

Michael Lipka
XENOPHON'S
SPARTAN CONSTITUTION



TEXTE UND KOMMENTARE

Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Siegmar Döpp, Adolf Köhnken, Ruth Scodel

Band 24

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
2002

XENOPHON'S
SPARTAN CONSTITUTION

INTRODUCTION. TEXT. COMMENTARY

by
Michael Lipka

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
2002

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

- ⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress – Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – Cataloging in Publication Data

Lipka, Michael:
Xenophon's Spartan constitution : introduction, text, commentary / by Michael Lipka. – Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 2002
(Texte und Kommentare ; Bd. 24)
ISBN 3-11-017466-9

© Copyright 2002 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany.

Umschlaggestaltung: Christopher Schneider, Berlin

To my parents, and Elena (again)

PREFACE

X(enophon)'s *S(partan) C(onstitution)* is a major source for the historian of classical Sparta. It is of interest to the philologist due to its peculiar literary form and language. The aim of this book is to assist both the historian and the philologist in their attempt to make some sense of it.

I have tried to include all relevant material that reached me before October 2001. Though the bibliography on X. and Sparta is huge and completeness far beyond reach, a missing reference does not necessarily indicate ignorance on my part. Relevance remains a debatable matter.

Greek authors are abbreviated according to LSJM or in easily recognizable form, Roman authors according to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Where a reference is not specified, I refer to the *SC*. Some further points should be noted:

- Plutarch's *Lives* are referred to according to Ziegler's Teubner edition.
- The *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* are quoted according to Chambers's Teubner edition, first the page number, then the line number.
- Hippocrates is referred to according to Littré's edition. After the title of the work and the work numbering, the volume and the page number appear in square brackets.
- Galen is quoted according to Kühn's edition, first the volume, then the page number.

Bibliographical references are found in the text in an abbreviated form. The full reference is given in the bibliography at the end of the book. Periodicals are abbreviated according to *L'Année philologique* or in easily recognizable form. Works which are particularly or exclusively important for the restitution of the Greek text (editions, commentaries, indices) are mentioned on pp. 59-61.

Cross-references to the introduction are by page numbers. Where I refer to the commentary, I give the number of the passage commented on, with the square brackets indicating the relevant section of the commentary (e.g. 1.1[1]).

A word about spelling: Greek personal names are normally rendered in their Latin or anglicized form, Greek place names or adjectives derived from Greek place names in their Greek or anglicized form. Thus I write *Agasilas*, *Lycurgus*, *Homer*, but *Lakedaimon*, *Lakonian*, *Athens* etc. I transcribe Greek words with Roman characters, where I am not concerned with philological aspects and where the underlying Greek term remains easily recognizable. It goes without saying that consistency is impossible.

All dates are BC, unless specified otherwise.

This book is the translated and largely revised version of a German D.Phil. thesis, which was submitted to the *Free University of Berlin* in 1997. Over the years I incurred many debts: to the supervisors of the thesis, Bernd Seiden-

sticker (Berlin) and Manfred Clauss (Frankfurt / Main), furthermore to Ewen Bowie (Oxford), Paul Cartledge (Cambridge), Menelaos Christopoulos (Patras), James Diggle (Cambridge), Stephen Harrison (Oxford), Stephen Hodgkinson (Manchester), Neil Hopkinson (Cambridge), Noreen Humble (Cork), Stefan Link (Paderborn), Andreas Panagopoulos (Patras), Anton Powell (Swansea), Michael Sharp (Cambridge) and many others. I am especially grateful to the editors of *TuK* for accepting this book into their series, most notably to Ruth Scodel for a large number of penetrating suggestions on the translation of the Greek text. Last but not least, I can only express my deepest gratitude to Sarah Newton, who proofread this book several times and improved it in countless ways.

Some institutions supported this project substantially. The *Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes* was benevolent and unbureaucratic in offering a three-year doctoral scholarship, the *Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst* covered expenses and fees for two years in Oxford. A one-year grant from the *Fritz Thyssen Foundation* and a two-year scholarship from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, though not awarded for this purpose in the first place, gave me leisure to put the book into shape. Finally, the splendid facilities of the *American School of Classical Studies at Athens* made writing this book a pleasant task.

I dedicate this book to my parents and to Elena, my wife; to the former for encouraging and supporting me over the years, to the latter for all that and –much more than anything– the gift of four wonderful children.

Patras, April 2002

M. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
I Xenophon's Life.....	3
II Authorship.....	5
III Date.....	9
IV Predecessors and Influences.....	13
a.) <i>Lakonophilia</i>	13
b.) <i>Socrates</i>	18
c.) <i>Critias</i>	19
d.) <i>Herodotus</i>	20
e.) <i>Thucydides</i> (<i>Epitaphios</i>).....	21
f.) <i>Thibron</i>	22
g.) <i>Lysander</i>	23
h.) <i>Pausanias</i>	23
i.) <i>Plato</i>	24
j.) <i>Rhetra</i>	24
V Composition.....	27
VI Purpose and audience.....	31
VII Historicity.....	32
a.) <i>In general</i>	32
b.) <i>Lycurgus</i>	35
VIII Reception.....	37
IX Structure.....	44
X Language.....	46
a.) <i>Spartan terminology</i>	46
b.) <i>Xenophontic diction</i>	47
c.) <i>Dialect, poeticism, archaism, neologism</i>	51
d.) <i>Prepositions</i>	52
XI Style.....	53
XII Text.....	56
a.) <i>Transmission</i>	56
b.) <i>Editions, commentaries, indexes</i>	59
SIGLORUM CONSPECTUS.....	63
TEXT AND TRANSLATION.....	64
COMMENTARY.....	97
APPENDIXES.....	253
Appendix I: Spartan marriage.....	253
Appendix II: The seizure of cheese from the altar of Orthia in Xenophon and the 'diamastigosis' of the later sources.....	255
Appendix III: The structure of the Spartan army according to Xenophon and Thucydides.....	257
FIGURES.....	265
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	269
INDEXES.....	285

INTRODUCTION

I Xenophon's Life

The main sources for X.'s life are his own writings and the biography of Diogenes Laertius (2.48-59), dating from the third century AD. Biographical information offered by Diogenes, which is not collected from X.'s writings directly, mainly derives from the biography of Demetrius of Magnesia (1st century BC), who himself exploited a court speech by Dinarchus written in the last third of the fourth century BC.¹

According to Diogenes X. was the son of Gryllus and came – like Isocrates – from the Attic deme of Erchia.² He was born around 430. His acquaintance with Socrates dated from the last years of the fifth century.³ In 401-399 he participated in the campaign of the Ten Thousand in Asia Minor. When Thibron took over the Ten Thousand in Pergamon in spring 399,⁴ X. stayed with the army and later became acquainted with Agesilaus, who followed Thibron's successor Dercylidas as supreme commander in Asia Minor in 396.⁵

X. followed Agesilaus when the latter was recalled to Greece in 394. He took part in the battle of Koroneia on Agesilaus' side against his fellow Athenian citizens (summer 394).⁶ After his victory Agesilaus dedicated a tithe of the booty to the Delphic Apollo.⁷ On this occasion X. himself may have visited Delphi and offered a dedication, thus commemorating his safe return from Asia Minor.⁸ Presumably in 394 X. was banished from Athens, most likely because of his participation in the battle of Koroneia or more generally

¹ The interrelation between the different sources was plausibly reconstructed by Wilamowitz 1881, 330-335, cf. Mejer 1978, 38f. Diogenes himself mentions Demetrius as a source at 2.52 and 56. Dinarchus started his career as a speech writer in the forties of the fourth century and reached the climax of his career after the death of Alexander the Great, D.H. *Din.* 2. It is quite possible that he was personally acquainted with X., especially since he came from Corinth (D.H. *Din.* 2) and X. died there according to Demetrius (D.L. 2.56), who again might reflect Dinarchus here; for Dinarchus' life cf. Worthington 1992, 3-12.

² D.L. 2.55, based on Apollodorus, places X.'s ἀκμῆ in 401/400; cf. *FGrH* 244 F 343 with Jacoby's note and Mejer 1978, 34. ἀκμῆ indicates an age around 30, cf. 1.6[1]. By the time of the campaign of the Ten Thousand X. was 30 years old or younger, cf. X. *An.* 6.4.25, 3.2.37. *An.* 2.1.13 possibly belongs here, if X. is to be understood as the νεανίσκος mentioned there.

³ X. *An.* 3.1.5-7, cf. D.L. 2.49f.

⁴ X. *An.* 7.8.23f., *HG* 3.1.6.

⁵ X. probably stayed with the army between 399 and 394 throughout, part of this time in command of the remnant of the Ten Thousand. Hence he is ὁ τῶν Κυρετῶν προεστηκός mentioned at *HG* 3.2.7 in 398. He was replaced by Herippidas around 395, cf. *HG* 3.4.20.

⁶ X. *An.* 5.3.6, *Ages.* 2.11; cf. D.L. 2.51, *Plu. Ages.* 18.2.

⁷ X. *HG* 4.3.21.

