



Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"
Faculty of History
Department of Ancient History, Thracology, and Medieval History

Dissertation Abstract
For the award of the educational and scientific degree
doctor
in the professional field 2.2 History and Archaeology (Ancient History)

on the topic:
“Ancient Thrace in the Works of Xenophon”

Doctoral Candidate: Nikolay Penev, full-time doctoral student in the PhD
program in Ancient History and Thracology (Ancient History) at the Department
of Ancient History, Thracology, and Medieval History
Academic Supervisor: Associate Professor Dr. Yulia Tsvetkova

Sofia 2025

The present abstract outlines the main theses, conclusions, and contributions of the dissertation. The study includes an introduction, three chapters (each with an internal hierarchical structure), a conclusion, an index, a bibliography (ancient and medieval authors, online resources, and contemporary scholarly research), as well as two appendices presented in the form of catalogues.

The total length of the dissertation is 578 pages.

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the guidance, support, and professional mentorship of Associate Professor Dr. Yulia Tsvetkova. I express my deepest and most sincere gratitude to her for her patience and her constant readiness to dedicate time to discussing a wide variety of ideas, as well as for the sleepless nights spent editing my texts. Thanks to Associate Professor Tsvetkova, I also had the opportunity to become acquainted with different branches of historical science — my participation in several archaeological and numismatic projects under her guidance significantly broadened the horizons of this research.

I owe an immense debt of gratitude to Professor Dr. Dilyana Boteva, as the beginning of my Anabasis with Xenophon was initiated by my master's thesis "Information on the History and Culture of Thrace and the Thracians in the Scripta Minora of Xenophon", which I wrote and defended under her supervision.

I am also deeply thankful to Professor Dr. Petar Delev, who kindly agreed to review my master's thesis. His advice and recommendations have proven invaluable to the present research.

I am profoundly grateful to Professor Dr. Mirena Slavova and Assistant Professor Dr. Nikolay Sharankov from the Department of Classical Philology at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski," who, with great patience and goodwill, introduced me to the Ancient Greek language and culture.

To the Department of Ancient History, Thracology, and Medieval History — and to the muse Clio — who guided me through the depths of Xenophon's works and the ideas embedded within them.

To Nadka Dimitrova — my first teacher in Malko Tarnovo — who introduced me to storytelling.

I am thankful to Dr. Atanas Orachev for the opportunity to consult with him on all kinds of historiographical issues.

I am also obliged to thank Professor Alexander Prilutsky, who was kind enough to send me the unpublished dissertation of E. Frolov "The Life of Xenophon and His Socio-Political Views (Mainly Based on the 'Minor Works').".

To Dr. Pavel Evdokimov, who photocopied for me E. Frolov's article "The Life and Work of Xenophon."

And last but not least — to my wife, Franziska van Buren-Penev, and to my family, who have supported me throughout the composition of the present dissertation.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1. XENOPHON. LIFE AND ACTIVITY	12
1.1 Historical Context	14
1.1.1 Xenophon's Date of Birth and the Year of his Death.....	15
1.1.2 Origins and Family	25
1.1.3 On the Education of the "Attic Muse"	30
1.1.4 The Battle of Delium.....	32
1.1.5 In Boeotian Captivity	32
1.1.6 The Symposium at Callias' House	32
1.1.7 The Campaign of Cyrus the Younger (Anabasis of Cyrus).....	33
1.1.8 The Retreat of the Mercenaries (Anabasis of Xenophon)	42
1.1.9 Commander of Seuthes	63
1.1.10 Under the Lambda Symbol	64
1.1.11 Honourable Exile from Athens.....	67
1.1.12 The Education of the "Dioscuri" in Sparta	68
1.1.13 Life in Scillus	69
1.1.14 Xenophon in Magna Graecia	70
1.1.15 The Heroic Death of Gryllus at Mantinea	71
1.2 Xenophon and His Anabasis	72
1.2.1 Xenophon and the Political Elite.....	73
1.2.2 Xenophon as Leader and Oekist	73
1.2.3 Xenophon's Political Views.....	74
1.3 Main Conclusions.....	76
CHAPTER 2. LITERARY LEGACY AND INFLUENCE	78
2.1 A Dance with the Muses	78
2.1.1 Xenophon as an Author	78
2.1.2 Xenophon as a Historian.....	79
2.1.3 Xenophon as a Philosopher	80
2.2 Corpus Xenophonticum	81
2.2.1 Agesilaus.....	83
2.2.2 Anabasis.....	85
2.2.3 Apology of Socrates	88
2.2.4 Constitution of the Athenians	90

2.2.5 On Hunting with Dogs.....	93
2.2.6 Cyropaedia.....	95
2.2.7 On Horsemanship	98
2.2.8 The Cavalry Commander	101
2.2.9 Hellenica	102
2.2.10 Hieron	105
2.2.11 Polity of the Lacedaemonians	107
2.2.12 Memorabilia	109
2.2.13 Oeconomicus.....	111
2.2.14 Symposium	116
2.2.15 Ways and Means	118
2.3 Influence and Reception.....	121
2.3.1 Xenophon and Plato	121
2.3.2 The Fall of the Achaemenid House	122
2.3.3 The Encoded Poem of Leo the Wise	125
2.4 Main Conclusions.....	127
CHAPTER 3. ANCIENT THRACE AND THRACIANS IN THE CORPUS XENOPHONTICUM.....	132
3.1 Images and Masks	135
3.1.1 Commanders and Mercenaries	136
3.1.1 Kings and Aristocrats	145
3.1.3 Who is hiding behind the mask of Sosias in ancient comedy?	159
3.1.4 The Teacher of the “Mad Socrates” and the Mother of the Gods	168
3.2 Thrace in Asia Minor (Xen., <i>An.</i> 6.4.1) and some related Thracian communities.....	170
3.2.1 Thrace in Asia Minor.....	170
3.2.2 Phrygia	177
3.2.3 Mysia in Asia Minor	181
3.2.4 Paphlagonia	183
3.2.5 Mossynoeci.....	186
3.3 Orchestra	188
3.3.1 Settlements and Economy.....	188
3.3.2 The Religion of the Thracians	195
3.3.3 The Banquet of the Thracians.....	196
3.4 List of some Geographical Realities in the Corpus Xenophonticum.....	199
CONCLUSIONS	204
INDEX.....	207

BIBLIOGRAPHY	215
Ancient Sources	215
Online Sources.....	223
Secondary Sources	223
TOM II. Appendices.....	
Appendix I. Catalogue of the Sources on the Life and Works of Xenophon.....	244
Xenophon	245
Agesilaus.....	245
Anabasis.....	245
Cyropaedia.....	366
On Horsemanship	367
Hellenica	368
Memorabilia	369
Oeconomicus	372
Symposium	373
CICERO	374
CORNELIUS NEPOS	376
DIODORUS SICULUS.....	377
STRABO	379
VALERIUS MAXIMUS.....	380
DION CHRYSOSTOM	381
PLUTARCH.....	382
PAUSANIAS	383
POLYAENUS	387
HARPOCRATION	389
LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA.....	390
AULUS GELLIUS.....	391
ATHENAEUS.....	394
CLAUDIUS AELIANUS	396
FLAVIUS PHILOSTRATUS	398
DIOGENES LAERTIUS.....	399
MARCELLINUS.....	405
PHOTIUS	407
SOUDA	408
APPENDIX II. CATALOGUE OF XENOPHON'S TESTIMONIES ON ANCIENT THRACE AND THE THRACIANS	410

XENOPHON	411
Agesilaus	411
Anabasis	413
Apology of Socrates	502
Constitution of the Athenians	503
On Hunting with Dogs	505
Cyropaedia	507
On Horsemanship	514
The Cavalry Commander	515
Hellenica	516
Hiero	563
Constitution of the Lacedaemonians	564
Memorabilia	565
Oeconomicus	568
Symposium	569
Ways and Means	578

Introduction

At the beginning of every scholarly text stands the introduction — which is often written last. Much like the snake biting its own tail — the ancient symbol of the uroboros (οὐροβόρος) — the preface connects the end with the beginning, recounting the journey taken and the lessons learned along the way.

The primary aim of this dissertation is neatly reflected in its title, “Ancient Thrace and Thracians in the Works of Xenophon”. Although this may initially appear to be a straightforward task, the vast and diverse nature of Xenophon’s corpus—earning him the epithet, “Attic Bee”—demands a nuanced, contextual, and intertextual approach. While his writings are frequently mined for insights into the ancient world, contemporary scholarship often engages with them selectively, leading to misinterpretations due to insufficient attention to internal coherence and the broader historical, philosophical, and cultural contexts.

Thus, appropriate to the imagery with which we characterised our undertaking in introducing the present study, the beginning and the end must be considered as one whole: the importance of Xenophon’s writings in reconstructing aspects of Thrace and its people must be considered only after the more basic task of reconstructing a context in which Xenophon’s comments may be placed.

Indeed, the key to any ancient text is its creator. It is hardly possible to conduct in-depth research in the field of source studies without understanding the views and era of its author. This is where the first difficulty arises — there are only a few comprehensive studies dedicated to the life and work of Xenophon, and most of the existing ones are the result of collective efforts. This is due both to the considerable volume of the Corpus Xenophonticum and to the wide variety of topics and genres in which Xenophon wrote.

A second methodological challenge stems from Xenophon’s relatively extensive literary legacy — fifteen works in total. The most common approach to overcoming this issue is to focus a given study on a single work or a group of texts united by a specific principle — whether the so-called *Scripta minora* (“minor works”), the Socratic dialogues, the didactic treatises, or texts grouped by another thematic or genre-based principle.

However, such an approach does not fully reflect the specifics of Xenophon’s work. His writings should not be viewed in isolation for one another, as they contain internal references, recurring structural patterns, and consistent literary devices. They need to be studied within a broader context that allows for intertextual and comparative analysis.

By taking such a holistic and context-based approach, the dissertation thus proposes a methodological framework for future Xenophontic studies, beyond this focused inquiry — one that is more comprehensive, philologically grounded, and interdisciplinary in scope than what has presently been utilised by scholars.

Research Aim, Methodology, and Chronological Scope. These methodological challenges have determined the main source-critical aim of this research: to extract from the Corpus

Xenophonticum any information that directly or indirectly relates to ancient Thrace and the Thracians, to analyse it comprehensively and interpret it historiographically. From this aim naturally follows the choice of a chronological framework, respective to the period during which Xenophon himself composed his works. However, this chronology remains somewhat indeterminate, as the ancient author often used the works of his predecessors, such as Herodotus and Thucydides, as well as writings of some authors whose works have not survived. At the same time, information about Xenophon and his views on Thrace are found in texts by authors writing over an exceptionally broad timespan — from the 4th century BC to the 14th century AD. Thus, it is necessary also to collect and analyse a diverse range of source and historiographical material spanning nearly twenty centuries.

This diverse body of textual information which has been used in this dissertation thus defined the main lines of source criticism and clarified the specific research questions, making it necessary to provide historiographical overviews ad hoc throughout the exposition.

The chosen approach required that two independent chapters be included at the beginning of the dissertation, before proceeding with the description, analysis, and commentary on the extracted Thracian material. One chapter is dedicated to Xenophon's life, and the other — to his literary legacy. Without such a foundational introduction, meaningful textual criticism and well-grounded source-critical and historiographical observations, analyses, and conclusions would not have been possible.

Structure of the Research. The structure of the present study mirrors the formulation of the dissertation topic: *"Ancient Thrace in the Works of Xenophon."* Xenophon's biography is examined in the first chapter, his works in the second, and ancient Thrace in the third. Whether intentionally or not, this arrangement follows Xenophon's typical use of "misleading" titles, a characteristic that will be discussed in the course of the exposition. Thus, the dissertation is structured as follows.

