

HONOUR AND THE ART OF XENOPHONTIC LEADERSHIP*

Benjamin D. Keim

Abstract: Throughout his wide-ranging corpus Xenophon portrays the desire for honour as a fundamentally human characteristic, one commonly attributed to rulers and commanders and yet also found among other individuals, regardless of their sex or social status. Here I explore how the motivations of honour, and the award of instantiated honours, are to be negotiated by Xenophon’s ideal leader. Every leader is in a position of honour: in order to be successful the good leader must first establish, by properly honouring the gods and his followers, the context within which he may then distribute honours effectively, thereby helping train his followers and achieve their mutual flourishing.

Keywords: Xenophon, honour, leadership, *philotimia*, awards, incentives.

ἀλλ’ ὄν ἂν ἰδόντες κινηθῶσι καὶ μένος ἐκάστω
ἐμπέση τῶν ἐργατῶν καὶ φιλονικία πρὸς
ἀλλήλους καὶ φιλοτιμία κρατιστεῦσαι ἐκάστω,
τοῦτον ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν ἔχειν τι ἦθος βασιλικῶ.

But if they have caught sight of their master and are invigorated—with strength welling up within each worker, and rivalry with one another, and the ambition to be the very best—then I would say that this man has a rather kingly character.

Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 21.10¹

* I am indebted to Richard Fernando Buxton both for his invitation to contribute and his editorial guidance. Critiques by Richard, Robin Osborne, and *Histos*’ readers helped clarify my earlier thoughts; all remaining infelicities are my own. My research was supported in part by the Loeb Classical Library Foundation. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my long-standing gratitude to the respondent, John Dillery, whose lectures on Greek Civilisation led me to major in Classics. All translations are my own.

¹ Compare Socrates’ remarks on ἀρετή ... βασιλική (*Mem.* 4.2.11).

The following surveys Xenophon's thoughts on the nature and functions of honour, in order that we might better understand the importance, for anyone practising the art of Xenophonic leadership, of properly negotiating honour in its myriad material and non-material guises. I begin by unpacking Ischomachus' arguments within the final chapter of *Oeconomicus*, an unfortunately neglected passage that preaches good Xenophonic orthodoxy while emphasising the psychological aspects of leadership.² Ischomachus' review of successful coxswains, generals, and overseers will help us chart our own study of honour, as it is negotiated within communities of leaders and led, and of honours, as they are used to incentivise desirable behaviours and dispositions.

Ischomachus embarks on his final voyage by conjuring up triremes sailing across the open sea (*Oec.* 21.3). These triremes are distinguished not by their build or by their rowers, but by the practical intelligence (*γνώμη*) of their coxswains.³ Some coxswains have the ability, through their own words and actions, to hone the spirits of their men and prepare them for the efforts at hand, while others lack this intelligence (*ἀγνώμονες*) and are unable to inspire their rowers. There are practical implications that arise immediately from these officers' differing abilities: drenched in sweat as they eagerly pull upon their oars, the motivated rowers reach their destination in half the time of their unmotivated colleagues. Ischomachus' vocabulary and syntax also attest implications for the continuing relationships between these officers and those they are leading. Whereas the successful coxswains and their rowers

² The brief discussion of the *Oeconomicus* in Caster (1937) 51–2 was rightly praised by Breitenbach (1950) 88 n. 143, and his remarks remain the most perceptive consideration of Ischomachus' peroration. Arguing that the treatise's 'véritable sujet' is 'qu'est-ce qu'un chef?', Caster elaborates how '[l]e chapitre final du dialogue montre bien sa pensée'.

³ As Pomeroy (1994) *ad loc.* notes, the *κελευστής* served as the conduit between the commands of the *κυβερνήτης* and the rowers' exertions. On the use of subordinate officers for the assessment and distribution of honour, see at n. 63 below.

disembark and immediately begin praising one another (*ἐπαινοῦντες ἀλλήλους*), their celebrations reinforcing their small communities of leader and led,⁴ the unsuccessful coxswains and their rowers are estranged from one another by their mutual hatred (*μισοῦντες τὸν ἐπιστάτην καὶ μισοῦμενοι*). While Ischomachus merely notes the character (*τοιαῦτα*) and not the content of the words with which able coxswains motivate their men, this naval illustration portrays the intelligent leader rousing his men's spirits and enabling their success, while the ignorant officer simultaneously destroys his men's morale, productivity, and relationship with their leader.

As he turns from coxswains to generals, Ischomachus elaborates on the ramifications of this practical intelligence (*Oec.* 21.4–8). Bad generals do not merely destroy their followers' willingness to work hard and to obey orders, but inadvertently encourage mutinous challenges to their own command. That their leadership yields shameless troops is unsurprising, since communal ties have been undermined and there are no restraints upon the individual. Under the watchful command of the good leader, however, these relationships and the obedience they engender may be rapidly restored, for under such leadership the ends of individual and community are aligned, and everyone recognises that obedience is superior to disgraceful behaviour.⁵ Just as the able coxswain rouses the spirits of his rowers, so the able general ensures ready obedience and spirited (*οὐκ ἀθύμως*) pursuit of his troops' objectives. But what is it, exactly, that so rouses men's spirits and directs their energies? Good commanders (*ἀγαθοὶ ἄρχοντες*) are able to inspire a love of work and, more importantly, 'an ambition to be seen by their commander when they are doing something good' (*τὸ φιλοτιμείσθαι ὀφθῆναι καλόν τι*

⁴ Compare the relieved celebrations, pointedly shared by the officers and their men, as the Ten Thousand finally caught sight of the sea (*An.* 4.7.25).

⁵ On the necessity of this alignment, see Bruit-Zaidman (2005). The best Xenophontic example of an individual leader quickly rehabilitating the character of those he leads occurs with Dercylidas' troops (*HG* 3.2.7).

ποιούντας ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος). Within this compact phrase we find the essence of Xenophonic leadership. Indeed, Ischomachus continues, ‘when followers have this sort of relationship with their commander, it is indeed these men who become the strongest commanders’ (21.7). In this way practical intelligence (*γνώμη*) is shown to be more important than bodily strength (*ῥώμη*), as Ischomachus puns (21.8; cf. *Mem.* 3.3.13).

Ischomachus’ final illustration considers those private endeavours pursued on the farm or within the workshop (*Oec.* 21.9–12). While the master (*δεσπότης*) whose men disregard his presence—and (dis)incentives—cannot be envied, the master possessing ‘a rather kingly character’ inspires competitiveness and love of honour within each of his servants (*φιλονικία πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ φιλοτιμία κρατιστεῦσαι ἐκάστω*).⁶ Although Xenophon does not cite Hesiod here, this kingly master may be seen as instilling (and thereafter inspiring) the good *Enis* that, by setting ‘potter against potter and carpenter against carpenter’, increases productivity and thereby wealth (*Op.* 20–6).⁷ Xenophon does not elaborate on the rewards that such followers might receive, but simply explains the manner in which the ideal leader, within the context of a good relationship with his men, ought to cultivate, and then employ, their desires for recognition.

Inspired by the rivalries and ambitions fostered by these good leaders, I will now trace the interwoven paths of honour and leadership across the entire Xenophonic

⁶ Compare *Cyr.* 8.1.39, with comments by Gray (2011) 322.

⁷ Compare Lycurgus’ use of *enis* at Sparta discussed below at n. 74. Examination of the vocabulary of competition (e.g. *ἔρις*, *φιλονικία*, *φιλονεικία*, *φιλοτιμία*) within the Xenophonic corpus reveals an overwhelming emphasis on the positive, beneficial aspects of competition. Xenophon is not unaware of the potential downsides of competition—consider poor Marysas, flayed after daring to compete with Apollo (*An.* 1.2.8)—but his own authorial intentions lead him to focus on, and teach about, the positive.

corpus.⁸ Throughout his works Xenophon portrays honour as an integral feature of human psychology and politics, with individual and community flourishing rooted in good leaders' careful nurturing and cultivation of honour. Although the Greek vocabulary of *τιμή* features prominently throughout this chapter, study of Xenophonic honour must be sensitive to a far wider range of Greek expression and activity, as well as the many diverse, simultaneous resonances of *τιμή*. Three particularly important, overlapping resonances—of psychology, position, and practice—may be noted briefly here. First, the psychological aspect of honour, the desire—natural for Xenophon's humans and yet also able to be nurtured—to receive recognition and reward for achievements. Thus the men chosen for the front ranks of the Athenian cavalry were those 'ambitious both to do and to hear something good' (*φιλοτιμοσάτων καλόν τι ποιεῖν καὶ ἀκούειν*, *Eq. Mag.* 2.2). Second, honour as it relates to leadership and positions of authority. Such positions and political offices were themselves considered honours,⁹ and were usually accompanied by subsidiary honours and privileges. Thus the Spartans bestowed double rations upon their kings, as a means both of honouring their leaders and enabling those men to honour others as they saw fit.¹⁰ Third, the regular practice of honouring individuals for their efforts, whether with non-material honours such as praise or material, instantiated prizes. As with those ambitious Athenian cavalrymen, here internal motivations may be linked with external incentives in order to encourage the satisfaction of

⁸ On the methodological importance of reading the Xenophonic corpus as a whole, see (e.g.) Dillery (1995) 7–8, and Tamiolaki (2012) 564. Hobden and Tuplin (2012a) 16 remark on the 'dialogic' nature of Xenophon's various presentations of leadership, a reality that again encourages reading broadly and comprehensively across the corpus.

⁹ As Aristotle suggests (*Pol.* 1281a32): *τιμὰς γὰρ λέγομεν εἶναι τὰς ἀρχάς*.

¹⁰ On these double portions see *Lac.* 15.4 and *Hdt.* 6.57; Agesilaus felt that his duty to honour others required the distribution of both portions (*Ages.* 5.1).

such individual desires for recognition through accomplishments benefiting both individual and community. Bearing this tripartite division in mind, I will first survey Xenophon's remarks on honour and human psychology, then assess the negotiation of honour within the relationships that provide the context for leadership, and finally examine Xenophon's lessons on honorific practice within these relationships.

Although scholars have commented previously on particular honour-related passages or themes, the broader landscapes of Xenophonic honour have been neither surveyed nor explored sufficiently.¹¹ My exploration of the tripartite manner in which the psychologies, positions, and practices of honour shape good leadership has been written as a prolegomenon encouraging additional scrutiny of these themes throughout Xenophonic thought and practice.