⁸ X. *An.* 5.3.5.

his devotion to Sparta, so strongly reflected in the *SC*, which was written around this time (see below pp. 9-13).⁹

Not much later X. received as a gift from the Spartans his famous estate at Skillous in Triphylia, a few kilometres from Olympia.¹⁰ X.'s marriage to Philesia may fall in the first decade of the fourth century. She bore him two sons, Gryllus and Diodorus.¹¹ After the battle of Leuktra in 371 X. had to abandon his estate when Skillous was taken by the Eleans. His sons fled to Lepreon, while X. himself went to Elis for unknown reasons (restitution of his estate?) and only afterwards joined his sons in Lepreon. Finally, together with his sons he settled at Corinth.¹² Not much later he was rehabilitated at Athens,¹³ where his sons seem to have lived afterwards. Gryllus died as an Athenian soldier in a cavalry engagement shortly before the battle of Mantinea

⁹ The dating of the banishment is controversial, cf. in general Tuplin 1987, Green 1994. Even if *X. An.* 7.7.57 gives the impression that in 399 the banishment was already impending, nothing explicit is mentioned in the text (cf. Higgins 1977, 23 and 150 n. 17; Rahn 1981, 118). From *An.* 5.3.7 one can deduce that X. lived in Skillous after the banishment (no matter whether one reads ἐπειδὴ δ' ἔφευγεν or ἐπειδὴ δ' ἔφυγε, *pace* Green 1994, 217f.). Finally the statement of Istrus (3rd century BC) ap. D.L. 2.59 = *FGrH* 334 F 32 αὐτὸν φυγεῖν κατὰ ψήφισμα Ἐυβούλου does not lead us beyond speculations (cf. Green 1994, 218f.). Those sources that represent the banishment as a result of the participation in Cyrus' campaign are interpretations of X.'s own remarks made in the *Anabasis* and as such worthless, cf. Paus. 6.5.5; D.Chr. 8.1; D.L. 2.58 (differently 2.51). Nevertheless the dating of 399 is followed by recent scholars (cf. the bibliography mentioned by Rahn 1981, 103 n. 1 and more recently e.g. Green 1994; Gray 1996, 163). To me a date around 394/393, as proposed by Rahn 1981, Humble 1997, 13, and others, seems more likely. The question of chronology is, however, not so essential for the understanding of X.'s writings as is sometimes claimed. X.'s admiration of Sparta was genuine, his attachment to Agesilaus therefore natural, whether as an exile or not. The banishment left no traces in X.'s writings; he remained the Athenian who admired Sparta but did not reject Athens.

¹⁰ *X. An.* 5.3.7, Paus. 5.6.5, D.L. 2.52; on the doubtful location cf. Pritchett 1989, 67 n. 151; for a map cf. Lendle 1995, 316. When he received this estate is difficult to determine. From *X. An.* 5.3.7 one might conclude that he moved in shortly before the arrival of the Persian Megabyzus who had kept part of Artemis' share of the booty of the Ten Thousand (therefore ἥδη). X. remarks that Megabyzus came on the occasion of the Olympic Games. Which games are meant is not clear: the Olympiads of 392 or 388 seem to me the most likely on the following grounds: X. had left to Megabyzus only Artemis' share, not Apollo's. Apparently X. intended to return to Asia in 394 and to make himself a dedication to Artemis after the solution of the internal Greek problems. At least Agesilaus was allegedly thinking of a quick return on his departure from Asia Minor, *X. HG* 4.2.3. In 388 at the latest, however, i.e. with the rapprochement of Persia and Sparta that led to the King's Peace, it became evident that Agesilaus was not to lead a campaign again to Asia Minor in the near future. Accordingly at this point at the latest X. might have asked Megabyzus for the goddess's share entrusted to the latter. With this X. purchased a small estate and built a small replica of the temple of Artemis of Ephesos near Skillous, *X. An.* 5.3.7-13.

¹¹ Cf. D.L. 2.52 who refers to Demetrius and Dinarchus. The wording of Diogenes suggests that he did not find Philesia's name in Dinarchus but in Demetrius only. The names of X.'s sons appear in Attic orators in another speech by Dinarchus and a speech by Hyperides, cf. Harp. s. vv. Γρύλλος, Κηφισώδορος. The children were born after 399, cf. *X. An.* 7.6.34.

¹² D.L. 2.53.

¹³ Istrus ap. D.L. 2.59 = *FGrH* 334 F 32. According to Istrus the same Eubulus (cf. n. 9) who had proposed his banishment recalled him.

(362).¹⁴ When Aristotle remarks that many encomia were written on his death, not least to please his father, he indicates that X. enjoyed a high reputation in Athens, too, by that time.¹⁵

The date of X.'s death can be inferred only from *Vect.* 5.9:¹⁶ the passage presupposes the independence of Delphi during the third Sacred War, which broke out between autumn 356 and spring 355.¹⁷ Hence X. died after 356/355, presumably in Corinth¹⁸ or –less probably– in Skillous.¹⁹

II Authorship

The first modern scholar to doubt the authenticity of the *SC* was Valckenaer (died 1785) in his posthumously published notes on the *New Testament*.²⁰ He was succeeded e.g. by Manso,²¹ Bernhardy,²² and most importantly Dindorf. Dindorf accepted the *SC* as authentic in his 1824 Teubner edition (only chapter 14 was spurious according to this edition).²³ It was not until his Oxford edition of 1866 that he advanced numerous arguments why the *SC* (apart from chapter 14, which allegedly belonged to the time immediately after the Peloponnesian War) should belong to a later period (*ibid.* pp. vii-xv).

Another course of argument was taken by Lehmann in 1853. He claimed that the *SC* was written by the pupil of Isocrates to whom Isoc. 12.200 refers.²⁴ This theory was extended by Beckhaus in an article from 1872,²⁵ which tried to identify this pupil with the younger X., the grandson of the writer. Both Lehmann and Beckhaus were refuted by Erler and others whose central argument was that the style of the *SC*, notably its use of hiatus, would

¹⁴ Ephor. ap. D.L. 2.54 = *FGRH* 70 F 85, according to which Gryllus fell during the battle, cf. also Paus. 8.11.6. But it seems that X.'s praise of those who fell in an encounter shortly before the actual battle refers to Gryllus among others, X. *HG* 7.5.16f.

¹⁵ Arist. ap. D.L. 2.55 = Arist. fr. 68 [R.] with Tuplin 1993, 32.

¹⁶ The dates of X.'s death as transmitted by the ancient authorities are unreliable, cf. Lucianus *Macr.* 21 [X. died older than 90]; D.S. 15.76.4 [X. died ἐσατογήρως 366/365]; Stesicrides ap. D.L. 2.56 = *FGRH* 245 F 3 (according to Wilamowitz 1881, 335 n. 20 Ctesicles is to be read; cf. Jacoby's introductory note on *FGRH* 245) [X. died 360/359].

¹⁷ Cf. Buckler 1989, 28; on the intricate chronology of the outbreak of the war cf. *ibid.* 148-181.

¹⁸ Demetrius Magnes ap. D.L. 2.56.

¹⁹ Paus. 5.6.6, for doubts on the veracity of this information cf. Hirt 1878, 37f.

²⁰ Cf. Valckenaer 1815, 168: "Adiect. μεγαλείος, frequentatum Xenophonti in Socraticis, in libello quoq. de Rep. Lacedaem. legitur, qui tribuitur quidem Xenophonti, sed potius illius est Sophistae recentioris, qui laudem Agesilai nobis conflavit, hactenus etiam lectam sub nomine Xenophontis, sed ab ingenio hoc castissimo, praeterquam in illis, quae ad verbum descripta sunt e Xenophonteis, remotam."

²¹ Cf. Manso 1800, 74-76 ['Beylagen'].

²² Cf. Bernhardy 1829, 223, 357, 453.

²³ In this edition he refers to the *SC* as *Χενοφώντος Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία*, but brackets chapter 14. In his second Teubner edition from 1853 he gives chapter 14 without brackets and calls the *SC* *Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία* [without ascription].

²⁴ Cf. Lehmann 1853, 76-121.

²⁵ Cf. Beckhaus 1872, 242-253.

not permit an author of the Isocratean circle.²⁶ In 1889 Hartman launched an attack against Cobet's recent defence of authenticity. Apart from repeating older arguments he underlined the different position of women in the *SC* and in the Xenophontic *Oeconomicus*, thus anticipating one of the arguments of Chrimes against genuineness.²⁷ The last and perhaps most vehement attack against the genuineness of the *SC* was launched by Chrimes in 1948. She assumed that chapter 14 originally stood at the beginning of the treatise. She claimed that it attained its present position by disintegration of the codex and misplacing of the relevant leaf.²⁸ She followed Hartmann in establishing differences between the *SC* and the *Oeconomicus* in terms of content, especially as to the picture of women,²⁹ and ascribed the work to the sophist Antisthenes.³⁰ In a recent study Lana attempted to prove the spuriousness of the work by means of an extensive computer analysis of the style.³¹

Despite these doubts, the majority of scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries regarded the *SC* as genuine. Weiske in his introduction to his edition of the *SC* (in 1804, reprinted by Schneider in his edition of the *SC* in 1815),³² defended its authenticity, regarding only chapter 14 as an interpolation.³³ Goette,³⁴ and Haase³⁵ in his magisterial commentary, defended authenticity, as did Fuchs,³⁶ Cobet (arguing that the *SC* was an epitomized version of an originally Xenophontic work),³⁷ Erler,³⁸ Naumann,³⁹ Stein,⁴⁰ Wulff,⁴¹ Bazin,⁴² Köhler,⁴³ and the majority of scholars in the twentieth century.⁴⁴

Antiquity already questioned the genuineness of the work. Diogenes Laertius at the end of the catalogue of X.'s writings points out:⁴⁵

²⁶ Cf. Erler 1874, 23-25; Stein 1878, 12-14.

²⁷ Cf. Hartman 1889, especially 279-282; Chrimes 1948, 23f.

