anabasis* alone, and not of the *Cyropaedia*. The copyists of Par. gr. 1640 possibly transcribed two independent codices, each containing a different work. The dedicatory poem begins:

οὐδέν τι τερπνὸν ὡς παλαιός τις λόγος
 μάλιστα μεστὸς Ἀττικῆς εὐγλωττίας
 ἔχων τε λαμπρὰν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πλέον
 καὶ ζωγραφοῦσαν τοῦ βίου τὰ πράγματα
 σοφοὺς διδάσκει καὶ σοφωτέρους ἔτι 5
 ἐν τῷ βίῳ τίθησιν εἰς τὰ πρακτέα·
 δίδωσιν ἀνδρείαν τε καὶ προθυμίαν
 καὶ προξενεῖ φρόνησιν ἀτρεκεστάτην·
 γέροντα ποιεῖ τὸν νεώτερον χρόνῳ
 ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς γνώσεως τῶν πραγμάτων. 10
 λέγε Ξενοφῶν τῷ λόγῳ συνηγόρει.
 σκοπὸς γάρ ἐστι τῶν λόγων ὁ δεσπότης
 Λέων, τὸ φαιδρὸν ἀγλάϊσμα τοῦ κράτους,
 ὃς ἐξερευνῶν συγγραφὰς παλαιότητας
 τρυγῶν τ' ἐκεῖθεν κοσμικὴν ἐμπειρίαν 15
 ὀφθαλμὸς ἐστι τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης.
 τίς γὰρ θεωρῶν ἔνθα Κύρον τὸν νέον
 τὸν μυρίαν τάξαντα κείνην ἀσπίδα
 καὶ χεῖρας ὀπλίσαντα πρὸς πρῶτον Κύρον

Θυμίαμα 193–201, and M. D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres* (Vienna 2003) 208–212.

⁴¹ According to Lauxtermann, this was done at the celebration of the Brumalia, as was the case with the copy of Theodoretos of Kyrrhos that Petros Patrikios gave to the emperor; the dedicatory poem preserved in Vindob. theol. gr. 212 (which is not the original codex) has been studied by A. Markopoulos, “Ἐπίγραμμα πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Λέοντος ΣΤ' τοῦ σοφοῦ,” *Symmeikta* 9.2 (1994) 33–40, who also notes the existence of a third dedicatory epigram in a book addressed to Leo, the *Strategikon* of Maurice, Ambros. B 119 sup. which, once again, is not the original codex. Leo is seen with his mother Eudokia Ingerina and his brother Alexander in the initial miniature of Par. gr. 510 (f. B): I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, “The Portraits of Basil I in Paris Gr. 510,” *JÖBG* 27 (1978) 19–24, esp. 19–20.

οὐκ εὐθὺς ἔγνω πῆμα τὴν φιλαρχίαν; 20
 θυμὸν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐμπνέων καὶ πικρίαν
 σφύζων τε πολλὰ καὶ διάττων ἀσκόπως
 ὀρμαῖς ἀτάκτοις συμπλακεῖς ἀνηρέθη.
 δοκεῖ δέ μοι Κλέαρχος ὁ κλεινὸς Λάκων 25
 σφῆλαι τὰ πάντα συσχεθεὶς ἀτολμία
 Κύρου σοφὸν βούλευμα φαυλίσας τότε.⁴²

According to Lauxtermann's interpretation, the date of the poem and, by extension, of the original MS. of the *Anabasis*, is 904. The main argument is the identification of Cyrus the Elder with Leo and Cyrus the Younger with Alexander, his brother (17–20), who, it seems, tried to assassinate Leo in 903.⁴³ Given that in the following year Thessaloniki had briefly fallen into Arab hands because of the cowardice of the general Himerios—a charge the poem would make by attributing ἀτολμία to Klearchos (24–26), the Spartan general who fought on the side of Cyrus at Cunaxa—the poem should be dated to 904. The historical inconsistencies have been explained by Lauxtermann as “Byzantium at its best” (212): the poet, who knows the *Anabasis* as well as does the recipient of the man-

⁴² Transl. Lauxtermann: “Nothing is as pleasant as an ancient text oozing with Attic eloquence, especially if it lucidly shows the truth and depicts the state of affairs; then it teaches the wise and renders them even wiser so that they know what to do in life. For it provides courage and readiness for action, procures the more accurate insights and renders the young more mature and aged through its lessons in ancient lore. Speak up, Xenophon, in support of what I am saying! For I have in mind our lord Leo, the bright splendour of the empire, who, having culled intimate knowledge about the world from his study of ancient writings, is the eye of the whole universe. For, whoever sees Cyrus the Younger here as he deploys his shield of ten-thousand men and takes up arms against Cyrus the Elder, would he not immediately understand that the lust of power is fraught with disaster? In a fit of blazing anger and spite, rushing at full speed but without any sense of direction, he was killed, a victim of his own undisciplined impulses. Yet I think that Clearchus, the famous Spartan, ruined the whole enterprise by his cowardice, thus thwarting the wise strategy of Cyrus.”

⁴³ But see S. Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI (886–912). Politics and People* (Leiden/New York 1997) 225–227, who disputes this accusation.

uscript, has played with the characters to denounce to the emperor the threat posed to him by the lust for power of his brother Alexander and by the cowardice of Himerios.

An objection to this interpretation is that the poem is addressed to a young Leo (line 9), but in 904 he was 38. The final part of the dedication, wishing him many years of peaceful rule, also suggests that we are at the beginning of his reign (886). And the *Anabasis* does seem an appropriate gift for a young emperor, who has understood the educational value of history and has studied it in depth, as suggested by the beginning of the poem. In my opinion, therefore, the date of the poem is 886: in the work dedicated to Leo, Cyrus the Younger takes up arms against the legitimate emperor Artaxerxes, who has just inherited the entire Persian empire. In 886, after the death of Basil I, the co-emperors Leo and Alexander have taken the reins of Byzantium. The older brother wastes no time in sending signals that he has the situation under control (one such signal is the second exile of Photios), and that his younger brother will be subordinate. But Alexander had been the heir apparent in 883–886 (during Leo's imprisonment) and was a legitimate son of Basil, unlike his older brother, whose father could have been Michael III. Consequently in 886 Alexander might have had no intention of being sidelined: the φιλαρχία which the poem denounces did not have to refer to the situation in 903 but to the permanent tension between the co-emperors.⁴⁴ This does not explain why the author of the poem changes Artaxerxes to Cyrus the Great, but neither does the interpretation of Lauxtermann; nor does the identification of Klearchos with Himerios explain lines 24–26, because it would suggest that he supported Alexander's ambitions, which is nowhere attested.

It is worth noting that, in blaming the defeat at Cunaxa on the disobedience and cowardice of Klearchos, the poet is not

⁴⁴ As explained in the chapter devoted to Alexander by Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI* 219–232, Cyrus the Younger was vexed by his father's decision to name Artaxerxes as his successor.

following Xenophon (*Anab.* 1.8.13–14). The latter attributed the defeat to a miscalculation by Cyrus, who had ordered the Greek hoplites of Klearchos to occupy the right wing, by the Euphrates, while he occupied the centre. But Artaxerxes' best troops, located at the centre of the formation, being more numerous, enveloped Cyrus' left wing. Understanding this, Cyrus ordered Klearchos to occupy the centre, that is, to place himself in front of Artaxerxes, but this would have required a diagonal advance and coming between the rest of the army and the royal units, which Klearchos was unwilling to do.⁴⁵ In his account of the battle (*Artax.* 8.1), Plutarch provides some details that are not in Xenophon, such as the name of the place, Cunaxa, and its location relative to Babylon. According to this version, Klearchos tried to convince Cyrus before the battle to leave him in the rearguard, and finally occupied the right flank in order to enjoy the protection of the river (8.2–3). It was the cowardice of Klearchos and not Cyrus' rashness that caused the latter's downfall (8.5). Thus, the author of the epigram was following Plutarch's version, not Xenophon's.⁴⁶ If we try to translate Klearchos' cowardice to the situation in 886, what the

⁴⁵ J. W. Hewitt, "The Disobedience of Clearchus at Cunaxa," *CJ* 14 (1919) 237–249, reconstructs the battle and shows that Klearchos could not obey the spur-of-the-moment order of Cyrus, who had miscalculated the deployment of Artaxerxes' forces and wanted Klearchos and his hoplites to be in front of the king, a movement which at this stage of the battle was already impossible. For a discussion of the texts on the battle see J. M. Bigwood, "The Ancient Accounts of the Battle of Cunaxa," *AJP* 104 (1983) 340–357. Photios cod. 224 includes a moral portrait of Klearchos (222b).

⁴⁶ Plutarch's *Vitae* were early favourites with Byzantine readers: Par. gr. 1678, for example, was copied in the first third of the tenth century, according to J. Irigoin, "La formation d'un corpus: un problème d'histoire des textes dans la tradition des *Vies parallèles* de Plutarque," *RHT* 12–13 (1982–1983) 1–11, and *La tradition des textes grecs. Pour une critique historique* (Paris 2003) 311–328, esp. 324. Another readily accessible source in the first half of the tenth century, Diodoros (14.22–24), does not mention Cyrus' error of tactics and, on the contrary, insists on the bravery and success in battle of the Spartan mercenaries.

poet is trying to say is that supporting Alexander militarily would only lead to failure.

The poem presents its author as well positioned at the court and familiar with ancient history. As it happens, there *was* someone there interested in ancient history and with a weakness for books. Arethas of Caesarea was the favourite orator of Leo VI in the years 901–902, according to the date given to a series of speeches made before the emperor,⁴⁷ but his relationship with Leo, who was of the same age, went back probably to the reign of Basil,⁴⁸ who would have considered Arethas a good influence on his son. Leo's wisdom is a subject that reappears in several of Arethas' compositions.⁴⁹ One of these, from 902, develops a metaphor that might well reflect the proliferation of books at the end of the ninth century, which Arethas here attributes to the interest of the emperor (II 46.23–27): "I no longer feel concerned about purchasing books, I have sated my thirst for them, for you have sown for us the seeds of all good things and our land yields fruit corresponding to the sower and the seed."

