

Tradition, Genre, and Character Portrayal: *Cyropaedia* 8.7 and *Anabasis* 1.9

Paula Winsor Sage

CYRUS THE GREAT, according to Xenophon, died peacefully at home after a long, illustrious life (529 B.C.). Over a century later (401), his namesake and distant relative, Cyrus the Younger, died violently in battle while still a young man, as he attempted to overthrow his brother Artaxerxes II. Their deaths, in *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9 respectively, occasion Xenophon's extended tributes to each. He adopts for these accounts narrative techniques that, on the surface, appear very different: at the conclusion of the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus the Great, immediately before his death, summarizes his accomplishments in direct speech; when Cyrus the Younger dies, early in the *Anabasis*, Xenophon interrupts his third-person account of the battle at Cunaxa to summarize his virtues.

Apart from some notice of verbal and thematic parallels, there has been no extensive comparison of these passages.¹ A closer examination reveals that, despite their differences in purpose, they also share common rhetorical strategies and a complex intertextual relationship that merit exploration.

Sustained allusions—both to a popular tradition and to a genre—constitute a vital part of Xenophon's compositional method here.² Specifically, allusions to Solon's well-known discussion of

¹ *Inter alios*, H. A. Holden, *The Cyropaedia of Xenophon, Books VI, VII, VIII* (Cambridge 1890) 147, 196f; J. J. Owen, ed., *The Anabasis of Xenophon* (New York 1843) *ad* 1.9.24; S. HIRSCH, *The Friendship of the Barbarians* (Hanover, N.H., 1985: hereafter 'Hirsch') 72; J. TATUM, *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction* (Princeton 1989: 'Tatum') 41.

² I use 'allusion' as Gian Biagio CONTE characterizes the term (*The Rhetoric of Imitation*, ed. and tr. C. Segal [Ithaca 1986: hereafter 'Conte'] 23–99): "Allusion, I suggest, functions like the trope of classical rhetoric. A rhetorical

true happiness (Hdt. 1.29–34) and to the rhetorical genre of the *encomium* control the relationship between these texts.³ The implicit presence of these allusions explains the verbal and topical parallels and suggests a way of understanding Xenophon's direct association of the two men. My concern is the intertextual relationship between the accounts rather than source criticism, priority of composition, or their respective historicity.⁴

trope is usually defined as the figure created by dislodging of a term from its old sense and its previous usage and by transferring to a new, improper, or 'strange' sense and usage. The gap between the letter and the sense in figuration is the same as the gap produced between the immediate, surface meaning of the word or phrase in the text and the thought evoked by the allusion. The effect could also be described as a tension between the literal and the figurative meaning.... In both allusion and the trope, the poetic dimension is created by the simultaneous presence of two different realities whose competition with one another produces a single more complex reality. Such literary allusion produces the simultaneous coexistence of both a denotative and a connotative semiotic." Conte is concerned with poetry, but the same dynamic is evident in Xenophon's prose.

³ I use 'encomium' (after T. BURGESS, "Epideictic Literature," *Studies in Classical Philology* III [Chicago 1902: hereafter 'Burgess'] 89–261) not merely to indicate laudatory style in general, but to refer to a distinct division of epideictic literature with an established point of view and method of treatment according to conventional rules. Later handbooks divide epideictic oratory into sub-categories (e.g. *epitaphios*, *basilikos logos*, *panegyrikos*). Aristotle (*Rh.* 2.22, 1396a12–15) treats the *epitaphios* and encomium as subdivisions of epideictic oratory, drawing no distinction between them. Cf. [Dion. Hal.] *Rhet.* 6.2. I am not arguing for exact *imitatio* of a specific genre or sub-genre, but for allusion to the general encomiastic form through style and the inclusion of characterizing topoi.

⁴ I use 'intertextual' in two ways: the first refers to the relationship between Herodotus and *Cyr.* 8.7 and to that between the encomiastic genre and both passages of Xenophon. I have defined this type of intertextual relationship as 'allusion' in Conte's sense (*supra* n.2). There is a clear chronological direction in the case of these allusions—one passage is prior to the other, and the influence is *unidirectional*. The second sense refers to the relationship between *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9. Although I do not assume priority of composition of one of the passages, it is generally accepted that the *An.* antedates the *Cyr.*: cf. J. K. Anderson, *Xenophon* (London 1974) 152 n.1. I begin discussing the relationship between the passages when each *already exists as a finished text*, without regard for which was written first, which records the earlier event, or which

Some general hypotheses advanced to explain Xenophon's parallels go beyond the content of *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9 to suggest the influence of Xenophon's personal experience with Cyrus the Younger on his portrayal of Cyrus the Great. Delebecque sees the *Cyropaedia* as a projection of how things might have been if the younger Cyrus had survived and become king.⁵ Tatum, though arguing for greater complexity in the relationship, also views Xenophon's Cyrus the Great as a fictionalized revision of the younger Cyrus.⁶ Hirsch suggests that Xenophon relied heavily on his experience with Cyrus the Younger and the practices of contemporary Persia for his portrait of the elder Cyrus in order to compensate for the absence of primary sources.⁷ He further sees the possibility of an actual propaganda campaign to lend legitimacy to Cyrus the

any given reader reads first. (For these two passages, the first two chronologies are antithetical, and the third always in flux.) Important here is the relationship that exists between these texts apart from any consideration of chronology: each suggests the other, regardless of the order in which one encounters them.