1. The Psychology of Honour

Fifty years after Neal Wood's essay on Xenophonic leadership sought 'to indicate something of the intellectual originality of the ancient Greek soldier and country squire', we are no longer surprised by the image of an imaginative and innovative Xenophon.¹² Fifteen years earlier H. R. Breitenbach had already suggested that Xenophon should

¹¹ Particularly notable is the treatment in Breitenbach (1950) 82–7 of the 'Wettkampf-Preis-Prinzip' and 'Topos ἀγῶνες-ἀθλα' (to which may be added Wilms (1995) 186–9), and the summary remarks on 'les distinctions honorifiques' by Azoulay (2004) 99–107. The remarks of Gauthier (1976) 83 on *Vect.* 3 are in many ways typical, inasmuch as they recognise the importance of honour(s) to Xenophon's thoughts yet do not explore its broader ramifications and resonances. Straussian readings, such as Higgins (1977), regularly acknowledge individuals' love of honour (*philotimia*), yet rarely set this ambitiousness in conversation with other aspects of individual and institutional honour. Although Gray (2007) comments compellingly on honour within *Hiero*, the concept is regularly mentioned but rarely discussed in her magisterial study of Xenophonic leadership (2011).

¹² Wood (1964).

be acknowledged as the ‘first military psychologist’;¹³ more recently, and with greater sensitivity to the breadth of our author’s observations, Emily Baragwanath has chronicled Xenophon’s early emphasis on the ‘leader’s expertise in human relations’.¹⁴ Xenophon’s status as an innovative observer of human relations should be connected to his complementary interest in honour as a fundamental(ly) human motivation. While leaders are especially sensitive to honour’s appeals, he suggests, every human may be motivated by honour; since humans are the building blocks of every endeavour,¹⁵ good leadership requires not merely awareness of this reality, but proper attention to its negotiation.

Xenophon regularly acknowledges leaders’ sensitivity to honour: many are explicitly noted as *philotimoi* or as motivated by *philotimia*, while others are clearly sensitive to honour’s allure.¹⁶ His two greatest heroes were innately *φιλοτιμότατος*, the elder Cyrus with regard to his soul (*Cyr.* 1.2.1: *ψυχῆν*)¹⁷ and Agesilaus naturally (*Ages.* 10.4: *πεφυκώς*); two of his greatest villains, Alcibiades and Critias, were singled out amongst their countrymen as particularly desirous for honour (*Mem.* 1.2.14: *φιλοτιμοτάτω πάντων*

¹³ Breitenbach (1950) 87: ‘So haben wir zweifellos das Recht, Xenophon den ersten Militärpsychologen zu nennen...’

¹⁴ Baragwanath (2012) 647 n. 55, with citations of earlier bibliography. For additional support of this broader ‘political’ focus, see Tamiolaki (2012) 567 n. 13, rejecting earlier arguments that emphasised the military roots of Xenophon’s theory of leadership (especially those of Wood (1964), but see also Dillery (1995) 94).

¹⁵ Gray (2011) 23–4, with reference to *Mem.* 3.4.12 and *Eq. Mag.* 6.1.

¹⁶ Azoulay (2004) 99 n. 34 is more emphatic: ‘Tous les héros de Xénophon sont épris de gloire, *philotimotatoi*.’

¹⁷ Due (1989) 182 notes that ‘Cyrus’ whole life, his career and his success bears witness to his *φιλοτιμία*. On *φιλοτιμία* within the *Cyropaedia*, see now the extended discussion by Sandridge (2012), who prefers an understanding of the concept that emphasises Cyrus’ ‘desire for [his followers’] fondness’ (32) and ‘desire to fit in, to win the approval and gratitude of one’s peers, those in authority, and those who are good people...’ (120).

Ἀθηναίων).¹⁸ Within *Hellenica* Peisander (3.4.29), Lycomedes (7.1.23) and Epaminondas (7.5.19) are noted for their love of honour,¹⁹ while Pharnabazus' refusal to ally with the advancing Agesilaus—so long as the King retains the satrap in his current station—is explicitly attributed to his *philotimia*, an explanation readily accepted by his Spartan adversary (*HG* 4.1.37–8). Although no *philotimoi* are identified within the *Anabasis*, we learn that ‘most people’ attributed the sudden departure of Xenias and Pasion, after their troops defected to Clearchus and Cyrus refused to intervene, to these officers' aggrieved sense of honour (1.4.7–9: φιλοτιμηθέντες). Little may be said about Chaerophon, whose status as a *philotimos* is merely suggested in passing by Socrates (*Mem.* 2.3.16), but the celebration of the successful pancratist Autolycus portrays an accomplished athlete willing and able to bestow honours on anyone who encourages his own pursuit of honours (*Smp.* 8.37). Athenian phylarchs are very sensitive to the force of honour, we are told, since it was their own desire for glory and honour that originally encouraged them to become cavalry officers (*Eq. Mag.* 1.23: οἳ γε φυλαρχεῖν ἐπεθύμησαν δόξης καὶ τιμῆς ὀρεγόμενοι; cf. *Hier.* 7.1); thereafter, they are keener than regular soldiers to distinguish themselves by some notable action, for example, and they handle commands more quickly (*Eq. Mag.* 2.6). If the Xenophontic leader is likely marked by a *philotimos* nature, for good or for ill, we have already encountered within Ischomachus' peroration the suggestion that the ideal leader is he—whether Cyrus the Great or an individual farmer—who is able to inspire *philotimia* within the souls of his charges.

Against this backdrop let us consider Xenophon's remarks about the nature and attractions of honour. Located at the very heart of a treatise that aims at

¹⁸ On the Athenians as inherently *philotimoi*, see *Mem.* 3.3 and 3.5, discussed at n. 56 below.

¹⁹ On Lycomedes see Pownall (2004) 72, 90–1. On the negative side of Epaminondas' *philotimia*, see Pownall (2004) 109–10 and Higgins (1977) 116–20, as well as Gray (2011) 96–7 on the greater significance of his ability to cultivate his followers' obedience.

understanding and pursuing true honour,²⁰ Simonides' celebration of *τιμή* within the *Hiero* offers the most exclusive limits on *philotimia* (7.3):

I think that the real man differs in the following way from other animals (*διαφέρειν ἀνὴρ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων*),²¹ in his yearning for honour (*τῷ τιμῆς ὀρέγεσθαι*). While all creatures seem to derive similar enjoyment from food and drink and slumber and sex, the love of honour (*ἡ δὲ φιλοτιμία*) occurs naturally neither within dumb beasts nor within every human (*ἐν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις*). But those in whom the lust for honour and praise (*τιμῆς τε καὶ ἐπαίνου ἔρως*) takes root,²² these are the ones who differ most from cattle, these are judged to be real men and not merely humans (*ἄνδρες δὲ καὶ οὐκέτι ἄνθρωποι μόνον νομιζόμενοι*).

Here the motivations of honour are said not merely to separate humans from animals, but to mark out 'real men' from mere 'humans'.²³ Despite this traditional association of honour with 'real men', evidence from elsewhere throughout the corpus indicates that all humans may fall under honour's sway. Declining the troops' invitation to serve as the sole leader of the Ten Thousand, 'Xenophon' describes his pleasure, *as an anthrōpos*, at being so honoured by his men (*An.* 6.1.26: *ἡδομαι μὲν ὑφ' ὑμῶν τιμώμενος, εἴπερ*

²⁰ As Gray (2007) *ad Hier.* 9.1–11 rightly suggests, the transformation from tyrant to good ruler occurs when Hiero recognises that if he 'wants his share of honour, he must arrange for others to secure theirs'.

²¹ Xenophon is consistent in never ascribing honour to animals: thus at *Oec.* 13.6 animals learn by being 'corrected' (*κολάζεσθαι*) and 'treated well' (*εὖ πάσχειν*), and at *Eq.* 8.13 one should 'show kindness' (*ἀντιχαρίση*) to horses when they are well-behaved and 'correct' (*κολάζης*) them when disobedient.

²² Compare Agesilaus as *ἐκ παιδὸς ἐρασθεὶς τοῦ εὐκλείης* (*Ages.* 10.4).

²³ Note the Arcadians' belief that the boastful Lycomedes alone was a real man (*HG* 7.1.24: *μόνον ἄνδρα*), as well as—albeit without similar rhetorical force—Ischomachus' use of *ἀνὴρ φιλότιμος* (*Oec.* 14.10).

ἄνθρωπός ἐίμι).²⁴ Within the *Cyropaedia*, young Cyrus repeatedly acknowledges the importance of fostering *philotimia* within all of his troops (1.6.26), even the lowliest foot soldier (*ιδιώτης*, 2.1.22).

Understanding a broader human sensitivity to honour is further encouraged by the recognition that, as *anthrōpoi*, women may also worry about their honour, not merely in the reductive sense of chastity but with regard to their own standing in the eyes of their communities. Ischomachus acknowledges his wife's fears that she might over time become less honoured by him, and thus encourages her by describing the ways through which she might become even more honoured (*Oec.* 7.42: ἀτιμότερα ... τιμωτέρα). As a leader within the *oikos*, Ischomachus' wife must be able to manage the administration of honours and corrections within the domestic sphere (*Oec.* 9.14), a responsibility that attests to not merely her own sensitivity to honour but also that of their servants and slaves, whether male or (as with their carefully-recruited *tamias*) female (*Oec.* 9.11–13). Xenophon's other significant consideration of feminine honour occurs within the *Cyropaedia*'s ill-fated romance of Panthea and Abradatas. As their story unfolds, Panthea thanks Cyrus for not keeping her as a slave under a 'dishonourable name' (ἀτίμω ὀνόματι, 6.4.7); later, after Abradatas' death, Cyrus promises that his fallen officer will never be without honour (7.3.11: ἄτιμος) and that he will also, in recognition of her many virtues, always honour his wife (7.3.12: τιμήσω). Although their activity within the broader political community was limited, Xenophon nonetheless shows women as very capable of recognising and negotiating honour.²⁵

²⁴ On the continuing negotiations of honour between Xenophon and the Ten Thousand, see at n. 48.

²⁵ Although there are other queens mentioned by Xenophon, and Ischomachus suggests that his wife's distribution of honours and corrections is a regal task (*Oec.* 9.14), perhaps the clearest example of a woman's political authority occurs with Mania, the wife of Zenis, who briefly succeeded her husband as an official under Pharnabazus (*HG* 3.1.11). As Xenophon recognises, there is much more to honour than

One additional note may be provided on the basis of Xenophon's remarks regarding the eunuchs whom Cyrus employed as his personal staff (*Cyr.* 7.5.60–5). Cyrus chose these eunuchs because he believed that they, bereft of other ties of *philia* and in need of a master, would be especially loyal; moreover, his consideration of parallels within the animal kingdom suggested that the eunuchs' castration would not impact their usefulness. Indeed, we learn that neither the eunuchs' military efficiency nor their status as *philotimoi* was impacted: both on campaign and on the hunt they revealed the rivalrous fervour they retained within their souls (7.5.64: τὸ φιλότιμον ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς).