The first chapter, *"Xenophon. Life and Work"*, is a biographical section dedicated to the personality and activities of Xenophon of Athens. The second chapter, *"Literary Legacy and Influence"*, presents an analysis of Xenophon's literary works. The third chapter, *"Ancient Thrace and the Thracians in the Corpus Xenophonticum"*, is a source-critical study and revision of the information about ancient Thrace and the Thracians found in Xenophon's works.

Another methodological feature stemmed from the necessity to compile two catalogues presented as appendices.

The first, *Catalogue of Information on the Life and Work of Xenophon* (Appendix 1), contains 94 passages gathered in a 169-page collection. These passages include autobiographical information on Xenophon of Athens, as well as information about him from several dozen later Greek and Latin authors. The entries are arranged, as far as possible, in chronological order and include authors such as Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Valerius Maximus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Pausanias, Polyaeus, Harpocration, Lucian,

Aulus Gellius, Athenaeus, Claudius Aelian, Flavius Philostratus, Diogenes Laertius, Marcellinus, Photius, and the *Suda*.

The second, *Catalogue of Xenophon's Information on Ancient Thrace and the Thracians* (Appendix 2), also spanning 169 pages, presents information on ancient Thrace and the Thracians, as well as on Asian Mysia, Paphlagonia, Greater and Lesser Phrygia (respectively Phrygia Magna and Hellespontine), and certain other ancient communities presumed to be culturally and ethnically close to the Thracians, as recorded in the *Corpus Xenophonticum*.

The passages in both catalogues are presented in a bilingual format — the original texts alongside their translations or verified versions. Xenophon's works are arranged alphabetically according to the Latin abbreviations used in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. The abbreviations are hyperlinked to the online *Perseus* library. The translations (or verified versions) are accompanied by footnotes indicating their location in the preferred edition. Short annotations have been added to the entries.

Chapter 1. Xenophon. Life and Activity.

Xenophon of Athens ranks among the most remarkable figures of antiquity. Although he was extremely popular even in ancient times and duly included by the Alexandrian grammarians among the great Greek historians — alongside Herodotus and Thucydides — many gaps remain in his biography. This is largely due to the loss of the works of the Peripatetics, who laid the foundations of biography as a literary genre. Representatives of this school were actually the first to collect purposefully and systematize information about notable historical figures, but their texts have not come down to us, swallowed by the fires of crises and shifting ideas. As a result, the existing information about Xenophon's life and work is rather fragmentary and can generally be divided into two main groups — information from Xenophon himself (autobiographical information) and accounts by later authors.

Autobiographical Information. The works of most historians of the 4th century BC have survived only in fragments, but fate has been kind to the writings of Xenophon. In the Middle Ages, all the works listed in the earliest extant catalogue of his writings — compiled around the 3rd century AD (Diog. Laert. 2.6.57) — were preserved. This gives scholars some grounds to believe that his entire oeuvre has survived.

Xenophon's texts are a valuable source of autobiographical information, as they contain numerous speeches, exhortations, and philosophical, political, and economic reflections. They reveal Xenophon's worldview, with the most information found in the *Anabasis* and the works written in dialogue form — *Symposium*, *Memorabilia*, and *Oeconomicus*. Additional information can be found in the *Cyropaedia* and in the *Scripta minora* — *Agesilaus* and *On Horsemanship*. Although the *Hellenica* lacks direct autobiographical references, it is likely that many of the events described in it were based on personal observation, even though this is not explicitly stated.

Information from Ancient Authors. Accounts of Xenophon's life, works, and literary methods appear in the writings of numerous later authors — from the early treatises of Cicero and the works of Roman encyclopedists, through the excerpts of Photius and the entries in the *Suda* encyclopedia, to the writings of Theodore Metochites at the twilight of the Byzantine Empire. These accounts are mostly incidental and often seem contradictory or even mutually exclusive at first glance. A further complication is the difficulty of tracing their original sources and verifying them.

Among these accounts is the earliest fully preserved biography of Xenophon (Diog. Laert. 2.6), compiled by Diogenes Laertius, probably in the first half of the 3rd century AD. This biography is included in a work that has reached us under the conventional title *Lives of the Philosophers*. However, it remains unclear who exactly Diogenes Laertius was (or whether this was a pseudonym), when and where he lived, or what the original title of his work was.

In keeping with the spirit of the age, Diogenes Laertius' text is a compilation — yet this does not make it any less valuable. He cites over three hundred authors, most of which are now lost. Furthermore, when Diogenes relies on a primary source, this source often remains anonymous, with only authors who confirm or contradict the piece of information being named. This seems to be the case with his account of Xenophon, where most historians of

philosophy believe Diogenes mainly followed Demetrius of Magnesia (1st century BC). It is unclear exactly how many works Diogenes used when compiling Xenophon's biography, but the explicitly named authors alone number a dozen. They include Xenophon himself; two of the ten Attic orators — Isocrates (5th–4th century BC) and Dinarchus (4th–3rd century BC); the Hedonist philosopher Aristippus (5th–4th century BC); the historian Ephorus (5th–4th century BC); Aristotle (4th century BC); the skeptic Timon of Phlius (4th–3rd century BC); Stesicrides of Athens, author of chronologies; the Peripatetic and biographer Hermippus of Smyrna (3rd century BC); Hister of Cyrene (3rd century BC), a pupil of Callimachus; Diocles of Magnesia (2nd–1st century BC), known for his biographical and doxographical studies on philosophers; and finally, the works of Demetrius of Magnesia. In fact, among all those listed, only Xenophon's own texts have survived in their original form.

The scarcity of information on Xenophon makes it necessary to consider also the minor works of so-called pseudo-historical epistolography, such as the 35 *Socratic Letters* preserved in Cod. Vat. gr. 64. These letters can be divided into two groups — letters attributed to Socrates (nos. 1–7) and those attributed to his disciples (nos. 8–35). Two of them (nos. 28 and 35) are considered authentic, while the rest were written sometime between the 1st and 3rd centuries AD. The second group provides valuable biographical details about Socrates' followers, with the source likely being a philosophical-historical lexicon now lost to us — possibly more detailed than the one used by Diogenes Laertius. Another notable example of the epistolary genre is the collection of 17 letters known as the *Letters of Chion of Heraclea* (1st century AD), which also contains references to lost works.

This type of literature deserves more attention than it is usually given, as S. Kondratiev aptly remarked: "*The letter and its history — an unwritten chapter in both history and literary history.*" Traditionally, such works are considered fictional and are often underestimated for that reason. Yet one must not forget that the sources used to create their literary images and plots are now lost to us. Here, too, looms the advice of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, who reminds us that if he is careful, a historian may find a pearl in a heap of rubbish.

1.1 Historical Context

1.1.1 Xenophon's Date of Birth and the Year of his Death

The available historical information allow us to assume with a fair degree of confidence that Xenophon was born within the third quarter of the 5th century BC. However, the exact year of his birth is not mentioned either in his own writings or in the works of later Greek and Latin authors. As a result, historians have attempted to determine the date by comparing pieces of information that, at first glance, may seem contradictory or even mutually exclusive. This, in turn, has led to the formation of two main scholarly hypotheses.

The first hypothesis proposes an earlier date — around the middle of the 5th century BC — based mainly on direct historical evidence. The second hypothesis places his birth later, during the so-called Archidamian War (431–421 BC) or shortly before it, relying chiefly on the interpretation of indirect autobiographical information.

Initially, the earlier dating was generally accepted in scholarly circles. However, in the 19th and 20th centuries, the later dating began to gain traction and today it dominates historiography.

Autobiographical Information and the Late Dating of Xenophon's Birth. The later dating of Xenophon's birth is based primarily on autobiographical evidence. Modern authors tend to place it in 430 BC or slightly later. This historiographical tradition was established at the end of the 18th century by W. Mitford in *The History of Greece*. Half a century later, C. Cobet — without citing W. Mitford — examined several passages in the *Anabasis* where Xenophon refers to himself as young and concluded that during Cyrus the Younger's campaign against Artaxerxes Mnemon, and the subsequent retreat of the mercenaries to the Black Sea (401–399 BC), Xenophon could not have been older than thirty. This interpretation was later adopted by many other scholars.

In the 1970s, J. Anderson published his monograph *Xenophon*, which in the following decades became a reference point for biographical sections in various translations of Xenophon's works and contributed to the acceptance of the later dating within academic circles.

The cornerstone of this hypothesis is the adjective “young” (νέος), with which Xenophon refers to himself in the *Anabasis* (see, for example, *An.* 3.1.14; 3.1.25; 3.2.37; 3.3.11; 3.4.42; 4.2.16; 5.3.1; 6.4.25; 7.3.47; 7.6.34). However, this term is subjective. Thucydides notes that the notion of “young” varies from city to city in Hellas (Thuc. 5.43.2). Xenophon himself refers to other figures as “young” — for example, the Spartan king Agesilaus, who was “young at the time of his accession” (*Ages.* 1.6). This statement inevitably raises questions, as Agesilaus II was over forty years old (probably forty-four or forty-five) when he was elected *archēgetēs* of Lacedaemon in 400 BC. Xenophon's use of the word “young” in this context undermines the fundamental argument in the scholarly tradition supporting a later birthdate for the writer.

The passages where Xenophon refers to himself as young require careful consideration within the broader historical context of the narrative in the *Anabasis*. After the Battle of Babylon and the death of Cyrus the Younger in 401 BC, the mercenaries found themselves in an extremely precarious situation. They were deep within the Achaemenid Empire, surrounded by enemies, leaderless, and without supplies. Thousands of kilometers separated them from their homelands, with unknown territories barring their way. The men mourned for their families, and on the night after the capture of their commanders, none of them could sleep (*An.* 3.1.3).

This is where the story of Xenophon's *Anabasis* begins (*An.* 3.1.4–10), with Xenophon as neither a general, nor a captain, nor even a soldier. The Athenian falls into a restless slumber and experiences a vision that compels him to act (*An.* 3.1.11–14). From his reflections following this dream (*An.* 3.1.14), J. Anderson assumes that Xenophon was under thirty years old at the time. This assumption is based on an analogy with the age of Proxenus — one of the mercenary commanders and a close friend of Xenophon — who was about thirty during the campaign (*An.* 2.6.20).

However, it is necessary to distinguish between the age requirement for holding the elected office of *strategos* in Athens and that of a commander of a mercenary unit, recruited on the

basis of personal reputation and at one's own expense, where age mattered little. For instance, among the captured commanders, Clearchus was fifty years old (*An.s* 2.6.15), while the other two were around thirty-five (*An.* 2.6.30).

There is not much information about the age requirement for election to the board of *strategoí* in the 5th century BC, but some idea can be gleaned from Thucydides' account of the Sicilian Expedition in 415 BC. From the text, it appears that before the ill-fated campaign, Alcibiades was accused by Nicias of being too young to hold the office of *strategos* (Thuc. 6.12.2). Since Alcibiades was born in the mid-5th century and was about thirty-five at the time, the age requirement seems to have been at least that — if it wasn't, once again, a matter of subjective judgment.

As for the other instances where Xenophon refers to himself as "young," they were already deemed unconvincing as evidence by K. Krüger in the mid-19th century.

Testimonies of Ancient Authors on Xenophon's Birth and the Early Dating Hypothesis

The early dating of Xenophon's birth is based on biographical references, most often placing it around 445–444 BC or earlier. The key arguments rest on several texts.

