

# Xenophon's Theory of Moral Education



# Xenophon's Theory of Moral Education

By

Houliang Lu

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



Xenophon's Theory of Moral Education

By Houliang Lu

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Houliang Lu

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6880-9

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6880-8

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	vii
Editions.....	viii
Introduction .....	1
<b>Part I: Background of Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education</b>	
Chapter One.....	13
Xenophon's View of His Time	
Chapter Two .....	41
Influence of Socrates on Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education	
<b>Part II: A Systematic Theory of Moral Education from a Social Perspective</b>	
Chapter One.....	63
Nature and Origin of Xenophon's <i>Cyropaedia</i>	
Chapter Two .....	97
Xenophon's <i>Hiero</i> : A Rhetorical Dialogue to Persuade the Organiser of Social Education	
Chapter Three .....	123
Dark Side of Xenophon's Social Education	
Chapter Four .....	153
A Supplement to Political Education of Social Morality: The Primitive Model of Moral Economics Established in Xenophon's <i>Oeconomicus</i> and <i>Poroi</i>	

**Part III: Application of Xenophon's Theory of Social Education in His Literary Composition**

Chapter One.....	177
Xenophon's <i>Agesilaus</i> and the Moral Tradition of Ancient Biography	
Chapter Two .....	203
Queen Bee and Housewife: Extension of Social Education into the Private Sphere in Xenophon's <i>Oeconomicus</i>	
Conclusion.....	221
Bibliography .....	227
General Index .....	239

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This small work, based on my PhD dissertation finished in Department of Classics, University of Edinburgh in 2013, cannot be completed without the help of many people. First of all, I express my profound gratitude to my PhD programme supervisors, Prof. Douglas Cairns and Prof. Andrew Erskine, for their careful correction and valuable advice for my thesis. I should also thank my former supervisor, Prof. Xiaoling Guo in Beijing Normal University as well as Prof. Shaoxiang Yan in Capital Normal University of Beijing, whose support and recommendation enable me to do my PhD programme in University of Edinburgh. Besides, I am very grateful to the Chinese Scholarships Council and the University of Edinburgh, whose funding covers my tuition fee as well as my living expenses, so that I can finish my PhD programme in Edinburgh much more easily.

Special thanks must also be given to Mr. Christopher Strachan, Dr. Lisa Hau, Dr. Sandra Bingham, Mr. John Houston as well as editors of *Journal of Cambridge Studies*. Mr. Strachan proofread the whole draft patiently and gave me a lot of guidance and encouragement to help me improve my ancient Greek and English since I came to University of Edinburgh. Dr. Hau kindly sent me her PhD thesis on ancient Greek historiography for reference. Dr. Sandra Bingham took part in the first and second annual reviews of my dissertation and provided lots of valuable advice for me. Mr. Houston, my landlord in Edinburgh, also proofread my early chapters and carefully corrected the English grammar mistakes in this work. And the editors of *Journal of Cambridge Studies* offered me a chance to publish an article based on Part 3, Chapter 2 of this work and provided some good advice for its later revision.

I dedicate this little book to my wife Xixi and my new-born son Luca.

## EDITIONS

As one of the most important and popular writers in classical age, most of Xenophon's works are available in almost all the four major modern series of classical texts.

BT (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum Teubneriana) offers Xenophon's works edited by Gemoll, Hude and other scholars in around 1910. The older edition of BT prepared by German scholar G. Sauppe is the basis of almost all later academic editions of the ancient Greek texts of Xenophon, and is still adopted by Loeb Classical Library. The major drawback of the latest Teubner edition is that it is compiled by many hands and many volumes of it are already out of print and not always easily available in libraries.

The Budé edition offers original texts of a few works of Xenophon, including the *Anabasis*, *Oeconomicus* and *Memorabilia*, usually with quite accurate and highly praised French translation, brief critical apparatus and full notes. The edition is still incomplete. Generally speaking it is conservative and does not make much crucial correction of former standard Greek texts.

Up to now, the standard edition of Xenophon's complete works is still that of Oxford Classical Texts, prepared by E.C. Marchant from 1900 to 1920. This edition is complete with brief critical apparatus, and is widely accepted and used for academic studies.

For the English translation, one of the most popular editions is that of Loeb Classical Library, translated by C.L. Brownson, E.C. Marchant and other scholars in early twentieth century. Most of these books adopt the old edition of the Greek text prepared by G. Sauppe, which is in need of correction itself. The translation is not always accurate and is occasionally quite old in language style. For example, Sarah Pomeroy points out that E.C. Marchant translates γύναι as 'my dear' instead of the more proper address 'wife' in the translation of *Oeconomicus* according to the common usage in English at his time, which lends the original word affective quality it does not have at all and may prevent us from finding out some information for gender studies in ancient texts. In 1989, Loeb Classical Library published a revised edition of Xenophon's works. They are not thoroughly reworked but offer some useful corrections on certain texts of translation and notes made by John Dillery and G.W. Bowersock.



Apart from the four major series above, certain separate editions and commentaries on Xenophon's individual works are more up-dated and therefore noteworthy, including Pomeroy's *Xenophon, Oeconomicus, A Social and Historical Commentary* (1994), with a new English translation from E.C. Marchant's OCT text; A.J. Bowen's *Xenophon, Symposium, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (1998); and Michael Lipka's *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution, Introduction, Text, Commentary* (2002) with both new Greek texts produced by study of manuscripts and a new English translation.

In my book, I will use E.C. Marchant's OCT texts and the English translation of LCL (with slight corrections when necessary) for citation as a general rule. For certain individual works with new text or translation, the most recent edition is preferred if it is academic and widely accepted.

### **Texts and Translations of Xenophon's Works Used in this Thesis**

Xenophon, *Opera Omnia*, Marchant, E., ed., Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press

Tomus I, *Historia Graeca*, 2008 (reprinted).

Tomus II, *Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Conuiuium, Apologia Socratis*, second edition, 1921.

Tomus III, *Expediitio Cyri*, second edition, 2008 (reprinted).

Tomus IV, *Institutio Cyri*, 1910.

Tomus V, *Opuscula*, 2005 (reprinted).

Xenophon, *Works*, Loeb Classical Library, London & Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press

Vol. I, *Hellenica*, Books 1-4, Brownson, C., tr., 1989.