Thus, despite Simonides' rhetorical emphasis on 'real men', the distinction emerging across the Xenophontic corpus is that human beings are distinguished from other animals by their potential sense of honour.²⁶ This sensitivity to honour extends across men and women, young and old, regardless of social and political status: Xenophon regularly comments on metics' awareness of honour (*Vect.* 2, *Eq. Mag.* 9), while Ischomachus readily identifies some of his slaves as 'lovers of honour', others as 'lovers of profit' (*Oec.* 13.9, 14.10). This two-fold categorisation reminds us that while every human may theoretically be moved by honour, in practice not everyone will be motivated by the same desires. The good leader will be aware of these possibilities as he works alongside and encourages those under his command, always striving to help his followers improve themselves and their communities, thereby securing honour for himself and for them all.²⁷

political status or office, and both the ability and the desire of women to negotiate honour must be acknowledged. On the literary and epigraphic evidence for Athenian women's engagement with *τιμῆ* and regular negotiation of honour(s), see Keim (forthcoming).

²⁶ And from the gods, who have their own allotted honour(s): see n. 36 below.

²⁷ Throughout this chapter I refer to the generic Xenophontic leader and his followers as 'he'; this usage is not meant to occlude Xenophon's remarkable, if less frequent, perspectives on female leadership.

2. The Honour of Leading

Every leader occupies a position of honour, and the quality of his leadership relies on his careful negotiation of honour. This negotiation involves both positional and practical elements, the former concerning the ongoing relationships between the gods, the leader, and the community, the latter comprising that adjudication of honour and distribution of honours by which the leader trains and encourages his followers. Here I explore four ways in which honour shapes the contexts of leadership, and discuss (a) the honours associated with leadership, the manner in which honour shapes the leader's relationships with (b) the gods and (c) those whom he is leading, and (d) the subsequent importance, within this context, of his distribution of honours.

(a) The Honour of Leadership

Leadership is an honour that, by resituating the leader within one (or more) communities, transforms his relationships with other individuals and with other honours. Cambyses prepares the young Cyrus for campaign by acknowledging that while the leader must show himself able to endure every sort of toil and discomfort, both the honour (*τιμή*) of his position and the public scrutiny of his every action lessen the weight of these burdens (*Cyr.* 1.6.25). The non-material honour of office and its attendant prestige (*τιμή*) are usually accompanied by privileges and material honours (*τιμαί*): thus the Spartan kings received double rations, as we saw above, and officers promoted under Cyrus' meritocratic scheme are promised honours (*τιμαί*) befitting their rank (*Cyr.* 2.1.23; cf. 3.3.7). As we shall see below, Polydamas' lengthy remarks on Jason of Pherae suggest that the measure of a leader may be taken by assessing whom he honours, and why and how he honours them (*HG* 6.1).²⁸

²⁸ On Polydamas' remarks see at n. 66 below; the obituaries in *Anabasis* (1.9, 2.6) are additional texts in which leaders' honorific

Although Xenophon often acknowledges leaders' *philotimia*, such eager pursuit of honour is not necessarily good: some individuals may pursue authority and honour simply to advance their own desires (*Mem.* 2.6.24).²⁹ Xenophon's obituary for the fallen general Meno of Thessaly warns that he was eager 'to lead so that he might obtain more wealth, and to be honoured (*τιμᾶσθαι*) so that he might profit (*κερδαίνοι*) even more' (*An.* 2.6.21).³⁰ While Agesilaus' character was reportedly unaffected by the honour, power, and sovereignty that he enjoyed (*Ages.* 8.1), Alcibiades, like a wayward athlete, neglected his training after he was honoured by the Athenians (*Mem.* 1.2.24; cf. 3.5.15). Not every leader responds, in the manner of Xenophon's Cyrus the Great, by redoubling their own pursuit of excellence.³¹

There is also a supernatural aspect to the honour of leadership. Within his peroration Ischomachus twice invokes the gods, first suggesting that the ideal leader must have a touch of the divine about himself (*Oec.* 21.11: *θεῖον*), then opining that the leadership of those who willingly obey has a similarly divine aspect (21.12: *οὐ ... ἀνθρώπινον εἶναι ἀλλὰ θεῖον, τὸ ἐθελόντων ἄρχειν*).³² On the grounds that goods bestowed by leaders are always valued more highly by their recipients, Simonides argues that leaders are

practices are used as a means of expressing their character. On Jason as a paradigmatic individual, see Dillery (1995) 171–6.

²⁹ On the ambiguities of *philotimia* and their management at Athens, see Whitehead (1983).

³⁰ On the rhetoric and (in)accuracy of this assessment of Meno, see Brown (1986).

³¹ Xenophon also recognises that the desire for recognition is not itself sufficient for success: thus the unprepared *philotimos* Peisander accomplishes nothing when he is put in charge of the Spartan fleet (*HG* 3.4.29), while Coeratadas of Thebes, 'afflicted with a desire to serve as general', failed to provide provisions and soon faded away (*An.* 7.1.33).

³² Dillery (1995) 242 considers Ischomachus' tripartite foundation of leadership in *Oec.* 21.11–12 to be education (*παιδεία*), a noble right nature (*φύσις ἀγαθή*), and this touch of the divine (*θεῖον*). The sole mention of this chapter by Gray (2011) 186 examines 21.10 as an example of 'the *topos* of willing obedience' within a non-military context.

accompanied by ‘a certain honour and grace from the gods’ (ἐκ θεῶν τιμὴ τις καὶ χάρις συμπαρέπεσθαι, *Hier.* 8.5).³³ The very appointment of leaders (ἐπιτακτῆρας) over other men is, according to Cyrus, a divine means of ameliorating the inability of some men to seek the(ir) good (*Cyr.* 2.3.4).

(b) Honouring the Gods

Besides possessing a certain divine tincture, good leaders maintain good relationships with the gods through their regular bestowal of the appropriate honour(s) upon them, and also ensure that these relationships are recognised by those under their command.³⁴ ‘For Xenophon’, as Robert Parker argues, ‘it makes sense to honour the gods: it is the reasonable, the natural thing to do’.³⁵ Thus his Socrates repeatedly affirms the importance of honouring the gods, and even acknowledges that ‘honouring the gods’ is the first unwritten law among all peoples (*Mem.* 4.4.19–20; cf. 1.4.10, 4.3.14–17). If everyone ought to honour the gods on the grounds that they are ‘men’s greatest friends’, leaders ought to be especially scrupulous, out of gratitude for their honoured status and their desire to lead successfully.³⁶

The primacy and character of the good leader’s relations with the supernatural are reiterated throughout *Hipparchicus*, a treatise that begins by prescribing sacrifice and ends by encouraging enthusiastic worship of the gods (9.9: θεραπεύωσιν ὅ τι ἂν δύνωνται τοὺς θεούς).³⁷ As Xenophon advises his countrymen (1.1):

³³ For a similar point on the value added to a gift by the exalted identity of the giver, see *Cyr.* 2.1.13.

³⁴ I am not concerned here with Xenophon’s personal beliefs, although I incline towards the view of Parker (2004) over Bowden (2004). Among the key Xenophonic principles enumerated by Dillery (1995) 15 is ‘divine providence’.

³⁵ Parker (2004) 133–4.

³⁶ Gray (2011) 304. On the reciprocity of honour (τιμὴ) between humans and gods, see Mikalson (1991) 183–202.

³⁷ For a recent overview of this treatise, see Stoll (2012).

First it is necessary to sacrifice to the gods (*θύοντα χρῆ ... θεούς*) and pray that you might think, speak, and do those things by which you may lead most acceptably before the gods (*θεοῖς ... κεχαρισμενώτατα*),³⁸ and also most pleasingly, gloriously, and advantageously (*προσφιλέστατα καὶ εὐκλέεστατα καὶ πολυωφέλεστατα*) for yourself, your friends, and your city.

This sacrifice marks a continuing relationship of reciprocity with the gods, a relationship that is necessary for the pursuit of those material and non-material goods that denote success. Such piety is necessary yet not sufficient for good leadership, since these gods help those who help themselves: only after the gods are propitious (*θεῶν δὲ ἴλεων ὄντων*), however, should the commander turn his mind towards his men and their horses (1.2).

Leaders' attentiveness to ritual extended well beyond sacrifices.³⁹ As he records the splendour of Agesilaus' 'workshop of war' at Ephesus, Xenophon offers the following endorsement (*HG* 3.4.18; cf. *Ages.* 1.27): 'For wherever men reverence (*σέβονται*) the gods, train themselves in the ways of war, and carefully obey their leaders, their every endeavour is full of good hope.' The catalyst for this celebratory remark was the procession of Agesilaus and his army from their training ground to the sanctuary of Artemis, where they dedicated their garlands in honour of the goddess. A similar example occurs within *Hipparchicus*' discussion of overseeing festival processions 'worthy of being beheld' (*ἀξιοθεάτους*, 3.1).⁴⁰ Staged within a religious context, these processions within the Agora should begin from the Herms and feature the cavalry 'honouring the gods' (*τιμῶντες τοὺς θεούς*) by riding in a circuit around

³⁸ Cf. on *Hier.* 8.5 at n. 33 above.

³⁹ For additional discussion of Xenophon on sacrifice, see Parker (2004).

⁴⁰ On Xenophonic processions and their relation to their Hellenistic descendants, see Dillery (2004).

their shrines and statues (3.2).⁴¹ Such piety embellishes performance and reinforces community spirit.