A crucial one comes from Strabo, who recounts how Xenophon, after falling from his horse, during the battle of Delium in Boeotia in the winter of 424 BC, was saved by Socrates. The geographer describes how the Athenians retreated toward the sanctuary of Apollo at Delium after their defeat by the Boeotians. Socrates, also retreating on foot after his horse had bolted, saw the fallen and wounded Xenophon, lifted him onto his shoulders, and supported him during the retreat (Strabo 9.2.7). Diogenes Laertius also mentions this episode when listing Socrates' military campaigns at Amphipolis, Delium, and Potidaea (Diog. Laert. 2.5.22; Ael. *VH* 3.17; 7.14), briefly repeating the story and adding details about Socrates' composure during the chaotic flight (Diog. Laert. 2.5.22–23). A curious detail about Socrates' escape at Delium is also mentioned in Cicero's *De divinatione* (1.3.5–6), where the Athenians fled until reaching a place where the road split into three. Socrates, warned by his daimon, did not follow the majority, and he and his companions were saved, while the rest ran into the Boeotian cavalry. A later retelling of this story, with important details absent from other sources, appears in the first of the *Socratic Letters* (§9–10).

Supporters of the later dating attempt to dismiss the testimonies of Strabo and Diogenes by referring to Plato's *Symposium*, where Alcibiades recounts how Socrates saved him (Pl. *Symp.* 220D–E; 221A–B), suggesting that later literary tradition replaced Alcibiades with Xenophon.

However, S. Sobolevsky rightly points out that this hypothetical scenario would require not only the substitution of Alcibiades with Xenophon but also of Potidaea with Delium, since Alcibiades was saved by Socrates at Potidaea in 432 BC, not at Delium in 424 BC. The information from both episodes thus complement rather than contradict each other. As for the absence of any reference to Xenophon being saved in Plato's text, Aulus Gellius affirms that nearly all biographers of Xenophon and Plato noted the rivalry between the two — a possible explanation for the omission (Gell. *NA* 14.3).

To the testimonies of Strabo and Diogenes, another piece of evidence is usually added. In *Symposium* (Xen. *Symp.* 1.1), Xenophon states that he was among the guests at the symposium organized in honor of Autolycus's victory in the pankration during the Great Panathenaea (421/420 BC). Proponents of the later dating either ignore this passage or explain it as a literary fiction. However, Xenophon had no need for such devices here, and in his other Socratic works, he reports either from direct experience or with clear attribution.

The symposium hosted by Callias can be precisely dated thanks to Athenaeus (Ath. 5.56), who, in *The Deipnosophists*, comments on the year Eupolis staged the comedy *Autolycus* — the archonship of Ariston (421/420 BC). Athenaeus is also the earliest surviving author to question Xenophon's youth, accusing him of a chronological mistake, claiming that Xenophon could not have attended the symposium because he either wasn't born yet or was just a child (Ath. 5.56). Therefore, Athenaeus must have been aware — or concluded — that Xenophon was born later, making his participation impossible. Unfortunately, the arguments behind this conclusion are unknown to us.

On the other hand, this claim requires critical assessment. In context, Athenaeus questions other commonly accepted facts, such as Socrates' participation in battles at Delium, Amphipolis, and Potidaea — a position that seems more rhetorical than historical.

Based on the above, S. Sobolevsky argues that Xenophon must have been born in 444 BC or earlier. His reasoning is that ephebes served only within Attica, so if Xenophon fought at Delium in 424 BC (outside Attica), he must have been at least twenty years old. Sobolevsky published this thesis in his introduction to *Xenophon of Athens. Socratic Writings* (1935), a work later expanded upon by E. Frolov — a leading Xenophon scholar and prolific author on the subject.

To their argumentation can be added the following. The battle of Delium is described in detail by Thucydides (Thuc. 4.76.1–77.2; 4.89.1–101.4) and Diodorus Siculus (Diod. Sic. 12.69–70), and is also mentioned by Xenophon (*Mem.* 3.5.4) and Plutarch (*Nic.* 6; *Alc.* 7). Thucydides adds a telling detail: a mass mobilization was declared in Athens for all citizens, metics, and foreigners in Attica (Thuc. 4.90.1). This suggests that even first- or second-year ephebes — serving as *peripoloi* (patrol guards) — may have been called up. Thus, Xenophon could have fought at Delium as an ephebe, being about eighteen years old or slightly younger, implying a birth date around 442/441 BC, which aligns with the account of Xenophon's prime (*akmē*) given by Diogenes Laertius — a point we will return to later.

Thucydides also reports on the Athenian general Hippocrates, who fortified and defended the sanctuary at Delium, leaving behind a cavalry force of three hundred as a reserve (Thuc. 4.93.2). After the sanctuary was captured, about two hundred Athenians were taken prisoner, likely held until the Peace of Nicias in 421 BC (Thuc. 5.35.5). Xenophon may have been among them. Philostratus the Elder (2nd–3rd century AD), in *Lives of the Sophists*, says that Xenophon spent some time in Boeotia, possibly as a captive later released on bail (Philostr. *VS* 12.1), though the exact timing is unclear. Some suggest he was captured during the fall of the garrison at Oropus in 410 BC, but this theory is no better supported than the possibility of an earlier event during the Peloponnesian War.

Returning to Xenophon's use of the word "young" for Agesilaus, who was over forty at the time (Xen. *Ages.* 1.6), this provides an argument for reconsidering — and possibly returning to — the earlier birthdate hypothesis for Xenophon. This would resolve contradictions in both autobiographical information and later testimonies.

In this context, another key piece of evidence from Diogenes Laertius deserves more attention. He states that Xenophon's prime (*akmē*) occurred in the fourth year of the 94th Olympiad (Diog. Laert. 2.6.55), which corresponds precisely to between July 401 and July 400 BC. This dating of his prime (likely around forty years of age) probably derives from the *Chronology* of Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BC), who followed Eratosthenes' (3rd century BC) studies on various dating systems. This points us toward 442/441 BC as Xenophon's birth year.

J. Anderson claims that Diogenes' statement refers only to the campaign of the Ten Thousand, not Xenophon's prime. However, the two events coincide in 401/400 BC, as Diogenes Laertius explicitly notes (Diog. Laert. 2.6.55).

True to his principle of presenting all available opinions, Diogenes Laertius adds at the end of his account a second reference, according to which Xenophon's prime occurred during the 89th Olympiad (424 BC). This would place his birth between 464 and 460 BC and is likely one of the reasons why the earlier information has often been undervalued. On the other hand, this confirms that in *Diog. Laert.* 2.6.55, the reference indeed concerns Xenophon's prime. However, here no specific year of the Olympiad is given, and the context suggests that the historian of philosophy did not attribute much importance to this source (*Diog. Laert.* 2.6.59).

On the basis of all the evidence discussed above, 442/441 BC emerges as the most probable year of birth for Xenophon of Athens.

The Year and Place of Death. Xenophon undoubtedly lived a long life. According to Diodorus Siculus, he reached an advanced old age (Diod. Sic. 15.74.4), and Lucian of Samosata, in *On the Long-Lived*, states that Xenophon died at well over ninety years of age (Luc. *Macr.* 21). These accounts also refute the hypothesis of a later birth date. If we assume that his death occurred at the end of 356 BC or shortly after 355 BC, a birth around the beginning of the Peloponnesian War would mean he lived approximately 70–75 years — which, considering the era and his social status, would hardly qualify him as a long-lived individual. By comparison, the life of Isocrates — who lived nearly a hundred years (436–338 BC) — is a clear example of exceptional longevity. Furthermore, both Xenophon and Isocrates came from the same deme — Erchia — indicating that such cases were not entirely exceptional.

Diogenes Laertius reports that Xenophon died in the first year of the 105th Olympiad (360–359 BC), during the archonship of Calidemides (or Calimedes), citing *The List of Archons and Olympic Victors* by Stesiclides, about whom nothing else is known. However, in *Hellenica*, Xenophon mentions an event most likely dated to 358/357 BC. Moreover, his economic treatise *On Revenues* contains a chronological marker (Xen. *Vect.* 5.8–9) probably referring to 355/354 BC. If we follow this evidence, the earliest likely year of his death would be 355 BC — or perhaps even later.

The place of burial of the notable Athenian also remains uncertain. According to Demetrius of Magnesia, Xenophon died in Corinth at an advanced age (Diog. Laert. 2.6.56). Another tradition suggests a different burial site: several centuries after Xenophon's death, Pausanias, passing through the ruins of Scillus in the Peloponnese, was shown a tomb near the sanctuary there, which the locals believed belonged to Xenophon. Pausanias' account likely reflects a later Eleian tradition, while the actual remains of Xenophon were probably interred in Corinth.

1.1.2 Origins and Family

Xenophon rarely uses patronymics in his writings — a characteristic feature of the late 5th century BC. In the *Anabasis* (Xen. *An.* 2.5.37), he mentions only that he is an Athenian (Ἀθηναῖος), providing no further information about his origin.

Origins. According to Diogenes Laertius (Diog. Laert. 2.6.48), Xenophon came from the Attic deme of Erchia (Ἐρχία), but this information about his *demotikon* is a *hapax eiremenon* — it appears only once and is not confirmed by other ancient authors. The location of Erchia has been established thanks to several inscriptions, the most important of which is the *lex sacra* of the deme (SEG 21.541). The settlement was situated south of present-day Spata — a small town in Eastern Attica. The deme's sacred calendar was discovered in the mid-20th century and published by G. Daux in 1963. The stele, set up in the first half of the 4th century BC (probably between 375 and 350 BC), contains a list of annual sacrifices to the gods, nymphs, and heroes worshipped in the deme.

It is not known exactly where Xenophon lived. The vision he describes on the restless night after the generals were captured is of his father's house (Xen. *An.* 3.1.11–12). In the dream, the house is struck by Zeus's lightning and set on fire. The text does not make it clear whether this refers to a city residence or a rural estate. It is possible that his family owned both. Xenophon's love of horses and his mastery of horsemanship suggest that he spent much of his youth riding across the fields of Mesogeia.

The name of Xenophon's father, Gryllus (Γρύλλος), is first mentioned by Strabo (Strabo 9.2.7) and later appears in other authors. Some scholars have suggested that Xenophon's mother may have been named Diodora, based on the name of his younger son, Diodorus. This is possible, but there are no written sources to confirm it.

As for his social status, the only direct information about Xenophon's origins comes from a conversation with the Spartan Hierus during the mercenaries' retreat to the Black Sea (Xen. *An.* 4.6.14–16). Another argument supporting his aristocratic background is his military experience in the cavalry and his horsemanship skills (Xen. *Eq.* 1.1). In his instructions to the Athenian *hipparch*, he cites as a well-known fact the law according to which only the wealthiest and physically strongest members of Attic families were accepted into the cavalry ranks (Xen. *Eq. mag.* 1.9; Xen. *Eq.* 2.1).

The name of his wife, Philesia, has come down to us through Diogenes, who refers to Demetrius of Magnesia. It is also mentioned in the *Suda* (s.v. Φ. 47). Most scholars believe that

Xenophon married in the first decade of the 4th century BC, after his return from Asia Minor, though it is possible the marriage took place earlier.

In one of his early treatises, *On Invention*, Cicero illustrates rhetorical principles with a humorous dialogue between Aspasia — the famous *hetaira* from Miletus and companion of Pericles — Xenophon, and his wife, who remains unnamed in the text (Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.51–52). The passage is borrowed from a now-lost work by Aeschines, *The Socraticus*. Though the dialogue may contain anachronisms, Photius even refers to Aeschines as a pupil of Socrates. Furthermore, whenever Xenophon mentions Aspasia, he does so with marked respect (Xen. *Mem.* 6.2.36; Xen. *Oec.* 3.14). Notably, the contexts of these passages involve discussions of matchmaking or similar topics. According to Plutarch, Socrates often conversed with the famous *hetaira*, and his students would bring their wives to meet her (Plut. *Per.* 24). From Plato's dialogue *Menexenus* (*Menex.* 236b), we know that around 400 BC Aspasia was still alive — making it entirely possible that she played a role in finding a bride for Xenophon and that the story has a basis in historical fact.

In the only place where Xenophon mentions his family his sons remain unnamed (Xen. *An.* 5.3.10). They were born after 399 BC (Xen. *An.* 7.6.34).