Vol. II, *Hellenica*, Books 5-7, Brownson, C., tr., 1989.

Vol. III, *Anabasis*, Brownson, C., tr., Dillery, J., rev., 1989.

Vol. IV, *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*, Marchant, E. and Todd, O., trs., 1989.

Vol. V, *Cyropaedia*, Books 1-4, Miller, W., tr., 1989.

Vol. VI, *Cyropaedia*, Books 5-8, Miller, W., tr., 1989.

Vol. VII, *Scripta Minora*, Marchant, E., tr., Bowersock, G., rev., 1989.

Xenophon, *Symposium, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Bowen, A., ed./tr. /comm., Warminster, 1998.

Xenophon, *Spartan Constitution, Introduction, Text, Commentary*, Lipka, M., ed./tr. /comm., Berlin & New York, 2002.

Xenophon, *Oeconomicus, A Social and Historical Commentary*, Pomeroy, S., ed./tr./comm., Oxford, 1994.

Citation of other classical writers is generally taken from the texts of the most standard editions available, and the translations in LCL with some necessary corrections. As the English translations of Plato edited by John M. Cooper (1999, Indianapolis/Cambridge) and of Aristotle edited by Jonathan Barnes (in two volumes, 1984, Princeton) are of high quality and influential, I choose them instead of the Loeb translations for citation. All abbreviations for ancient authors and texts adopted in this thesis generally follow the examples listed in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. and Eidinow, E., eds., fourth edition, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Full bibliographical detail of modern papers and monographs is provided in the bibliography.

## INTRODUCTION

As a prolific writer of the fourth century B.C., Xenophon offers modern scholars valuable clues for the study of ancient Greek history, philosophy and literature. His *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* provide basic materials for us to reconstruct historical events taking place in Xenophon's lifetime; his Socratic writings are the most important documents on Socrates' life and thought besides the works of Plato and Aristotle; and his *Agesilaus*, *Oeconomicus* and *Cynegeticus* are taken as examples and prototypes of later literary genres of biography, agricultural writing and practical manual. Nevertheless, in modern scholarship since the nineteenth century, Xenophon has seldom received serious treatment in his own right, and his thought has generally been considered to be unoriginal and unsystematic. This attitude is also reflected in modern scholars' ignorance or negative evaluation of Xenophon's role in the history of thought on education.

In 1948, Henri-Irénée Marrou published his *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. In this classic monograph on the great educators of the ancient western world, Xenophon's name is not even in the list. In Marrou's eyes, Xenophon's works have little to do with education, and they only deserve to be cited occasionally for the study of other great figures in this area, for example Homer,<sup>1</sup> Lycurgus,<sup>2</sup> Socrates<sup>3</sup> and certain sophists.<sup>4</sup> The only works in his corpus relevant to education are his three technical manuals.<sup>5</sup> But they can only prove that Xenophon advocated a type of physical training for traditional aristocrats, which had become conservative and out-of-date in his time. In short, Marrou believes that Xenophon is at most a marginal and minimal figure in the history of Greek thought on education; and his idea of physical training, if it can be taken as a type of educational thought at all, is unoriginal and conservative, and therefore contains very little value in itself.

In *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.* published in 1964, Frederick A.G.

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris: Editions Du Seuil, 1948), 35.

<sup>2</sup> Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, 41, 46.

<sup>3</sup> Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, 60.

<sup>4</sup> Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, 90.

<sup>5</sup> Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, 71.

Beck partly amends Marrou's neglect of Xenophon's contribution in Greek thought on education, and incorporates a brief section (roughly 8 pages) to discuss Xenophon's own ideas. The title chosen for this section, "Education as Social Habituation",<sup>6</sup> shows that Beck already notices that the type of education Xenophon advocates is not confined to school education. He also vaguely realises that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and some other works contain an intention to educate through great examples.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the whole section is full of harsh critique of Xenophon as a disappointing author on education.<sup>8</sup> In Beck's opinion, the *Cyropaedia* discusses only the education of princes<sup>9</sup> and represents a superficial understanding, which takes education as "the acquisition of certain basic skills necessary for the defence of the homeland, as well as the development of socially correct habits in and through typical social situations".<sup>10</sup> He complains that in Xenophon's scheme "there is no hint of what is actually regarded as cultural education — no reading, no writing, no study of literature or mathematics". Therefore, Beck's attitude towards Xenophon is in essence not greatly different from Marrou's. Although Beck admits that Xenophon's contribution to educational theory is not confined to his three manuals on physical training only, he still believes that what Xenophon discusses beyond that topic is superficial and contains little value; and Xenophon's neglect of cultural education is incompatible with the common concept of education in the twentieth century A.D. (which focuses on teaching young children to read and write as well as introducing cultural knowledge of humanities and natural science to youths in a high school or university) and is therefore a foolish and inexcusable fault.

However, a contemporary German classicist, Werner Jaeger, depicts a very different image of Xenophon as a valuable writer on education in his *Paideia; die Formung des griechischen Menschen*, published in 1933-1947. In his view, "all Xenophon's books are more or less dominated by the desire to educate",<sup>11</sup> and his *Cyropaedia* and *Spartan Constitution* are very important works on education. Jaeger points out that if we take the term "education" in its strict sense, we would assert that only the first few

---

<sup>6</sup> F. Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.* (London: Methuen, 1964), 244.

<sup>7</sup> Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, 249.

<sup>8</sup> Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, 244, 252.

<sup>9</sup> Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, 249.

<sup>10</sup> Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, 249.

<sup>11</sup> W. Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. III, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1945), translated by G. Hignett, 159.

chapters in those two works are relevant to it.<sup>12</sup> But Xenophon actually understands the term in a much broader sense, which also covers the content of the remaining parts of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*, namely the supervision of adult life.<sup>13</sup> Although Jaeger's account of Xenophon is also short and basically narrative, he points out that Xenophon as an educator and theorist on education is much more important in Greek history than what Marrou and Beck supposed him to be.