The practical significance of piety is elaborated on within *Anabasis*. In his initial address to the Cyrean officers, Xenophon twice acknowledges their dispiritedness (*An.* 3.1.40: ἀθύμως ... ἀθύμως), then encourages the officers to turn their soldiers' minds (γνώμας) and thereby enhance their morale (3.1.41: εὐθυμότεροι):

For you understand that neither the multitude nor strength of soldiers secure victories on the battlefield, but rather whichever of the two opposing sides, aided by the gods, march with more vigorous spirits (ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἔρρωμενέστεροι) against the enemy; for their opponents will rarely stand still and face these troops. (3.1.42)

Just as enthused spirits enabled the success of Ischomachus' rowers, so also with the Ten Thousand. Although there are various, complementary ways of enhancing morale—such as diligent provisioning, rigorous training, and collegial competition—we should not discount Xenophon's subsequent exhortation as his hoplites march out to rescue the stranded Arcadians. Perhaps some god has arranged matters this way, he muses, so that 'we, who always begin with the gods, should enjoy greater honour than those men' (ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρχομένους ἐντιμότερους ἐκείνων καταστῆσαι, *An.* 6.3.18). These remarks should not be read as cynically manipulative, but rather as an honest statement revealing our author's—and perhaps a great many of his troops'—understanding of a rightly-ordered existence (cf. *Oec.* 8.3, *Eq. Mag.* 1.24).⁴² They suggest 'spiritedness' and morale may result from the soldiers' recognition of their leaders' proper tending to the honour of the gods through

⁴¹ At Dracontius' games an altar serves as the start/finish for the horse race (*An.* 4.8.28).

⁴² On the relation between leaders' piety and followers' morale, see also Flower in this volume.

rituals, observances, and general piety. Indeed, besides merely inspiring his troops, such piety offers the leader—whether he is a Persian monarch or a democratically-elected Athenian hipparch—the opportunity to reveal his awareness of the honour due towards others, and thus the limits of his own privileges. All Xenophonic leaders are also being led, and the good leader must be capable both of leading and of being led well.⁴³

(c) Honouring Leaders and Led

Xenophon considers the relationship between the leader and those whom he leads as ‘the secret of success in any community’.⁴⁴ This relationship is often described in terms of friendship: thus the daring, spontaneous rescue of Cyrus by an aide-de-camp reveals ‘how valuable it is for the leader to be loved (*φιλεῖσθαι*) by those around him’ (*Cyr.* 7.1.38; cf. *An.* 1.9.28, 4.2.21), while *Hipparchicus* asserts that no leader can accomplish anything with his men unless they regard him affectionately and good-naturedly (6.1–2: *φιλικῶς, εὐνοικῶς*; cf. *Cyr.* 2.4.10). We must also acknowledge the frequency with which these critical relationships are denominated and negotiated in terms of honour. Reflecting on the occasion when Socrates encourages the impoverished Archedemus to undertake the anti-sycophantic efforts that would elicit both friendship and honour from Crito’s circle (*Mem.* 2.9.8: *ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων Κρίτωνος φίλων ἐτιμᾶτο*), Vivienne Gray concludes that ‘friends receive honour from each other in the usual operation of the dynamics of friendship’.⁴⁵

Friends and family comprise an immediate and important community within which honours (civic, familial, and otherwise) may be displayed and recognised, and their

⁴³ See, e.g., the remarks of Clearchus (*An.* 1.3.15) and of Chrysantas (*Cyr.* 4.1.2–4, 8.1.1–4).

⁴⁴ Gray (2011) 4.

⁴⁵ Gray (2011) 310–11. The entirety of her Chapter 6 explores the dynamics of friendship, with her characteristic emphasis on rebutting more negative, ‘manipulative’ interpretations of the text.

significance as such for individuals' honour is regularly attested. Pondering the possibility of leading the Ten Thousand, Xenophon notes that accepting this appointment would bring him 'greater honour amongst his friends' (τὴν τιμὴν μείζω οὕτως ἑαυτῷ γίγνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς φίλους, *An.* 6.1.20). Hiero's laments that he has been cut off from friends and other well-minded individuals (*Hier.* 6.3–4) are followed almost immediately by his claims that he receives no real honour, since the fear of his subjects means that their services and recognition cannot truly be accounted as honours (τιμαί, 7.5–8). The rivalry between Agesilaus and the now-eclipsed Lysander, who smarts from the dishonour (τῇ ἀτιμίᾳ) shown him, reaches its climax with the king's rebuttal that he does, in fact, know how to honour his friends, or, at least, those who intend his advancement (*HG* 3.4.9: τοὺς δέ γε αὖξοντας εἰ μὴ ἐπισταίμην ἀντιτιμᾶν, αἰσχυνοίμην ἄν). Nor are the ranks of friends and family closed: Xenophon's proposal for material and non-material commercial incentives in *Poroi* are proffered in the hopes that merchants will not merely hasten to Athens, but come 'as if to friends' (ὡς πρὸς φίλους, 3.4).

Let us now examine how honour was reciprocated and negotiated between leaders and followers by considering four lengthier passages. Clearchus' tearful address to his men at Tarsus reveals not only the 'reciprocal relationship between commander and commanded', as John Dillery has rightly argued, but also emphasises, in its framing and vocabulary, the centrality of honour to that relationship (*An.* 3.3–6).⁴⁶ After Clearchus' men pelt him with stones, on the grounds that they are being lied to and are being led out on campaign against the King of Persia, he addresses them with tears in his eyes. Clearchus explains his actions and his resolve in terms of honour, for he finds himself caught between his obligations to Cyrus and to his men. On the one hand, Cyrus befriended (ξένος) the exiled Clearchus, not only honouring him (ἐτίμησε) but also bestowing 10,000

⁴⁶ Dillery (1995) 66.

darics for his troops' support. After campaigning in Thrace and the Chersonese, Clearchus marched out in support of Cyrus in order to reciprocate these benefits. The troops' refusal to march forces him to choose between Cyrus' friendship and his position of leadership. Clearchus suggests he will abandon his Persian friend and remain with the troops: since they are unwilling (*οὐκ ἐθέλετε*) to follow or obey him, he will instead follow along with them, in the belief that with them he will be honoured (*τίμιος*) wherever they are. The success of this initial stage of Clearchus' address, utilising the shared vocabulary of honour and reciprocity to explain his actions and restore his own relationship with his agitated soldiers, cannot be separated from the negotiation of honours with which he frames and structures his remarks. His soldiers understood the claims made by such ties, and were appeased once they were persuaded that Clearchus valued his relations with them more than his ties to Cyrus.⁴⁷

Ariaeus reveals these ties of honour through their breach. After the death of Cyrus and the assassination of the leading Cyrean officers, Cleanor rebukes Ariaeus for disregarding the gods, failing to reverence Cyrus' memory, and trying to harm Cyrus' surviving friends, despite the fact that he had been greatly honoured by the living Cyrus (*An.* 3.2.5: *οὔτε Κύρον τεθνηκότα αἰδεσθεῖς, τιμώμενος μάλιστα ὑπὸ Κύρου ζῶντος*). Ariaeus' response stands in stark contrast to that of Artapates, Cyrus' most faithful chamberlain, who died over his master's body while wearing all sorts of gold ornaments, tokens with which he had earlier 'been honoured by Cyrus for his good-naturedness and faithfulness' (*ἐτετίμητο ... δι' εὐνοίαν τε καὶ πιστότητα*, 1.8.29); indeed, the obituary of Cyrus suggests that 'all his friends and companions' except Ariaeus died at his side. Unlike these other retainers, bound to Cyrus by their reciprocal ties of honour and affection,

⁴⁷ Note the later authorial remark that it was shame before their peers (*δι' αἰσχύνην*) that led the Cyreans to carry onwards towards Cunaxa (*An.* 3.1.10).

Ariaeus trampled upon those ties and was found wanting by his former colleagues.

Later in the *Anabasis* Xenophon repeatedly comments on the honour uniting leader and led. He encourages the Cyreans to remain together by emphasising the honour (ἔντιμοι) and provisions they may secure *en masse*, advantages that will be lost should they divide (5.6.32).⁴⁸ Subsequent morale-sapping rumours are attributed to rivals who are jealous of Xenophon because he is honoured by the troops (5.7.10: ὑφ' ὑμῶν τιμῶμαι). Forced to address accusations of *hybris*, Xenophon concludes his successful defence by invoking the many benefits he had provided for his men, including praising (ἐπῆνεσα) them for a deed well done, and honouring good men (τινα ἄνδρα ὄντα ἀγαθὸν ἐτίμησα) as much as he was able (5.8.25). When he eventually declines sole command of the army, Xenophon, as we have seen, admits his delight at being so honoured by the soldiers (6.1.26: τιμώμενος). Finally, throughout his negotiations with the deceitful Seuthes, Xenophon refuses to ignore or abandon his men, on the grounds that he is honoured by them (7.7.41: τιμώμενον ὑπ' ἐκείνων; cf. 7.7.50–2). If the apologetic aspect of Xenophon's self-presentation within *Anabasis* can never be fully untangled, any idealising aspects of that self-presentation simply underscore such negotiations of honour as a hallmark of good leadership.

Finally, we may observe how the elder Cyrus once persuaded his officers to remain willingly (ἑθελοντάς) at his side and campaign with him (*Cyr.* 5.1.19–29). After the jealous Cyaxares suddenly recalls his forces, Cyrus argues that these officers went on campaign neither for gain nor to assist Cyaxares, but because they wished to do Cyrus a favour (βουλόμενοι τοῦτο χαρίζεσθαι) and honour him (ἐμὲ τιμῶντες). Because Cyrus cannot currently repay their efforts, nor offer more than empty promises about future

⁴⁸ Compare *An.* 6.6.16, where Xenophon encourages the soldiers to acknowledge Spartan hegemony (and obey Cleander's orders), and to avoid jeopardising the praise and honour (ἐπαίνου καὶ τιμῆς) they anticipated on their return home.

returns, he simply says that he shall continue, with or without these officers, in such a way that they would praise him (*ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἐπαινεῖν*). After Artabazus, Tigranes, and then the Hyrcanians and the Medes express their continued willingness to remain under his command, Cyrus prays to Zeus in a very cryptic fashion, asking that the god ‘grant that I, doing well by them, may surpass the honour they have shown me’ (*δὸς τοὺς ἐμὲ τιμῶντας νικῆσαί με εὖ ποιοῦντα*). While the good leader need not honour his followers exactly as he would like them to honour him, he must nonetheless ensure that they are honoured and cared for appropriately.