For a discussion of various approaches to intertextuality see T. E. Morgan, "Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality," *American Journal of Semiotics* 3.4 (1985) 1–40. P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca 1987) 42f, takes a position similar to mine: "suppose, for instance, that we could determine for certain which of the two texts precedes the other. The certainty would be of extraordinary importance for all the historical questions that the two poems raise, but it would scarcely affect our specifically intertextual reading. The specularity of polemic gestures that we read in the two passages would remain untouched, even if we knew which of the two texts initiated the exchange, since by a sort of *après coup* the second text's reading would enforce this specularity on the earlier text." By intertextual (first type) allusion to the Solon-Croesus *logos* and to the encomiastic genre, *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9 are brought more closely into direct intertextual (second type) relationship with each other.

⁵ E. Delebecque, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* (Paris 1957) 394.

⁶ Tatum 41f, who also quite rightly sees (180ff) similarities between the deaths of Cyrus the Younger and another youthful hero, Abratadas (at *Cyr.* 7.1.29–32).

⁷ Hirsch 72–75, who further claims (85) that *An.* 1.9.2–6 is literally a "Cyropaedia" that prefigures the title and content of the larger work.

Younger's venture by connecting him to his distant relative.⁸ Although these theories offer possible reasons for Xenophon's association of the two Cyruses, they do not explore the relationship between the texts and therefore are not directly relevant to my purpose here.

One of the sources and influences mentioned for sections of *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9 independently is relevant, however:⁹ the influence of Solon's advice to Croesus (Hdt. 1.30–33) on Cyrus the Great's statements at *Cyr.* 8.7.7ff, although the implications of this relationship remain largely unexplored.¹⁰ The tacit presence of the Herodotean *logos* in Cyrus the Great's speech—far more pervasive and significant than previously noticed—affects, through the interconnections of these texts, Xenophon's characterization of the younger Cyrus. Xenophon's allusion at *Cyr.* 8.7 to the Solon-Croesus interchange

⁸ Hirsch 72f, whose arguments suggest priority of composition for *An.* (see also *supra* n.7), are not illogical in light of Xenophon's career, and are generally accepted, even if not actually provable; Tatum 40f suggests the likely possibility of Xenophon's simultaneous composition and/or revision of his work. My argument does not depend on the assignment of chronological priority: see *supra* n.4.

⁹ J. Luccioni, *Xénophon et le socratisme* (Paris 1953) 132, concentrates on what he sees as Socratic influence on the portrait of the younger Cyrus at *An.* 1.9; Tatum 38–41 summarizes with reservations the view that the idealization of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* as a whole is a response to Plato's *Republic*. He also notes (and qualifies) the view that “a trio of ideal leaders”—Agesilaus, Socrates, and Cyrus the Younger—were thought to inspire the literary persona of Cyrus (254f n.30). Hirsch (68f, 83f) argues for Ctesias (*FGrHist* 688F9) as a source for the death of Cyrus the Great, as well as for origins of the account in Iranian tradition. Both Tatum (109) and Hirsch (148) see the possible influence of ancient Iranian tradition in the dying king's instructions to his successors about the disposition of the kingdom.

¹⁰ Hirsch 83 notes echoes of Solon's advice to Croesus at Hdt. 1.30–33 in *Cyr.* 8.7.7f. Others have noted correspondences between the Herodotean *logos* and Cyrus' deathbed speech, without exploring the implications: W. J. Keller, “Xenophon's Acquaintance with the History of Herodotus,” *CJ* 6 (1911) 256, links Hdt. 1.30ff with *Cyr.* 8.7.7, 9, saying that Xenophon “intends to have his hero, Cyrus, fulfill the requirements of Solon's happiest man”; similarly, E. LEFÈVRE, “Die Frage nach dem βίος εὐδαιμόνων. Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos,” *Hermes* 99 (1971: hereafter ‘Lefèvre’) 283–96, at 296; Anderson (*supra* n.4: 38) credits the influence of the *logos* with Cyrus' waiting until his deathbed to make the speech; for a more detailed explication see P. W. Sage, *Solon, Croesus, and the Theme of the Ideal Life* (diss. Johns Hopkins 1985) 134–60.

should not surprise, given his productive use of Herodotus elsewhere.¹¹

In Herodotus' well-known account of Solon's discourse on happiness, Croesus is dismayed that Solon, citing divine envy of human prosperity, does not count him truly happy. Solon's happiest man, Tellus the Athenian, was of comfortable means, had thriving children and grandchildren, and died a glorious death, witnessed and celebrated, before suffering a reversal of fortune. The brothers Cleobis and Biton, awarded second place, were from a well-known city, possessed modest but adequate means, and died young at the peak of their fame, having performed an outstanding feat for which they were celebrated with a lasting memorial. Solon emphasizes the uncertainty of life, the impossibility of one person's having everything, and the necessity of waiting until the completion of life to pronounce someone happy. In the face of life's uncertainties, retention of one's goods to the end marks the difference between temporary good fortune and true happiness.

After Cyrus conquered Croesus, both Herodotus (1.86–91, 207) and Xenophon (*Cyr.* 7.2.9–29, 8.2.13–23) have this pair conversing on happiness and the uncertainty of life. Xenophon omits Croesus' meeting with Solon, but he clearly relied, at least in part, on the Herodotean version: similarities in Cyrus' dying speech to Solon's words are quite evident (Lefèvre 296).