In my opinion, the difference between the two views of Xenophon's status is determined by the different approaches adopted by the three scholars. For Marrou and Beck, the standard by which to judge the value of ancient authors is the established system of modern education; and their aim is to explain how ancient doctrines contribute to build up our understanding of cultural education and justify modern educational practice. For Frederick Beck, his choice of the period 450-350 B.C. as the object of his research is due to his view that it is "perhaps the most important period in the whole history of education"<sup>14</sup> and still has great impact on the age we live in. In that sense, Xenophon's discussion of the elevation of human virtue and the maintenance of social customs should be neglected as a heterodoxy, because it has little to do with intellectual education carried out in modern schools and universities, which is supposed to be shaped by other influential thinkers living in this key period, for example sophists, Socrates and Plato, but not by Xenophon. On the other hand, though as Clara Park and E. Harrison have already pointed out, Jaeger's work also has serious shortcomings and ceased to be influential after his lifetime: his general view of classical culture is profoundly influenced by biased ideology, as he exaggerates the greatness of the past;<sup>15</sup> and his original German text is obscure and sometimes difficult to understand.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, following the strict discipline of German philology, his study of Greek education starts from discussion on ancient Greeks' understanding of παιδεία and ἀρετή, which shows that he attempts to understand education in ancient Greek cultural context from the very beginning of his research. As Clara Park comments, Jaeger "did

---

<sup>12</sup> Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. III, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato*, 167.

<sup>13</sup> Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. III, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato*, 167.

<sup>14</sup> Beck, *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, 7.

<sup>15</sup> C. Park, "At Home in History: Werner Jaeger's *Paideia*," *The American Scholar* 52 (1983): 379.

<sup>16</sup> E. Harrison, "Jaeger's *Paideia* in English," *The Classical Review* 54 (1940): 32-33.

not simplify the past, nor did he sentimentalize it. He insisted, as only a true historian can, that we see it in its own terms and not ours, and cautioned against the easy game of drawing contemporary parallels”.<sup>17</sup> In the passage on Xenophon’s role in Greek education, he also pays enough attention to the social background which produced Xenophon’s ideas.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, he can clearly see that what Xenophon talks about is παιδεία in his mind as well as in contemporary cultural context, and would not totally neglect these valuable materials due to modern bias. In my opinion, Werner Jaeger’s approach in this aspect is relatively more historical and more reliable, and his principle should be adopted as a fundamental starting point for new research on Xenophon’s contribution on ancient Greek education.

From 1989 to 1993, three noteworthy English-language monographs on Xenophon’s most important work on παιδεία, the *Cyropaedia*, were published in succession, including James Tatum’s *Xenophon’s Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus* (1989), Bodil Due’s *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon’s Aims and Methods* (1989) and Deborah Levine Gera’s *Xenophon’s Cyropaedia, Style, Genre and Literary Technique* (1993). Tatum first argues that the *Cyropaedia* is not a marginal work in Xenophon’s corpus, as most former scholars believed, because “no other work he [Xenophon] wrote is so compendious, none is so evocative of his other writings”.<sup>19</sup> He also realises that Xenophon’s doctrine in this work contains an element of religious education,<sup>20</sup> and it is closely related to Xenophon’s other writings, such as his *Oeconomicus*, *Anabasis*, *Spartan Constitution*, *Memorabilia* and perhaps also *Hellenica*.<sup>21</sup> Generally speaking, Tatum takes the *Cyropaedia* as Xenophon’s blueprint of a fictional and utopian political model, in which moral and religious education of Socratic style plays a crucial role. Bodil Due adopts an approach similar to that of Werner Jaeger and recognises that Xenophon uses παιδεία in its wider sense,<sup>22</sup> so that the *Cyropaedia* on the whole is precisely a work on the “upbringing and education of Cyrus the Elder”.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Park, “At Home in History: Werner Jaeger’s *Paideia*,” 379.

<sup>18</sup> Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. III, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato*, 159.

<sup>19</sup> J. Tatum, *Xenophon’s Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 40.

<sup>20</sup> Tatum, *Xenophon’s Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus*, 31.

<sup>21</sup> Tatum, *Xenophon’s Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus*, 58.

<sup>22</sup> B. Due, *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon’s Aims and Methods* (Aarhus & Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press, 1989), 15.

<sup>23</sup> Due, *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon’s Aims and Methods*, 14.

The aim of Xenophon's composition of the *Cyropaedia* is to make his readers "learn from the example of Cyrus what it takes to become a good ruler", so that the disastrous and immoral scene he depicts in the opening passage should be avoided.<sup>24</sup> Deborah Gera studies the image of Cyrus the Great and suggests that it is partly based on the prototype of Socrates.<sup>25</sup> She points out that there are three kinds of Socratic influences shown in the *Cyropaedia*: "personal traits shared by Socrates and Cyrus, issues and events related to Socrates' trial and final days which are incorporated into the work, and didactic, dialectical conversations".<sup>26</sup>

In my opinion, the almost simultaneous birth of these three books on the same work of Xenophon shows both sides of the coin. First of all, it demonstrates that our view of Xenophon before 1989 is generally unsatisfactory and sometimes quite confusing, because even down to that age, scholars still shared little consensus on the very nature of the *Cyropaedia*, one of Xenophon's longest and most important works. James Tatum believes that it presents an ideal political regime; Bodil Due argues that its aim is educational; and Gera obviously takes it as a fictional literary work. And all these three authors still have to make an apology for Xenophon in their opening passages in order to justify that the *Cyropaedia* does deserve to be treated seriously as a valuable work in itself. In the second place, the publication of these three works is a landmark for the study of Xenophon as an important writer on education. In my view, their diverse opinions on the nature of the *Cyropaedia* are all partly right. The work is political, educational as well as philosophical. It takes up a central position in all those of Xenophon's extant works that are relevant to moral education and deserves to be studied seriously.

In 2011, Vivienne Gray published her latest monograph, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*. In this work, Gray compares all extant writings of Xenophon relevant to leadership, and concludes that "Xenophon has a universal definition of the leader's functions whenever they occur".<sup>27</sup> She summarises former scholarship on Xenophon's presentation of leadership, especially those works on Xenophon's "negative" depiction of ideal leaders (which Gray labels as "dark reading").<sup>28</sup> Finally, Gray argues that Xenophon is "a literary artist worth analysing" and "an innovator in

---

<sup>24</sup> Due, *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon's Aims and Methods*, 17.

<sup>25</sup> D. Gera, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia, Style, Genre and Literary Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 26-131.