(d) Managing Honours and Punishments

Socrates, consoling the would-be general Nicomachides, notes that one responsibility of every leader is ‘correcting bad men and honouring good men’ (*τὸ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζειν καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τιμᾶν*, *Mem.* 3.4.8).⁴⁹ Similar remarks occur throughout the corpus: Ischomachus charges his wife to maintain the order of their household by praising and honouring (*ἐπαινεῖν δὲ καὶ τιμᾶν*) those who are worthy and scolding those who need correction (*Oec.* 9.14–15), while Cyrus, within the *viva* concluding his childhood education, suggests that ‘in every endeavour the best prescription for obedience is: praise and honour the obedient, punish and dishonour the disobedient’ (*τὸ τὸν πειθόμενον ἐπαινεῖν τε καὶ τιμᾶν, τὸν δὲ ἀπειθοῦντα ἀτιμάζειν τε καὶ κολάζειν*, *Cyr.* 1.6.20).⁵⁰ While more might be said elsewhere about Xenophon’s rhetoric of honour and correction, in the remainder of this chapter I will focus on the positive portion

⁴⁹ On *Mem.* 3.4 and the universality of Xenophonic leadership, see Gray (2011) 22–4.

⁵⁰ A similar contrast between honouring and dishonouring—rather than the more common honour and punishment/correction—is found within the description of Persian education at *An.* 1.9.4. Elsewhere, as he overhauls the Persian army, Cyrus remarks on the utility of weeding out bad soldiers: witnessing their dishonour (indeed, expulsion from the community: *ἀτιμασθέντας*) will make those soldiers who are already noble even more spirited seekers of excellence (*Cyr.* 2.2.27).

of these remarks, as we move from the relational context of leaders-led (a positional question) to the content of how the good leader goes about honouring those under his command (an issue of practice).

3. Honouring Successfully

Although the adjudication and distribution of honours was a responsibility for every leader, within the household or within the infantry ranks, Xenophon rarely specifies the exact honours that might be awarded.⁵¹ While we occasionally learn about Ischomachus rewarding his better slaves with superior cloaks and shoes (*Oec.* 13.10) or Jason offering a golden crown for the finest bull at the Pythian festival (*HG* 6.4.29), more typical of our author is the suggestion that his proposed Guardians of the Metics would be suitably incentivised by the award of ‘some honour or another’ (τιμὴ τις, *Vect.* 2.7).⁵² Rather clearer are five lessons that Xenophon teaches about the effective bestowal of such rewards. In order to honour successfully the good leader should (a) know those whom he leads, (b) regularly use their names, (c) rely on his subordinates’ knowledge and assistance, (d) ensure that everyone is aware both of his desired standards and of the available rewards, and (e) bestow these rewards fairly.

⁵¹ This lack of detail should be unsurprising, and recalls his authorial characterisation of *Hipparchicus* not as a treatise but as a collection of tips and reminders (9.2: ὑπομνημάτων; cf. 1.9, 3.1). Throughout his writings Xenophon sketches the outlines of a theory of leadership and occasionally fills in some of the broader details, but almost always the specifics, should his lessons be employed, are left up to the abilities and circumstances of the individual leader.

⁵² Similarly, while there were certain golden gifts that only the King could bestow (*Cyr.* 8.2.8), Cyrus regularly encourages the pursuit of excellence by awarding ‘all sorts of honours’, including ‘gifts and offices and seats of honour’ (καὶ δάροις καὶ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἔδραις καὶ πάσαις τιμαῖς ἐγέραιρον, *Cyr.* 8.1.39; cf. *Oec.* 4.8).

(a) Know Your Followers

Leaders should know the individuals under their command personally, and should also familiarise themselves with the history and shared values of their community.⁵³ The importance of knowing individuals, and thus their particular motivations, is emphasised in Ischomachus' account of how he trains his own slaves to lead others. Those who are drunkards, lazy, or 'love-sick' are incapable of leading, while individuals who desire either profit or recognition may be taught (*Oec.* 12.11–14; cf. *Cyr.* 8.1.43). Prompted by Socrates, Ischomachus explains that lovers-of-profit may be made useful foremen simply by showing them the material gain they will enjoy by carrying out their responsibilities diligently; those desiring recognition may be trained by offering correction for their errors, and by honouring and praising them when they are attentive (12.15–16: *καὶ ἐπαινῶ καὶ τιμᾶν πειρῶμαι αὐτούς*). While some slaves are best incentivised with material rewards of food, those who are lovers-of-honour (*αἱ δὲ φιλότιμοι τῶν φύσεων*) are better motivated by praise (13.9), and so in addition to bestowing material rewards Ischomachus honours them 'as if they were *kaloikagathoi*' (14.9).⁵⁴ Although such familiarity may be achieved only within smaller communities such as the *oikos* or the infantry company, every leader may enhance their position by striving to recognise, and respond to, their charges' particular personalities and motivations.⁵⁵

Although there is a strong cross-cultural element to Xenophon's instruction, with the practices of the Spartans and Persians held in particularly high esteem, the leader

⁵³ Compare Xenophon's praise for Hermocrates of Syracuse, who daily gathered together and consulted with the best men under his command (*HG* 1.1.30).

⁵⁴ Ischomachus' description of the distinguishing characteristics of the *philotimos* slave echoes Socrates' description of the *philotimos* pancratist Autolycus (*Smp.* 8.37), and stands in stark contrast to the common contemporary view of slaves as 'mere bellies'.

⁵⁵ On the necessity of subordinates, see below. On the dynamics of the *lochos* and *syskenia* within the Cyrean army, see Lee (2007) 80–108.

may also benefit from consideration of his own community's history and values. The significance of recognising a common cultural *milieu* appears on several poignant occasions within *Memorabilia* and *Hipparchicus*, as Xenophon encourages would-be Athenian leaders to remember, resuscitate, and rely on their countrymen's innate love of honour. After encouraging one recently-elected hipparch to excite his men's spirits so that they will be more courageous (*θήγειν δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ... ἀλκιμωτέρους*), Socrates explains the splendour of the Athenian choruses sent to Delos, a splendour that he attributes not to his countrymen's mellifluous singing nor to their imposing stature but to their love of honour (*φιλοτιμία*). Led by this hipparch, the Athenian cavalry could be just as successful as these choruses if, by drawing their attention to the praise and honour (*ἑπαίνου καὶ τιμῆς*) on offer, their new leader roused the cavalrymen's competitive desires (*Mem.* 3.3.7–15).⁵⁶ Later, encouraging the younger Pericles to try and restore Athenian greatness, Socrates flatly states that the Athenians are 'more ambitious and more high-minded than everyone else' (*φιλοτιμώτατοί γε καὶ μεγαλο-φρονέστατοι πάντων*, following Cobet's emendation), and recounts the glories achieved by their ancestors. This ancestral excellence, he says, may be restored by recovering the ancestral ways and thereby restoring order and glory (*Mem.* 3.5.3). Within *Hipparchicus* Xenophon regularly invokes Athenian love of honour, whether with regard to cavalry officers (1.22–6), hoplites (so long as they are well-trained, 7.3–4), and cavalrymen, whether citizens (9.3) or metics (9.6). Recognising the nature, traditions, and values of those whom one is leading—on the individual and on the communal levels—may help enable individual and corporate success.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Compare, in a manner echoed by Demosthenes (4.36–40), *Mem.* 3.5.18–19 on the disorder of the infantry and cavalry, contrasted with the orderliness of athletic, choral, trierarchic, and Areopagite matters.

⁵⁷ Spartan or Persian (or other) leaders could benefit from similar knowledge of their own community's mores, while the many 'Persian *paideia*' passages suggest that (Xenophon's presentation of) Persian

(b) Use their Names

Xenophon encourages leaders to learn and employ the names of those under their command. Such acknowledgement can be an easy and effective means of bestowing recognition: the younger Cyrus regularly summoned his companions for conversations so that he might publically acknowledge those whom he honoured (*An.* 1.9.28: *τοὺς φίλους ... ὡς δηλοῖη οὖς τιμᾶ*). Calling out individuals' names also serves as a means of encouragement, as when soldiers simultaneously remind their comrades of their physical presence and mutual watchfulness. Later in *Anabasis*, as his troops attempt to cross a treacherous ravine amidst Bithynian attacks, Xenophon encourages them to 'Follow Heracles the Leader and encourage one another by name' (*ὀνομαστί*, 6.5.24).⁵⁸ Here, as with Cyrus' Persians marching into battle against the Assyrians, the soldiers' invocation of each other's names enhances their courage and steadfastness, just as their joint invocation of the god or recitation of the *paean* reminds them of their shared ties with the gods (*Cyr.* 3.3.59).

The elder Cyrus makes ideal use of this lesson. Within his *paideia* we see the future king engaging with his friends as they go out hunting together, kidding one companion and praising another, urging each of them on by their own names (*Cyr.* 1.4.15: *παρακαλοῦντι ὀνομαστί ἕκαστον*). Later, as the allies march out in support of Gadatas, Xenophon elaborates on the theory and practice of Cyrus' use of names (5.3.46–51).⁵⁹ As the allied officers return from their meeting they marvel at Cyrus' familiarity as he announced their positions for the march, specifically his ability to call each of them by name (*ὀνομάζων*). Xenophon suggests that Cyrus paid particular attention (*ἐπιμελεία*) to this matter,

mores could be of use to all leaders. Aristotle's lengthiest definition of *τιμῆ* (*Rhet.* 1361a28–b2) explicitly acknowledges such *variatio*, albeit with a more euergetic focus.

⁵⁸ Lee (2007) 92 considers the ties of bravery within the *lochos*.

⁵⁹ Another understudied passage: see along rather different lines Due (1989) 233; Tatum (1989) 176–7; Gray (2011) 280, 282.

on the grounds that it would be foolish not to know the names of those whom he was commanding (τῶν ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ ἡγεμόνων τὰ ὀνόματα), since these same men were the instruments (ὀργάνους) by which he might capture or defend a position. Three particular functions are mentioned: first, and most significantly, whenever Cyrus wished to honour (τιμῆσαι) someone, he thought it proper to address the individual by name (ὀνομασί). Second, his regular use of his officers' names made his subordinates more sensitive to his presence, and thus even more eager to be seen doing something good. Third, Cyrus used specific names (ὀνόμαζεν) whenever he issued commands, as those individuals' fear and shame of failure meant that such targeted orders were more effective.⁶⁰

Once the troops began their nocturnal advance against the Assyrians, Cyrus mounted his horse and rode along reviewing the ranks. When he saw troops marching in good order, he would ask who they were and then praise (ἐπῆνε) them; when he encountered others making a commotion, he would try to correct it quietly (5.3.55). His focus on these latter occasions is not on those individuals who are failing, but rather on discerning the causes of their failure and correcting them. From this particular celebration of Cyrus we learn that the good leader will strive to know the names and temperaments of those under his command, will personalise his praise of the worthy, and may choose to anonymise correction.⁶¹

(c) Use Subordinates

Since no one, not even the idealised Cyrus,⁶² is capable of knowing every man within an entire army or of observing

⁶⁰ Amidst Cyrus' praise for Chrysantas (*Cyr.* 4.1.3) is the detail that when the King called out *by name* for Chrysantas to stop fighting, he did so immediately.