1.1.3 On the Education of the “Attic Muse”

Most scholars who support a later birth date for Xenophon believe that he met Socrates no earlier than 404 BC and that he was never part of the philosopher's inner circle. However, the opposite is stated by Xenophon himself in the *Anabasis* (Xen. *An.* 3.1.5–7). Furthermore, Xenophon repeatedly refers to his presence alongside Socrates — several times in *Memorabilia* (Xen. *Mem.* 4.3.1–2; 1.3.8–13; 1.4.2; 1.6.14; 2.4.1; 2.5.1), once in *Symposium* (Xen. *Symp.* 1.1), and once in *Oeconomicus* (Xen. *Oec.* 1.1).

If Xenophon's participation in the symposium at Callias' house is not a literary device — and if we also consider the accounts of Strabo and Diogenes, who tell of Socrates saving Xenophon at Delium — then the relationship between teacher and student must have lasted for over two decades, dating back at least to the mid-420s BC.

Xenophon was not present at Socrates' trial and execution, as he was not in Athens at the time. Nonetheless, he dedicated both *Memorabilia* and *Apology of Socrates* to his teacher. Socrates appears as a central figure in Xenophon's dialogues *Symposium* and *Oeconomicus*.

We should also take into account Diogenes Laertius' statement that Xenophon of Athens was the first to record Socrates' words (Diog. Laert. 2.6.48).

Philostratus the Elder (Philostr. *VS* 12.1) recounts that Xenophon attended the lectures of Prodicus of Ceos (5th–4th century BC).

In his summary of Isocrates in the *Bibliotheca*, Photius writes that Xenophon, son of Gryllus, along with Theopompus of Chios and Ephorus of Cyme, were all students of Isocrates (Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 260). This information is often ignored by scholars, with some even suggesting that Photius confused Socrates' name with that of Isocrates. However, this

hypothesis seems unlikely, considering the encyclopedic knowledge of the Patriarch of Constantinople regarding ancient authors and literature.

It is possible that Isocrates himself encouraged Xenophon to write the *Hellenica* as a continuation of Thucydides' unfinished work.

1.1.4 The Battle of Delium

The battle was examined in the context of the debate concerning the year of Xenophon's birth.

1.1.5 In Boeotian Captivity

The testimony of Philostratus the Elder regarding Xenophon's capture by the Boeotians (Philostr. *VS* 12.1) is a single mention and was examined in the context of the discussion about the year of his birth.

1.1.6 The Symposium at Callias' House

The circumstances surrounding the symposium organized by Callias in honor of Autolycus's victory in 421 BC were analyzed when determining the probable year of Xenophon's birth.

1.1.7 The Campaign of Cyrus the Younger (Anabasis of Cyrus)

Xenophon's participation in the military events within the Persian Empire in 401 BC is of key importance to his biography. The primary source of information on this comes from Xenophon himself, mainly in his work *Anabasis*. One of the essential questions — his role in the mercenary army — is discussed in the section "Commanders and Mercenaries" in Chapter Three.

1.1.8 The Retreat of the Mercenaries (Anabasis of Xenophon)

Here begins Xenophon's own narrative of the *Anabasis* — the moment when the author reveals himself (Xen. *An.* 3.1.4–10).

1.1.9 Commander of Seuthes

This episode of Xenophon's biography covers the end of 400 and the beginning of 399 BC and is discussed in Chapter Three within the context of his account of Ancient Thrace and the Thracian tribes.

1.1.10 Under the Lambda Symbol

A significant episode in Xenophon's biography is his connection with Sparta. The events and his motivations he himself presents in the *Anabasis*.

1.1.11 Honourable Exile from Athens

The political upheavals in his native city-state did not spare Xenophon, who was declared an enemy of the state. This is mentioned by the exile himself, though the two brief references in the *Anabasis* do not clarify either the reasons for the decree or its exact date. The first mention appears in his account of life in Scillus, where Xenophon states that the Spartans settled him there after his sentence was pronounced (Xen. *An.* 5.3.7). The second reference comes in his description of his plans to return to Athens after the mercenaries were placed

under the command of Thibron (Xen. *An.* 7.7.57), where he notes that at that time, no sentence had yet been issued against him. This places 399 BC as the *terminus post quem* for the publication of the decree.

1.1.12 The Education of the “Dioscuri” in Sparta

In Sparta, Xenophon was honored as a guest (Diog. Laert. 2.6.51). According to Plutarch, who describes the life of Agesilaus in *Parallel Lives*, Xenophon belonged to the king’s closest circle and enjoyed his full trust (Plut. *Ages.* 20.2). This statement is repeated almost verbatim in *Sayings of the Spartans* (Plut. *Mor. Apoph.* 212b [50]). Both texts also mention that Agesilaus suggested Xenophon bring his sons — referred to as the “Dioscuri” (see Diog. Laert. 2.6.52; *Suda*, s.v. Δ. 47) — to Sparta so they could master, in the Spartan’s words, the finest of sciences: the art of obeying and commanding.

This refers to the *agoge* (ἀγωγή) — the traditional Spartan system of citizen training, which every *Spartiates* underwent. In Sparta, exceptions to this rule were made only for the firstborn heirs of the two royal dynasties — the Agiads and the Eurypontids. It is worth noting that Agesilaus II was the only *archēgetēs* of Sparta to have completed this training. This was because his elder half-brother, Agis II, was originally the heir to the dynasty, followed by his nephew Leotychidas. However, Leotychidas was later deposed by Agesilaus and Lysander, who exploited rumors that the boy was the illegitimate child of Timaea and Alcibiades.

The harsh trials of the *agoge* forged Agesilaus II’s steadfast character, despite his congenital lameness. Thanks to his exceptional will and abilities, he earned the epithet “the Great” in the history of Lacedaemon.

1.1.13 Life in Scillus

To paraphrase the words of Maximus of Tyre, Xenophon’s life was marked by constant wandering under the sign of Fortune (*Tychē*). Yet, Xenophon also knew peaceful days. Such was his period in Scillus, which most scholars date between 392 and 371 BC. The settlement was located in one of the most fertile regions of Elis, near Olympia (Peloponnese). Our understanding of this period comes from his description in the *Anabasis* (Xen. *An.* 5.3.7–13), the account of Pausanias (Paus. 5.6.5–6), and the biography by Diogenes Laertius (Diog. Laert. 2.6.52–53).

1.1.14 Xenophon in Magna Graecia

Xenophon likely undertook a journey to Syracuse as well. Athenaeus of Naucratis, in the tenth book of *The Deipnosophists*, recounts an episode in which Xenophon is a guest of Dionysius of Syracuse. During a symposium at the tyrant’s court, Xenophon reprimands a cupbearer for pestering him while serving wine (Ath. 10.31). No other records of this journey survive, but such a trip seems entirely plausible. Xenophon wrote about what he knew firsthand, and several embassies to and from Magna Graecia are described in the *Hellenica* as if from personal observation.

1.1.15 The Heroic Death of Gryllus at Mantinea

This event took place in the middle of 362 BC. Several authors mention the moment when Xenophon learned of the death of his eldest son, but once again, the account preserved by Diogenes Laertius proves the most informative (Diog. Laert. 2.6.54–55). Xenophon sent

Gryllus and Diodorus — known as the “Dioscuri” — to Athens after the Athenians allied themselves with Sparta. Diogenes recounts the story based on Book XXV of Ephorus.

This leads to the famous Battle of Mantinea, in which the Athenians, commanded by General Hegesilaus and *hipparch* Cephisodorus, fought as Sparta’s allies against the Boeotians led by Epaminondas. Gryllus fell in this battle (Harp., s.v. Γρύλλος).

The battle itself is described in *Hellenica* (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.16–17), but Xenophon does not mention his son’s name or that of Epaminondas. Instead, he provides a brief account of the bravery displayed by the Athenians against the numerically superior Thessalian cavalry, considered the finest of its time. Xenophon writes of the valiant men who fell on both sides but fulfilled their duty to their allies and defended their ancestral honor.

The circumstances of Gryllus’s death may serve as a key response to accusations of bias leveled against Xenophon by some scholars, who criticize him for scarcely mentioning Epaminondas in the *Hellenica*.

1.2 Xenophon and His *Anabasis*

The literary qualities of Xenophon and his works will be examined in the second chapter. The present section will explore what is known about his personal traits and actions.

1.2.1 Xenophon and the Political Elite

Xenophon’s relationships with Cyrus the Younger, Seuthes, Agesilaus the Great, and the tyrant of Syracuse are discussed in the context of historical events.

1.2.2 Xenophon as Leader and Oekist

Xenophon’s leadership qualities are best exemplified in his famous *Anabasis*. He displays them most prominently after being elected commander of the rearguard during the mercenaries’ retreat from central Persia, as well as later in his service as a strategist for Seuthes and in Agesilaus’ army.

Xenophon made several attempts to found a city (*An.* 6.4.1–7; 6.6.1–5). *Anabasis* contains a detailed account of the criteria for selecting a settlement site—probably the only preserved text of its kind in ancient literature. His second attempt as an *oecist* (founder of a colony) took place in Asia Minor Thrace, on the lands of the Thracian tribe of the Bithynians, an event further discussed in the third chapter.

For a time, Xenophon held the fate of Byzantium in his hands (*An.* 7.1.21–32). The enraged mercenaries seized the city, and the Spartan *harmost* and *navarch* escaped by fleeing. This scene was described several centuries later by an anonymous rhetorician in *The Letters of Chion of Heraclea* (Letter No. 3), attributed to a follower of Plato. Although the letters are fictional, they are based on real historical events from the 4th century BC, whose authenticity is confirmed by the Herculaneum List of the Academy—“Chion, who slew the tyrant of Heraclea”—as well as fragments of works by the historians Theopompus and Nymphis of Heraclea that have survived.

Xenophon as Peacemaker. In *Ways and Means*, Xenophon explicitly states that peace is necessary for increasing state revenues (*Vect.* 5.1). He proposes the establishment of a special magistracy—the peacekeepers (*eirēnophylakes*)—aimed at ensuring a lasting peace policy within the city-state.

1.2.3 Xenophon's Political Views

Many researchers attribute oligarchic sympathies to Xenophon, often commenting on his alleged support for or even involvement in the regime of the Thirty Tyrants. In fact, Xenophon clearly expresses his attitude toward this regime in *Hellenica*, where he describes the way power was seized in Athens (*Hell.* 2.3.13–14).

In *Memorabilia*, Xenophon recounts his teacher Socrates' stance on the Thirty. The mask of the regime falls when its leaders begin executing their fellow citizens. Socrates then publicly declares that it would be absurd for a shepherd, after slaughtering his flock, to claim he is a good leader. Even more horrifying would be if rulers destroyed their own people without even feeling shame for it (*Mem.* 1.2.32).

From Xenophon's words in these two texts, one can conclude that even if he initially placed some hope in this government, he quickly became disillusioned and distanced himself from it.

Xenophon and Sparta. Xenophon is often accused of sympathizing with Sparta or even of *Laconophilia*. In reality, in *Hellenica*, he criticizes Spartan policy (*Hell.* 5.4.1). In *The Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, the penultimate chapter (XIV) is so critical that its authorship has repeatedly been questioned.

1.2 Main Conclusions

Xenophon is the only philosopher who, according to Eunapius, managed to adorn philosophy both in word and in deed (*Lives of the Philosophers*, 453). In truth, the sophist forgets Socrates—but this only highlights Xenophon's completed *Anabasis* as a worthy disciple of the sage.

Xenophon took part in the campaign for the Achaemenid royal tiara, and after the Battle of Babylon and the capture of the commanders, he was elected as one of the leaders of the retreat. Thanks to his strategic decisions in the rear guard, the mercenaries managed to see their homelands again. Mastering the art of war, Xenophon fought for Seuthes against Thracian tribes in southern Strandzha, the Thracian Delta, and near Salmydessus. Later, we find him alongside Agesilaus II the Great in battles in Asia Minor and Europe. The Athenian and the Spartan were bound by a close friendship.