Cyropaedia 8.7

At the outset of 8.7, Xenophon presents an aging Cyrus, having lived a long, successful life, returning to Persia for the seventh time. At home in his palace he dreams on three successive nights of his approaching death. On each occasion he sacrifices and prays to the gods, thanking them for their care, reminding them that he was never arrogant despite his success, asking prosperity and happiness for his children, wife, friends,

¹¹ See Tatum esp. 68f, 146–55, 171f; Lefèvre 296; V. Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (Baltimore 1989) 2f, notes that Dionysius of Halicarnassus believed that Xenophon's *An.*, *Cyr.*, and *Hell.* were inspired by Herodotus, and also argues (6, 17–22) for the pervasive influence of Herodotean story patterns in the *Hell.* Cf. also V. Gray, "Xenophon's Hiero and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature," *CQ* NS. 36 (1986) 115–23; Sage (*supra* n.10) 71f, 134ff, 189ff.

and country, and for himself an end befitting his life (8.7.1–5). Summoning his sons, his *philoï*,¹² and the Persian magistrates, he then delivers a lengthy speech, opening with the announcement that he knows he is about to die and the following injunction (8.7.6): ὑμᾶς δὲ χρή, ὅταν τελευτήσω, ὡς περὶ εὐδαιμονος ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάντα.¹³

Cyrus next lists the reasons for this request, claiming that when he was a boy, he plucked all the fruits that boys count as best; when a youth, he enjoyed what was counted best among young men; and when a mature man, he had the best that man can have. As time passed, he continues, he recognized that his strength had increased with his years, so that he was not more feeble in old age than in youth, and as far as he knew had attempted nothing that he failed to secure. He claims, moreover, to have lived to see his *philoï* made happy, his enemies subjected, and his country, once of little account, now honored—through his own efforts—above all in Asia; and he adds that he has maintained all his conquests. Cyrus next boasts that, despite his continual faring as he wished, the ever-present fear that he might see or hear or suffer something difficult kept him from being arrogant or excessively happy. He concludes his summary of his accomplishments (8.7.8f): νῦν δ' ἦν τελευτήσω, καταλείπω μὲν ὑμᾶς, ὧ παῖδες, ζῶντας οὐσπερ ἔδοσάν μοι οἱ θεοὶ γενέσθαι· καταλείπω δὲ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους εὐδαιμονοῦντας· ὥστε πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ δικαίως μακαριζόμενος τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον μνήμης τυγχάνοιμι;¹⁴

¹² Xenophon's use of *philoï* in *Cyr.* implies a systematic network of relationships between leader and subordinates, with an emphasis on mutual benefit rather than affection. Elements of trust, devotion, and good will are present, and one could have 'friends' among one's *philoï*, but the two are not necessarily synonymous. Elsewhere Xenophon uses the term variously to refer to relatives, personal friends, and military, political, and business allies. It is unclear precisely which categories apply here. For further discussion of the concept in Xenophon and his contemporaries see L. Pearson, *Popular Ethics in Ancient Greece* (Stanford 1962) 140ff, 246 n.2; J.-C. Fraisse, *Philia: la notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique* (Paris 1974) 107ff.

¹³ "You must, when I die, both speak and act in every way about me as if I were happy."

¹⁴ "Now if I die, I leave you, my sons, whom the gods have given, surviving. And I leave my fatherland and *philoï* happy. Why then should I not justly be called truly happy and be remembered for all time?"

After speaking to his sons about the succession to the throne and related contingencies (8.7.9–16), on the immortality of the soul (17–23), further instructions to his sons (24), and funeral arrangements (25ff), Cyrus then adds (28): “Remember this final thing from me, treat your friends well and you will also be able to punish your enemies. And now farewell, my children, and say farewell to your mother for me. And farewell, friends, present and absent.” “Saying these things,” Xenophon recounts, “and shaking hands with all, he covered himself up and thus completed his life.”¹⁵

Cyrus’ dying speech serves as a capstone to and summary of the detailed account of his upbringing, virtues, and accomplishments presented in the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus’ summary of his achievements also parallels closely both the Herodotean Solon’s characterization of Tellus and his subsequent summary of the requirements for happiness. Cyrus claims that (1) he has kept health and strength to old age, (2) he is at the peak of his power, having succeeded at all he attempted at each stage of his life, (3) he has made his friends happy and prosperous and subdued his enemies, (4) he leaves his fatherland flourishing, (5) he has retained all his wealth to his deathbed, (6) he has not boasted prematurely about being excessively rich or happy, (7) he leaves sons surviving, (8) his *philoï* and his fatherland happy, and (9) he asks that his funeral be conducted as for one considered happy and that he have undying fame.

Without mentioning Solon or Herodotus, Xenophon has Cyrus’ self-assessment meet or surpass nearly all Solon’s requirements for true happiness, at the same time that he pre-emptively Solon’s cautions. Cyrus’ assertion, both in his prayer (8.7.2) and at the end of the first section of his speech (8.7.7), that he never boasted prematurely about being rich or happy because of his fear of retribution, appears as if in response to Solon’s warning. His behavior contrasts to, and perhaps

¹⁵ The reliability of Xenophon’s account has been much discussed. Despite Hirsch’s arguments for veracity (79, 83f), real doubts remain. Xenophon makes no explicit attempt to defend his radical revision of the Herodotean version of Cyrus’ death (1.214): see Tatum 39, 217, and n.18 *infra*. Xenophon’s text is perhaps rendered further suspect by the utter lack of any attempt at verisimilitude: the speech seems far too robust and protracted to reflect realistically that of a dying man, and there are no narrative interventions (cf. e.g. Tacitus’ description of Seneca’s death at *Ann.* 15.61–64).

corrects, the Herodotean Croesus stricken by powerful divine retribution (ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη) for prematurely thinking himself the happiest of men (1.34). Xenophon's Cyrus appears to have been acutely aware of the Herodotean Solon's cautions about life's uncertainty, the difficulties of retaining one's goods, and the danger of calling anyone happy before death. He has chosen his words carefully. He first asks the gods for an end befitting his life (8.7.3). Subsequently, he emphasizes the retention of his health, strength, and all his acquired goods (8.7.6f); and instead of pronouncing himself happy, he asks rather to be deemed so after he is dead (8.7.6, 9).