<sup>26</sup> Gera, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia, Style, Genre and Literary Technique*, 27.

<sup>27</sup> V. Gray, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 44.

<sup>28</sup> Gray, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*, 54-62.

his adaptations of previous literature, in his engagement with the reader in his overt evaluations, in his creation of his own formulaic scenes, in the theory of viewing and the theory of irony and of allegory, in his development of narrative devices such as the epilogue and in his use of irony”.<sup>29</sup> She further points out that these literary contributions are closely related to the images of power appearing in a series of his works, among which no passage “can be read without cross-reference to passages of similar type in his other works”.<sup>30</sup>

Although Vivienne Gray’s research on Xenophon takes a literary perspective and treats leadership rather than education, it has a lot in common with Jaeger’s work on παιδεία and ἀρετή, as well as Bodil Due’s study of the *Cyropaedia* as a work on education in the wide sense. Therefore, Gray’s work also contributes to the study of Xenophon as a writer on education by confirming his originality as an author, as shown in his creative adaptation of literary heritage and his consistency as a thinker, as shown in the consistent image of the ideal leaders depicted in his various extant works. Her monograph justifies and provides a solid foundation for future research on Xenophon’s thought on παιδεία.

In sum, from Henri-Irénée Marrou and Werner Jaeger to Bodil Due and Vivienne Gray, the development of scholarship generally shows three features. First of all, in the area of educational thought, the image of Xenophon has been elevated from that of a marginal and unoriginal writer to that of a systematic and creative thinker, whose main interest and chief contribution lies in his interpretation of morality and leadership. In the second place, researchers have gradually abandoned the method of imposing modern concepts and requirements of education on the term παιδεία that Xenophon discusses in his works; instead, they attempt to interpret Xenophon’s doctrine in his own context by clarifying the meaning of relevant ancient Greek vocabulary (Werner Jaeger), the aim of his composition in its contemporary background (Bodil Due), the source and prototype of his model (Deborah Gera), and his personal understanding of political power (Vivienne Gray). Thirdly, scholars’ interest in Xenophon’s contribution to Greek educational theory has been diverted from his practical guidance on physical training in his three manuals to his design of moral education carried out by ideal leadership, which is chiefly shown in his *Cyropaedia* but also exists in most of his other writings in a corresponding way. This breakthrough indicates that it is already possible (and necessary) to treat Xenophon as an independent

---

<sup>29</sup> Gray, *Xenophon’s Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*, 372.

<sup>30</sup> Gray, *Xenophon’s Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*, 372.



and important contributor to the history of ancient Greek educational thought, and to interpret the systematic theory shown in all of his extant works thoroughly.

The aim of my work is to analyse Xenophon's thought on moral education, the key point of *παιδεία* in Xenophon's extant writings. In Xenophon's eyes, *παιδεία* not only deals with the teaching of writing and calculating, poetry and music, but contains a much broader meaning. It is life-long and social, being similar to the Persian educational system (the *Cyropaedia*); it is philosophical and focuses on the pursuit of ἀρετή and εὐδαιμονία in a philosophical sense for all suitable people<sup>31</sup> living in the society (the *Hiero* and the *Memorabilia*); it is also political, as it must be carried out by competent leaders (the *Cyropaedia* and the *Agesilaus*) under a satisfactory πολιτεία (the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*); yet it is not confined to the political sphere only and is extended by Xenophon into domestic and economic life (the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*) and applied for his literary composition in innovative genres (the *Oeconomicus*, the *Agesilaus* and the *Cynegeticus*). In sum, it is a core issue which dominates the composition of most of Xenophon's extant writings and deserves to be treated seriously.

By interpreting Xenophon's doctrine on moral education, I shall show that Xenophon is not an unoriginal and uncritical author who copies arbitrarily from Plato, Isocrates and other contemporary or earlier writers, as many students supposed him to be. On the contrary, he managed to create a systematic theory, and consciously presented and developed it in his extant corpus. In the *Cynegeticus*, Xenophon claims that "my aim in writing has been to produce sound work that will make men not sophistical,

---

<sup>31</sup> In his extant works, Xenophon does not precisely confine the scope of application of his theory of moral education. Nevertheless, it is evident that certain people, who are evil in nature in Xenophon's eyes, cannot be educated for the better. Such examples include undisciplined mercenary soldiers in the *Anabasis*, slaves in the *Cyropaedia* and the *Oeconomicus*, and Critias and Alcibiades, who only deal with Socrates for political purposes. In my opinion, the scope of application for moral education in Xenophon's context might be similar to his understanding of the title "καλὸς κἀγαθός", which frequently appears in Xenophon's description of ideal moral characters. In contrast to Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle, Xenophon seems to be prepared to use this term in a purely moral sense (see K. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1974), 44) and in a much broader way. In the same way, people with all kinds of backgrounds (Greek/barbarian, male/female, wealthy/poor) who are morally educable, may be educated and even educate others, as Cyrus the Younger, Ischomachus' wife and Socrates in Xenophon's works illustrate.

but wise and good (καίτοι γέγραπταί γε οὕτως, ἵνα ὀρθῶς ἔχη, καὶ μὴ σοφιστικούς ποιῇ ἀλλὰ σοφούς καὶ ἀγαθούς). For I wish my work not to seem useful, but to be so, that it may stand for all time unrefuted.” (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.7; see also Thuc. 1.22.4) Judging from this claim and his critique of sophists in the following passage (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.8-9), I believe that Xenophon, like Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle and many other writers of the fourth century B.C., has a conscious intention to pursue philosophical education in his writings,<sup>32</sup> which is even reflected in the *Cynegeticus*, a work on hunting skill that has little to do with ethical education at first glance. The very same principle is also adopted in most of his other writings and remains consistent and recognisable albeit developed to a greater extent, as we can see in later chapters. Xenophon’s theory of moral education also contributes to his invention of prototypes of new literary genres on βίος and οἰκονομία, which ensures his lasting influence on the history of literature. Therefore, I believe that the analysis of Xenophon’s theory of moral education can help in our evaluation of Xenophon’s original contribution to the history of Greek educational thought and his impact on the development of ancient Greek literature.