⁴⁷ R. J. H. Jenkins, B. Laourdas, and C. A. Mango, "Nine Orations of Arethas from Cod. Marc. gr. 524," *BZ* 47 (1954) 1–65. M. Loukaki, "Notes sur l'activité d'Aréthas comme rhéteur de la cour de Léon VI," in M. Grünbart (ed.), *Theatron. Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter* (Berlin/New York 2007) 259–275, at 260, considers that this group of speeches reflects an attempt by Leo (thwarted in the Tetragamy) to set up a systematic programme of ceremonies at court. On the homilies of Arethas see Th. Antonopoulou, "Homiletic Activity in Constantinople around 900," in M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden/Boston 1998) 317–348, at 327. One of the practises described in *De caerimoniis*, and the first example of which is also from Arethas, is that of giving a speech in the palace during a banquet following the liturgy and processions of Epiphany: G. T. Dennis, "Imperial Panegyric: Rhetoric and Reality," in H. Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204* (Washington 1997) 131–140, esp. 136 and n.32.

⁴⁸ Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI* 51.

⁴⁹ L. G. Westerink, *Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis scripta minora* II (Leipzig 1972) 24–25 (Leo presented as a Platonic philosopher-king) and 46; cf. Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI* 115, 122.

If the recovery of ancient history took place thanks to Photios, his personal interests, and imperial policy (both domestic and foreign), it was in the next generation, that of Arethas, Leo Choirosphaktes, and the emperor Leo VI, that texts started to be copied with a frequency that would guarantee their survival. However, the real explosion in the copying of historical books was yet to come. The bibliophile Arethas had a particular interest in historical works, and even added into his copy of the *Short Chronicle* of patriarch Nikephoros, *Mosquensis gr.* 231, a summarized excerpt from the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* (of which Arethas himself was likely the original author), in order to supplement Nikephoros' text with information about his homeland, Patras, which was reconquered by the emperor Nikephoros in 805/6.⁵⁰ That Arethas had also read the *Anabasis* is shown by the sentence with which he began his famous invective against Leo Choirosphaktes in about 907:⁵¹ βαβαί, ἦν ἄρα καὶ τόδε χρυσοῦν ἔπος, οὐ τῷ τυχόντι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχόμενον, πάντα δὴ προσδοκᾶν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα φιλοσοφοῦν.⁵² Westerink recognizes the text of *Anab.* 7.6.11, where this rather sententious phrase has a similar meaning.⁵³ We might add that

⁵⁰ I. Duičev, *Cronaca di Monemvasia* (Palermo 1976) 24–25; S. Turlej, *The Chronicle of Monemvasia* (Cracow 2001) 18. For Arethas' authorship see J. Koder, "Arethas von Kaisareia und die sogenannte Chronik von Monemvasia," *JÖBG* 25 (1976) 75–80.

⁵¹ Χοιροσφάκτης ἢ Μισογότης (I 200.2–4); see P. Karlin-Hayter, "Arethas, Choirosphaktes and the Saracen Vizir," *Byzantion* 35 (1965) 468–481. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature* 79–83, has drawn attention to the reintroduction of the pamphlet and invective into Byzantine literature that this work implies. See P. Magdalino, "In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choirosphaktes and Constantine Manasses," in *Byzantine Court Culture* 141–165, esp. 151–161, on Arethas' reaction against Choirosphaktes.

⁵² "Aha! It really is a saying of gold, and more accurate than any other, that reflects thus: 'Being a human being, expect anything.'"

⁵³ ἀλλὰ πάντα μὲν ἄρα ἄνθρωπον ὄντα προσδοκᾶν δεῖ, ὅποτε γε καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν ὑφ' ὑμῶν αἰτίας ἔχω ἐν ᾧ πλείστην προθυμίαν ἐμαυτῷ γε δοκῶ συνειδέναι περὶ ὑμᾶς παρεσχημένους. Arethas highlights the dishonor done by Choirosphaktes to Hagia Sophia by pretending not to wonder at it, just as

in the same work (I 210.23–25, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μὴ ταῦτα, Χοιροσφάκτη δ' οὖν ὅμως εἰς ἐγκράτειαν παραγγέλλοντι τίς ἔψεται;) Arethas recalls the cry of encouragement that Cyrus the Elder addresses to his army: τίς ἔψεται; τίς ἀγαθός; (*Cyr.* 3.3.62).

Arethas had also read Plutarch's *Lives*. A skirmish of the Byzantine troops on the Euphrates⁵⁴ led him to compare Leo to Alexander the Great and Xerxes, a standard rhetorical device recommended by Menander Rhetor but attested here for the first time in Byzantine court rhetoric, in what is in fact the only surviving group of speeches addressed to Leo VI. This work, Δημηγορία ἐπιτραπέζιος ὑπὸ παρουσία Λέοντος βασιλέως (II 31–34), has been dated to the end of 901. There are scant forays into ancient history in Arethas' oratory, nor did he leave us his impressions of Athens, where he had to consecrate some churches rebuilt in 905/6 (an excuse, in fact, to keep him away from the court when Zoe gave birth to the heir of Leo VI).⁵⁵ Back in Constantinople, Arethas joined the opponents of the emperor in the conflict of the Tetragamy. Although he later repented and supported the newly appointed patriarch Euthymius, his relationship with the Emperor was never the same again.

Arethas liked to head his manuscripts with poems. He does so in his copy of Euclid's *Elements*, from 888 (*Bodl. D'Orville* 301). On the other hand, the *pinax* of Vat. Barb. gr. 310, containing a collection of Anacreontics prepared and copied in the im-

Xenophon admits that he is not surprised by the insult aroused by his generous act.

⁵⁴ That this was not an important battle can be deduced from its absence from historiography. Only Constantine Porph. *De admin. imp.* 45.43–50 confirms that the military governors of Armeniakoi, Koloneia, Mesopotamia, and Chaldia expelled the Saracens from Phasiane and freed the churches they had used as fortresses. On the military victories celebrated by Leo see S. Tougher, "The Imperial Thought-world of Leo VI: The Non-campaigning Emperor of the Ninth Century," in L. Brubaker (ed.), *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?* (Aldershot/Brookfield 1998) 51–60, esp. 58.

⁵⁵ J. Herrin, "Aspects of the Process of Hellenization in the Early Middle Ages," *BSA* 68 (1973) 113–126.

perial scriptorium shortly after 920,⁵⁶ includes the title of a poem addressed to Leo VI on the occasion of the Brumalia,⁵⁷ but the poem itself is lost. The somewhat stilted style of the dedicatory poem prefacing the *Anabasis* is perhaps strange for the pen of Arethas, but it shows affinities with the poetry of another of Leo's courtiers, a rival of Arethas, Leo Choiosphaktes. In his poems, this Leo tended to use long compound words, and one of these monsters is in the already mentioned poem in Vindob. Theol. gr. 212,⁵⁸ a copy of Theodoretos offered by Petros Patrikios to the emperor, the dedicatory poem of which may have been commissioned from Leo Choiosphaktes.

Despite the paucity of this initial evidence, it is possible to confirm that it was in the time of Leo VI that a form of oratory was formalized at the court, in which reference to ancient history came to form an inevitable part. In 927, in an encomium addressed to Romanos I Lekapenos celebrating the armistice with Bulgaria, Theodoros Daphnopates stressed the unique and ineffable nature of the armistice with a series of questions culminating in these words: "The histories of how many Polybioses, the *Parallel Lives* of how many Plutarchs, the verses of how many rhapsodists, the gems of how many rhetoricians will contain stories like this?"⁵⁹ Henceforward, there would be no imperial discourse that could do without *diegemata* from ancient

⁵⁶ Wilson, *Scholars* 143, has identified the writing and some elements of the decoration of this codex with those of Berol. gr. 134 (Phillipps 1538), a copy of the *Hippiatrica* dedicated to Constantine VII.

⁵⁷ A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* IV (Rome 1840) XXXVII.

⁵⁸ See n.41 above and Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry* 29.

⁵⁹ R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria (927) Celebrated by Theodore Daphnopates," in *Polychronion. Festschrift F. Dölger* (Heidelberg 1966) 287–303: πόσων ιστορίαι Πολυβίων, πόσων Πλουτάρχων παράλληλοι, ποίων ῥαψωδῶν μέτρα, τίνων εὐγλωττίαι ῥητόρων τὰ τοιαῦτα σχήσουσι διηγήματα (290); cf. 302, where Jenkins argues through this and other texts that Daphnopates was the author of Books 1–4 and 6 of Theophanes Continuatus. Cf. I. Dujčev, "On the Treaty of 927 with the Bulgarians," *DOP* 32 (1978) 219–295, esp. 266, containing the same text.

historiography.⁶⁰

It is also significant that during the reign of Leo VI were copied the oldest surviving codices of Xenophon, Escorial T.III.14⁶¹ and Erlangen ms. gr. A 1 (88),⁶² and it should come as no surprise that both contain the *Cyropaedia*, the work of Xenophon most copied in Byzantium, and the preference for which among Byzantine readers is explained by its greater political and ideological focus—in addition, no doubt, to the fascination aroused by the Persian paraphernalia and royal figure of Cyrus the Elder. We cannot locate the copying of these manuscripts with greater accuracy, but we can point to contemporary codices reflecting the same sensibility: Isocrates in Vat. Urb. gr. 111, usually dated to the late ninth century, Thucydides in Heidelb. Palat. gr. 252 (end of the ninth century),⁶³ and Cassius Dio in Marc. gr. 395 (second quarter of the tenth century).