Xenophon's Cyrus covers every point raised by Solon and includes others as well.¹⁶ In addition, Cyrus possesses the advantages of the very rich man in Solon's comparison (1.32): he is the richest man in the world and the ruler of an empire, making him in Solon's view better able to achieve his desires and survive ruin than those merely fortunate and of moderate means; he has all of Croesus' wealth and more; and he has had the good fortune to retain it to his deathbed.

With one exception Xenophon's Cyrus has surpassed in happiness both Croesus' claims and Solon's requirements—his sons. Tellus had thriving children and grandchildren. Xenophon has Cyrus mention his sons but not grandchildren, and he does not say that he leaves them happy, as he does his *philoï* and fatherland. Close parallels to the rest of Solon's list make Cyrus' single departure from it more noticeable. The next section (*Cyr.* 8.8) reveals, in fact, that neither his sons nor his fatherland

¹⁶ The emphasis on maintaining and benefiting *philoï*, absent in Herodotus, appears frequently in Xenophon as a quality of effective leaders and as a criterion for a happy life. In addition to *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9, see *Cyr.* 8.1.48, 2.9, 13f, 28, 3.48ff; *Ages.* 1.17ff, 6.4, 11.3–13; *Hiero.* 3.1–5, 11.13ff; *Hell.* 5.1.3, 13, 18; *Mem.* 2.4, 6. Gray (8) connects friendship, "one of the particular concerns of the Xenophontic philosopher," to securing willing obedience, which she regards as a focus of the *Oec.*, *Mem.*, *Cyr.*, and *Hiero.* I see Xenophon's concern with the reciprocal benefits of *philia* partly as a response to Solon's warning that no person is self-sufficient. *Philia* also figures significantly in Aristotle's definition of happiness: *Rh.* 1.5.4, 16 (1360b19, 1361b35).

continued to thrive after his death.¹⁷ Cyrus' sons apparently failed either to heed the sage advice he offers in his dying speech or to follow his example.

The sustained allusion to Solon's definition of the supremely happy man prompts readers to evaluate Cyrus against a traditional standard for true happiness. Despite the subtle qualification hinting that Cyrus was aware that not even he possessed *all* the possible goods, the potency of his case for happiness is strengthened by the allusion. To enhance his portrait of the ideal leader, Xenophon as narrator has assumed a position similar to Solon and has presented Cyrus the Great as his exemplum of true happiness.

Anabasis 1.9

The same allusion is less obvious in *An.* 1.9. We have noted the marked difference in Xenophon's narrative strategies for the deaths of the younger Cyrus and the elder:¹⁸ Cyrus the Great makes a speech, while Xenophon as narrator eulogizes Cyrus the Younger in the third person. Cyrus the Great's speech, preceded by a description of his homecoming, sacrifices, and gradual weakening, is followed by a simple statement of his peaceful death. Xenophon's tribute to Cyrus the Younger is abruptly inserted between the sudden and simply stated facts of his death and his subsequent mutilation. Tranquillity and timelessness surround the former; violence and prematurity, the latter. The attention of Xenophon's readers, however, would not be drawn to either comparison or contrast without the thematic and stylistic parallels in his tributes to the two men.

At *An.* 1.8.27ff Xenophon breaks off his fast-paced narrative of the battle to present a eulogistic summary of the younger

¹⁷ The authenticity of *Cyr.* 8.8 continues to be controversial. I argue for Xenophon's authorship in "Xenophon's Ideal Leader and the End of the *Cyropaedia*" (forthcoming). His audience would have, in addition to the mention of Cyrus' sons here, the very different account of Herodotus (Books 2-3) and the possibility of other accounts of Cyrus.

¹⁸ Although not directly involved in this discussion, the ironic similarity between the Herodotean version of Cyrus the Great's death (1.214) and that of Cyrus the Younger should be noted, as it would hardly have been lost on Xenophon's audience. Both die as the aggressors in battle, defeated in (overly bold) attempts to conquer, and both are mutilated by their victors.

Cyrus, precisely when this youth still in his twenties dies prematurely, after catching sight of the king and rashly charging into the enemy. The summary of Cyrus the Younger's virtues and achievements is understandably fuller than the elder Cyrus' list. *An.* 1.9 is the only presentation of the younger Cyrus' achievements, whereas those of the elder Cyrus have received extended treatment throughout the *Cyropaedia*.¹⁹ Similar topics and order of presentation in the two texts, however, sustain Xenophon's initial invitation to compare the two men, as the following reveals.