⁶¹ Elsewhere public correction may be viewed positively: see n. 50.

⁶² As the previous passage subtly indicates, there were limitations on Cyrus' familiarity with troops other than the officers immediately under his command. While he could easily rattle off his officers' names and the desired dispositions of their troops within the staff meeting, he had to

them constantly and carefully, Xenophontic leaders must rely on their subordinates to help them identify and encourage those worthy of honour. Ischomachus' estate-management becomes much easier once he has trained his wife (*Oec.* 9.14) and foremen (13.2), and allows them to shoulder the responsibilities of motivating the household.⁶³ Within military contexts subordinate officers should encourage and manage competitiveness amongst their own charges (e.g. Athenian phylarchs, *Eq. Mag.* 1.21; Abradatas' charioteers, *Cyr.* 7.1.18) in order to enhance troops' performance and assess other potential officers (*Eq. Mag.* 2.2–6, *An.* 5.2.11). Although born out of human limitations, such delegations of honorific practice are themselves part of the honour, both crown of recognition and spur of encouragement, associated with leadership positions.

After Cyrus returned to Media (*Cyr.* 3.3.6–7), he distributed funds to each of his taxiarchs so that they might themselves honour (τιμᾶν) those of their men who pleased them, and thereby ensure that the entire army, comprised of units worthy of praise (μέρος ἀξιέπαινον), would fare well. Addressing as friends (φίλοι) those officers and notables whom he himself wishes to honour (ἐτίμα), Cyrus acknowledges their present good fortune, which allows them both to honour (τιμᾶν) those whom they wish and to be honoured (τιμᾶσθαι) as each is worthy (ἕκαστος ἄξιός ἤ). Later (8.4.29–30), Cyrus divides the spoils of Sardis among his soldiers, giving the choicest bits to his myriadarchs and aides-de-camp, then dividing the remainder and instructing those myriadarchs to distribute it to their men just as he had, according to merit. Thus they scrutinised (δοκιμάζων) their subordinates and conveyed similar instructions, until finally the 'six-man-men' had examined and rewarded their handful of private soldiers as they deserved (πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν

rely on these subordinates in order to learn the names of those whom he wished to praise for their good marching.

⁶³ There are limitations to such delegation: while Xenophon encourages the surviving Cyreans to join with their officers and help 'correct' any of their colleagues who err, he does not mention any positive bestowal of honour(s) by the soldiers (*An.* 3.2.31).

ἐκάστω; cf. 7.3.1–2). Within these distributions of campaign spoils, as within his orders to the newly-minted satraps that they adopt his methods of honouring and incentivising their subordinates (8.6.10–14), Cyrus remains the central fount of honour, but as he distributes honour he relies heavily on subordinate officers as assessors and distributors of that honour to those whom they know are worthy.⁶⁴

(d) Publicise the Honours Offered and Awarded

Leaders must ensure that other individuals know about the honours on offer, so that they may be properly encouraged to act accordingly. Three examples of such publicity will suffice. First, immediately after Cyrus' meritocratic reform of the Persian honour system, we encounter a series of stories portraying the King as both judge and able administrator of honours. Pleased by both the 'clods vs. cudgels' war games and the 'careful practice' routines employed by certain junior officers, Cyrus expressed his approval by publicly honouring these officers and their men with invitations to dinner (*Cyr.* 2.3.17–21).⁶⁵ This gesture of approval led immediately, if indirectly, to the adoption of these practices by other companies. Cyrus' careful management of honours yields his troops' mimesis of desirable activities.

Second, Polydamas of Pharsalus' address at Sparta introducing Jason of Pherae contains an elaborate description of that leader's engagement with those under his command (*HG* 6.1.6). Jason tests his troops on a daily basis, discharging those who are unfit and honouring (τιμᾶ) those who serve well with double or triple pay. He provides for

⁶⁴ Simonides (*Hier.* 9.3) would be displeased by this arrangement, since he encouraged Hiero to monopolise the distribution of honours and other goods, and to deputise the administration of punishments and corrections.

⁶⁵ Compare Cyrus' explicit instructions to his satraps regarding mimesis (*Cyr.* 8.6.12). As Tatum (1989) 208 argues: 'The text of the *Cyropaedia* dissolves in mimetic replication of Cyrus, with his lieutenants and satraps doing what Xenophon's readers may now do in turn: imitate Cyrus.'

their care when they are ill, and for their funerals when they die. As a result of such actions, Polydamas emphasises, all of Jason's mercenaries know (*ὥστε πάντες ἴσασιν*) that their continued displays of martial skill will bring them a very honoured (*ἐντιμότατον*) and plentiful existence.⁶⁶ Finally, Simonides, encouraging Hiero to reinvent himself as the fount of Syracusan honour and to distribute all manner of awards for all sorts of activities on behalf of the civic good, insists that if these incentive structures are made clear (*εἰ δὲ φανερόν γένοιτο, ἐμφανές*), and thus it is revealed that the man introducing any good thing will not be without honour (*οὐκ ἀτίμητος*), then many individuals will be encouraged (*ἐξορμήσειεν*) to act on behalf of the community (*Hier.* 3.9–10). It is not enough simply to offer incentives for good performance; the standards, and thereafter the fair distribution of the rewards earned, must be announced to, and accepted by, those whom the leader wishes to incentivise.

(e) Award Honours Fairly

Xenophon regularly emphasises the importance of fairly distributing honours.⁶⁷ While this usually refers to the meritocratic distribution of goods, democratising extensions of this principle may be seen in Ischomachus' recognition of certain honour-loving slaves, or in the elder Cyrus' allowing his quartermasters an equal share in everything (*ἰσομοίρους πάντων*), since he thought it was fair to show equal regard (*τιμᾶν*) for the purveyors of the army's stores as for heralds or envoys (*Cyr.* 2.1.31).⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Dillery (1995) 172 emphasises that Jason's excellence is presented 'very much in Socratic terms'. For the elder Cyrus' refusal to leave the side of casualties after the Cadusian prince's ill-advised sortie, see *Cyr.* 5.4.18; on rewards for martial skill compare the presentation of the younger Cyrus at *An.* 1.9.14–15.

⁶⁷ A related Xenophontic theme is that the would-be honorand must have benefitted the source of honour, be it the community (*Mem.* 2.1.28, 3.6.3; *HG* 6.1.13) or family members (*Mem.* 1.2.55).

⁶⁸ A similarly democratising tone is struck by Cyrus when he urges Gobyas to stop undervaluing (*ἀτίμαζε*) his camp followers and

Incentive structures work only when ends and means are properly aligned: the failure to wield either carrots or sticks appropriately simultaneously undermines the structure and obstructs the pursuit of desired ends. The elder Cyrus' reform of the Persian honours system is the ideal embodiment of the meritocratic principle, with its formulaic proclamation that each would be honoured as Cyrus—and his delegates—deemed him worthy (*Cyr.* 2.3.16: ἔδοξε κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τιμᾶσθαι ἕκαστον, Κῦρον δὲ τὸν κρίνοντα εἶναι; cf. 3.3.6–7, 7.2.11). If means and ends fall out of alignment, discouragement and diffidence will result. While Ischomachus uses superior garments to reward and encourage good workers, he acknowledges the dispiritedness (ἀθυμία) that results when the same rewards are given both to those workers enduring toils and dangers and to those who avoid them (*Oec.* 13.11). Chrysantas, speaking in support of the Persian reform, self-deprecatingly acknowledges his own shortcomings as he worries that undesirable outcomes may ensue if the noble and able members of the community become dispirited (ἀθύμως ἔξουσι) by others sharing unjustly in the rewards (*Cyr.* 2.3.6). Because individuals are sensitive to honour in both its material and non-material forms, such fairness is necessary not merely for success, but for maintenance of the community.

The distribution of rewards must not only be done fairly, but also be known to be done so. Within his eulogy for the younger Cyrus, Xenophon points out that he was widely acknowledged for honouring the 'noble in battle' especially (ἀγαθοὺς εἰς πόλεμον ὁμολόγητο διαφερόντως τιμᾶν). Not only were the noble thus the most fortunate, but they were seen to be so, while the cowardly appeared worthy to be their slaves (*An.* 1.9.14–15). Here we learn both about what values and actions Cyrus honoured, and that he was known to honour such behaviour as it deserved. This attentiveness to honour may not provide the entire explanation for

recognise the tactical contributions made by their sheer numbers (*Cyr.* 5.2.36).

Cyrus' good leadership, yet such sensitivity explains its character.

4. What To Do With Honours

Once the leader has established a suitable rapport with those he is leading, he may cultivate his followers' desire for recognition (and reward) in order to accomplish desired ends. Xenophon suggests three broad categories of accomplishments: (a) completing specific tasks, (b) acquiring necessary skills and, most importantly, (c) honing appropriate dispositions.

(a) Accomplish Specific Tasks

Leaders may offer awards in order to achieve or expedite specific tasks. As the Ten Thousand completed a complicated series of fording manoeuvres in Carduchia, Xenophon encouraged his soldiers by reminding them that 'he who reached to the other side first would be the best man' (*ἀριστος ... πρῶτος*, *An.* 4.3.29; cf. *Cyr.* 3.3.62). Material rewards may also be offered, as when the Spartan commander Dercylidas ordered his troops to build a defensive wall across the Chersonese. After dividing the 37-stade course into sections and assigning each section to a group of soldiers, Dercylidas 'promised them he would give prizes (*ἄθλα*) to the first men to complete their sections (*τοῖς πρώτοις ἐκτειχίσασιν*) and also to the others, to each according to his merits (*ὡς ἕκαστοι ἄξιοι εἶεν*)'. Although they only began in the spring, much to Xenophon's amazement these suitably incentivised troops completed the wall before late summer (*HG* 3.2.10).

Other commercial and military endeavours might be similarly encouraged by more widely broadcasting the available honours. Xenophon envisioned the promise of honours as well as profits attracting merchants to a revitalised Athens, and suggested that wealthy foreigners would readily invest in Athens, should their names be inscribed on a public memorial (*Vect.* 3.3, 11; cf. *Hier.* 9.9).