4. *Xenophon and Constantine Porphyrogenetos*

Compared to Photios, the historical work of the successor of Leo VI had quantitatively superior material consequences, which puts at our disposal many historical codices contem-

⁶⁰ Cf. Alexander, *Speculum* 15 (1940) 196, on the *Vita* of Theodoros Stoudites apparently composed by Daphnopates, who also wrote an encomium of Theophanes Confessor: K. Krumbacher, "Ein Dithyrambus auf den Chronisten Theophanes," *SBMünch* 4 (1896) 583–624, where the *Chronicle* is not mentioned. On whether or not Daphnopates is the author of Theophanes Continuatus see A. Markopoulos, "Théodore Daphnopatès et la Continuation de Théophane," *JÖBG* 35 (1985) 171–182, with discussion of earlier bibliography; he does not think that the attribution has been securely proved.

⁶¹ G. de Andrés, "Sobre un códice de Jenofonte del s. X (Escorialense 174, T. III. 14)," *Emerita* 23 (1955) 232–257; L. Perria, "Arethaea. Il codice Vallicelliano di Areta e la *Ciropedia* dell'Escorial," *RSBN* 25 (1988) 41–56.

⁶² On this codex, the second of Xenophon to reach Italy, see M. Bandini, "Un nuovo libro della biblioteca di Guarino Veronese," *RivFil* 136 (2008) 257–266.

⁶³ A. Diller, "The Age of Some Early Greek Classical Manuscripts," in J. L. Heller and J. K. Newman (eds.), *Seria Turyniana* (Urbana 1974) 514–524.

porary with Constantine X, or shortly later, and their copies.⁶⁴ This plethora of historical codices, as would also be the case during the reign of Andronikos II Palaiologos, reflects the interest in historiography of the emperor himself and members of the court (Basil *parakoimomenos*, Alexander of Nicaea,⁶⁵ the anonymous professor of rhetoric appointed by Constantine, Niketas Magistros,⁶⁶ Kosmas Magistros, John Kourkouas). The immediate benefit was to provide materials that could be used in dealings, peaceful or otherwise, with the neighbours of the empire, as indicated, for instance, in the preface to Constantine's own *De administrando imperio*. The only example of Xenophon in this specific sense of the use of ancient historiography is in chapter 8 of *De thematibus*, dedicated to the *thema* of Chaldia: τὸ δὲ καλούμενον θέμα Χαλδία καὶ ἡ μητρόπολις λεγομένη Τραπεζοῦς Ἑλλήνων εἰσὶν ἀποικίαι, καθὼς καὶ Ξενοφῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀναβάσει Κύρου λέγει· τὰ δὲ ἄνω καὶ μεσόγαια

⁶⁴ J. Irigoin, "Les manuscrits d'historiens grecs et byzantins à 32 lignes," in K. Treu (ed.), *Studia codicologica* (Berlin 1977) 237–245 (rpt. *Tradition et critique des textes grecs* [Paris 1997]); a list of tenth-century historical codices in Wilson, *Scholars* 139.

⁶⁵ A. Markopoulos, "Überlegungen zu Leben und Werk des Alexandros von Nikaia," *JÖBG* 44 (1994) 313–326; Wilson, *Scholars* 141–142; N. Kavrus-Hoffmann, "From Pre-Bouletée to Bouletée: Scribe Epiphanius and Dating the Codices Mosq. Synod. gr. 103 and Vat. gr. 90," in A. Bravo García and I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon I* (Turnhout 2010) 55–56. Before 924, Alexander annotated and compiled Lucian's Vat. gr. 90.

⁶⁶ Niketas possessed a copy of the *Lives* of Plutarch and his readings included Herodotos and Arrian: L. G. Westerink, *Nicetas Magistros, Lettres d'un exilé* (Paris 1973) 33 and 77 (*Ep.* 9.29–30); cf. Markopoulos, *JÖBG* 44 (1994) 324. In *Ep.* 12.12–14 Niketas expresses his grief at the death of his son in heart-rending terms, and compares it to mourning from ancient times: ὦ μοι τῆς ἀπαρηγορήτου μου συμφορᾶς, ὦ μοι τῶν ἐπαλλήλων κακῶν. ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἦν μοι θεραπεία τις καὶ ὑπήκοον, ἐκείνοις ἂν ὡσπερ ὁ Κύρος τὸν θρήνον παρέπεμψα. Westerink rightly refers to one of the most moving passages of the *Cyropaedia* (7.3), Panthea's mourning for her husband Abradates, in which Cyrus takes part by ordering his generals to bring animals for sacrifice and fine ornaments for the dead man.

τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀρμενίας εἰςὶ προοίμια (cf. *Anab.* 4.8.22). At the same time, antiquarian interest in the past stimulated a passion for reconstructing events that had been erased by time and relegated to oblivion, as indicated by the preface of Theophanes Continuatus.⁶⁷

In the *Vita Basilii*, Constantine VII (or his ghost-writers) had in mind the models provided by the ancient biographies. Jenkins has pointed to the influence of Isocrates' *Evagoras*,⁶⁸ which is held to be the first eulogy written about a contemporary and, being the encomium of a king of Cyprus that Isocrates addressed to his son Nicocles, is presented as a work of filial love, so with the same orientation as the *Vita Basilii*. But the *Evagoras* is a speech, not a narrative, and a speech that reflects on its own significance as an encomium and that, either through its bombast or by reflecting on its own task, distances itself from its subject. Markopoulos has demonstrated the influence of the *Cyropaedia* on the *Vita Basilii*,⁶⁹ although he admits that it lies not so much in its use of language or in the motifs that make up the story but rather in that Xenophon composed a moral portrait of the sovereign, a portrait neither sober nor reliable, but

⁶⁷ 3–4 Bekker: καὶ τοῦτο πάντως τῶν σῶν, ὃ φιλοσοφώτατε βασιλεῦ, καλῶν μετὰ γε πολλῶν ἄλλων τε καὶ μεγάλων, τὸ τὰ τῷ χρόνῳ παραρρύνετα καὶ κερωρηκότα πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὄν πρὸς παλινζωϊάν αὐθις καὶ παλιγγενεσίαν ἀναγαγεῖν, καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπιμεληθῆναι καλοῦ, ἀλλὰ μὴ τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ τῆν βασιλικὴν ἐπιλημμένοις ἀμεληθῆναι ἀρχήν. Cf. I. Ševčenko, “The Title of and Preface to Theophanes Continuatus,” *BBGG* 52 (1998) 77–93, esp. 81–82.

⁶⁸ R. J. H. Jenkins, “The Classical Background of the *Scriptores Post Theophanem*,” *DOP* 8 (1954) 11–30 (rpt. *Studies on Byzantine history of the 9th and 10th Centuries* [London 1970] IV), esp. 19. When Jenkins writes that in the *Vita Basilii* we see the figure of the emperor through the eyes of Xenophon and Isocrates, not of Plutarch, we understand that, in his opinion, Constantine adopted the model of encomium and not of biography.

⁶⁹ A. Markopoulos, “Κύρου Παιδεία καὶ Βίος Βασιλείου. Ἐνας πιθανός συσχετισμός,” *Symmeikta* 15 (2002) 91–108, esp. 100; cf. his “From Narrative History to Historical Biography. New Trends in Byzantine Historical Writing in the 10th–11th Centuries,” *BZ* 102 (2009) 697–715, esp. 699.

created with the freedom that enabled him to convert Cyrus into a paradigm of good government. In that sense, Xenophon could have inspired Constantine to face the task of recounting the reign of his grandfather.⁷⁰

As far as the *Excerpta Constantiniana* are concerned,⁷¹ we should remember that, in the list of historical sources used in the *Excerpta* book *De virtutibus et vitiis*, Xenophon (no. θ' Ξενοφώντος Κύρου παιδείας καὶ ἀναβάσεως Κύρου τοῦ Παρυσάτιδος) represents classical Greek history together with Herodotus and Thucydides. Nevertheless, we find no trace of the *Hellenica* in these books nor in the others of the *Excerpta*, but only of the *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis*.⁷² The Xenophontean sections of *De virtutibus et vitiis*⁷³ do not seek to recount the formation of Cyrus' empire, but are a carefully-told narrative that allows us to understand the story as a whole. It begins with a presentation of the work (1.1.6) and then of its protagonist Cyrus (1.2.1–2); it explains the Persian diet (1.2.16), the character of Cyrus, his entry into adulthood (1.4.1–5), and his virtues (e.g. austerity 1.5.1, 4.5.4); relations with the Armenians (3.1.41–43, 3.3.1–5); the army on campaign (4.2.10, 4.3.3); the

⁷⁰ I have not found any special presence of the excerpta of the *Cyropaedia* included in *De virtutibus et vitiis* in the encomium of Basil, as we would expect from a personal involvement of Constantine in both projects. In fact, the excerpta do not give any biographical details, such as the premonitory dreams about his birth, which might have inspired the *Vita Basilii*. However, the excerptor has indeed been sensitive to the moral qualities of the monarch: his personality and upbringing, generosity, sobriety, loyalty, and friendship.

⁷¹ See A. Németh, *Imperial Systematization of the Past. Emperor Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts* (diss. Budapest 2010); B. Flusin, “Les *Excerpta* Constantinien. Logique d’une anti-histoire,” in S. Pittia (ed.), *Fragments d’historiens grecs autour de Denys d’Halicarnasse* (Rome 2002) 537–559.

⁷² Markopoulos, in *Proceedings* I 288. Ševčenko, in *Byzantine Diplomacy* 180, points out the percentage of classical texts in Constantinian compilations, where the literature from the classical period is indeed in a minority; the greater part of the texts are Hellenistic, Roman, or Byzantine.

⁷³ A. G. Roos, *Excerpta historica* II (Berlin 1910) 46: ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας Ξενοφώντος· Κύρου παιδείας.

story of Gobryas (5.2.2–19); the sack of Sardis (7.2.5–7); the story of Pheraulas and the Sacan (8.3.49–50); and the epilogue (8.8.1–27). The excerptor shows no interest in military tactics (he omits, for example, the preparation for war in Book II and the conquest of Babylon in Book VII), or in Persian government. Most notably, in the second part he does not adequately describe the wars.