²⁸ Cf. Chrimes 1948, 16f.

²⁹ Cf. Chrimes 1948, 23f.

³⁰ Cf. Chrimes 1948, 40-48.

³¹ Cf. Lana 1992.

³² Cf. Schneider, vol. vi, 1-10 (for editions of the *SC* see pp. 60-62).

³³ Cf. Weiske, vol. vi, 1-12.

³⁴ Cf. Goette 1830.

³⁵ Cf. Haase 1833.

³⁶ Cf. Fuchs 1838.

³⁷ Cf. Cobet 1858, 705-738.

³⁸ Cf. Erler 1874.

³⁹ Cf. Naumann 1876.

⁴⁰ Cf. Stein 1878.

⁴¹ Cf. Wulff 1884.

⁴² Cf. Bazin 1885.

⁴³ Cf. Köhler 1896.

⁴⁴ Recently e.g. Rebenich 1998, 14f.; Humble 1999, 347 n. 9; Cartledge 1999, 320; Hodkinson 2000, 61 n. 4.

⁴⁵ D.L. 2.57.

Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν οὐκ εἶναι
Ξενοφώντος ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτριος.

Many arguments could be put forward to explain why Demetrius doubted X.'s authorship, starting from the work's stylistic simplicity, unevenness, and linguistic obscurity (cf. pp. 53-55).⁴⁶ But these arguments did not convince any other surviving ancient writer. On the contrary, the passage just quoted shows clearly that already in Demetrius' day (1st century BC) the *SC* was regarded as a Xenophontic work (for Demetrius clearly rejects this widespread view). Hence, Demetrius provides indirectly the first evidence for the authenticity of the *SC*.⁴⁷

Two arguments have been repeatedly put forward to prove the spuriousness of the *SC*:

1. Polybius (6.45.1) reports that X. along with Plato and other authors stresses the resemblance of the Cretan and the Spartan constitutions. In the surviving Xenophontic writings, however, there is no evidence to support this; indeed, *SC* 1.2 claims the opposite, that the Spartan constitution was unprecedented when Lycurgus created it (cf. pp. 35f.). In this statement one might see with Chrimes⁴⁸ an indication that X. wrote a treatise on the Spartan constitution but that this treatise is not identical with the one that has come down to us under X.'s name. One might, however, argue with equal plausibility that Polybius was wrong, or that in Polybius' day works were circulating under X.'s name that were actually not Xenophontic and that Polybius refers to one of these.⁴⁹

2. Arr. *tact.* 6.3 remarks that X. nowhere says how many enomoties make up a lochos, although at 11.4 X. is very clear on this issue: according to this passage a lochos contains four enomoties. Again one might side with

⁴⁶ The wording is suspicious because the *Athenaion Politeia* is in all likelihood not Xenophontic; cf. Treu 1967, coll. 1930-1932 on this passage and the relationship between Diogenes and Demetrius.

A longer quotation from Demetrius preserved in D.H. *Din.* 1 shows that he was quite capable of a verdict on stylistic grounds: in his opinion the speech 'Against Demosthenes' circulating under Dinarchus' name was not by Dinarchus, because it was 'much different from his style' (πολὸν γὰρ ἀπέχει τοῦ χαρακτῆρος).

⁴⁷ The *SC* is regarded as Xenophontic by Plu. *Lyc.* 1.5; Harp. s.v. μόραν; Poll. 6.142; *de subl.* 4.4; Stob. IV 2.23. An even older witness than Demetrius is possibly the scholion on *Od.* 4.65, according to which X. remarks that the Spartan kings claimed a double ration of food (δύμοιρία). The scholion might well go back to the learned criticism of a Homeric scholar of the hellenistic age. X. mentions the double ration at *SC* 15.4 and *Ages.* 5.1. The general wording suggests the *SC* as a source rather than *Ages.* 5.1; so also Fuchs 1838, 4.

⁴⁸ Chrimes 1948, 24f.

⁴⁹ Cf. also Hodkinson 2000, 29f. The catalogue of D.L. 2.57 contains all the works that are generally ascribed to X. nowadays, and no further items except the *Athenaion Politeia*. It follows that in Diogenes' day there existed a fixed Xenophontic canon. Ath. XI 506 C makes clear, however, that this had not always been the case: according to this passage the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Alcibiades II* was actually a Xenophontic work. Hence it is conceivable that Polybius regarded, say, the pseudo-Platonic *Minos* as Xenophontic. That dialogue indeed deduces the Spartan constitution from Crete (cf. [Pl.] *Min.* 320 A – B).

Chrimes⁵⁰ and argue that the *SC* circulated under a different name in Arrian's day, or that Arrian did not know it, or that the passage at 11.4 is a gloss that entered the text after Arrian. There are, however, no indications that we are dealing with a gloss; quite the opposite, since the character of the whole passage, full of details about the Spartan army, suggests originality. Besides, the curious and specific pieces of information it conveys cannot stem from any other surviving author.⁵¹ Presumably the passage and perhaps all the military part of the *SC* were unknown to Arrian.⁵² This does not exclude the possibility (but does not prove either) that the *SC* circulated under the name of a different author in Arrian's time – cf. the above-mentioned doubts of Demetrius on authenticity – but even if it did, it is unlikely that this hypothetical work under a different name would have been known to Arrian.⁵³

In favour of authenticity further arguments can be produced. First, there are conceptual similarities. The sympathy towards Sparta so characteristic of the *SC* (even chapter 14 confirms this, criticizing, as it does, the abandonment of the 'true' Spartan way of life) runs through the whole work of X. The Socratic way of life as reflected in other Xenophontic works plays an important role in representing the ideal Spartan education in chapters 1-10 (cf. pp. 18f., 33f.). The notion of unconditional obedience is found in the *SC* as elsewhere in X. (see 2.2[6] and 8.2[2]), as is the idea that war is a full-time profession that should be practised as such by all citizens (see 7.2[3]).⁵⁴

Cogent evidence for Xenophontic authorship seems to me to be afforded by the linguistic particularities that link the *SC* with other authentic Xenophontic writings. One can summarize the more detailed study below (cf. pp. 46-53) by stating that the use of particles in the *SC* coincides in great detail with that in the other Xenophontic works. Furthermore, various words can be found in the *SC* that in classical times are restricted almost exclusively to X. The prologue of the *SC* is composed according to a scheme that can be found frequently at the beginning of Xenophontic works (see 1.1[2]). This suggests at the same time that the work started with chapter 1 as transmitted and not with chapter 14 as Chrimes thought.⁵⁵ Besides, if the dating of the *SC* between 395 and 394 is

⁵⁰ Chrimes 1948, 28.

⁵¹ At least since Harpocration the passage was part of the *SC*, cf. Harp. s.v. μόραν.

⁵² Conceivably the title of the treatise and the different beginning induced Arrian to think the work would not contain any military information. At any rate, X.'s name does not appear in the (admittedly fragmentarily preserved) preface.

⁵³ Arr. *Tact.* 6.2 and Ael. *Tact.* 5.2 know of writers who mention a lochos of four enomoties, but these authors called two enomoties a dimoiria as pointed out by Arrian and Aelian *ibid.* This information is not found in the *SC*. Ascl. 2.2 remarks that διμοιρία is a later tactical term. If that is correct, it follows that the source of Arrian and Aelian was also later. Köchly/Rüstow 1855, 90 seem to assume nevertheless that Aelian here refers to the *SC*.

⁵⁴ As a conceptual difference one may point to the representation of Agesilaus in terms of money-making elsewhere and of the Spartans in the *SC*, see commentary on 7.1-4.

⁵⁵ Chrimes 1948, 1-8. Also the fact that in the imperial period speeches could start with ἀλλά following the Xenophontic pattern shows that chapter 1 was the first chapter, if the later orators were not influenced only by the Xenophontic *Symposium* (cf. 1.1[1]).

correct (for the arguments see below), no other candidate apart from X. has survived even by name.⁵⁶ Furthermore, possible differences in style as pointed out by Lana⁵⁷ would be explained by the timespan of 30 years or more between the composition of the *SC* and that of most (all?) other Xenophontic writings (apart from the fact that the topic of the *SC* is unparalleled in X.'s other writings).

There are two more indications that the work was regarded as Xenophontic from a relatively early stage. On the one hand, such a work of very mediocre quality would hardly have survived if it had not been protected by X.'s name. On the other hand, the *Athenaion Politeia* (which I believe to be wrongly ascribed to X.) would hardly have been transmitted at all if it had not been linked with the *SC* from very early on. Both arguments carry all the more weight since the *SC* is the only surviving Spartan constitution and the *Athenaion Politeia* the only surviving pamphlet of the classical period, and their survival cannot therefore be explained by a specific interest in the respective literary genres.⁵⁸

III Date

The few established dates of composition for Xenophontic works may be summarized briefly. The treatise *de Vectigalibus* was written after 356.⁵⁹ The second part of the *Historia Graeca* (2.3.11-end) came into being after 357, if one assumes – as I do – that this part was written in one piece.⁶⁰ The year 357 is the *terminus ante quem* of the *Anabasis*, because *HG* 3.1.2 refers to this work. The *Agésilas* was finished after the death of the king, i.e. not before 360.⁶¹ The last chapter of the *Cyropaedia* mentions the Satraps' revolt of 362/361 (*Cyr.* 8.8.4).⁶² In short, literary production is attested only for the end of X.'s life, roughly after 365.