Xenophon opens his summary of the younger Cyrus' accomplishments with a direct reference to Cyrus the Elder (1.9.1):²⁰ Κῦρος μὲν οὖν οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀνὴρ ὢν Περσῶν τῶν μετὰ Κῦρον τὸν ἀρχαῖον γενομένων βασιλικώτατος τε καὶ ἄρχειν ἀξιώτατος, ὡς παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογεῖται τῶν Κύρου δοκούντων ἐν πείρᾳ γενέσθαι.²¹ Xenophon continues with a catalogue of superlatives: first, while still a boy, and being educated at court with the other boys, Cyrus was regarded best in all respects (2). He learned discretion and self-control, and observed those whom the King honored and dishonored, thus learning to rule and to be ruled (3f). Cyrus was the most modest, most obedient to his elders, most devoted to horses and skilled at managing them, most eager to learn, most diligent in

¹⁹ Youth and natural abilities: e.g. *Cyr.* 1.1.6, 2.2, 3.1 with *An.* 1.9.2–5; rashness in youth/courage: 1.4.2–24 with *An.* 1.9.6; *philia*: *supra* n.16 with *An.* 1.9.7–30. These parallels are not exhaustive, but an audience reading 8.7 would have already been exposed earlier in the *Cyr.* to the specific information that informs Cyrus the Great's condensed characterization of his achievements. For more complete lists of specific parallels see Holden and Owen (*supra* n.1).

²⁰ Not the only passage where Xenophon explicitly linked the two Cyruses. On his frequently-noted confusion of them at *Oec.* 4.16–19 see A. Pelletier, "Le deux Cyrus dans l'Économique de Xénophon," *RPhil* SER. 3 18 (1944) 84–93; Hirsch 175 with n.47. I am reluctant to believe that Xenophon's confusion was unintentional.

²¹ "Thus then Cyrus ended his life, a man, of the Persians born after Cyrus the Elder, most kingly and most worthy to rule, as is agreed by all reputed to have personal experience with him."

practising military accomplishments. When of suitable age, he was fondest of hunting and of incurring danger in pursuit of wild animals (1.9.2–6).²²

Sent by his father to be satrap of a province, he showed that he thought it most important not to prove false to his word, causing cities to trust him and put themselves under his protection. He showed his loyalty and trust to his *philoï* in word and deed. His striving as much to outdo people in benefits as to be merciless in punishments, with the prayer that he might excel all, prompts Xenophon's claim that he had a greater following than any single man of his day (1.9.7–12).

Xenophon emphasizes that he honored especially the brave in war, claiming that generals and captains came from afar (as Xenophon did) to serve him—initially for money, but in time staying because of the loyalty and obedience Cyrus inspired (1.9.13–19). An extended account of Cyrus' generous treatment of his *philoï* (20–27) follows, after which Xenophon concludes (28): “no man, Greek or Barbarian, has ever been loved by a greater number of people.” As proof of Cyrus' abilities in establishing loyalty and assessing character, Xenophon points out (30f) that no one but Orontas deserted Cyrus for the King, while many deserted the King to join Cyrus, and that when Cyrus died, all his *philoï* and tablemates died fighting around him (except Ariaeus, who fled with the cavalry). At this point, as suddenly as he had broken off his narrative to deliver this obituary, Xenophon returns to the battle.

Unusually stark and simple statements of Cyrus' death and mutilation and of the death of his companions both precede and follow the rhetorically embellished account of his life. After Xenophon's eulogy, instead of next hearing about honors paid by the Persians to the fallen leader, we are told quite abruptly (1.10.1) that ἐνταῦθα δὴ Κύρου ἀποτέμενεται ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ ἡ χεὶρ ἡ δεξιὰ. βασιλεὺς δὲ διώκων εἰσπίπτει εἰς τὸ Κύρειον στρατόπεδον· καὶ οἱ μὲν μετὰ Ἀριαίου οὐκέτι ἴστανται, ἀλλὰ φεύγουσι διὰ τοῦ αὐτῶν στρατοπέδου εἰς τὸν σταθμὸν ἔνθεν

²² The example chosen to illustrate his risk-taking is his slaying of a charging bear. Cf. Cyrus the Great's narrow escape as a youth, when he dashed off in pursuit of a deer and almost was thrown from his horse. Immediately following one reprimand for rashness, he earned another through his encounter with a wild boar (Cyr. 1.4.8f). The parallel and the emphasis is significant in light of the way Cyrus the Younger dies.

ἔωθεν ὠρμῶντο.²³ The narrative goes on to describe the King's plundering of the camp and the Greeks' attempts to stop him, highlighting the disarray and confusion in which the previously organized offensive forces now find themselves.

Despite the contrast between the elder Cyrus' death (amid the warmth of friends, family, and clean white sheets) and Cyrus the Younger's sudden and brutal mutilation on the battlefield, the similarity of Xenophon's tributes to these fallen leaders is remembered and commented on. The comparison is assisted by the way each passage is separated from the surrounding narrative—one by sudden interruption of the battle narrative, the other by the shift to first-person speech.

A comparison of *An.* 1.9 with *Cyr.* 8.7.6ff reveals a parallel selection of topics for praise and a similar chronological progression. Each account begins with the subject's childhood, emphasizing his early training and propensity for excellence. Each account mentions or gives examples of the subject's development and retention of these early talents. Each excelled in benefiting *philo*i and punishing enemies, and was known for generosity, justice, trustworthiness, and a natural suitability for leadership.