The extracts ἐκ τῆς ἀναβάσεως Κύρου Παρυσάτιδος that follow those from the *Cyropaedia* have suffered an accident leading to the loss of the final part, along with the extracts from Arrian's *Anabasis* and the beginning of the extracts from Dionysios of Halikarnassos.⁷⁴ Unlike the *Cyropaedia*, the excerpts from the *Anabasis* do not attempt to tell the story of the Ten Thousand, but have chosen static events, such as the portrait of Cyrus the Younger from the end of Book I (1.9) and the characterizations of Klearchos (the leader of the Greeks), Proxenos (Xenophon's friend), and Menon (the traitor) from the end of Book II. The explanation of Xenophon's participation in the expedition (3.1.4–8) does contain action, but is also a moral argument. The last surviving excerpt (5.3.5–10) is an excursus that illustrates Xenophon's piety and recounts an important moment in his biography: as this passage from the *Anabasis* relates, Xenophon gave part of the booty from Kerasos to the temple of Apollo at Delphi, in his own name and in that of his friend Proxenos, killed in battle, and another portion to a priest of Artemis. Later, during his exile at Scillus near Olympia, Xenophon used the money to buy a piece of land where hunting was excellent and to build an altar and temple to Artemis, where he made annual offerings.⁷⁵

The *De sententiis* excerpts begin with fourteen fragments of varying length from Books VII and VIII of the *Cyropaedia*.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Th. Büttner-Wobst, "Die Anlage der historischen Encyclopädie des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos," *BZ* 15 (1906) 88–120, esp. 94.

⁷⁵ E. Badian, "The Life of Xenophon," in Chr. J. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and his World* (Stuttgart 2004) 33–53, esp. 34, 45–46.

⁷⁶ These are 7.2.29, 7.4.12–13, 7.5.75–79, 7.5.80–83, 7.5.84, 8.1.1, 8.1.8,

Some are simple sentences, while others are long extracts like those contained in *De virtutibus et vitiis*. As in that collection, they follow the original order and reflect a certain amount of effort to complete the sense of the fragments, for example by replacing pronouns by their referents at the beginning of each text.⁷⁷ The sentences chosen are not part of the gnomological collections, and generally have a distinct tradition, except for some chance overlap with Stobaeus.⁷⁸ This means that the selection made by Constantine's excerptors was original.

As for the long fragments, they complete those collected in *De virtutibus et vitiis*: excerpts nos. 3–5 are part of the discourse of Cyrus with which Book VII ends, in which the king, with his leaders, tries to establish the organization of Babylon. Excerpt no. 12 (8.4.7–8+21–27) includes part of Cyrus' conversations with his guests at a banquet: they are verbal duels with which the feast ends, and contain nothing noteworthy. No. 14 (8.7.5–22) includes most of the last will of Cyrus, the words addressed to his family and friends, taking stock of his life, thinking about death, and more importantly, naming an heir and setting out what Cambyses' relationship with his brothers should be.⁷⁹

This is all of Xenophon contained in the *Excerpta*, and, as we have seen, it is limited to the two most widely circulating works, the *Anabasis* and *Cyropaedia*. The manuscript of Xenophon closest to the work of the emperor's excerptors is Vat. gr. 1335,

8.1.12, 8.2.5, 8.2.1, 8.3.35–48, 8.4.7–8+21–27, 8.4.32, 8.7.5–22.

⁷⁷ As in no. 13 (8.4.32).

⁷⁸ As in 8.1.1 (ἄρχων ἀγαθὸς οὐδὲν διαφέρει πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ), and the end of 8.4.32 (οὐχ ὁ Κύρον τρόπος τοιοῦτος ὅλος χρηματίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ διδοῦς μᾶλλον ἢ κτώμενος ἴδεται), which appears among the proverbs of Arsenios (13.130), in the *Epitome* of Zonaras (1.258, whose source is Xenophon), and in Dio Chrysostom (3.110).

⁷⁹ Xenophon appears elsewhere in *De sententiis*: in two extracts from Arrian's *Anabasis* (1.12.1–4, 4.11.9) alluding to the expedition of the Ten thousand (pp.55, 61), and one from Polybios (3.6, included on p.115), who explains Alexander's invasion of Persia by the antecedents of the expeditions of Xenophon and Agesilaos.

whose oldest part (ff. 69–237), usually dated to the second half of the tenth century, contains the *Cyropaedia*, *Anabasis*, *Socrates' Apology*, *Agesilaus*, *Hiero*, and the *Constitution of Sparta*. This makes Vat. gr. 1335 the oldest surviving example of a corpus of Xenophon's works, though it omits the *Memorabilia* and the technical treatises. Since the codex suffered two restorations, in the twelfth century and the late fourteenth, the original selection may not coincide with that preserved today; but it is in the spirit of the times that the works transcribed are the most political of our author, while those of a more technical nature are not included. Not even the Constantinian ambitions to create a practical encyclopaedia seem to have aroused any interest in *On Horsemanship*, *Hipparchicus*, or *On Hunting*. Constantine's team satisfied its curiosity instead with technical treatises from late antiquity, such as the *Geoponica* by Cassianus Bassus.⁸⁰ Constantine did not encourage a search for new sources on such vital questions for the government as the breeding of

⁸⁰ J. L. Teall, "The Byzantine Agricultural Tradition," *DOP* 25 (1971) 33–59, at 40; H. Beckh, *Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi scholastici De re rustica eclogae* (Leipzig 1895); English transl. A. Dalby, *Geoponika: Farm Work* (Totnes 2011). A. Bryer, "Byzantine Agricultural Implements: The Evidence of Medieval Illustrations of Hesiod's *Works and Days*," *BSA* 81 (1986) 45–80, noted medieval inertia on matters of cultivation: "One might fondly expect more stimulus from Byzantine landowners, who inherited ancient agricultural treatises and were capable of reading them. But in fact such gentry also made a virtue out of self-sufficiency, rather than exploitation" (46). The phenomenon recurs with works on the breeding of horses or *Hippiatrica*, a collection of texts created in late antiquity and reworked in the tenth century: A.-M. Doyen-Higuet, "The *Hippiatrica* and Byzantine Veterinary Medicine," *DOP* 38 (1984) 111–120; A. McCabe, *A Byzantine Encyclopaedia of Horse Medicine* (Oxford 2007) 23–27, 269–275, on Berol. gr. 134 (Phillipps 1538), the copy offered to Constantine VII and probably produced by the imperial scriptorium. The text of this collection is characterized by polished language, more analytical organization, and two new sources. According to McCabe (4, 194–200, 218), Xenophon's *On Horsemanship*, although it deals with the breeding and training of horses and not with their illnesses, was used only by writers of late antiquity; there is no evidence of the veterinary collection in Macedonian texts.

horses. This lack of interest set the tone in Byzantium and certainly lay behind the fact that the oldest manuscripts containing these treatises are from the Palaiologan period.

5. *Xenophon and military strategy*

Byzantines interested in strategy do not seem to have felt the need to browse Athenian historiography for examples of military successes and failures, but this did not apply to Roman historians.⁸¹ To give one example, the *De obsidione toleranda*, composed after 924, incorporates in its final part passages from Polybios, Arrian, and Flavius Josephus, dealing with famous sieges.⁸² A famous codex at Milan, Ambros. B 119 sup., copied in Constantinople about 950–960 and linked by C. M. Mazzucchi to the imperial library and members of the court of Constantine VII (specifically Basil Lekapenos, the *parakoimomenos*), contains fragments of ancient historiography incorporated into a corpus of military works from Macedonian times.⁸³

⁸¹ On Byzantine writers' weakness for military anecdotes see M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid. Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (Aldershot 1997) 69–78; J. D. Howard-Johnston, "Anna Komnene and the *Alexiad*," in M. Mullett and D. Smythe (eds.), *Alexios I Komnenos* (Belfast 1996) 260–302, at 273–276.

⁸² D. F. Sullivan, "A Byzantine Instructional Manual on Siege Defense," in J. W. Nesbitt (ed.), *Byzantine Authors: Literary Activities and Preoccupations* (Leiden 2003) 139–266, esp. 143–144.

⁸³ H. Bolla, "De Xenophontis fragmentis quae leguntur in Ambrosiano codice vetusto," *RivFil* 21 (1893) 366–369; C. M. Mazzucchi, "Dagli anni di Basilio Parakimomenos (cod. Ambros. B 119 sup.)," *Aevum* 52 (1978) 267–316, at 291. According to Németh, *Imperial Systematization* 176, these are the eight speeches taken from Xenophon. Their order is the original one, they reproduce the whole text (with minor omissions), and are introduced by individual titles: 1. Δημηγορία Κύρου πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς στρατιώτας (*Cyr.* 1.5.7–14); 2. Δημηγορία τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλέως πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοῦ στρατιώτας (3.3.44–45); 3. Δημηγορία Κύρου πρὸς τοὺς συμμάχους Ἑλλήνας (*Anab.* 1.7.3–4); 4. Δημηγορία Ξενοφῶντος πρὸς τοὺς Κύρου συμμάχους Ἑλλήνας μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου ἐν τῷ πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν αὐτοῦ ἀδελφὸν ἀναίρεσιν ἀπιέναι βουλόμενον εἰς τὰ οἰκεῖα (3.1.15–18, 21–25); 5. Δημηγορία Ξενοφῶντος πρὸς Ἑλληνικὸν στράτευμα (3.1.35–44); 6. Δημηγορία

Probably because of his or his patron's literary interests, the copyist responsible decided to include in ff. 141–145 several speeches drawn from the *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis*, followed by similar ones from Josephus and Herodian. The Ambrosian codex is not a copy of a previous codex but its selection was taken directly from a complete original, since the fragments of each author occupy separate quires, with some folios remaining blank at the end and now cut out. The speeches are followed in the manuscript by two harangues of Constantine VII himself, composed to be read to the troops who were preparing to fight the emir of Aleppo.⁸⁴ Although the textual tradition of the Ambrosian speeches does not coincide with that of the text of Xenophon that the emperor had available,⁸⁵ Németh has shown that it is a selection closely linked to the text of the *Excerpta*, one (lost) volume of which bore the title Περὶ δημηγοριῶν.⁸⁶

The *Sylloge tacticorum* (Συλλογὴ Τακτικῶν), a compilation falsely attributed to the emperor Leo VI but actually linked to the activity of Porphyrogenetos around 950, uses ancient sources and the *Tactica* of Leo VI, though it updates their information on military equipment and cavalry tactics.⁸⁷ The work makes a reference to Xenophon concerning a Persian measurement, the *parasanges*, which for this author is equivalent to 30 *stadia*.⁸⁸ The information does not come directly from Xeno-

Χειρισόφου πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς Ἕλληνας (3.2.2–3); 7. Δημηγορία Ξενοφῶντος πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς Ἕλληνας (3.2.10, 21.26–32); 8. Δημηγορία τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς αὐτούς (3.2.39).