In his later years, Xenophon settled as a *proxenos* (resident representative) of Sparta in Elis, where he spent several peaceful decades—years that gave him the opportunity to reflect upon and record his life's journey, ultimately establishing him as a world-renowned writer.

Although the *Corpus Xenophonticum* secures Xenophon's place as an author, few ancient figures have been subject to as many claims contradicting both facts and common sense. Thucydides' words—that most people do not seek the truth but prefer ready-made opinions

(*Thuc.* 1.20.3)—still hold true today. Hence, it is necessary to avoid both neglecting written sources and excessive hypercriticism when interpreting them.

To summarize, 442/441 BC seems the most probable year of birth for the traveler, historian, and philosopher who would later be called “the Attic Muse” (*Diog. Laert.* 2.6.57) and “the Attic Bee” (*Suda*, s.v. Ξ. 47). Revising Xenophon’s birth year is of particular importance, as it is closely tied to arguments about the disputed authorship of *The Constitution of the Athenians*.

What follows is a table summarizing episodes from Xenophon’s biography that lend themselves to some form of historical reconstruction.

Date	Event
442/441 BC	Xenophon is born and registered in Erchia.
424 BC	Xenophon takes part in the Battle of Delium.
?	Xenophon is captured in Boeotia.
421/420 BC	Xenophon is among the guests at the symposium hosted by Callias.
401 BC	Xenophon joins the campaign of Cyrus the Younger.
401-400 BC	Xenophon serves as a general during the mercenaries' retreat.
400-399 BC	Xenophon is a general under Seuthes.
after 399 BC	Xenophon enters Spartan service.
after 399 BC	A decree of exile is issued against Xenophon in Athens.
394 BC	Xenophon fights in the Battle of Coronea.
c. 392-371 BC	Life in Scillus.
362 BC	Gryllus dies heroically in the Battle of Mantinea.
?	Xenophon visits Magna Graecia.
after 355 BC	Xenophon dies (probably in Corinth).

Chapter 2. Literary Legacy and Influence

2.1 A Dance with the Muses

History is, above all, storytelling—it is no coincidence that it has its own Muse. The name of the messenger Clio (Κλειώ) derives from the verb κλέω, meaning “to tell,” “to praise,” “to celebrate.” These meanings are applicable to the works of Xenophon, which fully embody the virtues of a historian—and above all, the art of storytelling.

2.1.1 Xenophon as an Author

Xenophon was not the first writer to speak of his own deeds and present his speeches in the third person. Before him, the orator Antiphon had used a similar literary device. The intended effect—maximum distancing from the narrative—has a strong impact on the reader and was even employed by Caesar in *Commentaries on the Gallic War*.

2.1.2 Xenophon as a Historian

According to Diodorus of Agyrion (*Diod. Sic.* 1.2.2), history is the metropolis of philosophy. What distinguishes Xenophon from most historians is that he was not only a direct witness but also an active participant in the events he describes. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that he was also a writer, which means his work cannot be viewed in isolation.

2.1.3 Xenophon as a Philosopher

It is puzzling that some modern authors attempt to exclude Xenophon from the circle of philosophers or suggest that he knew Socrates only briefly, in passing, or lacked the natural abilities to comprehend his teaching. This view is diametrically opposed to the commentary of Diogenes Laertius regarding the most important representatives of the so-called Socratics—Plato, Xenophon, and Antisthenes (*Diog. Laert.* 2.5.47).

Socrates left no writings of his own, but many of his listeners did. Only the works of Xenophon and Plato (and a small part of Aristotle) have survived. Xenophon relates much about his teacher. His Socrates does not rush to teach his listeners eloquence or clever rhetorical devices. His goal is to make his students virtuous citizens. Socrates believes that talented but immoral people are more prone to violence and wrongdoing, which makes them much more dangerous to society (*Mem.* 4.3.1–2). Xenophon’s own life confirms this.

As for his philosophical views, they focus on power in all its various forms and manifestations—from types of government—democracy, monarchy, oligarchy, or tyranny—to relationships between individuals—the art of commanding and obeying. His interest in political philosophy is also one of the reasons he has been attributed with sympathies for various forms of political systems.

2.2 Corpus Xenophonticum

We owe to Diogenes Laertius the earliest preserved catalogue of Xenophon’s works (*Diog. Laert.* 2.6.56–57), though it does not appear in the Bulgarian edition of *Lives of the Philosophers*. That edition, published in a translation by T. Tomov in 1985, contains significant omissions, making its use in historical research problematic.

The corpus of Xenophon is presented here in alphabetical order, following the Latin abbreviations (*Abbreviations List*) of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

2.2.1 Agesilaus

Structure and Content. *Agesilaus* (Greek: Ἀγησίλαος; Latin: *Agesilaus*) is an encomium of Agesilaus II, written in the form of a panegyric, as intended by the author himself (Xen., *Ag.* 10.3). In the first two chapters, the life of the Spartan king is presented in chronological order, making the work the earliest preserved example of the biographical genre. The text is structured into 11 chapters.

Dating and Issues. The death of Agesilaus II serves as a *terminus post quem* for the composition of the text (Xen., *Ag.* 10.3), though the exact year is debated among scholars (360 BC, 359 BC, 358 BC). The *terminus ante quem* is the death of Xenophon, which likely occurred after 355 BC.

Manuscripts. The *Pinakes* database lists 14 manuscripts containing *Agesilaus*. The earliest is preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Library—Vat. gr. 1335. The text occupies folios 209–220v and is dated to the third quarter of the 10th century (ca. 960 AD).

Selected Translations:

- The work has not been published in Bulgarian, but part of a passage (Xen., *Ages.* 2.26) is translated and included in ITT2.
- A modern English translation by R. Bartlett—*Agesilaus*—was published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* in 2018.
- A significant Russian translation by V. Borukhovich and E. Frolov was published in „Ксенофонт. Киропедия“ in 1976.

2.2.2 Anabasis

Structure and Content. *Anabasis* (Greek: Ἀνάβασις; Latin: *Anabasis*) is a work dedicated to the campaign of Cyrus the Younger (*Anabasis of Cyrus*) toward Babylon and the subsequent retreat of the mercenaries. The text is structured into seven books.

Dating and Issues. In the summaries (*periochae*) of *Persica*, compiled by Photius and included in the *Bibliotheca*, the events following the Battle of Babylon are described. Ctesias of Cnidus recounts the death of Cyrus the Younger and the fate of the captured commanders. They were not executed immediately after being brought to Babylon, as the physician makes a point of assuring his readers that he had tended to Clearchus while the Spartan was in custody.

According to Ctesias, after the execution, Clearchus' body was discarded, but a sandstorm covered it with dust, and eight years later, the natural mound was already overgrown with palm trees secretly planted by the eunuchs of the queen mother. This serves as a chronological marker for the publication of *Persica*.

Even if we assume that Clearchus' execution took place no later than 400 BC, and consider the physician's note about the palms growing on his grave eight years later, the earliest possible date for the composition of *Persica* would be 392 BC.

The death of Cyrus the Younger at the Battle of Babylon is described by Xenophon in the first book of *Anabasis*, following the account of Ctesias (Xen., *An.* 1.8.26–27). This citation

makes it impossible for *Anabasis* to have been published in the first decade of the 4th century BC.

Manuscripts. A total of 59 manuscripts containing the text of *Anabasis* are recorded. The earliest is *Vat. gr. 1335*, where the text occupies folios 116v–205v and is dated to the third quarter of the 10th century (ca. 960 AD).

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Исторически съчинения* (1984), based on the 1942 translation by M. Mirchev (with later revisions).
- In English, a revision of C. Brownson's 1960 translation was done by J. Dillery in *Xenophon. Anabasis* (1998). A modern English translation was also made by W. Ambler in *Xenophon. The Anabasis of Cyrus* (2011).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Osherov was published in *Историки Греции* (1976). There is also a translation by M. Maksimova, first issued in 1951, but the text was censored and only fully republished after the collapse of the USSR.

2.2.3 Apology of Socrates

Structure and Content. *Apology* of Socrates (Greek: Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους [πρὸς τοὺς Δικαστάς]; Latin: *Apologia Socratis*) is a short work, structured into 34 paragraphs.

Dating and Issues. In his introduction, *Xenophon* states that “others” have also written about the defense of Socrates and his final days (Xen., *Ap.* 1). From this, it follows that *Apologia* was written some time after the philosopher's death.

The Apology of Socrates or *The Apology* is an example of Xenophon's “misleading titles.” The title does not correspond exactly to the content, since Socrates' speech forms only the middle part of the work.

Manuscripts. Seven manuscripts containing *Apologia Socratis* are recorded. The earliest is *Vat. gr. 1335*. The text occupies folios 206–209 and is dated to the third quarter of the 10th century (ca. 960 AD).

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения* (1985), translated by R. Stefanov.
- A modern English translation was made by R. Bartlett in *The Shorter Socratic Writings. Apology of Socrates to the Jury, Oeconomicus, and Symposium* (2006).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Sobolevsky was published in *Ксенофонт Афинский. Сократические сочинения* (1935).

2.2.4 Constitution of the Athenians

Structure and Content. *The Constitution of the Athenians* is a short political pamphlet. The text is structured into three chapters.

Dating and Issues. The writing of the text is generally dated to the second half of the 5th century BC or even to the 4th century BC, though most studies favor the period between 431 and 424 BC. The authorship of Xenophon has traditionally been disputed, since the language and style of the treatise differ from those of his other works. As a result, the author of the treatise is usually referred to impersonally as Pseudo-Xenophon. It is likely that G. Murray introduced the term “The Old Oligarch,” and in the 21st century, the designation “X” for the author is also used.

The now widely accepted later dating of Xenophon’s birth strengthens the arguments against his authorship because, at the time the treatise was likely written, he would have been a small child. Thus, Xenophon’s authorship has been rejected on stylistic and chronological grounds.

However, in the preface to *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* and in the essay accompanying *The Regime of the Athenians*, McBrayer suggests that the arguments against Xenophon’s authorship are far from definitive and may even be questionable. It can also be added that, despite stylistic differences, the treatise is permeated with irony—a hallmark of Xenophon’s writing.

The text may be interpreted in completely opposite ways: is the author a supporter of oligarchic rule, or does he use ironic devices to defend the democratic order of Athens? Moreover, the structure of *The Constitution of the Athenians* resembles that of *The Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*—a work whose attribution to Xenophon has not been questioned.

If the treatise was written during Xenophon’s youth, this might explain the differences in style and language. One should also consider the influence of his teacher under whose guidance Xenophon studied at that time. In this context, the purpose of the polemical text was probably not public dissemination but rather an exercise in mastering rhetorical techniques.

The author expresses disapproval of Athens’ political system but is “forced” to defend it in a debate with his opponent.

Manuscripts. Fifteen manuscripts containing *The Constitution of the Athenians* have been recorded. The earliest is preserved in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice—*Venetus Marcianus gr. Z. 511 (coll. 0590)*. The text occupies folios 293v–295v and is dated to the first half of the 14th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Атинската държавна уредба. Лакедемонската държавна уредба* (2016), translated by M. Slavova.
- A modern English translation was made by R. Bartlett—*Regime of the Athenians*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Radzig was published in *Аристотель. Афинская полития* (1937).

2.2.5 On Hunting with Dogs

Structure and Content. *On Hunting with Dogs* is a treatise devoted to the topic of hunting. The text is structured into thirteen chapters.

Dating and Issues. *On Hunting with Dogs* is one of four works by Xenophon related to practical skills. The other three are *The Cavalry Commander*, *On Horsemanship*, and *On the Estate Manager*. Several centuries after Xenophon, Arrian also wrote a work with the same title and subject matter. The dating of the text can generally be placed in the first half of the 4th century BC.