For this research, the key points of my approach are as follows. First, instead of borrowing modern understandings and principles of education to evaluate Xenophon’s ideas and suggestions, I shall try to follow closely his own use of key terms, such as παιδεία, ἀρετή and καλὸς κἀγαθός. Second, in Xenophon’s extant corpus, I shall choose his *Cyropaedia* as the core text on moral education, as it is, in my opinion, Xenophon’s masterpiece on that subject, and explains his relevant theory most thoroughly and systematically. In the third place, I shall take account of Xenophon’s other philosophical and historical writings, thereby avoiding the traditional but harmful scholarly practice of treating his philosophical works in isolation from his historical ones.<sup>33</sup> In my view, the whole corpus of Xenophon is indivisible. His works generally follow the same principle but also show the development of the author’s thought and his adaptation of the system in particular situations. What is more, one of the most attractive features of Xenophon is his prolific output and the range of literary forms to which he contributed, including “Hellenic history, campaign record, biography, encomium, Socratic dialogues, constitutional

---

<sup>32</sup> F. Pownall, *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 3.

<sup>33</sup> F. Hobden and C. Tuplin, ed. *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 1-2.

analysis, encomic treatise and training manuals".<sup>34</sup> Therefore, we can only fully recognise Xenophon's value and contribution as a systematic author on moral education by examining his extant corpus as a whole.<sup>35</sup>

The first part of this work discusses the background which produces Xenophon's theory of moral education. Xenophon's thought mainly comes from two sources. The first of them is (in his eyes) the confused, corrupt political situation of the contemporary Greek world. According to his account in the *Hellenica*, the peace and happiness of Greek people were destroyed by their internal strife and the external interference of Persia. Political disorder and the collapse of established social rules caused the corruption of social morality and much brutal, impious behaviour. Among the contemporary powers in Xenophon's world, Athens, Sparta and Persia were all in decline and failed to provide examples of a successful constitution which could unite the disrupted Greek world and re-establish a suitable social morality that would lead people to happiness; powerful and ambitious individual leaders were active in political and military affairs during this time, yet they were also disappointing owing to their own lack of virtue. Therefore, Xenophon had to turn to ages past to find his ideal models of leadership (the reign of Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus) and create an innovative, utopian leadership to carry out his design of moral education.

The second source of Xenophon's thought on moral education comes from Socrates. As a great teacher and hero in Xenophon's mind, Socrates stimulated his interest in the study of morality and leadership; the accusation against Socrates and the need to make apology for both Socrates and Xenophon himself as a follower of Socrates helped to shape the images of heroes in Xenophon's other works, who are always extremely pious and beneficial to the people they deal with.

Part Two, the core of my work, studies Xenophon's theory of moral education. I would argue that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is a work on παιδεία in the author's own context. This type of education is moral, social and philosophical. It must be carried out by ideal leaders such as Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus, while it declines inevitably after these heroes' death. The ideal political leader in Xenophon's mind is pious, just, wise, diligent, generous, and in most cases thrifty; and he is also able to help his subjects achieve those virtues and lead them to harmony and happiness in a philosophical sense. In order to carry out this type of social education in a

<sup>34</sup> Hobden and Tuplin, ed. *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, 1.

<sup>35</sup> M. Tamiolaki, "Virtue and Leadership in Xenophon: Ideal Leaders or Ideal Losers?" In *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), edited by F. Hobden and C. Tuplin, 563.

dark and highly dangerous political situation, the ideal leader's willingness to suffer all kinds of labours and his firm control of power must be secured. Therefore, Xenophon uses rhetorical skill in his *Hiero* to persuade his readers to believe that just kingship can also bring happiness in a philosophical sense for the monarch himself, while tyranny is the true source of all kinds of worries and pains for tyrants. What is more, certain dark arts of government, which must be considered immoral and cruel by modern standards, are tolerated and even praised in Xenophon's works, as long as their final aim is moral and positive. Xenophon's concept of παιδεία is highly political, but is sometimes also economic. In the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*, a work composed in his old age, Xenophon provides a supplement to his educational theory in economic terms by arguing that the ability to obtain and make good use of wealth is in itself a kind of ἀρετή, because wealth is a reliable insurance of peace and happiness in social life.

Part Three treats the application of Xenophon's theory of moral education in his literary works. His *Agésilas* displays similar educational principles to the *Cyropaedia* and shows Xenophon's effort to make the positive influence of heroes on social morality everlasting by providing after their death a record of their monumental achievements and daily behaviour during their lifetime; while his *Oeconomicus* attempts to introduce successful experience in political and military affairs into the domestic sphere, and to establish guidelines for arranging private life well by borrowing from his theory of social education. As prototypes of the biography and agricultural writing which flourished in Hellenistic and Roman ages, Xenophon's *Agésilas* and *Oeconomicus* exert a great and lasting influence on later literary composition in antiquity.

## **PART I:**

### **BACKGROUND OF XENOPHON'S THOUGHT ON MORAL EDUCATION**

The background of Xenophon's thought contains many elements, for example the influence of contemporary writers (Plato, Isocrates) and his unique experience in Persia and Sparta. This part only focuses on two aspects, which are most important for and relevant to moral education. Chapter 1 interprets Xenophon's view of the world he lived in as a historian of contemporary affairs; Chapter 2 analyses the influence of Socrates and the lasting mark he made on Xenophon's literary composition.



## CHAPTER ONE

### XENOPHON'S VIEW OF HIS TIME

In most cases, a very valuable clue for analysing the background of a writer's composition and thought is his/her life experience. A writer's social status, the role he/she played in the events he/she describes, and even certain daily habits and other elements of private life can be helpful for later scholars to understand his/her works and views. Nevertheless, the application of this research method to the study of Xenophon is not often advantageous and sometimes can even cause trouble and confusion.