⁸⁴ Mazzucchi, *Aevum* 52 (1978) 298 and 303–304; E. McGeer, “Two Military Orations of Constantine VII,” in *Byzantine Authors* 111–135, at 113; A. Markopoulos, “The Ideology of War in the Military Harangues of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos,” in J. Koder and I. Stouraitis (eds.), *Byzantine War Ideology* (Vienna 2012) 47–56, esp. 48.

⁸⁵ Mazzucchi, *Aevum* 52 (1978) 290–292.

⁸⁶ Németh, *Imperial Systematization* 175.

⁸⁷ A. Dain, *Sylloge tacticorum* (Paris 1938); A. Dain and J. A. de Foucault, “Les stratégistes byzantins,” *TravMém* 2 (1967) 317–392, at 357–358.

⁸⁸ *Syll.tact.* 3.3: ὁ παρασάγγελος περσικόν ἐστὶ μέτρον· οὐ παρὰ πᾶσι δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ δέχεται μέτρον, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς πλείστοις τεσσαρακονταστάδιος

phon (who, indeed, normally measures distances in different units, and in these measurements the *parasanges* is equal to 30 *stadia*), but from a lost work of Posidonius (second-first century B.C.) by way of the *Metrologica* of Julianus of Ascalon.⁸⁹

One of the texts used in the composition of the *Sylloge tacticorum* is responsible for the indirect dissemination of the work of Xenophon: a compilation of the *Strategemata* of Polyaeus known as the *Hypotheseis*.⁹⁰ Polyaeus was not a widely read author in Byzantium and, although Constantine VII did use the *Strategemata*, the entire manuscript tradition is derived from a single Byzantine codex, Laur. Plut. 56.1, which was traditionally dated to the thirteenth century, but is undoubtedly from the Komnenian period.⁹¹ However, Polyaeus' work was summarized in the Ὑποθέσεις τῶν ἐκ τῶν στρατηγικῶν πράξεων,⁹² which survives in ff. 76^v–103^v of Laur. Plut. 55.4, the famous Florentine codex of the tacticians.⁹³ The *Hypotheseis* includes 354 *strategemata* or anecdotes of the original 833 (but the text selected is not even a quarter part of the original), ordered thematically, headed by ὅτι, and in some cases paraphrased and abridged. Although this type of abstract of ancient texts does not usually have an independent tradition, the *Hypotheseis*,

ἔστι, παρὰ δὲ Ξενοφῶντι τριακονταστάδιος, παρ' ἄλλοις δὲ καὶ ἐξηκονταστάδιος, καὶ ἔτι πολλῶ πλέον ἐν ἄλλοις, καθ' ἃ φησι Στράβων (11.11.5), προφέρων μάρτυρα τοῦ λόγου τὸν πολυμαθῆ Ποσειδώνιον. Cf. Agathias *Hist.* 21.6, mentioning the similar equivalent in Herodotus and Xenophon.

⁸⁹ A. Dain, "Les cinq adaptations byzantines des 'Stratagèmes' de Polyen," *REA* 33 (1931) 321–346, esp. 341.

⁹⁰ According to Dain, *Sylloge tacticorum* 9, it is the source of ch. 77–102 of the *Sylloge*.

⁹¹ F. Schindler, *Die Überlieferung der Strategemata des Polyainos* (Vienna 1973) 17 and Taf. I.

⁹² I. Melber, *Polyaeni Strategematon libri octo* (Leipzig 1887) 427–504; P. Krentz and E. L. Wheeler, *Polyaenus, Stratagems of War II* (Chicago 1994) 851–1073. On Byzantine adaptations of Polyaeus see Dain, *REA* 33 (1931) 321–346; Dain and de Foucault, *Trav.Mém* 2 (1967) 317–392; Schindler, *Die Überlieferung* 205–225.

⁹³ Wilson, *Scholars* 143, thinks it is a product of the imperial scriptorium.

perhaps because of its organization which made it a collection of advice on how to act in many different theatres of war, aroused some interest: it was copied in Macedonian and Palaiologan times, and was also partially included in the *Sylloge tacticorum*. Finally, we have no fewer than four reworkings of this text that alter the order of the original, or include stratagems that were not in the drafting of Laur. Plut. 56.1.⁹⁴

What effect did the success of the *Hypotheseis* have on the dissemination of the writings of Xenophon? In Polyaeus, whose work is organized around various historical figures, Xenophon is the protagonist of 1.49, containing four short paragraphs inspired by Book III of the *Anabasis* to narrate some moments of the expedition of the Ten Thousand. The first of the four is also picked up in the selection of *Ambros. B* 119 sup.: Xenophon's advice to leave the carriages and superfluous baggage, under pressure from the horsemen of Tissaphernes (*Anab.* 3.2.27). The second relates to the organization of the soldiers to protect the baggage when travelling (*Anab.* 3.3.16 = *Hypoth.* 46.2). The third tells how he avoided the danger of a gorge in which the enemies were lying in wait, being able to attack them from a higher position on a hill (*Anab.* 3.4.37). The fourth presents a diversionary stratagem: a river crossing was occupied, so Xenophon sent a party of soldiers to cross it by another ford and surprise the enemy from behind, while he distracted them by pretending to try to cross there (*Anab.* 4.3.20 = *Hypoth.* 48.1).

A second group of *strategemata*, drawn from the *Hellenica*, deals with Agesilaos and forms ch. 2.1. The first story illustrates the prudence of the general, who waits for the Acarnanians to gather in the harvest before attacking them, because at that moment they will be more inclined to negotiate peace (*Hell.* 4.6.13). The second (2.1.5, from *Hell.* 4.3.20) is an apophthegm about the inadvisability of attacking a desperate enemy (in this case, the Thebans after Koroneia, in 394). In the third (2.1.8, from *Hell.* 3.4.5 and *Ages.* 1.10), Tissaphernes breaks the truce

⁹⁴ One of these, *Ambros. B* 119 sup., has been edited by J.-A. de Foucault, *Strategemata* (Paris 1949).

agreed on with the Greeks and Agesilaos responds to the fears of his countrymen with the confidence of someone who has the gods on his side in the face of a perjurer. The next anecdote (2.1.10, from *Hell.* 4.6.5) shows us Agesilaos gaining a rapid victory over the Acarnanians who had left their refuge in the mountains and had come down to the plain. In the two final paragraphs (2.1.11 and 12, from *Hell.* 5.4.48–49) we find authentic stratagems: in the first, the Thebans are stationed at Skolon waiting for the army of Agesilaos, but he announces to all the Greeks that they will pass through Thespieae. The news soon reaches the Thebans, who leave Skolon in the direction of Thespieae; Agesilaos can then cross unhindered through Skolon. In the last story, Agesilaos gets the Thebans to abandon a privileged position on a hill by threatening to attack Thebes.⁹⁵

6. *The reign of Basil II (976–1025): John Geometres and the Souda*

The great work of Constantine—especially his funding of education and his efforts to preserve ancient texts in new copies—was followed by a period of inertia until the reign of Basil II. The culture of the second half of the tenth century was thus dominated by writers trained in the age of Porphyrogenetos who sometimes held positions of increasing responsibility at the court, such as John Geometres and the *logothetes* Symeon Metaphrastes.

The reign of Basil II has traditionally been depicted as a time of cultural decline, based on the assertion of Psellos (*Chron.* 1.29) that the emperor despised culture and read only books on strategy.⁹⁶ But what actually characterizes the reign of Basil is

⁹⁵ In Polyaeus, there are other isolated anecdotes concerning Iphicrates (3.9.4, from *Anab.* 2.2.20) and Mania, the wife of Zenis the Dardanian (8.54, from *Hell.* 3.1.10). These do not appear to have circulated in Byzantium.

⁹⁶ Wilson, *Scholars* 148–150; B. Crostini, “The Emperor Basil II’s Cultural Life,” *Byzantion* 66 (1996) 55–80, which focuses on Psellos’ claim about Basil’s disdain for literary culture and presents Psellos as prejudiced, unjustly accusing the emperor. C. Holmes, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire* (Oxford 2005), has no chapter about cultural life. A copy of the *Cyropaedia*, Vat. gr. 129, is datable to the first decades of the eleventh century: it is a

the absence of imperial patronage of literature, which is what Psellos is referring to when he mentions the distancing of the *λόγιοι* from the palace in about 990, when the emperor took effective control of the administration.⁹⁷ This meant removing courtiers from their positions, among whom were men of letters such as John Geometres himself. As Psellos states in the same passage, at that time orators and philosophers flourished but apart from imperial patronage.