Cyrus offered similar awards for those merchants accompanying his army with the largest stock of goods (*Cyr.* 6.2.38: δώρων καὶ τιμῆς τεύξεται). When the outbreak of the Corinthian War led the Spartans to recall Agesilaus from his Asian campaign, he resolved to return home with the most useful army (*HG* 4.2.2–8).⁶⁹ Thus Agesilaus,

wanting to take back with him as many of the best soldiers as he could, set out prizes for whichever city would send the best army, and for whichever mercenary commander would supply the best-prepared company of hoplites, archers and peltasts. He also told the cavalry commanders that he would give a prize (νικητήριον) to whomever should provide the best-horsed and best-prepared company.

What is unusual about this passage is not Agesilaus' methods but rather Xenophon's detailed description of these prizes, consisting 'for the most part of exquisitely crafted hoplite and cavalry arms, as well as golden crowns. The cost of all the prizes was not less than four talents'. Elsewhere—from Hermogenes' acknowledgement that 'praising the gods costs nothing' (*Smp.* 4.49) and Simonides' remarks on the cheapness of prizes (*Hier.* 9.11) to the impoverished Athenians employing various honours as a thrifty way of jumpstarting their economy (*Vect.* 2–3)—Xenophon stresses the affordability of prizes. The apparent discrepancy may be resolved by his suggestion that in this fashion 'arms worth a vast sum of money were provided for the army'; if not cheap, these prizes still provided a sound return on Agesilaus' investment. Rather than simply encouraging excellence amongst a *standing* army, these prizes recruited and mobilised a *new* army in a manner

⁶⁹ By obeying these orders Agesilaus, as we would expect the ideal leader to do, set aside his personal aspirations and thoughts of honour (*HG* 4.2.3: καὶ οἶον τιμῶν καὶ οἶον ἐλπίδων ἀπεστερεῖτο).

reminiscent of the crowns awarded to Athenian trierarchs for the speedy and thorough preparing of their triremes.⁷⁰

(b) Develop Skills

Another, broader use of honours was modelled by Agesilaus earlier in his Asiatic campaign within the ‘workshop of war’ he inspired at Ephesus (*HG* 3.4.16; cf. *Ages.* 1.25; also cf. *Cyr.* 2.1.22):

At the very beginning of the spring he gathered his entire army together at Ephesus. Wanting to train (*ἀσκησαι*) the army, he set out prizes (*ἄθλα*) for the fittest company of hoplites and best company of cavalry. He also set out prizes (*ἄθλα*) for those peltasts and archers who were best at their respective tasks. As a result, one could see the gymnasia full of men exercising, the track full of men galloping on horseback, and the javelin-men and archers practising carefully.

Although Xenophon does not detail the specific prizes offered, Agesilaus’ expectations were readily apparent and soon accomplished. The good leader should deploy prizes, as appropriate, to encourage not merely particular achievements but also the development of skills that will, in turn, enable those particular achievements.⁷¹ Agesilaus’ careful motivation of his troops at Ephesus worked: when this army subsequently marched against the Persians, they were a most formidable opponent (3.4.24).

Similarly instructional is Iphicrates’ command of the Athenian fleet (*HG* 6.2.27–30). As the triremes embarked on their campaign around the Peloponnese, Iphicrates offloaded their main sails so that his men would be forced to

⁷⁰ Compare Cyrus’ announcement to his new satraps that he will ‘honour (*τιμήσω*) as a valuable ally and fellow-guardian of Persia’ whoever has the highest *per capita* number of chariots and of very fine cavalry (*ἀρίστους ἵππείας*, *Cyr.* 8.6.10–11).

⁷¹ On this passage see Gray (2011) 99, and on the ‘*Τοπος ἀγῶνες-ἄθλα*’, see n. 11.

row more and improve their fitness. He also staged regular morning or evening races among his fleet, with the winners (the first to reach shore) enjoying easier provisioning and an earlier meal, while the losers were penalised both by their defeat and by their subsequent scarcity of provisions and time to recuperate. As they rowed onwards Iphicrates also had them training *en route* by altering formations. Xenophon explicitly praises Iphicrates for this swift, and yet educational, transit that did not require significant outlay yet harnessed the sailors' own competitiveness to help them train for their present and future toils (6.2.32).⁷²

The broadest endorsement of offering incentives for training comes from Simonides, who suggests that the appropriate offer and distribution of prizes may enhance every human endeavour (*Hier.* 9.5–6). Noting that all communities (*πόλεις*) are divided into sub-communities that may be posed as rivals, one against the other, Simonides suggests that

If someone should offer prizes (*ἄθλα*) to these groups for displays of well-maintained equipment, good discipline, horsemanship, courage in battle and fair business dealings, then all of these things would, on account of rivalry, be keenly pursued (*εἰκὸς καὶ ταῦτα πάντα διὰ φιλονικίαν ἐντόνως ἀσκειῖσθαι*).

Even agriculture, the endeavour least marked by rivalry, would be enhanced if prizes (*ἄθλα*) were offered to those farms and villages that produced the finest harvests (9.7). Simonides' emphasis on the universality of this process, rather than its applicability to any particular skill or endeavour, brings the underlying aspects of its character, the stoking of (good) competitiveness and rivalry, to the fore. Whether tending vines, plundering enemies, or rowing

⁷² While the setting of this Iphicrates narrative recalls Ischomachus' ideal coxswain (*Oec.* 21.3, discussed above), it stands in immediate juxtaposition (and contrast) with Xenophon's negative portrait of Mnesippus of Sparta (*HG* 6.2.17–26). On this leaderly diptych see Dillery (1995) 164–71.

across the wine-dark sea, leaders may lay the foundations for success by carefully suggesting incentives, thereby stoking first their followers' individual desires for honour(s) and thus a competitiveness with one another that will be fairly rewarded for achievements benefitting the community.

(c) Foster Rivalry, Carefully

Thus, as Ischomachus originally suggested, the most fundamental reason for a leader to distribute honour(s) is to encourage the rivalrous ambitions of those whom he is leading. Within *Hipparchicus* Xenophon suggests that prizes (ἄθλα) be awarded, by illustrious judges, for all of the manoeuvres that would be performed publicly; these prizes would stoke the competitiveness (φιλονικία) of every Athenian cavalryman and ensure their excellence (1.26).⁷³ Agesilaus, amongst his many preparations before Coronea, inspired his troops' competitiveness (φιλονικία) so that each wished to appear the best (*Ages.* 2.8: ἄριστοι φαίνονται). And Lycurgus, as he completely reformed Spartan society, noted that where φιλονικία is strongest, 'there the choruses are most worth hearing and the athletic contests afford the finest spectacle'. If he could manoeuvre the ephebes into rivalrous competition for excellence (εἰς ἔριν περὶ ἀρετῆς), they would reach the heights of manliness (ἀνδραγαθία). This is the 'most divinely-pleasing and most citizenly strife' (ἡ θεοφιλεστάτη τε καὶ πολιτικωτάτη ἔρις), which keeps every member at his best and all ready to support the polis (*LP* 4.2–6).⁷⁴

⁷³ The exalted identity of the judges adds to the honour of victory. Compare the meritocratic reforms of *Cyr.* 2.3, with Cyrus established as the judge; Xenophon's suggestion to the Ten Thousand that their current campaign was a contest, with the gods as *agōnothetai* (*An.* 3.1.21); and Plutarch's account of Sophocles' first dramatic victory, when Cimon and the nine other generals were pressed into service as tragic judges (*Cim.* 8).

⁷⁴ Compare Socrates' similar remarks on Athenian choruses and innate *philotimia* at n. 56 *supra*.

An excellent example of such rivalry in practice occurs amongst the Ten Thousand shortly before they glimpse the Black Sea (*An.* 4.7.2–12).⁷⁵ Xenophon and several *lochāgoi* were contemplating the road ahead, their path obstructed by the boulders tumbling down from the Taochian stronghold. Callimachus, the head *lochāgos* that day, decided to draw the Taochians' fire by darting out from the tree line before quickly retreating to safety. Suddenly rivalrous emotions take hold of Agasias, another *lochāgos*, who fears that Callimachus will be the first to run across the stronghold. Thus, Agasias 'dashed forward himself and proceeded to go past everybody', at least until Callimachus seized the rim of his shield and allowed Aristonymus of Methydrum to move ahead, followed by Eurylochus of Lusi. Xenophon explains by noting that 'these four men were contending rivalrously for valour (*ἀντεποιοῦντο ἀρετῆς*) and continually striving with one another (*διηγωνίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους*); and by contending (*ἐρίζοντες*) in this manner they captured the stronghold, for once they had rushed in not a stone came down more from above'. As their leaders ponder what course of action would be best, these soldiers—individually motivated by their desire to surpass the excellence of their colleagues, yes, but also acting within a context in which they know their actions will be evaluated and rewarded accordingly by their superiors—expose themselves to dangers and, by storming the stronghold, secure the provisions and security that ranked foremost amongst their traveling community's goods.

Yet the fostering of such ambitions had a downside, and not simply because sudden, rivalry-fuelled sorties might be unsuccessful and potentially disastrous.⁷⁶ On three occasions Xenophon records commanders' desires to achieve 'some

⁷⁵ Most of these men were recorded, shortly before, as participating in a similarly rivalrous volunteer mission (*An.* 4.1.26–7). Lee (2007) 93–4 emphasises the importance leaders' examples had on their men (and thus the broader army). See also Dillery (1995) 75.

⁷⁶ Compare Dercylidas' fears, after Athenadas of Sicyon's ill-fated raid outside Cebren in the Troad, that his troops' efforts would be 'less spirited' (*ἀθυμοτέραν*, *HG* 3.1.18).

brilliant deed' (*λαμπρόν τι*), and on each occasion the subsequent sorties—Herippidas' antagonism of the Paphlagonian allies (*HG* 4.1.21–8), Phoebidas' seizure of the Theban Cadmea (*HG* 5.2.28), and the Cadusian prince's attack on the Assyrians (*Cyr.* 5.4.15–22)—end badly. The Herippidas affair in particular reveals the complexity of honour-related challenges that leaders might be forced to negotiate. Eager to distinguish himself, Herippidas marshalled the several thousand troops allotted by Agesilaus and successfully attacked Pharnabazus' camp; when he arrogantly seized the allies' share of the booty, however, the Paphlagonians defected to Ariaeus. The subordinate's arrogant ambition and the allies' resultant dishonour (*ἀτιμασθέντες*) precipitated, Xenophon reports, the worst moment of Agesilaus' impressive campaign.