There are small differences in emphasis between the two accounts. Cyrus the Great's piety emerges in his prayers and sacrifices, and his military success through the aggrandizement of his empire. Xenophon does not mention Cyrus the Younger's piety, but comments extensively on his loyalty, generosity, and personal appeal, especially in a military context. Repeated superlatives dominate Xenophon's account of Cyrus the Younger as he calls attention to his physical and moral excellence, and groups his virtues around the qualities of trustworthiness, justice, *philia*, generosity, natural suitability for leadership, and personal appeal. Cyrus the Great uses fewer superlatives in characterizing himself, and he does not mention his own personal appeal; but his succinct summary reflects many of the same virtues—virtues that Xenophon has treated more extensively elsewhere in the *Cyropaedia*.

²³ "Then, in fact, Cyrus' head and his right hand were cut off, and the King, pursuing Ariaeus, rushed upon Cyrus' camp; the men with Ariaeus no longer stood their ground, but fled through their own camp to the stopping place whence they had started out."

Despite difference in emphasis, the parallels in structure, content, and arrangement are undeniable. This emerging pattern bears a marked similarity to the guidelines for the *topoi* and arrangement of *encomia* in rhetorical handbooks.

The Encomium

Detecting tacit allusion to one genre in a work of another genre is not an exercise invented by modern literary critics (e.g. Conte 23–27). The elder Seneca (*Suas.* 6.21) attests to its ancient practice: *quotiens magni alicuius viri mors ab historicis narrata est, totiens fere consummatio totius vitae et quasi funebris laudatio redditur.*²⁴

Although formal analyses of the encomiastic genre in rhetorical handbooks postdate Xenophon, some evidence suggests that the genre was developing in his day²⁵ and that Xenophon participated in various ways in the expanding rhetorical tradition.²⁶ Yet beyond the casual labelling of *An.* 1.9 as an “encomium” of Cyrus, the influence of this genre on the structure and arrangement of these two passages has not been explored.²⁷

For each Cyrus Xenophon presents a summary of his outstanding features paralleling the *topoi* that rhetorical handbooks

²⁴ “As often as the death of some great man is narrated by historians, something like a summary of his life is rendered, even as if it were a funeral oration.”

²⁵ For discussion see Burgess xxvii–xxviii, 126; D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, edd., *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981) xiv–xviii, who mention Xen. *Ages.*, Agathon’s speech at *Pl. Symp.* 194E–197E, and Isocrates’ *Euagoras* in this regard. Xenophon calls his *Ages.* an *epainos* (1.1) and an encomium (10.3). See also Hirsch 166 n.34.

²⁶ See e.g. H. Schacht, *De Xenophontis studiis rhetoricis* (Berlin 1890); G. Lange, “Xenophons Verhältnis zur Rhetorik,” in *Johannes Geffcken zum 70. Geburtstag*, 2. Mai 1931 (Heidelberg 1931) 67–84; J. Bigalke, *Der Einfluß der Rhetorik auf Xenophons Stil* (diss. Greifswald 1933); G. Stégen, “Sur la composition d’un chapitre de l’Anabase,” *EtCl* 27 (1959) 293–303; R. Cavenaile, “Aperçu sur la langue et le style de Xénophon,” *EtCl* 43 (1975) 243ff.

²⁷ Xenophon’s praise of Cyrus the Younger at his death is often labelled (loosely and without comment) an “encomium” or “eulogy”: see e.g. W. Harper and J. Wallace, edd., *Xenophon’s Anabasis* (New York 1893) 115; Hirsch 72.

prescribed for various types of encomia: *genos* (ancestry, country), *genesis* (noteworthy facts surrounding birth), *anatrophe* (circumstances of youth, early manifestations of character and natural ability), *paideia* (training, love of learning), *epitedia* (inclinations and pursuits), and *praxis* (deeds illustrating *epitedia* and grouped according to such virtues as wisdom, temperance, justice, and courage).²⁸ The method of praising a man by proceeding through the stages of youth to a record of adult accomplishments and categorizing his virtues, is advocated for encomia by Aristotle, Anaximenes Rhetor, Ps.-Dionysius, and Menander Rhetor.²⁹ Although the correspondence is not exact and each *topos* is not individually treated, much of the content and arrangement of both Cyrus the Great's speech and Xenophon's *laudatio* of Cyrus the Younger is consistent with the recommendations of rhetors from Aristotle to Menander.³⁰

The allusion to this rhetorical genre has a twofold effect: first, it brings the deaths of the two Cyruses into closer intertextual relationship with each other than would result from the direct comparison at *An.* 1.9.1 alone, making it more difficult for an audience to hear one account of Cyrus' death without thinking of the other, regardless of which account Xenophon wrote first, or which the reader encounters first (*cf.* Conte 29); second, although neither passage is technically an encomium or an *epitaphios*, the allusion in each case is sufficient to create the impression of a eulogy or funeral speech. The rhetorical structure communicates on the connotative level more than the narrator does on the denotative level alone (see *supra* n.2).

²⁸ I use Burgess' synthesis (122) of the essential features for the ordinary enkomiastion of a person derived from all the extant rhetors. He notes similar features for the *epitaphios* (148).

²⁹ Burgess (106f, 119–23), Russell and Wilson (*supra* n.25: xxi–xxx), J. Ziolkowski (*Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* [New York 1981] 33ff), N. Loraux (*The Invention of Athens*, tr. A. Sheridan [Cambridge (Mass.) 1986] 221–25, who questions inclusion of the public *epitaphios* as part of the larger category), and G. Kennedy (*The Art of Persuasion in Greece* [Princeton 1963] 154) demonstrate convincingly the consistency of *topoi* in various forms of epideictic oratory from Aristotle to Menander.

³⁰ Writers of handbooks speak of the license allowed in combining and arranging the precepts: see Burgess 121.