Only chapter 14 provides some indications of the date of composition of the *SC*. The position of this chapter as well as its chronological relationship to the remainder of the text have long been controversial. The position of the chapter is doubtful because it intervenes quite unexpectedly between chapter 13 and chapter 15. The chronological relation to the remainder is controversial since the critical remarks on the contemporary state of affairs in chapter 14 patently

⁵⁶ According to the surviving fragments it can hardly be a work of Critias (cf. pp. 20f.), nor can it be the Spartan constitution composed by Thibron as mentioned by Arist. *Pol.* VII 1333b 18f. because of the Attic dialect (cf. p. 23).

⁵⁷ Lana 1992.

⁵⁸ Both writings were perhaps found among the unpublished works of X. after his death; as to the *Athenaion Politeia* this was already suggested by Diels 1894, 298, as to the *SC* e.g. by Moore 1983, 72f.

⁵⁹ Cf. p. 5.

⁶⁰ Dillery 1995, 257 n. 32.

⁶¹ *Ages.* 10.3; 11.15.

⁶² Cf. Gera 1993, 23-25.

contradict the effusive praise of Sparta in the rest of the work.⁶³ Hence, two particular questions have concerned scholars – whether chapter 14 stood originally after chapter 15 and whether chapter 14 is a later addition to an earlier draft. The latter assumption would necessarily entail reversing the order of chapter 14 and chapter 15.⁶⁴ I leave aside these intricate questions for a moment and propose to approach the problem from a slightly different angle, concentrating on chapter 14 alone.

Various reasons support the view that chapter 14 was written before the battle of Leuktra (371):⁶⁵

1. At 14.2 X. says of certain Spartans that they did duty as harmosts ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι. The context – X. is talking about the corruption of *all* the Spartans – and also the unspecific ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι suggest that X. imagined here a significant number of cities and harmosts. By contrast, immediately before the battle of Leuktra Sparta withdrew, as it seems, all garrisons and their harmosts (apart from the army standing in Phocis under Cleombrotus) and there is no mention of their reinstatement before the battle of Leuktra, and apparently not much opportunity of such a reinstatement afterwards (cf. *HG* 6.4.1 Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέντοι ἐκ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τοὺς τε ἀρμοστὰς καὶ τοὺς φρουροὺς ἀπήγαγον ...).

2. X. remarks at 14.2 καὶ κολακευομένους διαφθείρεσθαι. It seems unthinkable that the Spartan harmosts were courted or even corrupted by flattery after the battle of Leuktra. This kind of ingratiating fits much better into the main period of the Asian harmostships during the first decade of the fourth century, cf. e.g. X. *HG* 2.3.14; *An.* 3.1.5; 6.6.12.

3. X. remarks at 14.4 νῦν δ' ἐπίσταμαι τοὺς δοκοῦντας πρώτους εἶναι ἐσπουδακότας ὡς μηδέποτε παύονται ἀρμόζοντες ἐπὶ ξένης. Such a continuance of one's office is not attested immediately before or after Leuktra. However, there are earlier examples of long-term harmosts, especially Dercylidas,⁶⁶ who was possibly in charge of the Ten Thousand after their return and thus personally acquainted with X. (cf. note on 14.4[3]), or Clearchus⁶⁷ or Thibron.⁶⁸

4. X. remarks on the Spartans at 14.5 πραγματεύονται ὅπως ἄρξουσι and on the Spartan enemies at 14.6 παρακαλοῦσιν ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ τὸ διακωλύειν ἄρξαι πάλιν αὐτούς. Both passages show how close to ἀρχή Sparta was, or, in other words, that the Spartan assumption of ἀρχή was a

⁶³ For a discussion cf. pp. 28-32.

⁶⁴ An extensive survey of the different approaches to these questions and the chronology of chapter 14 is given by Tigerstedt 1965, 462-464, n. 530. A more recent and thorough discussion is offered by Carlier 1984, 252-254; cf. also MacDowell 1986, 8-14; Meulder 1989; Bianco 1996; Rebenich 1998, 25-31.

⁶⁵ So already Haase 1833, 26 and recently e.g. Bianco 1996, 23; Rebenich 1998, 30f.

⁶⁶ First harmost in 411, last in 394, cf. Bockisch 1965, 237.

⁶⁷ First harmost in 411, last in 403, cf. Bockisch 1965, 238.

⁶⁸ First harmost in 400/399, last in 392, cf. Bockisch 1965, 239.

realistic prospect if not a fact already. The tone is hardly compatible with the situation after the battle of Leuktra.

5. In chapter 14 X. criticizes only certain aspects that he had expounded in chapters 1-10 which concern the internal condition of Sparta (see p. 30). The army as well as the kingship are omitted, although the battle at Leuktra provided sufficient reason for criticism of both. So elsewhere X. rebukes the Spartan cavalry before the battle, cf. *HG* 6.4.11 τῶν δ' αὖ στρατιωτῶν οἱ τοῖς σώμασιν ἀδυνατώτατοι καὶ ἥκιστα φιλότιμοι ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων ἦσαν. Moreover he admits strategic failures by Cleombrotus (cf. *HG* 6.4.12, depth of the phalanx), which he tries to explain away elsewhere by lack of experience on the part of the king (*HG* 5.4.14, the ephors sent Κλεόμβροτον πρῶτον τότε ἡγούμενον). A direct or indirect comment on the defeat of the Spartan army, which appears to have been organized at Leuktra as described in chapters 11-12, would have been necessary lest the credibility of chapters 11-12 be questioned.⁶⁹

Hence 371 as the *terminus ante quem* of the composition of chapter 14 can be regarded as most likely. Chapter 14, however, provides further hints as to the date of composition. At 14.6 X. writes νῦν δὲ πολλοὶ παρακαλοῦσιν ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ τὸ διακωλύειν ἄρξαι πάλιν αὐτούς. This passage is undoubtedly to be interpreted in the sense that the Spartans did not have the hegemony during the composition of chapter 14 and that the unspecified 'many' are trying to impede the Spartans from taking the lead *once again*, see 14.6[3]. One has to conclude that Sparta no longer exercised the *ἀρχή* in Greece when chapter 14 was composed. This conclusion must be combined with another piece of information in chapter 14. According to 14.2 and 4 the harmostships were so influential at the time chapter 14 was composed that the harmosts were courted by many, and the old customs were thus corrupted. If X. does not contradict himself in chapter 14, here the harmostships of Asia Minor must be meant, not those of the Greek mainland. For at 14.6 X. points out the decline

⁶⁹ Another argument in favour of a date of composition of chapters 1-13 before the battle of Leuktra is found at 12.3, where X. remarks νόκτωρ (δὲ) ἔξω τῆς φάλαγγος ἐνόμισεν ὑπὸ Σκιριτῶν προφυλάττεσθαι νῦν δ' ἤδη καὶ ὑπὸ ξένων (...) αὐτῶν τινες συμπρόντες, cf. 13.6. Despite the lacuna (see note ad loc.) it is clear that the Skiritai formed an integral part of the army. The task of this unit could be fulfilled also (καὶ) by ξένοι at the time of the composition of the *SC* (νῦν). The Skiritai used to be deployed on the left wing of the army (cf. Th. 5.67.1) and were as such presumably not entirely destroyed in the battle of Leuktra (it was mainly the right wing with the position of the king which was wiped out, X. *HG* 6.4.14). But their losses were so considerable that the Arcadians launched a successful attack on Oion, the capital of the Skiritis, in the wake of the defeat. In 369 Oion possibly joined the synoicisms of Megalopolis which was clearly directed against Sparta, although the city does not appear in the list of the unified poleis at Paus. 8.27.3-8, cf. D.S. 15.72.4. Then in 364 the Skiritis appears as hostile towards Sparta, X. *HG* 7.4.21. Hence it is rather unlikely that a Spartan unit of the Skiritai existed after Leuktra. Nor does it seem possible to argue that X. meant by Σκιριτῶν an army unit that was only originally made up of native Skiritai, but later on of mercenary soldiers of other provenance: X. himself distinguishes at 12.3 explicitly between Skiritai and other mercenaries.

of Spartan power on the mainland, as shown by the meaning of *πάλιν* just mentioned. Chapter 14 was composed at a time when the harmostships of Asia Minor were at the peak of their power, whereas the hegemony on the Greek mainland had passed to the unspecified *many* (14.6 πολλοί).⁷⁰

The harmostships of Asia Minor were almost completely abolished after the devastating defeat of the Spartan fleet off Knidos in 394.⁷¹ This date is thus the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of chapter 14 given the aforementioned considerations. What is the *terminus post quem*? The first serious opposition to Spartan rule after the Peloponnesian War was stirred up in 395/394. Lysander died in late summer 395 in a skirmish at Haliartos by Lake Kopais.⁷² As a consequence the Boiotian League, Athens, Corinth, Argos, major parts of Thessaly, and other cities joined an alliance against Sparta.⁷³ It is tempting to see in those allies the *many* who had seized the *ἀρχή* from Sparta according to 14.6. In other words, the composition of chapter 14 falls between the defeat at Haliartos (late summer 395) and the expulsion of the harmosts from Asia Minor after the Knidian defeat (late summer 394).⁷⁴ X. might have composed it on Agesilaus' return from Asia Minor to Greece.⁷⁵

This chronological approach fits well with the following observations:

- X. cautiously avoids blaming his benefactor Agesilaus for any failure. His criticism is restricted – in marked opposition to the similar critical chapter of the *Cyropaedia* 8.8 – to the commonplaces of chapters 1-10 (see p. 30) and to the mismanagement and avarice of the harmosts appointed by Agesilaus' predecessors, not Agesilaus (for a comparison of the two concluding chapters *Cyr.* 8.8 and *SC* 14 see Gera 1993, 299f.; Tuplin 1994, 139-141).
- At least since Lysander had fallen out of favour with Agesilaus, criticism of the former and his favourites was legitimate in the king's circle.⁷⁶ Hence it is hardly coincidental that Lysander and his followers personify what X. criticizes so markedly in chapter 14, i.e. the godless opportunist.
- The sharply derogatory remark that the would-be leading Spartans (14.4 τοὺς δοκοῦντας πρώτους εἶναι) competed to stay abroad for an unlimited

⁷⁰ Hence, the hypothesis of Ollier 1934, xv that the harmostships of the Greek mainland (mentioned at Plb. 4.27.5 after the King's Peace) are here referred to is refuted.