Just as the *philotimia* of individual leaders could destroy companies or tear communities apart, the competitiveness of enlisted soldiers could be similarly ruinous. In the build-up to the battle against the Assyrians, Xenophon has Cyrus issue an executive summary of his troops' condition and urge them into battle (*Cyr.* 3.3.9–10; cf. 1.6.26).⁷⁷ They are physically fit, they have contempt for the enemy, they are skilled in the tactics for their armour, and they are trained to obey their leaders (*πείθεσθαι ... τοῖς ἄρχουσιν*). Another reason for attacking, however, is that they are so rivalrous (*φιλοτίμως*) that they were beginning to be jealous (*ἐπιφθόνως*) of one another. Engagement with common dangers would extinguish any jealousy towards those wearing decorations on their armour or striving for glory (*τοῖς δόξης ἐφιμένοις*); soldiers would then praise (*ἐπαινοῦσι*) and adore their fellow soldiers even more, because they see one another as fellow workers (*συνεργοί*) for the common good (*ἀγαθόν*). Thereafter Cyrus' army marches into battle against the Assyrians rapidly and in good order, following on courageously (*ἐρρωμένως*) in no small part because of their rivalries with one another (*διὰ τὸ φιλονίκως ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους*); once they are underway,

⁷⁷ Gray (2011) 320 compares *Cyr.* 3.3.10 and *LP* 4.

their love of honour once again becomes positive (3.3.57, 59). This passage reveals the potentially *deleterious* aspects of ginning up rivalries amongst the troops, which leaders are called on to do and which even the lowest-level soldier is called on to embrace (*Cyr.* 2.1.22). The good leader must use his relation to, and knowledge of, his men to motivate them, so that by ensuring both the proper spirit and the proper skills they may, individually and collectively, achieve their common ends.

Conclusion

Xenophon viewed honour as a fundamental aspect of human psychology and therefore of every human relationship. The successes enjoyed by good leaders—whether or not they were themselves particular lovers of honour, whether they were leading an army or a handful of fieldworkers—were built on the foundations of relationships denominated in honour and were reinforced by incentives for honourable actions and comportment. I conclude by considering the symposium convened by Cyrus after the fall of Babylon (*Cyr.* 8.4), an occasion that offers Xenophon’s idealised leader the opportunity to stage, and to explain, a dynamic display of honour that may serve as a microcosm of the broader picture explored above.⁷⁸

On this occasion Cyrus invited a handful of his leading associates, all of them friends (*φίλοι*) distinguished by their desire for their leader’s advancement (*αὔξειν*) and for their continued honouring of him in a good-natured manner (*τιμῶντες εὐνοϊκώτατα*, 8.4.1).⁷⁹ This symposium thus marks and encourages the reciprocation of honour within this small community: as these Persians and allies have

⁷⁸ Gera (1993) 132–91 considers ‘The Symposia of the *Cyropaedia*’, with 132–5 and 183–90 focusing on this passage; although sensitive to the ‘theme of rivalry or competition’ (133), she says little about the dynamics of honour discussed here.

⁷⁹ Compare Agesilaus’ presentation of his friends’ actions, for which he reciprocates honour (*HG* 3.4.9).

honoured Cyrus, so they are repeatedly honoured here by Cyrus' invitation and subsequent rewards.

The King and his companions are not entirely alone on this occasion: as the very first word of the chapter (*θύσας*) suggests, Cyrus has begun once again by remembering the gods and offering them the appropriate honours. As the guests arrive they are not allowed to sit wherever they wish, but are carefully seated in accordance with their relative standing.⁸⁰ The significance of this visual display is twice stressed as Cyrus' theory and practice is related: by clearly revealing how much he honoured each guest (*σαφηνίζεσθαι δὲ ὡς ἕκαστον ἐτίμα*) Cyrus reiterated his own status as the adjudicator of honours, reminded these honorands that he was attentive both to their motivations and their actions, and thereby both warded off the diffidence that undermines good competitive rivalries (*οὐ φιλονίκως πρὸς ἀλλήλους*) and stoked their individual desires to continue striving for superiority (*προθυμώτατα φανεροί εἰσιν ἀγωνιζόμενοι πάντες*, 8.4.4). Whether they were mingling before dinner, being seated, or being recognised thereafter, at every moment Cyrus was able to make a display of those whom he felt were most deserving (8.4.5: *οὕτως ἐσαφήνιζε μὲν τοὺς κρατιστεύοντας παρ' ἑαυτῷ*).⁸¹ In order to keep the flames of his guests' ambitions burning keenly, there was no fixed seating: those who accomplished noble deeds between symposia might be moved to a more honourable seat (*εἰς τὴν τιμιωτέραν ἔδραν*), while those who were lazy or dissolute would find themselves dishonourably demoted (*εἰς τὴν ἀτιμοτέραν*).⁸²

⁸⁰ Although honour was the main factor in determining the seating arrangements, Cyrus' protection from treacherous attacks was also considered (*Cyr.* 8.4.3). Gera (1993) 133 cites Xerxes' similarly hierarchical seating arrangements for his commanders before Salamis (Hdt. 8.67), while Xenophon's presence alongside Seuthes forms part of another significant negotiation of honour (*An.* 7.3.19, 29).

⁸¹ Compare Cyrus the Younger (*An.* 1.9.29).

⁸² Gray (2011) 258 n. 17 cites *Cyr.* 8.4.5 (*pace* Nadon (2001) 184) as proving that Cyrus 'honoured only good deeds'.

Cyrus' position as the fount of honour is undisputed, and is defensible not merely on grounds of justice,⁸³ but also beneficence. Besides assessing his guests and assigning their seats, Cyrus bestows additional gifts on each in accordance with that seat, these additional honours further confirming the honour already afforded by their placement. Moreover, any guests who are dismayed by their appointed position may appeal to the King for an explanation.⁸⁴ Midway through the symposium Cyrus, prompted by Hystaspas' dissatisfaction at the preference shown for Chrysantas (*εἰς τιμωτέραν ἐμοῦ χώραν*), is allowed to explain—in his characteristically winsome, persuasive, and inspirational way—how this dynamic system of honours works (8.4.10–11).⁸⁵ Chrysantas was preferred because his service was *even better* than the good service provided by Hystaspas; Cyrus' careful recounting of Chrysantas' several merits not only provides support for his earlier decision, but also endorses the sorts of behaviours Cyrus wished to honour and encourages those, such as Hystaspas, who would like to receive greater honour. As this system of honour is challenged and defended, Cyrus reveals the continued dynamics of honour within this specific honour-group, with the intention of spurring each of these leaders on in their pursuit of excellence. Within his dinner-parties, as within his more vigorous contests, Cyrus, as we would expect of the ideal Xenophontic leader, does not merely elicit good *eris*, but also smoothly, rationally, persuasively, and productively channels such competitiveness and desire for honour towards the good of his community.

Pomona College

benjamin.keim@pomona.edu

⁸³ Besides the legal grounds of the meritocratic reform (2.3.16), there is his explanation of why Hystaspas is not being treated unjustly (8.4.11: *οὐκ ἀδικοῦμαι*).

⁸⁴ Compare Cyrus' availability as adjudicator of the Babylonian spoils (*Cyr.* 7.5.35).

⁸⁵ Tatum (1989) 205 notes Cyrus' emphasis on Chrysantas' intellectual abilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Azoulay, V. (2004) *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir: de la charis au charisme* (Paris).
- Baragwanath, E. (2012) ‘The Wonder of Freedom: Xenophon on Slavery’, in Hobden and Tuplin (2012b) 631–63.
- Bowden, H. (2004) ‘Xenophon and the Scientific Study of Religion’, in Tuplin (2004) 229–46.
- Breitenbach, H. R. (1950) *Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons* (Freiburg).
- Brown, T. S. (1986) ‘Menon of Thessaly’, *Historia* 35: 387–404.
- Bruit-Zaidman, L. (2005) ‘Xénophon entre dévotion privée et dévotion publique: l’exemple de l’Anabase’, in V. Dasen and M. Piérart, edd., *Idia kai demosia: les cadres ‘privés’ et ‘publics’ de la religion grecque antique* (Liège) 99–111.
- Caster, M. (1937) ‘Sur l’Économique de Xénophon’, in *Mélanges offerts à A.-M. Desousseaux par ses amis et ses élèves* (Paris) 49–57.
- Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London).
- (2004) ‘Xenophon, the Military Review and Hellenistic *Pompai*’, in Tuplin (2004) 259–76.
- Due, B. (1989) *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon’s Aims and Methods* (Aarhus).
- Gauthier, P. (1976) *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon* (Paris).
- Gera, D. L. (1993) *Xenophon’s Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford).
- Gray, V. J. (2007) *Xenophon: On Government* (Cambridge).
- (2011) *Xenophon’s Mirror of Princes: Reading the Reflections* (Oxford).
- Higgins, W. E. (1977) *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis* (Albany).
- Hobden, F. and C. Tuplin (2012a) ‘Introduction’, in idd. (2012b) 1–41.
- , edd. (2012b) *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden).

- Keim, B. (forthcoming) 'Harmodius' Sister, or, Rethinking Women and Honor in Classical Athens', *PA* 6.
- Lee, J. W. I. (2007) *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis* (Cambridge).
- Mikalson, J. D. (1991) *Honor thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (Chapel Hill).
- Nadon, C. (2001) *Xenophon's Prince: Republic and Empire in the Cyropaedia* (Berkeley).
- Parker, R. (2004) 'One Man's Piety: The Religious Dimension of the *Anabasis*', in R. Lane Fox, ed., *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 131–53.
- Pomeroy, S. B. (1994) *Xenophon Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary* (Oxford).
- Pownall, F. (2004) *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor).
- Sandridge, N. B. (2012) *Loving Humanity, Learning, and Being Honoured: The Foundations of Leadership in Xenophon's Education of Cyrus* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Stoll, O. (2012) 'For the Glory of Athens: Xenophon's *Hipparchikos Logos*, a Technical Treatise and Instruction Manual on Ideal Leadership', *SHPS* 43: 250–7.
- Tamiolaki, M. (2012) 'Virtue and Leadership in Xenophon: Ideal Leaders or Ideal Losers?', in Hobden and Tuplin (2012b) 563–89.
- Tatum, J. (1989) *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On The Education of Cyrus* (Princeton).
- Tuplin, C., ed. (2004) *Xenophon and His World* (Stuttgart).
- Whitehead, D. (1983) 'Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: *φιλοτιμία* in Democratic Athens', *C&M* 34: 55–74.
- Wilms, H. (1995) *Techne und Paideia bei Xenophon und Isokrates* (Stuttgart).
- Wood, N. (1964) 'Xenophon's Theory of Leadership', *C&M* 25: 33–66.