The main reason for this phenomenon is that the information we have about Xenophon's life is extremely scarce and uncertain. We do not know the dates of Xenophon's birth and death.<sup>1</sup> Édouard Delebecque believes that Xenophon was born in 426 B.C.,<sup>2</sup> but his view is not universally accepted. J.K. Anderson, the author of an influential modern biography of Xenophon, suggests that we can place Xenophon's birth "a little after 430 B.C."<sup>3</sup> However, even adopting Anderson's guess, which is already inexact and uncertain in itself, as a basis, we still do not know how long Xenophon lived and where and when he died.<sup>4</sup> We can only satisfy ourselves with the rough conclusion that Xenophon was born in the early 420s, and perhaps died in 355/4 B.C., which allows him time to finish his last extant work, the *Poroi*, in which he mentions the Social War (Xen. *Vect.* 4.40.) taking place from 357 to 355 B.C.<sup>5</sup> Yet we still have to face the challenge on the reliability of this date as well as the authenticity of Xenophon's authorship of the *Poroi* raised by the record of the ancient biographer Diogenes Laertius, who consults the work of Ctesiclides of Athens and claims that Xenophon passed away in 360/359 B.C. (Diog. Laert. 2.56.)

---

<sup>1</sup> E. Badian, "Xenophon the Athenian," in *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), edited by C. Tuplin, 40.

<sup>2</sup> É. Delebecque, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1957), 24.

<sup>3</sup> J. Anderson, *Xenophon* (London: Duckworth, 1974), 10.

<sup>4</sup> Badian, "Xenophon the Athenian," 38.

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion, see Part 2, Chapter 4 of this book.

In the case of Xenophon's life experience we do know some basic facts. Xenophon is an Athenian and names himself a disciple of Socrates. He served in the mercenary army of Cyrus the Younger, took part in the expedition to Babylon, and shared the commandship in the retreat from central Persia to Asia Minor. Later he served in Agesilaus' army as an Athenian exile and passed his later years in Corinth. However, quite a lot of detail in this summary, which might be of great importance for modern students on Xenophon, is either lacking or in dispute. Xenophon never names himself in the *Hellenica*.<sup>6</sup> He does so in the *Anabasis*, yet most information presented in that work focuses on the expedition alone. Therefore, modern scholars have to use Diogenes Laertius' biography,<sup>7</sup> which is very short and must contain certain mistakes, to reconstruct Xenophon's life experience. Unfortunately, Diogenes obviously does not possess a reliable biographical tradition on Xenophon's life either.<sup>8</sup> His report offers little that is new, so that Wilamowitz-Moellendorff even suggests that almost all of Diogenes' biography is more or less based on Xenophon's own works.<sup>9</sup> Although his claim may be considerably exaggerated<sup>10</sup> and is no longer believed nowadays, it remains true that efforts aiming to discover information on Xenophon's life from Diogenes' short and inaccurate biography are often proved to be frustrating.

Some other scholars try to obtain information by scrutiny of Xenophon's extant corpus. Martin Dreher attempts to clarify the case in

---

<sup>6</sup> Anderson, *Xenophon*, 146.

<sup>7</sup> H. Breitenbach, "Xenophon von Athen," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol.9A.2 (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1967), edited by K. Ziegler, 1571.

<sup>8</sup> Badian, "Xenophon the Athenian," 33.

<sup>9</sup> U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin: Weidmannische Buchhandlung, 1881), 330-335; Badian, "Xenophon the Athenian," 36.

<sup>10</sup> As Badian points out, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's study, for example his understanding of the influence of Dinarchus' speech on Diogenes Laertius, is based on "a favourite secret mark recognised only by a few chosen German scholars", therefore his conclusion is a mixture of "truth, possibility and error". Please see Badian, "Xenophon the Athenian," 36-38. The very basis of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's supposition is that Diogenes Laertius' biography of Xenophon was copied from a lost work by Demetrius of Magnesia (1st century B.C.); while the latter's biography of Xenophon was in its turn derived from a court speech by Dinarchus written in the last third of the fourth century B.C. (M. Lipka, ed. *Xenophon: Spartan Constitution*, Introduction, Text and Commentary (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 3) with much fictional addition. However, this complex hypothesis of literary transmission is no longer widely accepted in recent academic researches.



Athens which resulted in Xenophon's exile,<sup>11</sup> and suggests that it took place in 395/394 B.C.<sup>12</sup> Marta Sordi puts forward a hypothesis that Xenophon published the first part of the *Anabasis* in Sicily,<sup>13</sup> and that he had been invited by Dionysius I to Syracuse to lead a mercenary army.<sup>14</sup> These researches are innovative and suggestive, but are at the same time quite subjective and not universally accepted, therefore cannot offer solid and convincing evidence on Xenophon's life.

After realising how poor the historical evidence on Xenophon's life is, it is easy to understand why H.R. Breitenbach spends only eight pages talking about Xenophon's life in his ambitious and classic introduction to Xenophon written for the *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* in 1967, which takes up nearly 500 pages in total and aims to be complete. And even those eight pages<sup>15</sup> are still full of uncertain conjectures and hypotheses. In short, it would be very difficult for us to find useful information from materials on Xenophon's life to explore the background of the formation and development of his thought without high controversy, as these documents are insufficient and not of good quality themselves.

Another common approach to the study of a prolific writer is to establish a firm chronological order of all his/her extant writings and to analyse the trace and turning points of the development of the writer's ideas. This is also an almost impossible task for Xenophon's corpus. In the case of the *Hellenica*, some scholars believe that Books I-II and Books III-VII (the opinions on the exact cut-off point between the two parts are diverse) were written in different periods owing to differences in their method and manner, but there is no mark indicating the time of composition of the first two mysterious books.<sup>16</sup> Most of Xenophon's minor works, for example his *Spartan Constitution*, cannot be dated with any certainty.<sup>17</sup> In 1928, Theodor Marschall published his dissertation *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, in which he

---

<sup>11</sup> M. Dreher, „Der Prozeß gegen Xenophon,“ in *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), edited by C. Tuplin, 55.

<sup>12</sup> Dreher, „Der Prozeß gegen Xenophon,“ 63.

<sup>13</sup> M. Sordi, „Senofonte e la Sicilia,“ in *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), edited by C. Tuplin, 71.

<sup>14</sup> Sordi, „Senofonte e la Sicilia,“ 77.

<sup>15</sup> Breitenbach, „Xenophon von Athen,“ 1571-1578.

<sup>16</sup> Badian, „Xenophon the Athenian,“ 46.