⁷¹ Cf. X. *HG* 4.3.10-12.

⁷² Cf. X. *HG* 3.5.18f.; Plu. *Lys.* 28.9.

⁷³ Cf. D.S. 14.82.1-4.

⁷⁴ Bazin 1885, 106-109 argues for the same dating along different lines; Chrimes 1948, 18-22 places the composition into the same period, but denies X.'s authorship; similarly Cawkwell 1983, 395 n. 38, who elsewhere (Cawkwell 1976, 83) dates the work to the 370s and regards it as genuine.

⁷⁵ MacDowell 1986, 14 thought that the use of the local particle *ἐκεῖ* for Sparta at 7.6 and 9.6 would indicate that X. was not in Sparta when he composed the treatise. This is hardly convincing. X. speaks as an Athenian to an Athenian audience and from an Athenian standpoint Sparta was, of course, *ἐκεῖ*.

⁷⁶ Cf. X. *HG* 3.4.7-10.

period is an overt attack on Lysander's system of favouritism. Perhaps the remark is chosen in deliberate opposition to Agesilaus' 'selfless' abandonment of the Asian campaign.⁷⁷ This hypothesis would presuppose that the abandonment was known to X. in chapter 14, i.e. that chapter 14 was written after spring 394.

If one places the composition of chapter 14 between autumn 395 and autumn 394, one must assume that at least chapters 1-10 and presumably the whole *SC* were written during this period (cf. pp. 29-31). More general observations confirm this dating:

- The early dating explains the linguistic simplicity of the *SC*, unsurpassed by any other Xenophontic work. If the dating is correct, the *SC* is presumably the earliest Xenophontic work. Stylistic features different from other Xenophontic works could be explained by different dates of composition (cf. pp. 53f.).

- The early dating makes plain why the *SC* addresses a non-Spartan, mainly Athenian readership. A treatise praising Sparta and at the same time addressed to an Athenian audience is conceivable only before the battle of Koroneia in 394, i.e. before X.'s exile. On the other hand, X.'s unconditional devotion to the Spartan cause as testified by this work might well have been one of the reasons for his banishment.⁷⁸

IV Predecessors and Influences

a.) *Lakonophilia*

Since it is in the context of *lakonophilia* that the *SC* must be understood, it may be useful to give a general survey of the phenomenon, before discussing the influence of individual sources on the *SC*.⁷⁹ The first Athenian known to

⁷⁷ This abandonment is praised by X. *Ages.* 1.36; cf. *HG* 4.2.1-8; D.S. 14.83.1-3; *Plu. Ages.* 4.2-6. The description, however, of the extraordinary obedience of the Spartans, as mentioned at 8.1f., is hardly a hidden allusion to Agesilaus' compliance in returning after his successful expedition in Asia Minor.

⁷⁸ The fact that X. does not mention maritime affairs in the *SC* cannot be brought into play for the dating. Seafaring had never been a characteristic of the Spartans (*Th.* 1.142.4-9). The Spartan upbringing dealt with in chapters 1-10 served to train hoplites, not marines, and the percentage of Spartans among the crews was presumably very small anyway. Besides, X. was not so well acquainted with maritime affairs as with the mainland army for which his first-hand experience and his friend Agesilaus served as constant and reliable sources.

⁷⁹ Fundamental for the history of the idealization of Sparta and the different forms of *lakonophilia* in antiquity are Ollier 1933/1943; Tigerstedt 1965/1974; Rawson 1969 and the essays collected in Powell/Hodkinson 1994 and Cartledge 1999. Important too is Hodkinson 2000, 19-64.

have been a notorious lakonizer was Cimon, the son of Miltiades.⁸⁰ He seems to have been one of a relatively small circle of admirers of Sparta, to which among others Ion of Chios belonged.⁸¹ By the end of the fifth century the number of lakonizers had increased and they became a favourite target of the comedians.⁸² Socrates' pupil Critias, a member of the Thirty, was one of Sparta's most fervent admirers. He is the first writer from whom considerable fragments of pro-Spartan literature are preserved. In terms of both scope and concept his two treatises on Sparta (one in prose, one in verse) may be regarded as the immediate predecessors of the *SC* (see pp. 19f.). Simultaneously he inaugurates a long literary tradition which praised single-mindedly the one-sided orientation towards military efficiency of the Lycurgan constitution, criticized already by Aristotle.⁸³

Of course, one did not need to be a full-blooded lakonizer to admire one or more aspects of Spartan society. To take just the most conspicuous examples: Herodotus on occasion expressed his admiration of the Spartans and most notably for the heroic death of their king Leonidas and his band;⁸⁴ even the otherwise highly restrained Thucydides shows a remarkable sympathy for a Spartan figure like Brasidas (though Thucydides' own failure to save Amphipolis from Brasidas' grip may play a part).⁸⁵ Socrates shared at least some characteristics with the (ideal) Spartan (see pp. 18f.),⁸⁶ and his most influential student, Plato, was heavily influenced by the (idealized) Sparta.⁸⁷ Others – Isocrates, for example – followed suit.⁸⁸

It has correctly been observed most recently that X. was not the stout, simple-minded lakonist that he was supposed to be by previous scholarship. Among others Humble in her 1997 dissertation has reminded us of the importance of nuancing and questioning this old cliché.⁸⁹ Since the problem

⁸⁰ E.g. Plu. *Cim.* 15.3f., 16.1-3.

⁸¹ Cf. Ion 63 [*TGF*] and 27 [*IEG*] with Fisher 1989, 34f. for the context of the latter fragment.

⁸² E.g. Ar. *Av.* 1281-1283; Pl. *Com. fr.* 132 [*PCG*]; *Epil. fr.* 4 [*PCG*]; cf. also Pl. *Prt.* 342 B-C, *Grg.* 515 E. For Sparta in Aristophanes cf. Ollier 1933, 159-164; Tigerstedt 1965, 122-127; Rawson 1969, 25f.; Harvey 1994.

⁸³ Cf. Arist. *Pol.* VII 1333b 12-21. For Aristotle on Sparta cf. Ollier 1933, 294-326; Tigerstedt 1965, 280-304; Rawson 1969, 72-80; Schüttrumpf 1994; Herrmann-Otto 1998; Hodkinson 2000, 33-35.

⁸⁴ *Hdt.* 7.220-233, for his positive picture of Sparta cf. also 7.102-104 al.; in general Ollier 1933, 122-132; Tigerstedt 1965, 81-107; Rawson 1969, 19f.; Bradford 1994, 59-66, especially 64-66 [on Leonidas].

⁸⁵ For Thucydides on Sparta see Ollier 1933, 149-159; Tigerstedt 1965, 127-148; Rawson 1969, 20-24; Bradford 1994, 66-78; for Brasidas in Thucydides cf. Connor 1984, 126-140; Bradford 1994, 74-76; Hornblower 1996, 38-61.

⁸⁶ Cf. Tigerstedt 1965, 241-244; Rawson 1969, 28; Cartledge 1999, 316f.

⁸⁷ Cf. Ollier 1933, 217-290; Tigerstedt 1965, 244-276; Rawson 1969, 61-72; David 1981, 59-65; Powell 1994; Cartledge 1999, 321-323; Hodkinson 2000, 31f.

⁸⁸ For Isocrates cf. Ollier 1933, 327-369; Tigerstedt 1965, 179-206; Rawson 1969, 37-49; David 1981, 54f.; Gray 1994; Hodkinson 2000, 26f.

⁸⁹ For X. as a stout lakonist cf. e.g. Schepens 1993, 184f.; *contra* e.g. Tuplin 1993 [on the *Historia Graeca*]; Tuplin 1994 [on the *Cyropaedia*]; Humble 1997.

has some bearing on the evaluation of the *SC*, I shall state my own position more extensively.

It seems sensible to divide the discussion into X.'s stance towards Agesilaus and towards the Spartans.

1. Agesilaus. X. spent a substantial period of his life on his estate in Skillous in Elis, hardly without Agesilaus' consent, if not at his prompting (cf. *An.* 5.3.4-13). Besides, it may be assumed with reasonable certainty that a number of details involving Agesilaus' private life found in X.'s writings (e.g. the Sphodrias episode at *HG* 5.4.25-33) were derived either directly from the Spartan king or from his confidants. In short, the position of X. both as a protégé of Agesilaus and as someone with immediate access to Agesilaus or his confidants precludes, I believe, a critical stance towards Agesilaus, at least in the 390s, when, as argued above, the *SC* was probably written.