Manuscripts. Eighteen manuscripts containing *On Hunting with Dogs* have been recorded. The earliest is *Vat. gr. 0989*, where the text occupies folios 001–013 and is dated to the second half of the 13th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work has not been published in Bulgarian, but a passage from it (Xen., *Cyn.* 11.1) has been translated and included in *ITT2*.
- A modern English translation was made by M. Ehrmantraut and G. McBrayer—*The One Skilled at Hunting with Dogs*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, only a translation by G. Yanchevetsky is available, published at the end of the 19th century.

2.2.6 The Education of Cyrus

Structure and Content. *The Education of Cyrus* is a work about Cyrus the Great, in which Xenophon presents the image of the ideal ruler. The title is usually translated as *The Education of Cyrus*, but it is somewhat misleading since the account of Cyrus' upbringing concludes with the first of the eight books into which the text was later structured.

Dating and Issues. The work was most likely completed after 362/1 BC, or even around 360 BC, but before December 359 BC. This is because Xenophon mentions (*Cyr.* 8.8.4) the capture of Ariobarzanes, the governor of Hellespontine Phrygia, who was betrayed by his son Mithradates during the so-called Great Satraps' Revolt.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Киропедия* (1995), translated by V. Atanasov.
- A modern English translation was made by W. Ambler in *Xenophon. The Education of Cyrus* and reissued in 2015.
- In Russian, a significant translation by V. Borukhovich and E. Frolov was published in *Ксенофонт. Киропедия* (1976).

2.2.7 On Horsemanship

Structure and Content. *On Horsemanship* (also translated as *On the Cavalry*) is a short treatise dedicated to the selection, care, and training of horses, as well as to the art of riding. The text is structured into twelve chapters, in which Xenophon shares his knowledge and experience on the subject (*Xen., Eq.* 1.1).

Dating and Issues. The work was written before *The Cavalry Commander* (Xen., Eq. 12.14). In scholarly research, the year 367 BC is often discussed as the likely time of its composition.

Manuscripts. Twenty-two manuscripts containing *On Horsemanship* have been recorded. The earliest is Vat. gr. 0989, where the text occupies folios 013v–023 and is dated to the second half of the 13th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work has not been published in Bulgarian, but a part of its passage (Xen., Eq. 8.6) has been translated and included in *ITT2*.
- A modern English translation was made by A. Bonnette—*On Horsemanship*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, the only modern translation is by V. Ponaryadov, published in *Ксенофонт. О верховой езде* (2005).

2.2.8 The Cavalry Commander

Structure and Content. *The Cavalry Commander* is a short treatise dedicated to military training and the duties of the *hipparch* (commander of the cavalry). The text is structured into nine chapters.

Dating and Issues. The treatise itself indicates that it was written after *On Horsemanship* (Xen., Eq. 12.14). In scholarly research, the year 367 BC is often discussed as the likely date of its composition.

Manuscripts. Twenty-one manuscripts containing *The Cavalry Commander* have been recorded. The earliest is Vat. gr. 0989, with the excerpt occupying folio 055, dated to the second half of the 13th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work has not been published in Bulgarian.
- A modern English translation was made by W. Ambler—*The Skilled Cavalry Commander*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, only a translation by G. Yanchevetsky is available, published at the end of the 19th century.

2.2.9 Hellenica

Structure and Content. *Hellenica* is a historiographical work. The text is structured into seven books. The first two were conceived as a continuation of Thucydides' unfinished work on the Peloponnesian War. The remaining five books cover the events that followed, up to the Battle of Mantinea.

Dating and Issues. The rule of Tisiphonus serves as a chronological marker for the creation of the text (Xen., Hell.6.4.37).

Manuscripts. Thirty-two manuscripts containing *Hellenica* have been recorded, with the earliest dating from the 14th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Исторически съчинения* (1984), translated by R. Stefanov.
- A modern English translation was also made by J. Marincola in *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika* (2010).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Lurie was reissued with revisions by R. Svetlov in *Ксенофонт. Греческая история* (1993).

2.2.10 Hieron

Structure and Content. *Hieron* is a short work written in the form of a dialogue between Hieron, the tyrant of Syracuse, and the poet Simonides of Ceos. The treatise explores the theme of power, particularly the power of a tyrant. The text is structured into eleven chapters.

Dating and Issues. The dialogue was likely written in the mid-360s BC.

Manuscripts. Thirty-two manuscripts containing *Hieron* have been recorded. The earliest is *Vat. gr. 1335*, where the text occupies folios 220v–229v and is dated to the third quarter of the 10th century (ca. 960 AD).

Selected Translations:

- The work has not been translated into Bulgarian.
- A modern English translation was made by D. O'Connor—*Hiero, or The Skilled Tyrant*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, a more recent translation was made by A. Rossiuss, published in *Гиерон, или Слово о тирании* (2006).

2.2.11 Polity of the Lacedaemonians

Structure and Content. *Polity of the Lacedaemonians* is the earliest (and the only fully preserved) treatise on the social, political, and military system of Sparta. The text is structured into fifteen chapters.

Dating and Issues. The assumption by Demetrius of Magnesia that the work does not belong to Xenophon (*Diog. Laert.* 2.6.57) has been rejected by modern scholarship. The composition of the text is generally dated to the period between 394 and 371 BC.

Manuscripts. Thirty-nine manuscripts containing *Polity of the Lacedaemonians* have been recorded. The earliest is *Vat. gr. 1335*, where the text occupies folios 229v–238, dated to the third quarter of the 10th century (ca. 960 AD), with folio 238 later restored at the end of the 14th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Атинската държавна уредба. Лакедемонската държавна уредба* (2016), translated by M. Slavova.
- A modern English translation was made by C. Kuiper and S. Collins—*Regime of the Lacedaemonians*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, a significant translation by L. Pechatnova was published in *Ксенофонт. Лакедемонская полития* (2014).

2.2.12 Memorabilia

Structure and Content. *Memorabilia* is an apologetic work written in dialogue form. Xenophon's aim is to vindicate Socrates and prove that his condemnation was unjust. The text is structured into four books.

Dating and Issues. The work was most likely written after 371 BC.

Manuscripts. Seventy-one manuscripts containing *Memorabilia* have been recorded. The earliest are dated to the 13th century and are preserved in the Vatican—*Pal. gr. 093* (folios 145–151*)—and in Paris—*Grec 1302* (folios 154–179*) and *Grec 1740* (folios 001–117v*).

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения* (1985), translated by R. Stefanov.
- A modern English translation was also made by A. Bonnette in *Xenophon. Memorabilia* (2015).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Sobolevsky was published in *Ксенофонт Афинский. Сократические сочинения* (1935).

2.2.13 Oeconomicus

Structure and Content. *Oeconomicus* is a two-part dialogue. The first part consists of a conversation between Socrates and Critobulus, while in the second part, Socrates recounts to Critobulus his discussion with Ischomachus, who in turn retells a conversation with his own wife. This work is unique in ancient literature, combining a discussion on the proper management of an estate with didactic material on agriculture. It is also one of the most valuable primary sources for the economic and social history of Classical Athens. The text is structured into twenty-one chapters.

Dating and Issues. The dialogue was likely written during the time Xenophon lived and managed his estate in Scillus. The events (the internal chronology of the work) occur after 401 BC, as the death of Cyrus the Younger is mentioned (*Xen., Oec.* 4.18), and before 399 BC, as Socrates is still alive.

Manuscripts. Forty-five manuscripts containing *Oeconomicus* have been recorded. The earliest is *Urb. gr. 095*, where the text occupies folios 001–031, with an excerpt on folios 072–073*, and is dated to the first half of the 14th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Платон. Ксенофонт. Аристотел. Икономика. Античните философи за дома и стопанството* (2018), translated by G. Gochev.
- A modern English translation was also made by R. Bartlett in *The Shorter Socratic Writings. Apology of Socrates to the Jury, Oeconomicus, and Symposium* (2006).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Sobolevsky was published in *Ксенофонт Афинский. Сократические сочинения* (1935).

2.2.14 Symposium

Structure and Content. *Symposium* is a short work written in the form of a dialogue, in which Socrates and his friends (Critobulus, Hermogenes, Charmides, Antisthenes, and others) are invited by the wealthiest Athenian—Callias, son of Hipponicus—to a banquet held in honor of Autolycus' victory in the pankration during the Great Panathenaea. The text is structured into nine chapters.

Dating and Issues. The exact date of the work's composition is unknown, but the events in the dialogue take place during the Great Panathenaea of 422/1 BC, which serves as a *terminus post quem* for the writing of the text.

Manuscripts. Twenty-eight manuscripts containing *Symposium* have been recorded.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения* (1985), translated by R. Stefanov.
- A modern English translation was also made by R. Bartlett in *The Shorter Socratic Writings. Apology of Socrates to the Jury, Oeconomicus, and Symposium* (2006).
- In Russian, a significant translation by S. Sobolevsky was published in *Ксенофонт Афинский. Сократические сочинения* (1935).

2.2.15 Ways and Means

Structure and Content. *Ways and Means* (Greek: Πόροι ἢ περὶ Προσόδων; Latin: *De vectigalibus*) is a treatise that addresses the economic problems of Athens and offers practical solutions for improving the city's financial situation. The text is structured into six chapters.

Dating and Issues. The work is considered a late, or even the final, work of Xenophon, written around 355–354 BC. It contains a chronological marker (Xen., *Vect.* 5.8–9), likely referring to events from the Third Sacred War.

Manuscripts. Fourteen manuscripts containing *Ways and Means* have been recorded. The earliest complete text is preserved in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice—*gr. Z. 511 (coll. 0590)*, occupying folios 296–298v, and is dated to the first half of the 14th century.

Selected Translations:

- The work was published in Bulgarian in *Платон. Ксенофонт. Аристотел. Икономика. Античните философи за дома и стопанството* (2018), translated by G. Gochev.
- A modern English translation was made by W. Ambler—*Ways and Means, or On Revenues*—and published in *Xenophon. The Shorter Writings* (2018).
- In Russian, a significant translation by E. Frolov was published in *Хрестоматия по истории Древней Греции* (1964).

2.3 Influence and Reception

The influence of Xenophon—called even in antiquity “the Attic Muse” (*Diog. Laert.* 2.6.57)—runs like a red thread through the literary tradition. His language, considered for centuries the model of the Attic dialect, actually laid the foundation for the so-called Hellenistic literary *koine*.

2.3.1 Xenophon and Plato

Aulus Gellius writes that nearly all biographers of Xenophon and Plato have touched upon the question of rivalry between the two (Gell., *NA*. 14.3). In addition to *Attic Nights*, the topic is also addressed by Athenaeus (Ath. 11.112) and Diogenes Laertius (Diog. Laert. 2.6.57; 3.1.34), as well as commented on by Marcellinus (Marcellin. 27).

Summarized, the arguments of the Peripatetics—according to the authors that have come down to us—appear as follows. Athenaeus and Diogenes reflect on the identical titles and themes of their works—whether *Symposium* (Συμπόσιον) or *Apology of Socrates* (Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους). Ultimately, Aulus Gellius concludes that there were probably no real grounds for rivalry between them, and such rivalry would not align with their philosophical education.

Nevertheless, the facts remain that Xenophon's name never appears in any dialogue of the Platonic corpus, while the "Attic Muse" mentions Plato only once—and even then, in passing (Xen., *Mem.* 3.6.1). Moreover, in Xenophon's Socratic works, a hidden polemic can be traced, though it is unclear at whom it is directed.

These are also the only works by Xenophon (besides *Anabasis*) in which the author explicitly marks his own presence—likely to lend greater credibility to the image of his teacher (Xen., *Mem.* 4.3.1–2; 1.3.8–13; 1.4.2; 1.6.14; 2.4.1; 2.5.1; *Symp.* 1.1; *Oec.* 1.1).