<sup>17</sup> Badian, „Xenophon the Athenian,“ 48.

attempts to fix the chronological order of Xenophon's whole corpus<sup>18</sup> by the combination of philological and historical methods. But as he admits himself, the method he adopts is insecure and subjective.<sup>19</sup> Although he is quite confident when he claims that "im ganzen glaube ich ein festes Schema für die zeitliche Abfolge einer Reihe von Xenophons Schriften gefunden zu haben", <sup>20</sup> neither his method nor his conclusions are universally accepted by later scholars on Xenophon, and the problems of the chronological order of most of Xenophon's works remain unsolved.

In sum, our knowledge about Xenophon's life, including the dates of his birth and death, his life experience and the chronological order of his works, is extremely poor. Before we start any serious exploration of the background of Xenophon's thought on moral education, it is very important to realise this basic fact first. We must always keep in mind that any research based on information on Xenophon's life may lead to controversy, for the evidence is usually not universally accepted from the very beginning. Unfortunately, such confusions caused by the abuse of biographical evidence are not uncommon in Xenophontic scholarship. For example, J.K. Anderson claims that Xenophon belonged to a "post-war generation" and was hardened to violent death.<sup>21</sup> In my opinion, this seems to be contradictory to the sympathy shown in the *Hellenica* towards people suffering from disasters of wars and cannot be proved from a historical point of view, because we know too little about Xenophon's personal experience during the Peloponnesian War in his childhood. J.K. Anderson and Sarah Pomeroy believe that Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is a record of his memory of Athenian domestic life in his youth<sup>22</sup> and reflects the economic structure of a normal οἶκος in Athens.<sup>23</sup> These hypotheses are still possible. But when they go further to suppose that the location of this οἶκος is in Scillus,<sup>24</sup> where the Spartan king Agesilaus bestowed land and property on Xenophon,<sup>25</sup> the prototype of Ischomachus' wife in this work

---

<sup>18</sup> T. Marschall, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons* (München: Lehmaier, 1928), 8.

<sup>19</sup> Marschall, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, 17.

<sup>20</sup> Marschall, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, 101.

<sup>21</sup> Anderson, *Xenophon*, 49-50.

<sup>22</sup> Anderson, *Xenophon*, 11.

<sup>23</sup> S. Pomeroy, "Slavery in the Greek Domestic Economy in the Light of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*," in *Xenophon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), edited by V. Gray, 33.

<sup>24</sup> S. Pomeroy, ed. *Xenophon: Oeconomicus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 5.

<sup>25</sup> C. Tuplin, "Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*," in *The Shadow of Sparta* (London & New York: Routledge for the Classical Press of Wales, 1994), edited by A. Powell and S. Hodkinson, 264-266.

is Xenophon's own wife Philesia,<sup>26</sup> and Xenophon's basic motive in composing the *Oeconomicus* is to turn away from harsh and disappointing politics to the peaceful private realm,<sup>27</sup> I believe they are actually guilty of over-interpretation and abuses of evidence regarding Xenophon's personal life. We know almost nothing about Xenophon's household and his wife Philesia, and there is no convincing cause to connect these elements to the content of the *Oeconomicus*. In my opinion, instead of showing Xenophon's despair of politics, the intention of the *Oeconomicus* is to adopt his successful experience in public affairs into the private sphere and make use of Xenophon's theory of moral education in daily life, as the third part of my work shows.

Certain misuses of Xenophon's biographical materials also reflect a traditional bias regarding Xenophon's talent and moral character and are therefore harmful to the objectivity of academic research. For instance, in E.M. Soulis' *Xenophon and Thucydides* completed in 1972, the author claims that Xenophon enters the area of historiography without any particular historical knowledge and his motive is merely self-glorification.<sup>28</sup> In Soulis' view, Xenophon is "a conceited lover of display, a hypocritical teacher of morality, an insincere historian, a flatterer of the strong men, a seeker of glory and apostate of his country, a self-centred individual".<sup>29</sup> His praise of Epaminondas in the final chapters of the *Hellenica* is revenge upon his former patrons, namely Agesilaus and the Spartans, who failed to reward him for his flattery.<sup>30</sup> Such a man "could not have been sincere in any sector of his life".<sup>31</sup> Once we realise the paucity of reliable evidence on Xenophon's life, we can easily see the bias and error in Soulis' comments. We have very little evidence beyond Xenophon's corpus to analyse his character and personal experience. And Soulis' negative image of Xenophon must ultimately come from subjective bias and unproved conjectures. In my opinion, up to now, the study of Xenophon's life still cannot offer sufficient and reliable evidence for us to understand the background of Xenophon's system of moral education. Therefore it is necessary to find an alternative approach.

In this chapter, I plan to study the background of Xenophon's theory of moral education by analysing his views on and attitudes towards contemporary events and figures of the world he lived in. My approach

---

<sup>26</sup> Anderson, *Xenophon*, 174.

<sup>27</sup> Pomeroy, ed. *Xenophon: Oeconomicus*, 5.

<sup>28</sup> Soulis, *Xenophon and Thucydides* (Athens: ΚΛΑΠΑΚΗΣ, 1972), 16.

<sup>29</sup> Soulis, *Xenophon and Thucydides*, 189.

<sup>30</sup> Soulis, *Xenophon and Thucydides*, 189.

<sup>31</sup> Soulis, *Xenophon and Thucydides*, 53.

involves using Xenophon's *Hellenica* as the basic document, supplemented by additional historical information we can safely conclude that Xenophon must know. In my opinion, this approach can be justified for the following two reasons.

First of all, though the *Hellenica* is not a perfect work of political and military history, it is an invaluable and first-hand document reflecting Xenophon's own attitude to many affairs taking place in his time. Three of Xenophon's works on history, namely the *Hellenica*, the *Anabasis* and the *Agésilas* deal with events and figures of Xenophon's own time. Among these three writings, the scope of the *Hellenica* is indisputably the broadest. Although we cannot be sure that Xenophon did take part in most of the events he narrates<sup>32</sup> – owing to lack of biographical information as discussed above – it is at least certain that the description in the *Hellenica* reflects the contemporary Greek world in Xenophon's eyes. Vivienne Gray convincingly proves that Xenophon's narrative system in the *Hellenica* is consistent<sup>33</sup> and unified.<sup>34</sup> The geographical sphere of the events in the first two books is still limited to the eastern Aegean and Attica, but in the following five books it is expanded to the whole eastern Greek world, including Asia Minor, the Peloponnese, Macedonia and Corcyra.<sup>35</sup> In this sense, Paul Cartledge justly points out that Xenophon should have called the *Hellenica* "A History of My Times", which is the title adopted for the translation in the Penguin Classics series.<sup>36</sup> What is more, Xenophon's *Hellenica* is not simply a record of facts; it also shows the author's effort to find out causes and explanations of contemporary events.<sup>37</sup> For the study of Xenophon's thought, the *Hellenica* offers a precious document recording his understanding of what happened in his lifetime;<sup>38</sup> and it can be of great help for our study of Xenophon's idea of moral education, because as a moralist and philosopher, Xenophon naturally thinks about history in terms of the good and bad that men perform.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> W. Henry, *Greek Historical Writing, A Historiographical Essay Based on Xenophon's Hellenica* (Chicago: Argonaut, 1967), 33.