Now, it may be objected that the date of composition of the *SC* is not beyond doubt and that, if X. had written it in, say, the 350s, he would no longer have reason to bias the picture in favour of Agesilaus, who by then was dead. Nevertheless in the 350s X. was still an unstinting adherent of Agesilaus (or rather the ideals the latter stood for in X.'s mind), as becomes strikingly clear in the *Agesilaus*, finished after 360. Again one may object, as is done with emphasis by Humble,⁹⁰ that X. follows the 'encomiastic genre' in the *Agesilaus*, and that for this reason his praise of the king does not reflect his own opinion. But this argument is weak; encomiastic passages are, of course, as old as Homer – though the earliest prose encomium, Isocrates' *Euagoras*, predates the *Agesilaus* by a mere ten years. Attempts to prove an earlier tradition of such encomia are doomed to fail due to lack of evidence; and it is worth remembering that Isocrates explicitly regards himself as a pioneer of the prose encomium (cf. *Isoc.* 9.8). But even if we grant that such an encomiastic tradition with a fixed canon of *topoi* existed already in X.'s day, one may wonder whether X. was the kind of author to stick to literary theory rather than to his own convictions and practical experience. At most I would grant that both the encomiastic *topoi* (if already existent as such) and the personal traits of Agesilaus may have coincided in X.'s eyes, but I would find it very hard to credit that X. (and especially X.) embarked upon such an effusive praise of Agesilaus without, in practice, regarding him praiseworthy. Besides, if he was not praiseworthy in X.'s eyes, why was it he whom X. chose as the subject of his encomium?

Given that the *Agesilaus* reflects X.'s admiration of the king, I am not quite as optimistic as Tuplin and Humble⁹¹ that X.'s picture of Agesilaus in the *HG* is balanced. To mention three examples: I find the stress on Agesilaus' obedience (a classical Xenophontic theme, cf. 2.2[6] and 8.2[2]) to the magistrates on his return from Asia Minor (*HG* 4.2.3), the suppression of his involvement in the Kadmeia episode (as opposed to the description by

⁹⁰ Cf. Humble 1997, 247-253.

⁹¹ Cf. Tuplin 1993, *passim*; Humble 1997, 126-158.

Ephorus),⁹² and the absence of the Theban general Epameinondas from the Xenophontic description of the battle of Leuktra still easiest to explain by X.'s sympathy for Agesilaus (and his anti-Theban policy).

2. Spartans. "Bias towards Agesilaos is of course not the same as bias towards Sparta", as Hodkinson aptly remarked.⁹³ So how much, if at all, does X. distort his material in favour of Sparta? It is the merit of Tuplin and Humble to have shown that X.'s account is more balanced than generally thought (which is not to imply, I believe, that it was actually balanced). X. does not give us much information about internal affairs in the *HG* or the *Agesilaus* (deliberately in order to avoid criticism?), and where he does (as in the case of the conspiracy of Cinadon or the trial of Sphodrias) he is even prepared to admit extreme social tensions, the infringement of human and divine rights in Sparta (in which no less a person than Agesilaus is involved), and the selfish exploitation of a military force of non-Spartans by the Spartans for particularly dangerous enterprises.⁹⁴ X. is well aware of the personal deficiencies of a number of Spartans, who do not conform to the 'Spartan ideal'.⁹⁵ Fleeting laudatory remarks about Sparta appear occasionally,⁹⁶ but they are clearly not as frequent as one would expect from a stout lakonizer. In short, in his later writings X. endeavours (with varying success) to give a balanced picture of Sparta, which, however, may occasionally merge with and be overshadowed by his admiration of Agesilaus.

What of the Spartans of the *SC*? A number of scholars has argued that the *SC* does *not* have a deliberately pro-Spartan character. The interpretations here waver between reading the whole treatise as a persiflage or, at least, as a critical unbiased account. The former approach is too extravagant to need much refutation.⁹⁷ It is the latter, recently expounded by Humble with much persuasion,⁹⁸ that I shall be concerned with here.

Humble's general approach is to compare statements in the *SC* with those of other Xenophontic writings and to claim criticism of Sparta where the *SC* differs from the general (ideal) concept as represented by X.'s other writings. I would object that X.'s idealistic conceptions do not have to be consistent in his whole oeuvre, especially in the case of the *SC*, the bulk of which may have been written some 30 years or more before his other works. Besides, where evaluations of Sparta as found in the *SC* are not in line with the picture of the 'ideal state' as represented in the remainder of X.'s work, this may be often

⁹² Cf. David 1981, 29f.

⁹³ Cf. Hodkinson 2000, 25.

⁹⁴ Cf. *HG* 3.3.6 with Tuplin 1993, 52; Humble 1997, 224 [social tensions]; *HG* 5.4.1 with Tuplin 1993, 99f. [divine laws]; *HG* 5.4.24 [human laws]; *Cyr.* 4.2.1 [exploitation of non-Spartans].

⁹⁵ E.g. *An.* 2.6.6-15 [obituary of Clearchus]; *HG* 4.8.22 [on Thibron].

⁹⁶ E.g. *Mem.* 3.5.15f., 4.4.15.

⁹⁷ So Strauss 1939; Proietti 1987, 44-79; sympathetic Carlier 1978, 137 n. 12, 160 n. 64.; *contra* e.g. Delebecque 1957, 194; Tigerstedt 1965, 464 n. 530; Cartledge 1999, 320.

⁹⁸ Cf. Higgins 1977, 65-75, Humble 1997, 187-240.

explained as an attempt in the *SC* to account for a widely known and criticized fact in an apologetic manner.

But not only is X. apologetic in the *SC*, he is, I believe, also overtly pro-Spartan, especially in the first part (chapters 1-10). Though the *SC* is the only source for most of the information it provides, X.'s pro-Spartan bias appears clearly at a number of points:

(i) At 2.13 X. insists that Spartan pederasty was chaste. The idea of chaste pederasty is similarly found in connection with Socrates in the *Symposium*⁹⁹ and ascribed to Agesilaus in X.'s encomium (5.7). Was it historical when applied to Sparta? There is plenty of evidence that it was not (cf. 2.13[1] and [3]). Rather, X. here tried to explain the paramount importance of Spartan homosexuality in an apologetic, sublimated manner, which is in accordance with his later idealizing concept of chaste pederasty elsewhere.

(ii) At 10.7 X. claims that financial weakness would not exclude a Spartan from exercising his civic rights, as long as he was a worthy citizen. This statement appears to be a topos of classical state panegyric (cf. Th. 2.37.1), but is it also historical as Humble claims?¹⁰⁰ All the external evidence belies the Xenophontic statement (cf. 10.7[5]). It seems unavoidable to assume that X. deliberately interpolated a panegyric topos here to create the desirable picture of a 'state of the best', not a 'state of the richest'.

(iii) A number of Spartan traits as represented in the *SC* coincide arrestingly with the picture of the Xenophontic Socrates (see pp. 18f.), and though it may often remain debatable whether these traits were historical or not, the very fact that X. chose to single them out as typical of Spartan education makes the latter seem an ideal-philosophical fabrication.

(iv) Finally a general consideration. What reason could a member of the Athenian upper class possibly have to write a treatise on the Spartan (not the Athenian) constitution if not admiration of the Spartan system? I would argue that it would be most natural to parallel the *SC* with Critias' two Spartan constitutions, the pro-Spartan tendency of which is beyond doubt.

In short, in my view X. is likely to have been a fervent and biased admirer of Agesilaus for most of his life (though perhaps not to the extent earlier scholarship took for granted). In all his historical and semi-historical works X. was, to put it cautiously, certainly more inclined to distort the picture in the king's favour than against him. On the other hand, X.'s evaluation of the Spartan system may have differed according to the political situation: so actions for which Agesilaus' internal political enemies were liable are more likely to appear in X.'s writings as Spartan blunders. Starting from admiration in his presumably earliest work, the *SC*, X.'s evaluation of Sparta turned into plain sympathy, largely due to an affection for Agesilaus. In a sense the composition of the *Cyropaedia*, written at the other end of X.'s life, is a confession that the

⁹⁹ Cf. *Symp.* 8 with Huß 1999, 32-37.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Humble 1997, 216f.

ideal as proposed in the *SC* can be put into practice only in the realm of fiction.¹⁰¹

b.) Socrates

The main task of literature on the ideal state is to outline a constitutional framework within which εὐδαιμονία of the citizens can be achieved. The term εὐδαιμονία seems to belong "peculiarly to Socratic thought".¹⁰² In the *SC* it plays a particularly important role: it is the unique Spartan εὐδαιμονία, which forms the starting point of our treatise (1.2).

Nowhere does X. give a clear definition of the term εὐδαιμονία, and it seems that the word is not fixed terminologically in X.; it denotes a 'good' state of things, while X. does not assess this state always in the same manner.¹⁰³ *Mem.* 1.6.1-10 is illuminating for the meaning of the word in connection with the *SC*. Socrates contrasts his concept of εὐδαιμονία with that of the sophist Antiphon: Socrates concludes at the end of the passage with rhetorical exaggeration that according to Antiphon εὐδαιμονία denotes softness and extravagance, according to his own definition restraint and self-control.

The Spartans of the *SC* correspond to the definition of Socrates.¹⁰⁴ They are restrained (ἐγκρατέστεροι, 2.14) as to their sexual conduct towards women (1.5) or their male lover (2.13). The life of the boys is modest: they walk around barefooted (2.3), dress with only one garment in all seasons (2.4), and eat frugally (2.5); the older men do likewise (5.3-4). Even the representation of royal power in the *SC* corresponds to the ideal of the *Memorabilia* (2.1.17-19), according to which the 'royal art' (βασιλικὴ τέχνη) is identical with εὐδαιμονία, provided it consists of restraint and self-control. Hence X. underlines in the *SC* that the wealth (15.3) and honours (15.8) of the Spartan kings do not exceed the ordinary.