Xenophon's praise of these leaders thus appears magnified, the effect being achieved primarily through indirection.

Delivering one's own funeral speech is irregular, perhaps, but at the conclusion of the *Cyropaedia* no single character worthy of the charge emerges. Cyrus' direct speech contributes further to his characterization and is more effective than a third-person narrative intervention would have been. By privileging none of Cyrus' survivors, Xenophon indirectly addresses the same point he states so dramatically in his conclusion, that immediately after Cyrus' death everything began to deteriorate because it had been achieved through Cyrus alone (8.8.1).

Xenophon presents Cyrus the Younger's extended obituary in a formal and deliberate style, as if delivering an *epitaphios* on the very spot where he fell. Its encomiastic quality gives it a prominence that sets it apart and renders it a permanent (literary) memorial to the fallen leader at the spot (in the narrative) where he dies. Although Xenophon makes no mention of any funeral or memorial for Cyrus, his own tribute serves a similar purpose. It may be the only memorial Cyrus the Younger received.

Interplay of Allusion

The rhetorical allusion in *Cyr.* 8.7 and *An.* 1.9 strengthens their intertextual connection. Given the practices of the encomiastic genre, this structural allusion to encomium has the further effect in each passage of creating the expectation of unqualified praise.³¹ Were it the only allusion operating, Xenophon's audience would be left with the impression that these expectations had been realized. But we have already seen how allusion to the Solon-Croesus *logos* invites an assessment of Cyrus the Great against Solon's standard, revealing that even he falls short of an absolute ideal in the happiness of his sons and the future well-being of his kingdom.

The intertextual relationship created by the encomiastic allusion allows the Herodotean allusion to extend to the

³¹ Burgess 94 and Russell and Wilson (*supra* n.25) xxi give evidence for the standard practice in encomia of bringing only the good forward, stating the unfavorable in a favorable light, and exaggerating or even inventing good qualities. Cf. Isoc. *Busiris* 4.

Anabasis passage as well, suggesting comparison of Cyrus the Younger not only to Cyrus the Great but also to Solon's exemplum.³² By itself, Xenophon's portrait of Cyrus the Younger does not immediately and directly suggest Solon as Cyrus the Great's speech does. But Xenophon tells us directly that Cyrus the Younger is second only to Cyrus the Great in kingliness and worthiness to rule. As readers we know that the younger Cyrus is from an illustrious family. We are told that he possessed health, strength, and exceptional physical and military abilities. His personal charm, leadership abilities, and integrity enabled him to perform a feat worthy of some admiration—he was able to gather a sizeable army of loyal supporters to embark on a bold venture. His attempt was of heroic proportions; and he died fighting bravely. He also died at the peak of his fame, but he did so without gaining his end. The similarities to the virtues praised in Cyrus the Great, Tellus, and Cleobis and Biton

³² The interaction of these two traditions—the Solon-Croesus *logos* and the encomium—may be earlier than Xenophon and may already have seemed natural to a fourth-century audience. Xenophon also reflects the association elsewhere: *Ages.* 10.4, 11.8; *Ap.* 34; *Mem.* 4.8.1. Some fourth-century writers even considered Solon the originator of the Athenian tradition of public funeral orations: Anaximenes Rhetor, *FGrHist* 72F24; Σ Thuc. 2.35.1. For discussion and complete references see Ziolkowski (*supra* n.29) 15ff; L. Weber, *Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede* (Frankfurt a.M. 1935) 66. Cicero (*Leg.* 2.25, 63) places the origin of the tradition before Solon; most scholars locate it after: W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* IV (Berkeley 1985) 106–24, posits 464. The actual date of origin remains controversial, but my concern is the common belief in Xenophon's day. See Loraux (*supra* n.29: 28) for discussion of the origins, and for the post-411 Athenian tendency to attribute much that was patriotic to Solon. Echoes of the Herodotean *logos* have been detected in Pericles' celebrated *epitaphios* (Thuc. 2.35–46): see K. Gaiser, *Das Staatsmodell des Thukydides* (Heidelberg 1975) 65–71. The traditions have clearly merged by Aristotle's day: his definition of happiness at *Rh.* 1.5.4, 16, derives, with an added emphasis on *philia* and control over one's circumstances echoing Xenophon's, directly from the Solonian tradition. His debt, unacknowledged in the *Rhetoric*, is clear in his discussion of happiness at *Eth. Nic.* 1100a, 1179a. Russell and Wilson (*supra* n.25: 326f) and Ziolkowski (57, 146) posit the *makarismos* in later handbooks as a regular part of *paramythioi* within and apart from *epitaphioi*. In the third century the Solon-Croesus *logos* remained so familiar that Menander Rhetor (414.1) recommends use of Cleobis and Biton for consolatory speeches or as examples of premature but glorious death (Russell and Wilson 162f)

are obvious. At this point, given that Cyrus died bravely while still young, much like Cleobis and Biton, and left no sons to survive him, we might conclude that Xenophon was awarding him second place in happiness.

The interconnections in these passages form a “contextualized network”³³ that privileges the deaths of these two leaders, associating them with each other and with the encomiastic tradition and the tradition of the happy life. Through this network of allusion, Xenophon’s praise of each leader is formalized and appears, on one level, intensified. But the praise, especially for Cyrus the Younger, is indirectly qualified as well.