Concerning the reception of Xenophon at this time, we can identify some broad outlines that foreshadow the apathy of the eleventh century. Noteworthy is a passage of the *Chronicle of the Logothetes* or, more specifically, of the *Chronicon Ambrosianum*.⁹⁸ Its composer comments about Artaxerxes II:⁹⁹

Artaxerxes, the son of Darius and Parysatis, received from his father the empire he held for forty-two years. In his time Socrates the philosopher was executed as having corrupted the laws of the Greeks, drinking hemlock in prison. Contemporaries of his

parchment codex of medium format on which copyists of diverse sensitivities worked (one of them was linked to the administration, as his handwriting suggests).

⁹⁷ According to M. Lauxtermann, “Byzantine Poetry and the Paradox of Basil II’s Reign,” in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantium in the Year 1000* (Leiden/Boston 2003) 209, the intellectuals that Basil had at his side were Nikephoros Ouranos, John Sikeliotēs, Leo of Synnada, and Symeon Metaphrastes; cf. Magdalino at 59–62.

⁹⁸ This is ‘Redaction Ab’, the version preserved in *Ambros. D 34 sup.*, of the tenth–eleventh century (which contains the *Onomasticon* of Pollux as well as the *Chronicle* in question): St. Wahlgren, *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon* (Berlin/New York 2006) 47*. On the difference in cultural level between the redactions see A. Markopoulos, “Byzantine History Writing at the End of the First Millennium,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000* 183–197, at 188–189.

⁹⁹ 46.14: Ἀρταξέρξης ὁ Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος τὸν πατέρα διαδεξάμενος ἐβασίλευσεν ἔτη μβ´ ἐπὶ τούτῳ Σωκράτης ὁ φιλόσοφος ὡς φανλίσας τοὺς Ἑλλήνων νόμους θανατοῦται, κόνιον πιὼν ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Ξενοφῶν ἱστορικοί· καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος, μαθητὴς Σωκράτους, καὶ Ἀρίστιππος.

were the historians Thucydides and Xenophon, and the philosopher Plato, a student of Socrates, and Aristippus.

This is an excursus that breaks with the overall succinct tone of the chronicle, although it does not deviate from the model that puts famous characters from the past into the context of their contemporaries. The source of the *Chronicon Ambrosianum* was perhaps Georgios the Monk, where the list of persons is more complete but also more absurd.¹⁰⁰

Xenophon's works do not appear to have been used in the *Historia* of Leo the Deacon,¹⁰¹ although in Leo's encomium of Basil II the emperor is compared to other monarchs who were the objects of encomia, Ξέρξας δὴ τινὰς καὶ Κύρους καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρους, ἔτι τε Καμβύσας καὶ Πομπηίους.¹⁰² Admiration for Xenophon is clear in the other great writer of the period, John Geometres,¹⁰³ a military poet who recognized Athens as Constantinople's predecessor as the home of knowledge.¹⁰⁴ In

¹⁰⁰ C. de Boor, *Georgii monachi chronicon* (Leipzig 1904) 284: μετὰ δὲ Ἀρταβάνην ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀρταξέρξης ὁ Μακρόχειρ ἔτη μα'. ἐφ' οὗ Σοφοκλῆς καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Εὐριπίδης καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Διογένης καὶ Ζήνων καὶ Φερεκύδης καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἴπποκράτης καὶ Παρμενίδης καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Δημοσθένης ἐγνωρίζοντο, καὶ Σωκράτης ὡς φαλίσις τοὺς νόμους τῶν Ἑλλήνων θανατοῦται κόνειον πίων ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ.

¹⁰¹ On Leo see C. Holmes, *Basil II* 36–37; A.-M. Talbot and D. F. Sullivan, *The History of Leo the Deacon. Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century* (Washington 2005) 23–25, on his literary background. In the *Historia*, the emperors Nikephoros Phocas and John Tzimiskes are models of virtue: A. Markopoulos, in *Byzantium in the Year 1000* 186.

¹⁰² I. Sykoutres, “Λέοντος τοῦ διακόνου ἀνέκδοτον ἐγκώμιον εἰς Βασίλειον τὸν Β',” *EEBS* 10 (1933) 425–434, esp. 429.7–16.

¹⁰³ M. D. Lauxtermann, “John Geometres – Poet and Soldier,” *Byzantion* 68 (1998) 356–380; E. M. van Opstall, *Jean Géomètre. Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques* (Leiden/Boston 2008).

¹⁰⁴ R. Macrides and P. Magdalino, “The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism,” in P. Magdalino (ed.), *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe* (London/Rio Grande 1992) 117–156, esp. 143.

epigram 127, Xenophon appears as the first among rhetors.¹⁰⁵ Our historian also inspired epigram 126, Εἰς τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς πολέμους, about the childish Greeks who stopped their wars against the barbarians to draw swords against each other.¹⁰⁶

About the figure of Xenophon himself, the *Souda*—the great lexicon combining prosopographical entries with the normal contents of a dictionary and which, despite its length, circulated widely—has two entries, of which the first (ξ 47) gives a succinct presentation of Xenophon’s merits:¹⁰⁷

Xenophon, son of Gryllus, Athenian, Socratic philosopher. He was the first to write the lives of philosophers and memoirs about them. He had two sons by Philesia, Gryllus and Diodorus, who were also called “Dioscuri.” He himself was nicknamed the “Attic Bee.” He was a fellow student of Plato and flourished in the ninety-fifth Olympiad. He wrote more than forty books, including the eight of the *Cyropaedia*, seven of the *Anabasis*, seven of the *Hellenica*, the *Symposium*, and many others.

The success of the *Souda* made it a reference work for anyone who wanted information about an ancient author, indispensable when there was no *Vita* or brief note heading the writer’s works in manuscripts. While manuscripts of Thucydides or Aristophanes, for example, preface their works with a *Vita* of the author, Xenophon did not enjoy this advantage; readers of his work, or those who found his name in gnomologies or

¹⁰⁵ Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature* 259. Cramer, *Anecd. Par.* IV (1841) 326: Εἰς τὸν Ξενοφῶντα. Ξενοφῶντος ἡ γλῶσσα πρῶτα ῥητόρων, / ψυχὴ δὲ καὶ νοῦς πρῶτα τῶν φιλοσόφων.

¹⁰⁶ *Anecd. Par.* IV 326: μωροὶ τὰ πολλὰ κἄν σοφοὶ πεφυκέναι / δοκῶσιν, οἱ γῆς Ἑλλάδος πεφυκότες, / οἱ βαρβάρων ἀφέντες ἐκφύλους μάχας, αὐτοὶ καθ’ αὐτῶν ἐσπάσαντο τὰ ξίφη.

¹⁰⁷ Ξενοφῶν, Γρύλου, Ἀθηναῖος, φιλόσοφος Σωκρατικός· ὃς πρῶτος ἔγραψε βίους φιλοσόφων καὶ ἀπομνημονεύματα. παῖδας ἔσχεν ἀπὸ Φιλησίας Γρύλον καὶ Διόδωρον, οἱ καὶ Διόσκουροι ἐκαλοῦντο· αὐτὸς δὲ Ἀττικὴ μέλιττα ἐπινομάζετο. γέγονε δὲ συμφοιτητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ ἤκμαζε κατὰ τὴν οὐδ’ ὀλυμπιάδα. ἔγραψε βιβλία πλείονα τῶν μ’, ὧν καὶ ταῦτα· Κύρου παιδείας βιβλία ἡ’, Κύρου ἀναβάσεως βιβλία ζ’, Ἑλληνικῶν βιβλία ζ’, Συμπόσιον· καὶ ἄλλα πολλά.

lexica, knew his life from the *Souda*. Among the readers of this succinct biography of Xenophon were Eustathios of Thessalonike¹⁰⁸ and Theodoros Metochites, who at the beginning of the chapter of *Miscellanea* dedicated to Xenophon (p.149), recalls the nickname “Attic Bee.”

That the *Souda* is more than a linguistic tool explains the presence in it of stories told by Xenophon, such as that of Herakles which, according to *Mem.* 2.1.21–34, came from the *Hours* of Prodikos of Keos. In this famous story, an adolescent Herakles has to choose between virtue and vice, and the discussion takes the form of an encounter with two women who embody and defend both options before the young man.¹⁰⁹ The story is also in the *Souda* s.v. Ὠραι· Προδίκου βιβλίον ἐπιγραφόμενον Ὠραι, ἐν ᾧ πεποίηκε τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ κακίᾳ συντυγχάνοντα, καὶ καλούσης ἑκατέρας ἐπὶ τὰ ἥθη αὐτῆς, προσκλῖναι τῇ ἀρετῇ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνης ἰδρῶτας προκρίναι τῶν προσκαίρων τῆς κακίας ἡδονῶν.

But the great Xenophontean story included in the *Souda* is the expedition of the Ten Thousand, summarised in the second entry on Xenophon (ξ 48):¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ G. Stallbaum, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* I (Leipzig 1825) 418 (ad 11.299, on the Dioscuri): ἱστορία δὲ, ἢ λέγουσα ὅτι Ξενοφῶν ὁ γλυκὺς ἐκεῖνος Ἀττικὸς μέλισσα ἐπωνομάζετο, παραδίδωσι καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ Φιλησίας υἱοὶ Γρύλος καὶ Διόδωρος Διόσκουροι ἐπεκαλοῦντο.

¹⁰⁹ In Xenophon, where Socrates recounts Prodikos’ short moral story, the context of the dilemma is political and the virtue has to do with government; cf. A. Kaldellis, *The Argument of Psellos’ Chronographia* (Leiden 1999) 53. The story is also told by Basil of Caesarea in his treatise on how should Greek literature be read: *Ad iuvenes* 5.55–77.