By making restraint and self-control the main Spartan characteristics, X. presents an ideal picture of a Spartan that does not differ from that of Socrates, as painted in the *Memorabilia*. Socrates shows himself restrained as to physical love (*Mem.* 1.2.1), and his way of life corresponds in great detail to the representation of the Spartan youth in the *SC*. He is barefooted, dressed in one garment only and modest in consumption of food and drink (*Mem.* 1.6.2; 1.6.5-8). Restraint and self-control are not innate; they must be acquired (ἄσκησις, 2.3, 4.5) by privations and pains (πόννοι, 3.2, 7.4). This opinion, which is already expressed by Critias D/K B 9, is found also in the

¹⁰¹ Cf. Ollier 1933, 434-439; Rawson 1969, 50f. [highlighting the similarities between the *Cyropaedia* and the *SC*]; Tuplin 1994 [highlighting the differences].

¹⁰² Gigon 1953, 153.

¹⁰³ When Herakles confronts the evil and the good in the guise of two women, the evil (κακία) claims of itself that some call it εὐδαιμονία, cf. X. *Mem.* 2.1.26. From *Mem.* 4.2.34-36 it follows that it included beauty, strength, wealth and fame.

¹⁰⁴ They also correspond – via Socrates – to other Xenophontic characters, cf. Huß 1999, 25-30, 274f.

Memorabilia: due to his training Socrates endures tribulations better than anyone else (*Mem.* 1.2.1, 1.6.6f.). It is especially the term *σωφρονεῖν* ('to control oneself') at *SC* 3.4 that marks the *SC* as typically Socratic (cf. 3.4[7]).

The concept of 'privation/pain' (*πόνος*) elucidates more than anything else the degree to which idealistic evaluation and historical reality are blurred in the *SC*. It is certainly a historical fact that Spartan training was more austere than that of other cities (cf. e.g. *Th.* 2.39.1, *X. HG* 5.1.16, *Pl. Lg.* 633 B-C). In the *SC* these *πόνος* are transfigured idealistically (though other writers did not necessarily approve of them, cf. *Th.* 2.39.2, *Arist. Pol.* VIII 1338b 12-14). The almost dictatorial punishing rights of the superiors, and more specifically of the *paidonomoi* (1.2), of the scourge-bearers (2.2), of older men in general (6.2), and the *ephors* in particular (4.6, 8.4, cf. 10.5), besides the flogging at the altar of *Orthia* (2.9), the mock battles between the young (4.4) resulting in mutilations ridiculed by Plato (*Pl. Prt.* 342B, *Grg.* 515E) – all these 'customs' were praised unreservedly by X. as exemplary.¹⁰⁵

c.) Critias

Critias wrote among others a work on the Spartan constitution in elegiac couplets and a work on the same topic in prose.¹⁰⁶ Both may have suggested to X. the idea of an encomium on Sparta.

If X. adopted the theme from Critias, his work nevertheless has an independent character as far as the few fragments of the Critian work allow a comparison. No literal or direct thematic adaptations of the two Critian constitutions are traceable. Common to both Critias and X. is the belief that the Spartan constitution is the ideal constitution *par excellence*, cf. *X. HG* 2.3.24 [speech of Critias] and 1.1f. Possibly the structure of the *SC* and the prose work of Critias showed similarities: both start with the procreation of healthy children and in both the basic concept is that the offspring may be strengthened by proper food and physical exertion, cf. Critias D/K B 32. Critias (in his prose as well as poetic version) and X. underline the effectiveness of the Spartan institutions in opposition to other cities. But while Critias refers to the other cities by name (*Lydia* D/K B 6.6; *Chios*, *Thasos*, *Attica*, *Thessaly* D/K B

¹⁰⁵ Finally in the *Cynegeticus* a direct connection is established between pain (*πόνος*) and virtue (*ἀρετή*) (*Cyn.* 12.9, cf. 3.2[3]).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. D/K B 6-9 and 32-37. Apart from these, Critias wrote a treatise on the constitution of the Thessalians (D/K B 31) and possibly of the Athenians. Alexander of Aphrodisias (3rd century AD) ap. *Phlp. in de An.* 89.8 claimed that only the metrical works were by the politician. The relation of Critias to Socrates is not clear. Critias appears in several Platonic dialogues, namely the homonymous *Critias*, as an interlocutor of Socrates, and according to X. *Mem.* 1.2.12 his acquaintance with Critias and Alcibiades was produced as a charge against Socrates. According to *Mem.* 1.2.29 Socrates blamed Critias for his passion for Euthydemus (cf. Hindley 1999, 77f.). But the assertion that Critias 'hated' Socrates because of a scolding remark made then (*Mem.* 1.2.31) has a strongly anecdotal character. At any rate, Critias left his teacher unmolested during the rule of the Thirty, cf. also *Aeschin.* 1.173, *Ael. VH* 2.13.

33; Miletos, Chios, Rheneion D/K B 35) and generalizes nowhere, in the *SC* X. exclusively talks of the 'other cities' (1.2 τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις; 1.3 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ... οἱ ἄλλοι "Ἕλληνες etc.). Actually the detailed report is typical of Critias, the generalization of X.: one may compare the extensive poetic passage on modest drinking in Sparta (Critias D/K B 6) or the meticulous prose representation of drinking customs elsewhere (Critias D/K B 33) with the short Xenophontic note on Spartan self-restraint in drinking (5.4); or the precautions for protection against the helots in the Critian prose version (removal of the handle of the shield, permanent carrying of the spear in the field, special locks, cf. Critias D/K B 37) with the lapidary Xenophontic statement that the Spartans used to patrol in the field with their weapons for fear of the helots and did not move away from them more than was necessary (12.4); one may compare, too, the minute Critian prose description of the appearance and purpose of the drinking vessel called κώθων (Critias D/K B 34) or *ibid.* the exact description of the Spartan 'tongs-dance' (Critias D/K B 36). The sparse material available for comparison renders likely the assumption that both Critian constitutions centred mainly on the question of daily Spartan life with emphasis on the aspects of simplicity and practical needs, and that these characteristics were compared with other cities. Nothing indicates that the Spartan upbringing or military organization were dealt with in depth as in the *SC*. Finally, an important difference is that Lycurgus, who in the *SC* plays the crucial part as a founder and guarantor of the Spartan state, does not even appear by name in the preserved Critian fragments.¹⁰⁷

In short, it seems that the *SC* supplemented the two Critian works on the Spartan constitution rather than imitating them: the focus of the two Critian constitutions was on daily life; the focus of the Xenophontic *SC* on outlining the Spartan education, the Spartan character, and –in notable detail– the Spartan military organization.

d.) Herodotus

Herodotus does not say much about the Spartan education. Like X. Herodotus knew the age classes that stood in the field, i.e. the eirenes (cf. p. 131 n. 13). He was familiar with the elite troops of the hippeis (Hdt. 1.67.5, 8.124.3 al.) that according to 4.3 consisted of the eirenes (= hebontes, cf. commentary 2.11[3]). At the same time the mention of the hippeis by Herodotus and X. shows the different perspective of each writer: while in Herodotus the hippeis appear exclusively as elite troops in action, subject directly to the royal command, X. 4.3f. affords some insight into their selection and (competitive) relation to their fellow contenders without naming the hippeis explicitly (instead their leaders are named, the hippagretai (4.3), who conversely are not mentioned by Herodotus), let alone their function. In other words, by mentioning the hippeis X. focuses on the ideal-philosophical

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Köhler 1896, 371.

question of the best education, i.e. the permanent competition of the young with each other (cf. 4.2 ἔρις περὶ ἀρετῆς); Herodotus, however, concentrates on the historical role of the *hippeis* at the side of the king, mainly in the struggle against the Persians. It remains unclear why X. does not mention the *hippeis* again in the detailed military part of the *SC* (chapters 11-13).

X. gives more detail on Spartan education than Herodotus, with one exception: Hdt. 1.67.5 mentions the *agathourgoi*. These are the five oldest members of the annually changing *hippeis* who were employed as messengers.¹⁰⁸ They were known to Herodotus because they habitually travelled outside Sparta keeping contact with friendly cities (Hdt. 1.67.5-1.68.1). For this very reason X. deemed them not worth mentioning: they did not have educational or military importance. In short, as to the Spartan education the account of the *SC* is largely supported by Herodotus, but comparison reveals more about the different perspective of the two authors than about their (common?) sources. For a common source of parts of chapters 13 and 15 of the *SC* and Hdt. 6.56-58 cf. pp. 24-27.

e.) *Thucydides* (Epitaphios)

The *SC* may be compared with the Thucydidean *Epitaphios* (Th. 2.34-46). In this speech Pericles (Thucydides) views Athens as compared to Sparta. Similarly in the *SC* X. considers the Spartan state against the foil of 'other cities' (cf. e.g. 1.2 al.). The following examples may elucidate how differently Pericles (Thucydides) and X. interpret partly identical historical facts:

1. Pericles praises the fact that the Athenians do not begrudge each other's freedom to do whatever they please (Th. 2.37.2). Conversely, X. praises the control of one citizen by another (5.2, 7.5f.).

2. Pericles praises the fact that in Athens people enjoy products from all over the world (Th. 2.38.2), while X. praises in Sparta the restrictive way of life, especially in terms of nutrition (2.5, 5.3).