2.3.2 The Fall of the Achaemenid House

One of the largest state formations in human history—the Persian Empire—was founded by Cyrus the Great in the mid-6th century BC. From that moment on, the Ionian cities and the empire's expansionist policies became a nerve center of Greek-Persian relations. This rivalry sparked a series of conflicts lasting nearly two centuries, ultimately culminating in the downfall of the Achaemenid royal house under the blows of Alexander.

Seventy years earlier, however, an event occurred that reshaped the Greeks' perception of the Persian Empire's actual capabilities and further undermined its prestige—already damaged by the wars. This event was the famous retreat of Cyrus the Younger's former mercenaries (among them several thousand Thracians—both cavalry and light infantry) from central Persia back to their homelands.

Many ancient authors compare the mercenaries' march to that of Alexander, son of Philip, seeking parallels and causal links between the two. Eunapius even claims that Alexander of Macedon would never have become Alexander the Great if not for Xenophon (Eunap., *VS* 453).

2.3.3 The Encoded Poem of Leo the Wise

In his monograph *Byzantine Readings of Ancient Historians*, A. Kaldellis publishes a full translation of an iambic poem preserved in the codex *Parisinus gr. 1640*. The poem appears inserted between the texts of *The Education of Cyrus* and *Anabasis* (f. 123v) and is likely a copy of a dedication addressed to the Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire, Leo VI the Wise (866–912 AD).

A. Kaldellis suggests that the text is more than a conventional dedication and contains encrypted messages. The poem features many problematic passages—for example, the anonymous poet accuses Cyrus the Younger of a “lust for power” but directs his “Ten Thousand” not against Artaxerxes, but against Cyrus the Elder—the founder of the Achaemenid state.

2.4. Main Conclusions

Historians often forget that Xenophon was a philosopher, while philosophers tend to forget that he was a direct participant in the events he describes. The *Corpus Xenophonticum* establishes Xenophon as a world-renowned writer, and his philosophical views on the role of the ideal ruler present him as a forerunner of a new era—the age of Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic kingdoms.

In the centuries that followed, Xenophon became a model for imitation, and his influence on literary tradition can still be traced today.

If *The Constitution of the Athenians* was indeed written around 424 BC, when Xenophon was likely still of ephebic age, this raises grounds for reconsideration and revision of its authorship. Thus, if we allow ourselves to use Xenophon’s own literary device—his famous irony—“The Old Oligarch” may have been neither so old nor a staunch supporter of oligarchy.

A table with summarized information on the works included in the Xenophontic corpus follows. The dating of individual works remains debatable in most cases and is therefore not included in this table. Accurately dating ancient texts is inherently problematic. One must also consider the possibility that an original version of a work may have undergone revisions or more substantial interventions by contemporaries of the author or later “editors”—such as the so-called *diaskeuasts* (see, e.g., Diod. Sic. 40.8).

Work № 1	„Agesilaus“ (ancient Greek: Ἀγησίλαος; Latin: Agesilaus)
Abbreviation	<i>Ages.</i>
Codices	14
Translation	There is no translation in the Bulgarian language.

Work № 2	„Anabasis“ (ancient Greek: Ἀγησίλαος; Latin: Agesilaus)
Abbreviation	<i>An.</i>
Codices	59
Translation in Bulg.	„Ксенофонт. Исторически съчинения“ (М. Мирчев и др., 1984 г.)

Work № 3	„Apology of Socrates“ (ancient Greek: Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους [πρὸς τοὺς Δικαστάς]; Latin: Apologia Socratis)
Abbreviation	<i>Ap.</i>
Codices	7

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения“ (Р. Стефанов, 1985 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 4	„Athenian Consitution“ (ancient Greek: Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία; Latin: Respublica Atheniensium)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	[<i>Ath. pol.</i>] (<i>Ath.</i> по LSJ)
---------------------	--

Codices	15
----------------	----

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Атинската държавна уредба. Лакедемонската държавна уредба“ (М. Славова, 2016 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 5	„On Hunting with Dogs“ (ancient Greek: Κυνηγετικός; Latin: Cynegeticus)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Cyn.</i>
---------------------	-------------

Codices	18
----------------	----

Translation	There is no translation in the Bulgarian language.
--------------------	--

Work № 6	„On the Education of Cyrus“ (ancient Greek: Κύρου παιδεία; Latin: Cyropaedia)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Cyr.</i>
---------------------	-------------

Codices	122
----------------	-----

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Киропедия“ (В. Атанасов 1995 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 7	„On Horsemanship“ (ancient Greek: Περὶ Ἱπικῆς; Latin: De equitandi ratione)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Eq.</i>
---------------------	------------

Codices	22
----------------	----

Translation	There is no translation in the Bulgarian language.
--------------------	--

Work № 8	„The Cavalry Commander“ (ancient Greek: Ἱππαρχικός; Latin: De equitum magistro)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Eq. mag.</i>
---------------------	-----------------

Codices	21
----------------	----

Translation	There is no translation in the Bulgarian language.
--------------------	--

Work № 9	„Hellenica“ (ancient Greek: Ἑλληνικά; Latin: Hellenica)
--------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Hell.</i> (HG. по LSJ)
---------------------	---------------------------

Codices	32
----------------	----

Translation in Bulg.	„Ксенофонт. Киропедия“ (В. Атанасов 1995 г.)
--------------------------------	--

Work № 10	„Hieron“ (ancient Greek: Ἱέρων ἢ Τυραννικός; Latin: Hiero)
---------------------	--

Abbreviation	<i>Hier.</i>
---------------------	--------------

Codices	32
----------------	----

Translation	There is no translation in the Bulgarian language.
--------------------	--

Work № 11	„Polity of the Lacedaemonians“ (ancient Greek: Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία; Latin: Respublica Lacedaemoniorum)
---------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Lac.</i>
---------------------	-------------

Codices	39
----------------	----

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Атинската държавна уредба. Лакедемонската държавна уредба“ (М. Славова, 2016 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 12	„Memorabilia“ (ancient Greek: Ἀπομνημονεύματα; Latin: Memorabilia)
---------------------	--

Abbreviation	<i>Mem.</i>
---------------------	-------------

Codices	71
----------------	----

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения“ (Р. Стефанов, 1985 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 13	„Oeconomicus“ (ancient Greek: Οἰκονομικός; Latin: Oeconomicus)
---------------------	--

Abbreviation	<i>Oec.</i>
---------------------	-------------

Codices	45
----------------	----

Translation	„Платон. Ксенофонт. Аристотел. Икономика. Античните философи за дома и стопанството“ (Г. Гочев, 2018 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 14	„Symposium“ (ancient Greek: Συμπόσιον; Latin: Symposium)
---------------------	--

Abbreviation	<i>Sym.</i> (<i>Smp.</i> по LSJ)
---------------------	-----------------------------------

Codices	28
----------------	----

Translation	„Ксенофонт. Сократически съчинения“ (Р. Стефанов, 1985 г.)
--------------------	--

Work № 15	„Ways and Means“ (ancient Greek: Πόροι ἢ περὶ Προσόδων; Latin: De vectigalibus)
---------------------	---

Abbreviation	<i>Vect.</i>
---------------------	--------------

Codices	14
----------------	----

Translation	„Платон. Ксенофонт. Аристотел. Икономика. Античните философи за дома и стопанството“ (Г. Гочев, 2018 г.)
--------------------	--

Chapter 3. Ancient Thrace and the Thracians in the Corpus Xenophonticum

Research on Xenophon's works in Bulgarian historiography was initiated by the founder of Bulgarian Thracology—Gavril Katsarov. Early in his academic career, he published the study *Объ отношеніи Аѳинской политіи Аристотеля къ Ксенофону* (1904). Later, this prominent Bulgarian antiquarian used information from Xenophon in *Битът на старите траки според класическите писатели* (1913), as well as in his monograph *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Thraker* (1916).

He was followed by publications from Yanko Todorov—*Тракийските царе* (1933)—and Mladen Tonev's *Приноси към историята на траките* (1942), both of which also drew on Xenophon's information. A section dedicated to Xenophon appears in *Извори за старата история и география на Тракия и Македония* (1915; 1949).

Hristo Danov, in turn, provided a historiographical assessment of Xenophon in his study *Към историческия облик на древна Тракия II. Хекатей, Херодот, Тукидид и Ксенофонт* (1947; 1998). He also paid special attention to Xenophon in his focused publication *Югоизточна Тракия по сведенията на Ксенофонт* (1951). The findings of these works were later incorporated into his monograph *Древна Тракия*, also published in German translation (1976).

Alexander Fol used the accounts of the "Attic Muse" in his analyses included in several monographs: *Демографска и социална структура на древна Тракия. I хилядолетие преди н. е.* (1970), *Политическа история на траките. Краят на второто хилядолетие до края на пети век пр. н. е.* (1972), *Тракия и Балканите през ранноелинистическата епоха* (1975), and *Политика и култура в древна Тракия* (1990).

The thorough integration of Xenophon's information on the history and culture of ancient Thrace is owed to Ivan Venedikov and his study *Тракийската топонимия в движение. Населението на Югоизточна Тракия* (1982). His historiographical achievement also includes the study *Земеделието при траките* (1981), whose valuable observations on Thracian agrarian practices were later adopted by Rumyana Georgieva in *Храна и хранене (края на II–I хил. пр. н. е.)*, part of the volume *Етнология на траките* (1999).

B. Bogdanov authored the introductory article *Историкът Ксенофонт* for *Ксенофонт. Исторически съчинения* (1984). Margarita Tacheva focused on the Athenian historian in her study *Der soziale und juristische Status der Thraker in der Zeit Xenophons und Strabons* (1989) and later in *Царете на древна Тракия* (2006). Dimitar Popov analyzed Xenophon in the "Historiography" section of *Гръцките интелектуалци и тракийския свят* (2013). The second volume of *Извори за историята на Тракия и траките* (2003) includes new translations of numerous texts.

Numerous references to Xenophon can also be found in Petar Delev's study *Някои проблеми на етнотопонимията в централна и югоизточна Тракия* (2010).

The information from the Athenian historian's corpus are cited by Yu. Tsvetkova in her monograph *История на тракийския Херсонес от Троянската война до времето на*

римското завоевание (2008). Xenophon's information also forms the basis of her studies *Земите на Месад* (2016) and *Дълголетникът Терес* (2018). His information is thoroughly examined and applied in *ГИС и Тракология. Приложения на Географските информационни системи в изследванията на тракийската история* (2018).

3.1 Images and Masks

The references to Old Attic Comedy used in the titles of some subsections of this chapter serve purely structural and stylistic purposes and are not intended for historiographical interpretation.

3.1.1 Commanders and Mercenaries

The institution of mercenary service has a long-standing tradition—in the late 5th century BC and especially throughout the 4th century BC, it was widespread across the Mediterranean world, including ancient Thrace. Xenophon was not merely a mercenary (μισθοφόρος), but also a commander of significant military detachments, which served and received payment both from Persian and Thracian rulers. This necessitates the systematization and analysis of his observations within the context of a complex and much-debated topic, here explored through its Thracian dimension.

Foundational works on the study of Greek mercenary service are those of H. Parke and G. Griffith, who also raised the issue of its connection with the crisis of the *polis*. Among the contributions to this subject, the works of several Bulgarian authors stand out.

The earliest layer of evidence on this matter in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* dates back to the mid-6th century BC. In *The Education of Cyrus*, Xenophon mentions Thracian sword-bearers (Θρᾷκες μάχαιοφόροι), hired by Croesus before the battle at Thymbrara (Θύμβραρα) against Cyrus the Great (Xen., *Cyr.* 6.2.9–11) in 546 BC. This information has received little attention in Bulgarian historiography despite its importance—not only because of its early chronological frame but also because, in the listing of allied and mercenary contingents, the Thracians are named first. It is plausible that these Thracians came from the region of the Thracian Chersonese or Southeastern Thrace, especially considering the well-documented good relations between Croesus and Miltiades the Elder.