¹¹⁰ Ξενοφῶν, Σωκράτους μαθητής, ἐστρατεύσατο ἐπὶ Πέρσας Κύρω συνανελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀρταξέρξην. ὁ Κύρος δὲ ἦν μετὰ Τισσαφέρνην ὑπαρχος ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καταστάς. μετὰ δὲ τὸν Δαρείου θάνατον Κύρον Ἀρταξέρξης διαβληθέντα ὑπὸ Τισσαφέρνους ἀναίρειν μέλλων ἀφήκε, Παρυσάτιδος τῆς μητρὸς παραιτησαμένης αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν αὐτῷ φυλαξάσης. ὁ δὲ ὡς Τισσαφέρνει πολέμων ἤθροισε δύναμιν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἔγνω στρατεύειν. ὃ δὲ κατέλιπον τὸν Κύρον καὶ ἔφυγον ἐκ τῶν συστρατευσάντων ὀπλίται καὶ πελτασταὶ , γφ’. Ξενοφῶν δὲ

Xenophon, a pupil of Socrates, campaigned against the Persians after joining the army of Cyrus to fight against Artaxerxes. Darius appointed Cyrus to replace Tissaphernes at the head of the province of Asia, and after the death of Darius Artaxerxes wanted to kill Cyrus, who had been slandered by Tissaphernes; but he yielded to the entreaties of his mother Parysatis, who preserved his military command for him. Then Cyrus raised an army to fight against Tissaphernes, aware that he would be fighting against his brother. Four hundred deserted Cyrus and 3500 of their fellow soldiers, infantry and peltasts, fled. Xenophon marched inland with him. So, after gathering 10,000 barbarians, from there he went to Pisidia, and as he passed through the tribes, whom he was looking for an excuse to attack, the Greeks who were with them were afraid that the march was against the king. But when Klearchos said that turning back was impossible if Cyrus did not consent, they agreed. Cyrus fought bareheaded against Tissaphernes, although Klearchos had advised him not to fight, and he died. The Greeks who were under the command of Klearchos proposed Ariaaios as their king, but he refused. The king cut off Cyrus' head and hands and sent them to the Greeks, demanding the weapons of the defeated, but they did not surrender them to him. Tissaphernes, violating his oath, betrayed the Greeks and Klearchos and Menon, whom he murdered. Xenophon became leader and was victorious over all of them. When they arrived in Thrace, thousands of survivors put themselves under the orders of Seuthes as mercenaries.

συνανέβη. δέκα οὖν βαρβάρων μυριάδας συναθροίσας ὡς ἐπὶ Πισίδας δῆθεν ἐπορεύετο. ὡς δὲ τὰ ἔθνη διήλθεν, ἐφ' ἃ στρατεύειν προεφασίζετο, συνέντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπὶ βασιλέα εἶναι τὴν στρατείαν ὄκνουσιν τὴν ἀνάβασιν. Κλεάρχου δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν ὑποστροφὴν ἄπορον εἶναι, Κύρου μὴ συναιρομένου, συνήεσαν. Κύρος δὲ γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ πρὸς Τισσαφέρην μαχόμενος, καίτοι Κλεάρχου ἀπαγορεύοντος αὐτῷ μὴ πολεμεῖν, ἀπέθανεν. οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὑπὸ Κλεάρχῳ τεταγμένοι Ἀριαῖον προεβάλλοντο βασιλέα ἑαυτῶν, ὃ δὲ παρητήσατο. βασιλεὺς δὲ τὴν τοῦ Κύρου κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκόψας τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἔπεμπε, ζητῶν τὰ ὄπλα ὡς παρὰ νενικημένων· οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔδοσαν. δόλω δὲ Τισσαφέρην παραβάς τοὺς ὄρκους προδίδωσι βασιλεῖ τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ Κλεάρχον καὶ Μένωνα, οὓς ἀναιρεῖ. καὶ Ξενοφῶν αὐτῶν στρατηγεῖ καὶ πάντας νικᾷ. ἐλθόντες δὲ εἰς Θράκην ἐμίσθωσαν ἑαυτοὺς Σεύθῃ τῷ βασιλεῖ μύριοι διασωθέντες.

It is a summary similar to that already found in Georgios Synkellos. It focuses on the Persian civil war and ignores the rest, except the arrival in Thrace of the Greek survivors. It is poorly written and confusing.

The sources used by the author of the *Souda*, whose work dates from the 970s and 980s, have been analysed with the thoroughness that their complexity requires.¹¹¹ From the 202 explicit mentions of Xenophon (and others not explicit), we know that a part comes from previous lexica such as the *Συναγωγή λέξεων* or Pseudo-Cyril, the scholia on Aristophanes, and the *Lexicum tacticum* of Par. Coislin 347,¹¹² but also from the *Excerpta Constantiniana* taken from the *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis*.¹¹³

7. *Xenophon at school: the lexica of the ninth century*

To paraphrase a reflection by Photios himself (cod. 187), the criterion of usefulness is what decides which texts may survive and which will fall victim to the passage of time.¹¹⁴ If we apply this criterion to Xenophon, the reason for his survival is surely the quality of his prose. In the mid-ninth century, the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, collections of terms together with their definition and origin, put some expressions of Xenophon back into circulation.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* I (Leipzig 1928) XVI–XXII, and “Suidas,” *RE* 4A (1931) 675–717, esp. 706–709.

¹¹² Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* IV 855–864; on the *lexeis* of Xenophon taken from the tactical collection see C. de Boor, “Suidas und die Konstantinische Exzerptsammlung,” *BZ* 23 (1914–1919) 1–127, at 34–35; Adler, *RE* 4A (1931) 702.

¹¹³ De Boor, *BZ* 23 (1914–1919) 33–37, 118.

¹¹⁴ W. T. Treadgold, “Photius on the Transmission of Texts,” *GRBS* 19 (1978) 171–175.

¹¹⁵ These collections and Photios’ *Lexicon* have been described by R. Tosi, “Prospettive e metodologie lessicografiche,” *RSBS* 4 (1984) 181–203, at 202, as basically compilations, unlike collections from the Roman period, which were critical and selective of materials.

In the (so far) partial edition of Photios' *Lexicon*¹¹⁶ there are 84 mentions of Xenophon, and his name accompanies expressions drawn from all his works, probably more from the *Anabasis* than the others. It is accepted that the *Lexicon* is a youthful work of the future patriarch, and the quotations and extracts from our author, when they appear in no other similar compilations,¹¹⁷ likely have their origin in his personal reading of Xenophon, which would have occurred at an early age and which we have seen was precise.¹¹⁸

Xenophon's language had spurred two commentaries by the earlier Byzantine scholar Helladios Besantinoos noted by Photios: the first is a correction to the text of *Hell.* 4.10.4;¹¹⁹ the second, more interesting, disqualifies Xenophon as a model of Atticism because he was away from his homeland for a long time.¹²⁰ This disqualification is common in Atticist lexica, from Phrynichus to Thomas Magistros, who classifies some of Xenophon's expressions as Ionic.¹²¹ In general, these lexica include

¹¹⁶ Ch. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon I–III* (Berlin/New York 1982–2012).

¹¹⁷ On Photios' sources see Wilson, *Scholars* 91–92; K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* (Berlin/New York 1981) 69–79, on the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*, which is the main source.

¹¹⁸ For example, Pollux attributes an expression to Herodotus (ἀνεστόμωσε τὰς τάφρους) which in fact comes from *Cyr.* 7.5.15; cf. R. Tosi, *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci* (Bologna 1988) 101. But Photios *Lex.* α 1887 gives the correct origin: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνέφξε. Ξενοφῶν Παιδείας ζ'. The expression is included by Zonaras, *Epit.hist.* I 254 Dindorf.

¹¹⁹ Cod. 279 (532a) on the indeclinability of the names of the Greek letters, which leads to the correction of Xenophon's text: διὸ καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ξενοφῶντι ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς εἰρημένον οὐχ ὑφ' ἐν "τὰ σίγματα τῶν ἀσπίδων" ἀναγνωστέον, ἀλλὰ διςυλλάβως μὲν "τὰ σίγμα" καὶ ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς "τὰ τῶν ἀσπίδων" κατὰ διάστασιν.

¹²⁰ Cod. 279 (533b): εἰ δὲ καὶ Ξενοφῶν εἴρηκε τοὺς νομεῖς (*Mem.* 2.9.7, *Cyr.* 1.1.2), οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἀνὴρ ἐν στρατείαις σχολάζων καὶ ξένων συνουσίαις εἴ τινα παρακόπτει τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς· διὸ νομοθέτην αὐτὸν οὐκ ἂν τις ἀττικισμοῦ παραλάβοι. Cf. M. Bandini, "Testimonianze antiche al testo dei *Memorabili* di Senofonte," *AATC* 57 (1992) 11–40, at 15–16.

¹²¹ Xenophontean non-Attic words repeated in the lexica are ὁδμή for

the more unusual expressions,¹²² which have no tradition in Byzantium, but there are also many examples of Xenophon's correct syntactic use of common words.¹²³

While the presence of Xenophon among the instruments of linguistic learning is established, ninth-century Byzantine literature contains next to no historical exempla. These, in antiquity and Byzantium, were food and drink to the progymnasmata,¹²⁴ but the only progymnasmata composed in the Macedonian period, those of John Geometres, do not deal with historical subjects.¹²⁵ This does not mean that historical material was not used in the schools: the collection of letters of an anonymous professor in Constantinople, dated to the second quarter of the tenth century, contains several references to figures from the past,¹²⁶ but it would not be until the Komnenian period that historical themes would be fully reinstated in the composition of progymnasmata.

ὄσμή, or the use of ἀκμήν for ἔτι.

¹²² M. Naechster, *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis* (Leipzig 1908) 15; Alpers, *Lexikon des Oros* B 105 (νεατόν), B 90 (λεωργόν), B 14 (ἀνεξυνοῦτο).