Departures from Solon’s ideal, as significant as the similarities, emerge in Cyrus the Younger’s portrait. Xenophon does not say, like Solon for Cleobis and Biton, that the god showed through him how it was better to die than to live. Xenophon does not directly suggest that Cyrus the Younger be called happy. It would be difficult to argue that Cyrus had the good fortune that Solon deemed necessary for true happiness and that Cyrus the Great claimed for himself. Had Cyrus been lucky, he would have killed Artaxerxes and escaped with his own life. Had he not lost control, he might not have needed luck. The blunt narrative surrounding Xenophon’s memorial to the younger Cyrus makes it clear that despite his virtues and brave death, his demise and that of his men resulted from his own rash action.³⁴ Unlike Cyrus the Great, Tellus, and Cleobis and Biton, this

³³ Conte 49: “Seen from below, from the perspective of culture, the text is no longer the neat, checkered chessboard of *horizontal* coherence on which words are locked in [meter] but is now instead a profoundly contextualized network of association, echoes, imitations, allusions—a rich root system reaching down and entwined with the fibers of the culture in its historical dimension.... The job of the committed philologist is to map the relations of meaning and to show their significance in the context.”

³⁴ The younger Cyrus’ behavior here is in direct contrast to Cyrus the Great’s at *Cyr.* 7.1.36–41: when this Cyrus was trapped in battle, his only thoughts were of his men. This departure from the ideal becomes the more significant when compared to Xenophon’s direct criticism of Teleutias (*Hell.* 5.3.3–7), whose death occurred under similar circumstances and caused the loss of many of his men. Teleutias, earlier praised by Xenophon (*Hell.* 5.1.3f), prompts here a brief discourse on the destructive qualities of *orge*—both in rare first-person narrative interventions. Cf. also the parallels to Herodotus’ account of Cyrus the Great’s death (*supra* n.18) and the death of Abratadas at *Cyr.* 7.1.29–32 (see Tatum 180ff).

younger Cyrus did not leave his survivors better off. From 1.10 to its conclusion, the *Anabasis* testifies to the resulting hardships.

Xenophon's strategy of intertextual allusion permits him to extol Cyrus the Younger and his kingliness by associating him with his elder and greater namesake and with others idealized as truly happy at their deaths. This strategy adds to the poignancy of the younger Cyrus' death, while the complex network of intertextual allusion allows us to see that his praise is qualified by omission.³⁵

Xenophon's concern with leadership is well established, as is his adherence to the topological view that a leader has responsibilities to his people as a shepherd to his flock (*Cyr.* 8.2). Xenophon risked and lost much through his participation in Cyrus' expedition, and he must have been extremely disappointed by Cyrus' early defeat. His encomiastic portrait of Cyrus may have been motivated, in part, by an attempt to compensate, however inadequately, for that loss and to make his participation more understandable to his Athenian audience.³⁶ The emphasis on Cyrus' worthiness to rule, his trustworthiness, and his overwhelming personal appeal may have been intended, in part, to counter the reality that Xenophon had been deceived at first about the real purpose of the expedition, that it was aborted at such an early stage, and that luck and effective leadership nearly failed to insure the safe return of the Greeks.

The extended eulogy removes the emphasis from the actual circumstances of Cyrus the Younger's death, but its stark reality has not disappeared. Xenophon's praise of Cyrus can be genuine, although he was too directly affected, too experienced a

³⁵ G. Cawkwell, *Xenophon: A History of My Times* (Harmondsworth 1979) 34–38, 43, posits criticism by omission as a prevalent strategy of Xenophon: "His method was to commemorate the commendable, and by silence to censure." Silence alone is not enough. For this strategy to work, readers must be first led to compare one character with another possessing the virtue. Sufficient similarity between the figures must first be established by creating an intertextual relationship.

³⁶ I do not agree with Delebecque's view (*supra* n.5: 200) that he was forced to praise Cyrus to justify his participation in the expedition, nor do I adhere to Hirsch's view (14, 153 n.1) of *An.* as apologia.

leader, and too concerned with the ideal of good leadership not to notice Cyrus' failings. His intertextual approach allowed him to be true to his own assessment of the requirements of a good leader and, without openly criticizing Cyrus or openly praising himself, to invite the contrast of Cyrus' rashness with his own leadership and the constant concern for his men he records in the remainder of the *Anabasis*.³⁷ The interplay of allusion extends the counterpoint of leaders to include Xenophon the character, also adducing his association with Cyrus the Great and Solon's exempla.

An intertextual reading of these two passages suggests a productive strategy for a more comprehensive understanding of Xenophon's attitudes toward leadership. His use of standardized *topoi* from two familiar traditions not only enriches his comparison of the two Cyruses, but establishes a means of comparing other leaders, both in and beyond the *Cyropaedia* and the *Anabasis*, to the portraits of these two men. Xenophon has clearly associated his ideal of leadership with the philosophical ideal of human happiness expressed by Solon. Through the interplay of allusions to Solon's canonical definition of happiness and the tradition of encomiastic rhetoric, Xenophon's work also prefigures Aristotle's more explicit association of the two traditions in the *Rhetoric*.³⁸

HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES
September, 1991

³⁷ Xenophon's portrayal of himself as leader in the *Anabasis*, too complex an issue to be explored here, constitutes part of a longer study (forthcoming).

³⁸ See *supra* n.25. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Cincinnati meeting of the American Philological Association, 29 December 1983. I wish to thank the following for helpful comments at various stages of the project: J. Clay, C. Kalkavage, B. Lanciaux, D. Mankin, L. Robertson, W. Waller, and the anonymous referee.