3. Pericles criticizes the fact that the Spartans screen off all internal affairs (Th. 2.39.1), while X. regrets that such expulsions have ceased to exist and that Sparta is liable to foreign influence (14.4).

4. According to Pericles the Spartan training is characterized by 'pain' (ἐπίπονος ἄσκησις), while the Athenians are fitter for action than others (Th. 2.39.1-4, 2.41.3f.; cf. 2.38.1). Conversely, it is the aspect of 'pain' that X. puts forward as one of Sparta's major advantages (e.g. 3.2). According to X. the Spartan training leads to superiority in military matters, while all the others are 'amateurs' (13.5).

Frequently Pericles claims for Athens what X. mentions in Sparta: Pericles praises the Athenian constitution for not imitating others, but serving as a model for others (Th. 2.37.1, 2.41.1 with 1.2[5]); the same is said by X. about Sparta (1.2). Pericles states that it is not descent or wealth that qualifies one in

¹⁰⁸ Cf. p. 145 n. 21.

Athens for a political office, but personal suitability (Th. 2.37.1); X. says exactly the same about Sparta (10.3.7). According to Pericles 'fear' (δέος) leads in Athens to obedience to the state officers and the law (Th. 2.37.3), just as the Spartan obedience results from 'awe' (αἰδώς, 2.2).

All in all the differences between the representation of Sparta in the *SC* and in the *Epitaphios* are noteworthy, even if one takes into account that the *SC* is an encomium on Sparta, the *Epitaphios* an encomium on Athens. The *Epitaphios* provides support for several historical facts about Sparta; however, it turns them completely into the negative. Those cases in which the *Epitaphios* and the *SC* praise the same historical circumstances are mainly topoi of state panegyric. X. and Thucydides apparently follow here the same panegyric tradition.

f.) *Thibron*

At *Pol.* VII 1333b 12-21 Aristotle mentions a number of works which praise Lycurgus for focusing on military efficiency in his legislation. As an example of such works he mentions a treatise by Thibron.¹⁰⁹ The writer may be confidently identified with the commander of that name in Asia Minor who took over the remainder of the Cyreans at the Hellespont in 399 (cf. *X. An.* 7.8.24, *HG* 3.1.6; *D.S.* 14.37.2).¹¹⁰ Immediately after that he went home, where he was exiled after an accusation brought by the Spartan allies against him (*X. HG* 3.1.8; *D.S.* 14.38.2). He returned to Sparta before 391, since in this year he appears again as commander-in-chief in Asia Minor (*X. HG* 4.8.17; *D.S.* 14.99.1). It is a reasonable guess that Thibron's treatise was written during his absence from Sparta (after 399 and before 391). If so, it comes chronologically close to the *SC*. From Aristotle's wording it appears that Lycurgus was a central figure in this treatise (in apparent contradiction to, say, Critias' Spartan constitutions), that the work centred on military education, and that its tone was laudatory. All this coincides more or less with the content of the *SC*. X. may have been influenced by or even have responded to this work by writing the *SC*.

Oncken's idea that X. published the *SC* under the pseudonym Thibron¹¹¹ cannot be proved to be wrong, but is unlikely on two grounds: first, the *SC* may well not have been published by X. himself in its present form: note a number of inconsistencies and the addition of chapter 14 (cf. pp. 29-31); second, if publishing under a pseudonym, why did X. choose the name of the Spartan general or the name of a Spartan at all? X. does not betray a particular fondness for Thibron, but characterizes him as debauched (cf. *X. HG* 4.8.22) and militarily inept (cf. *X. HG* 3.1.10, 3.2.1, 4.8.22).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *FGrH* 581 with Boring 1979, 54f.

¹¹⁰ For the identification see Jacoby ad *FGrH* 581.

¹¹¹ Cf. Oncken 1875, 179.

g.) *Lysander*

Lysander and/or Cleon of Halikarnassos – a client (rhetor?) commissioned by Lysander – wrote a speech in which he demanded the opening of the kingship to the most competent (Plu. *Lys.* 30.3 τὴν ἀρεσιν ἐκ τῶν ἀρίστων).¹¹² This speech, of which nothing else is known, is, if not a viciously circulated anti-Lysandrian rumour, to be dated after Lysander demitted the position of the *de facto* commander-in-chief of the Spartan fleet in 404 and his death in 395 (for he was supposed to manifest his continued claim to power by this speech). It appears to have questioned the legal foundations of Spartan kingship, very likely by denying its Lycurgan origin. Even if Lysander never delivered the speech, its existence would show that it was – at least theoretically – possible to contest the Spartan kingship on such grounds around 400. Hence such a speech would bear on X.'s attempt in the *SC* (unprecedented in the sources) to make the Spartan kingship a Lycurgan institution (see p. 36).

h.) *Pausanias*

King Pausanias wrote a treatise on Sparta after his expulsion in 395 or slightly later (cf. X. *HG* 3.5.25), as recorded by Ephor. ap. Str. 8.5.5 = *FGrH* 582 T 3. Since the following words of Strabo's text are corrupt, the content of the treatise is uncertain. In particular it remains doubtful whether the work simply dealt with the Lycurgan laws or whether it was directed against them.¹¹³ In the latter, more probable, case one could assume at a first glance that the *SC* reacts against the Pausanian pamphlet.¹¹⁴ To this opinion one may object, however, that nowhere in the *SC* is the fact that Lycurgus was the creator of the Spartan institutions or their excellence discussed or even questioned. This also applies to the only point at which a direct comparison between the Pausanian treatise and the *SC* may be possible: Pausanias had tried to abolish the ephorate, as is reported by Arist. *Pol.* V 1301b 19-21 adducing an unnamed Spartan source.¹¹⁵ It is a plausible hypothesis that this hostile stance towards the ephorate was reflected by the fact that Pausanias may not have regarded the ephorate as a Lycurgan institution in his treatise, as attested by other earlier authors (e.g. Hdt. 1.65.5), but as a post-Lycurgan, i.e. royal institution. The latter version is found in Aristotle and Plato from the middle of

¹¹² Cf. *FGrH* 583 with Boring 1979, 52-54. All sources apparently go back to Ephorus.

¹¹³ For an extensive and cautious discussion of the treatise cf. Richer 1998a, 25-43. For the view that the treatise *supported* the Lycurgan laws cf. David 1979 followed by Hodkinson 1994, 200f.; Hodkinson 2000, 28f. But though David argues extensively for what Pausanias *could* have written (i.e. a pro-Lycurgan treatise), he does not make clear why he *could not* have written what appears to be (despite all deficiencies) the preserved reading of the text, i.e. *κατά*, in other words a treatise *against* the Lycurgan laws (banished, as he was, by the Spartans).

¹¹⁴ E.g. Bianco 1996, 24; van Wees 1999, 18.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Richer 1998a, 24-35.

the fourth century (for references cf. 8.3[1]). But X. does not seem to have known this version. Otherwise he would not have employed a wording which was – at least on the surface – ambiguous when he talks about the creation of the ephorate (cf. 8.3[1]), but would have either unequivocally accepted or rejected this view.

i.) *Plato*

There are a number of similarities between the *SC* and the early Platonic dialogues written before the conjectured date of the *SC*. Both 2.1 and *Pl. Prt.* 325 C-D stress with similar wording that in Athens children are entrusted to pedagogues as soon as they learn to speak, cf. commentary 2.1[4]. Apart from 2.1 this practice is criticized by *Pl. Ly.* 208 C. In the *Protagoras* Plato shows himself informed about the Spartan fist fights, the special training of Spartan women and the *xenelasiai* (cf. *Pl. Prt.* 342 B-D with 1.4, 4.4-6, 14.4). Fist fights are also alluded to at *Grg.* 515 E. Like Plato at *La.* 179 A X. censures at 3.1 the fact that the young men (*μειράκια*) in Athens are not subject to any control (cf. 3.1[3]). The *hoplomachoi* seem to have been a special topic of discussion in the first decade of the fourth century: Plato's *Laches* and the *SC* refer to them, cf. 11.8 and *La.* 179 E - 184 C and also *Euthd.* 271 B - 273 C. Possibly the second part of the *SC* (chapters 11-13) was originally conceived as an answer to the Athenian *hoplomachoi* (cf. pp. 30f. n. 135).

These and other passages show that X. in the *SC* and Plato had a similar picture of Sparta in mind. Nowhere, however, can a dependence of the one author on the other be shown or at least made plausible: the existence of written sources on Sparta on which Plato based his information remains unprovable and is altogether unlikely, given the nature of the supposedly *realistic* setting of his dialogues (which of course must have reflected common knowledge). It remains more than doubtful that X., who stayed in Asia Minor until 395, knew anything about the Platonic dialogues when composing the *SC*, and such an Athenian influence on X.'s work, where the latter had Spartan life literally before his eyes, is virtually unthinkable. Conversely, where the *SC* coincides with the later Plato, notably the *Republic* and the *Laws*, no direct influence of the *SC* on Plato is traceable.¹¹⁶

j.) *Rhetra*

The subject of chapter 15 is, as X. stresses at 15.1, how Lycurgus regulated the relation between king and city: ἄς βασιλεῖ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν συνθήκας ὁ Λυκοῦργος ἐποίησε. The term *συνθήκαι* is noteworthy: the word, which appears only here in the *SC*, elsewhere in X. denotes a paraphrased, written

¹¹⁶ Such cases are e.g. the description of the excesses of timocracy (cf. chapter 14 and *Pl. R.* 548 A-C), or of the seizure of cheese (cf. 2.9 and *Pl. Lg.* 633 B).