¹²³ See for example D. Petrova, *Das Lexikon "Über die Syntax": Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe des Lexikons im Codex Paris. Coisl. gr. 345* (Wiesbaden 2006) 50.15 (ε 76), one citation of Xenophon *Cyr.* 3.3.50 for the use of the subjunctive with εἰ.

¹²⁴ C. A. Gibson, "Learning Greek History in the Ancient Classroom: The Evidence of the Treatises on Progymnasmata," *CP* 99 (2004) 103–129. The progymnasmata of Theon are those that give the greatest role to historical works; at 68 (Spengel) he puts forward the *Agesilaus* as a model encomium. Aphthonios, on the other hand, gives as an example an encomium of Thucydides (22–24 Rabe).

¹²⁵ A. R. Littlewood, *The Progymnasmata of Ioannes Geometres* (Amsterdam 1972).

¹²⁶ A. Markopoulos, *Anonymi professoris epistulae* (Berlin/New York 2000): Jason (*Ep.* 64), Chryses (76), the source of Cleanthes (54), Harmodius and Aristogeiton (79) and even two Athenian generals, Chabrias and Iphicrates (96.29–30). The collection shows its author to have been not only a teacher but also the careful copyist and editor of a text, commissioned by the patriarch Nikolaos I: A. Markopoulos, "La critique des textes au X^e siècle. Le témoignage du 'Professeur anonyme'," *JÖBG* 32 (1982) 31–37.

8. *Moral florilegia*

Xenophon is represented in Macedonian florilegia¹²⁷ particularly as a disciple of Socrates and in terms of his own biography; contents drawn from his historical works are less common.¹²⁸ The Κύρου Αποφθέγματα in the *Florilegium profhanum*, one of the collections included in the *Corpus Parisinum* (CP 3.445–448), the richest of the whole Corpus in secular epigrams and the oldest surviving Byzantine collection of *sententiae*,¹²⁹ are also partly based on the works of Xenophon. In particular, *Anab.* 1.9.23–24 is the source of CP 3.446–447 (= MaxSarg 6.88, Patm. 11.124), which, with the changes needed to transform the text into an apophthegm, faithfully reflects the words concerning friendship that Xenophon puts into the mouth of Cyrus.

Aside from anecdotes that draw on the works of Xenophon, the sacred and secular florilegia present both minimally modified passages from Xenophon and aphorisms that paraphrase the original more loosely. The *Loci communes* of Pseudo-Maximos reflects this variety of methods, and its source is not always the *Anthologion* of Stobaeus. The typology of texts includes statements of just a short sentence,¹³⁰ passages with a single subject

¹²⁷ CP = D. M. Searby, *The Corpus Parisinum I–II* (Lewiston 2007); MaxIhm = S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor* (Stuttgart 2001); MaxSarg = E. Sargologos, *Florilège sacro-profane du Pseudo-Maxime* (Syros 2001); Patm. = E. Sargologos, *Un Traité de vie spirituelle et morale du XI^e siècle: le florilège sacro-profane du manuscrit 6 de Patmos* (Thessalonike 1990); Stob. = O. Hense and C. Wachsmuth, *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium I–V* (Berlin 1884–1912).

¹²⁸ S. Ihm, “Xenophon und Maximus,” *Eranos* 97 (1999) 68–85.

¹²⁹ P. Odorico, *Il Prato e l’ape. Il sapere sentenzioso del Monaco Giovanni* (Vienna 1986) 7–8, dates CP to the first half of the ninth century. Searby (I 112) suggests a much broader possible dating, the eighth and ninth centuries, the *terminus post quem* being the composition of its most recent source, the *Sacra Parallela*. On the CP see also J. Gerlach, *Gnomica Democritea: Studien zur gnomologischen Überlieferung der Ethik Demokrits und zum Corpus Parisinum* (Wiesbaden 2008).

¹³⁰ ἔάν οἱ σώφρονες τοὺς φαύλους ἴδωσιν ἀτιμαζομένους, πολὺ προθυμότερον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀνθέξονται (CP 1.8, MaxIhm 61.5/68.5) comes from

but respecting the original syntax,¹³¹ and finally long extracts such as *Cyr.* 5.1.7–16 (MaxIhm 37/21, Patm. 48.37) illustrating the subject of beauty and *Mem.* 1.2.20–22 (Stob. 3.29.95, MaxIhm 15.–/48) on the educational value of conversation. Some of these selections from Xenophon are repeated in many compilations, and continue in the tradition until the end of Byzantium,¹³² but in general they are texts that did not circulate outside the florilegia. We can mention two exceptions, however: Chorikios (37.1.6) repeats the anecdote in Xenophon (*Cyr.* 1.3.17: MaxIhm 51.9/58.11) recounting Cyrus' decision about the boy with a small tunic who replaced it with the large tunic worn by a smaller boy, but without explaining it properly, as the reader presumably already knew the story. Another example likely due to a reading of the complete text is *Anab.* 3.2.35 (MaxIhm 66.13/37.16; Patm. 42.40), οἱ μὲν πολέμιοι, ὡσπερ οἱ δειλοὶ κύνες τοὺς μὲν παριόντας διώκουσιν τε καὶ δάκνουσιν, εἰ δύνωνται, τοὺς δὲ διώκοντας φεύγουσιν. Comparing the enemy to a dog is not very original, but we find the same comparison in Nikephoros Gregoras.¹³³

Cyr. 2.2.27–28 (οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ τοὺς κακοὺς ἰδόντες ἀτιμασθέντας πολὺ εὐθυμότερον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀνθέξονται), in spite of being attributed in some cases to Basil of Caesarea. Also, from *Cyr.* 3.1.23 comes Ξενοφώντος ἐκ ἧς Κύρου Παιδείας, ὁ φόβος τοῦ ἔργου κακοῦσθαι μᾶλλον κολάζει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους (MaxIhm 24.21/23, Patm. 43.57); from *Oec.* 7.43 comes Σωκράτους, τὰ γὰρ καλὰ τε κάγαθὰ, ἐγὼ ἔφην, οὐ διὰ τὰς ὠραιότητας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς εἰς τὸν βίον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπαύξεται (Stob. 3.37.28, MaxSarg 44.22, MaxIhm 38.27/45.28, Patm. 48.30).

¹³¹ *Ages.* 11.2 (MaxIhm 1.61/58 + 1.62/58); *Cyr.* 1.3.17 (MaxIhm 51.9/58.11); *Anab.* 3.2.35 (MaxIhm 66.13/37.16; Patm. 42.40); *Cyr.* 1.6.10 (MaxIhm 41/19); *Cyr.* 2.3.4 (MaxIhm 32.27/28).

¹³² *Cyr.* 7.5.82, Ξενοφώντος, οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν τὰγαθὰ οὕτω χαλεπὸν ὡσπερ τὸ λαβόντα στερηθῆναι [λυπηρόν] (Stob. 3.15.13, CP4.69, MaxIhm 54.15, MaxSarg 61.15, Arsen. *Aprophth.* 13.39i).

¹³³ *Hist.Rom.* I 535 Bonn: ἔνθα δὲ καὶ, συμβᾶν οὕτωςί πως, Τούρκων τισὶν ἐντυχόντες, ὅποσοι ληστρικόν τινα τρόπον κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς περαιούμενοι τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον τὴν παράλιον πᾶσαν ληΐζονται Θράκην, τοὺς μὲν δῆσαντες ἀπήνεγκαν, τοὺς δ' ἀντιστάντας κατέκοψαν, πολέμιοι πολεμίους, ὡσπερ κύνες τεθηκότι σώματι πολλακίς ἄρδην ἐπεισπίπτοντες.

The late Macedonian period marks a temporary decline in the reception of Xenophon in Byzantine texts.¹³⁴ The eleventh-century historians Michael Psellos and Michael Attaleiates do not seem to have particularly appreciated his works; nor did Kekaumenos, who could have turned to the *Hipparchicus* for information suited to his own interests. The poems of Psellos, at least, contain some echoes of Xenophon, precisely in a didactic context, on grammar and rhetoric.¹³⁵

9. Conclusion

To treat the ancient heritage in Byzantine texts as a mere matter of form (the slavish use of expressive resources or archaisms) can mask the fact that the information provided by the ancient texts (on customs, beliefs, forms of government, observations of nature or the stars, etc.) was a point of reference for Byzantine culture; in it could be found all the elements inherited from the ancient world likely to generate intellectual conflict, as Kaldellis' study shows.¹³⁶ Access to the ancient legacy was restricted, however, and the number of scholars or students for whom the ancient texts were more than an ornament was even smaller; but it is hard to believe that the consequences of the frequent use of ancient texts in Byzantium were merely literary and did not lead readers to gain a better idea of their own reality, to contemplate it with the detachment that came from not being submerged in their own culture. The fact that excessive familiarity with secular texts was a regular feature of attacks made against rival intellectuals is in itself indicative of the personal consequences that might come from the demonstration of classical scholarship.

Byzantium had at its disposal a convenient mirror in which

¹³⁴ L. R. Cresci, "Personaggi ed eventi della storia greca antica negli encomi bizantini," *SicGymn* 57 (2004) 163–178, at 171–172, refers exclusively to texts from the Komnenian period.

¹³⁵ L. G. Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli poemata* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1992) 6.192, 7.314.

¹³⁶ A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (Cambridge/New York 2007).

to look at itself, and this enriched and benefited its culture. Hellenism owed the recovery of this legacy to a small group of influential figures at the court or the church, intellectually gifted, aware of historical change, able to think outside of religious paradigms, and active in politics and literature. Byzantium cannot be understood without their work. They are the best of Byzantium, and access to ancient knowledge made them what they were. Studying what uses they gave to ancient texts is not about recovering an outdated approach: it is about a better understanding of the best of Byzantium.¹³⁷

July, 2013

CCHS-CSIC
C/ Albasanz, 26-28
E-28037-Madrid, Spain
inmaculada.perez@cchs.csic.es

¹³⁷ Funding for this research was provided by the MICINN, Project number FFI2009-10860.