<sup>33</sup> V. Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (London: Duckworth, 1989), ix.

<sup>34</sup> V. Gray, "Continuous History and Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1-2.3.10," *The American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991): 227-228.

<sup>35</sup> Henry, *Greek Historical Writing, A Historiographical Essay Based on Xenophon's Hellenica*, 11.

<sup>36</sup> P. Cartledge, *Agésilas and the Crisis of Sparta* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 61.

<sup>37</sup> J. Riedinger, *Étude sur les Helléniques, Xénophon et l'histoire* (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1991), 245.

<sup>38</sup> J. Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London: Routledge, 1995), 3.

<sup>39</sup> Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, 249.

In the second place, the *Hellenica*'s incompleteness and its striking omission of important historical events should not be neglected.<sup>40</sup> The first two books are very concise and sometimes inaccurate;<sup>41</sup> while the remaining five books generally focus on affairs within the Peloponnese,<sup>42</sup> though their geographical scope is broader. The serious omissions throughout the *Hellenica* are hard to explain. One plausible explanation is that Xenophon deliberately passes over certain events as not deserving of mention,<sup>43</sup> as he claims in 4.8.1 himself. But obviously it is not the whole truth. For instance, one of the most striking omissions of the *Hellenica* is that it fails to record the foundation of the second Athenian Alliance,<sup>44</sup> which is described by Cawkwell to be not only amazing, but "a scandal".<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, this omission is by no means due to Xenophon's ignorance or bias,<sup>46</sup> as later references to the alliance, such as 5.4.60-6 and 6.5.1 clearly show that Xenophon knows of its existence and its importance. Xenophon also fails to show his readers a complete picture of the Theban hegemony,<sup>47</sup> which no Greek writer would consider to be unimportant; nor does he mention the Greek mercenary army's expedition with Cyrus the Younger against the Persian king, in which he took part and whose leadership he shared during the retreat, as another historical work of his, the *Anabasis* shows. A thorough study of the cause of these omissions, as well as the attitude of Xenophon and other classical writers to historiography, is of course beyond the task of this book. What I plan to do to compensate for the shortcomings of the *Hellenica* as a reflection of Xenophon's view of his time is to draw historical details from other ancient writers, for example Thucydides, Diodorus of Sicily, Nepos and Plutarch, as long as I have good reason to believe that Xenophon must

---

<sup>40</sup> C. Hamilton, "Sparta," in *The Greek World in the Fourth Century, from the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander* (London & New York: Routledge, 1997), edited by L.A. Tritle, 43-44.

<sup>41</sup> Anderson, *Xenophon*, 62.

<sup>42</sup> J. Buckler, *The Theban Hegemony, 371-362 B.C.* (Cambridge, Massachusetts & London: Harvard University Press, 1980), 263; Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, 179; S. Hornblower, "Sources and Their Uses," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, second edition, Vol. VI (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), edited by D.M. Lewis, J. Boardman and M. Ostwald, 4.

<sup>43</sup> P. Rhodes, *Alcibiades* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2011), 72-73.

<sup>44</sup> R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 401; G. Cawkwell, "The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy," *The Classical Quarterly* 23 (1973): 47.

<sup>45</sup> Cawkwell, "The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy," 57.

<sup>46</sup> Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, 178.

<sup>47</sup> Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, 179.

know these historical events, though he chooses not to record them in his *Hellenica*.

## I. The Greek World Presented in Xenophon's *Hellenica*

### a. Disorder and Confusion

The first feature of the Greek world displayed in the *Hellenica* is disorder and confusion. In modern scholarship, there is a tendency, as the works of Christopher Jones and Mogens Herman Hansen show, to amend the negative image of Greek world in the fourth century B.C. depicted by Xenophon and other contemporary writers.<sup>48</sup> But we still have to keep in mind that Xenophon must consider, perhaps subjectively, the history he recorded in the *Hellenica* as a particularly bloody and confusing period.<sup>49</sup> According to the statistics of Joseph M. Bryant, Xenophon records nearly forty cases of civil discord in his *Hellenica*.<sup>50</sup> The narrative of the *Hellenica* starts from the middle of the Peloponnesian war, (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.1) and ends with another brutal war at Mantinea in which “while each party claimed to be victorious, neither was found to be any better off, as regards either additional territory, or city, or sway, than before the battle took place” (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27). And, as Xenophon comments himself, “there was even more confusion and disorder in Greece after the battle than before (ἀκρισία δὲ καὶ ταραχὴ ἔτι πλείων μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐγένετο ἢ πρόσθεν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι)” (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27). Even in most modern scholars’ eyes, Xenophon’s complaint is fully understandable. As John Dillery explains:

Seldom before in the history of the Greek world had power proved so labile. Two hegemonies had fallen, and the third, that of Thebes, was soon to give way to Macedon, and all this in less than fifty years. Warfare was almost a constant feature of life during the period. Cities seemed continually to realign themselves in a series of alliances and confederations, and in place of cities new ways of concentrating power even came into being in certain areas. The world of the independent and aggressive polis was not to last for long.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> M. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes, Structure, Principles and Ideology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), translated by J. Crook, 24.

<sup>49</sup> Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, 3.

<sup>50</sup> J. Bryant, *Moral Codes and Social Structure in Ancient Greece, A Sociology of Greek Ethics from Homer to the Epicureans and Stoics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 238.

<sup>51</sup> Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, 4.