The interaction between Greeks and Thracians in the context of mercenary service also has a long tradition. Around the same time in Europe, the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus used gold from Mount Pangaion and hired detachments from the local population to return from exile to Attica (Arist., *Ath. Pol.* 15.2). A few decades later, Miltiades the Younger maintained his rule in the Thracian Chersonese with the help of mercenaries—probably also Thracians (Hdt. 6.39). During the 5th and 4th centuries BC, Thracian mercenaries became especially valued as cavalymen and light infantry.

In one of his discussions on bravery, even Socrates emphasizes the skills of Thracian peltasts in handling light shields and throwing spears, comparing them with the Spartans in heavy infantry and the Scythians in archery (Xen., *Mem.* 3.9.2). In *On Horsemanship*, Xenophon compares the combat qualities of the Odrysian horses and their performance in rough terrain to those of the Persians (Xen., *Eq.* 8.6).

In *The Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, there is a description of the organization of the Spartan military camp, noting that although the camp was traditionally guarded by the Sciritae, by the time the text was written, these duties were mostly performed by mercenaries (Xen., *Lac.* 12.3). This change most likely dates from the time of Brasidas' campaigns in Thrace, when Thracian peltasts proved better suited for night operations and security tasks.

Alcibiades — the Prodigal Son of Attica. From the late 5th century BC date the connections between Alcibiades (born ca. 450 – d. 404 BC) and the dynasts of the hinterland of the Thracian Chersonese and Thrace. It would be hard to find a better characterization of Pericles' nephew than the comment of Archistratus—that Athens could not bear two Alcibiadeses (Ael., *VH.* 11.7).

A political assessment of the Athenian's activities in Thrace was made by A. Fol, while a chronological reconstruction of his actions in the Thracian Chersonese was offered by Yu. Tsvetkova.

Clearchus — A Life under the Sign of Ares. Among the commanders treacherously captured by Tissaphernes, the personality and deeds of Clearchus (ca. 450 – ca. 401 BC) deserve special attention. The Spartan not only waged war against Thracian tribes in the region of the Thracian Chersonese and near Perinthus (Xen., *An.* 1.1.9; 1.3.3–4; 2.6.1–5) but also commanded troops composed entirely of Thracian mercenaries (Xen., *An.* 1.2.9; 1.5.13).

Xenophon — A General by Necessity. *Anabasis* conceals many mysteries, one of which concerns Xenophon's role in the early stage of the campaign, before the battle at Babylon. Xenophon himself recounts this (Xen., *An.* 3.1.4), but here the Athenian skillfully employs Thucydides' technique of "obscure writing" (σκοτεινὸς λόγος), revealing not what his position was, but what it wasn't. This is likely deliberate, though we can only speculate about the reasons.

By excluding himself from the military hierarchy, Xenophon leaves few options for interpretation, since private individuals in an army are usually limited to camp followers—servants or slaves, merchants, artisans, and courtesans. This leaves a few possibilities: that he served as an advisor and/or chronicler of the campaign.

It is most likely that *Anabasis* is based on a military journal—a hypothesis that fits both the documentary nature of the work and the Athenian's literary interests. Xenophon also displays a keen interest in the art of divination and military mantic practices, weaving related accounts throughout his works (see, e.g., Xen., *An.* 1.7.18; 4.5.4; 5.2.9; 6.2.15; 6.4.9; 6.4.14; 6.5.2; 6.5.8; 6.5.21).

Even in his introduction to the *Anabasis* narrative, Xenophon chooses a dialogue with Cyrus centered on military divination. During this conversation, just before the fateful battle, Cyrus delivers a message through Xenophon to the mercenaries—that the sacrifices were favorable (Xen., *An.* 1.8.15). This episode reflects not only Xenophon's role as a mediator between the command and the troops but also highlights his proximity to the decision-making center.

3.1.1 Kings and Aristocrats

Xenophon's interest in political philosophy and systems of government can be traced consistently throughout his entire body of work. In *The Education of Cyrus*, he compares the imperial policy of Cyrus the Great with that of the Scythians, Thracians, and Illyrians (Xen., *Cyr.* 1.1.4). Although written in the form of a biographical-historical novel, the work reflects not only the author's views but also the political ideas of his era.

It is notable that the text refers to the "king of the Thracians," most likely referring to the ruler of the Odrysian dynasty—the most influential Thracian state formation. The conclusion Xenophon reaches is that, despite their significant numbers and resources, these peoples did not pursue expansionist policies but rather sought to preserve their power within their own territories.

On the independent Thracians. While recounting the history of the early Odrysian kingdom, Thucydides notes that a significant portion of the Thracian tribes remained independent (Thuc. 2.29.2). The historian uses the adjective αὐτόνομος—"living by their own laws," "self-governing," "independent," but also "free" or "unrestrained."

In *Hellenica*, Xenophon reports a speech delivered by an envoy from the neighboring cities of Olynthus to the Peloponnesian League, which also mentions independent Thracians (Xen., *Hell.* 5.2.17). Unlike Thucydides, Xenophon uses a different adjective—ἄβασιλευτος—"without a king," "without a monarch."

On royal hunting. In *On Hunting with Dogs*, Xenophon discusses the so-called honorable or royal hunt—that is, hunting lions, leopards, lynxes, panthers, bears, and other predators (Xen., *Cyn.* 11). He specifies the range of these "dangerous beasts," listing Mount Pangaion in Thrace first. The toponym is presented as part of "foreign lands."

Xenophon notes that such hunting is carried out by mounted men and involves great risk—not only from the prey itself but also because of the rough mountainous terrain, posing a significant hazard to the rider (Xen., *Cyr.* 1.4.7). The treatise describes various hunting techniques, including some unusual ones, like the use of poison derived from the plant wolfsbane (*aconitum*) and the construction of elaborate traps.

Like most of Xenophon's works, the treatise should not be viewed in isolation. The topic of hunting also appears in *The Education of Cyrus*, where the author distinguishes between the "honorable" (or "royal") hunt—aimed at dangerous animals like bears, boars, lions, and panthers—and the "safe" hunt—of deer, gazelles, wild goats, and donkeys. This distinction reflects the ideals connected with the education of rulers and the aristocracy, as well as the virtues of martial skill and moral excellence.

Teres. The earliest layer of information related to the royal onomastics of the Thracians appears in Book VII of *Anabasis*. The events in the text unfold at the beginning of 399 BC, though some of the details refer back to the 5th century BC.

The first mention (Xen., *An.* 7.2.22) introduces Seuthes into the narrative of *Anabasis*.

The second mention (Xen., *An.* 7.5.1) comes from Xenophon shortly before the mercenaries end their relationship with the dynast:

“Then they marched against the Thracians above Byzantium, in the so-called Delta. It no longer belonged to Medocus, but to Teres, an Odrysian (an ancient one)...”

The most detailed study of the name appears in Yu. Tsvetkova’s *Дълголетникът Терес* (2018), which also includes a list of attestations of the name Teres.

In this discussion, we will focus on the problematic reading of part of the passage (Xen., *An.* 7.5.1): “(...) but to Teres, an Odrysian (an ancient one) (...)” — ἀλλὰ Τήρους τοῦ Ὀδρύσου ἀρχαίου τινός

Given the complex manuscript tradition of *Anabasis*—with its two codex families—and the difficulties posed by translating ethnonyms/patronyms from Ancient Greek, this is illustrated by the translations of M. Maksimova and T. Clark.

In their versions, “the Odrysian Teres (an ancient one)” is respectively rendered as: “Тер, сына Одриса [какого-то древнего царя]” and “Teres the (son) of-Odryses, some ancient (king).”

Thus, depending on how the text is read, it may or may not be possible to add a ruler named Odrysus to the stemma of Thracian kings as the eponym of the Odrysian kingdom

On Medocus and the “Illness” of the Odrysian State. In the tower near Perinthus, Seuthes tells Xenophon the history of his family (Xen., *An.* 7.2.32). From the dynast’s speech, we learn that his father’s name was Medocus (Μαισάδης), and his rule (ἀρχή) encompassed the territories of the Melanditae (Μελανδίται), the Thyni (Θυνοὶ), and the Tranipsae (Τρανίψαι).

Yu. Tsvetkova offers a detailed analysis of the information and publications concerning this Thracian ruler in her study *Земите на Месаџ* (2016).

Here, we will emphasize Xenophon’s statement that when the Odrysians “fell ill” (ἐνόσησεν), Medocus was driven out of these lands and soon afterward died (from an illness).

Usually, translations of this passage use a paraphrase such as “(...) the Odrysian state declined (...)”, but a literal translation reveals that the text mentions “illness” twice within a single sentence.

This recalls a fragment attributed to Hermippus (5th century BC), preserved by Athenaeus (Ath. 1.49). In this parody catalogue from Old Attic Comedy, “gifts” that are actually misfortunes are listed, alluding to events from the Peloponnesian War.

In political satire and poetry, *psora* (ψώρα)—literally mange or scab—often symbolizes social decay.

There is also a possible correlation with Aristophanes’ *The Birds*, where “the city has fallen from mange,” and the king of the birds is the Hoopoe (Tereus—the Thracian king).

Medocus — King of the Interior. During the negotiations between Xenophon and Seuthes in the tower, the dynast tells the Athenian how, as an orphan, he was raised by Medocus (Μηδόκος), “who is now king” (Xen., *An.* 7.2.32). As a young man (νεανίσκος), Seuthes sat in

a place of honor (ἐν-δίφριος) beside Medocus and, according to his own words, received (limited) resources from the king (Xen., *An.* 7.2.33).

Heracleides of Maroneia, during the symposium at Seuthes' court, moved about the vestibule advising the guests on court protocol. He also spoke with envoys from the city of Parion, as the polis sought to establish a friendship alliance with Medocus, bringing gifts for the king and his wife. Heracleides made a highly valuable comment (Xen., *An.* 7.3.16–17), namely that Medocus is located twelve days inland from the sea.

During negotiations with Xenophon near Selymbria (Xen., *An.* 7.7.3), Medosades brought with him the most notable Thracian, stating that the Odrysian represented Medocus, here called “upper king” (ἄνω βασιλεύς), i.e., king of the interior—as opposed to the “ruler of the coast.”

In *Hellenica*, however, Xenophon speaks instead of Amadocus (Ἀμήδοκος), king of the Odrysians, and of Seuthes—the ruler of the coast (ὁ ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ ἄρχων). By the late 390s BC, relations between these two Odrysian leaders evidently deteriorated, prompting Thrasybulus to intervene in the conflict (Xen., *Hell.* 4.8.26).

These accounts are examined in detail by M. Tacheva in her monograph *Тракуйськые царе* ("The Thracian Kings").

Seuthes — The Ruler of the Coast. The story of Seuthes, dating to the end of 400 and the beginning of 399 BC, was analyzed in the previous section. Here, we will consider additional aspects of his activities and personality, which fall outside the narrative framework of the “Commanders and Mercenaries” section.

The first mention of the dynast by Xenophon is found in Book V of *Anabasis* (Xen., *An.* 5.1.15). The action takes place in 400 BC, but the reference to the punishment that befell Dexippus pertains to a later time—within the first decade of the 4th century BC, though it cannot be dated more precisely.

The next mention of Seuthes occurs in the conversation between Xenophon and Medosades (Xen., *An.* 7.1.5), where the dynast is called Seuthes the Thracian (Σεύθης ὁ Θρᾷξ). After transferring from Asia Minor to Byzantium, the mercenaries were expelled from the city by order of the Spartan navarch Anaxibius. The Spartan tried to direct them toward Heraclea Pontica, promising they would be hired (Xen., *An.* 7.1.13). This prompted the commanders to explore other options (Xen., *An.* 7.1.14).

Cotys or Otys — A Slip of the Pen. In the late 370s BC, a separatist movement—the so-called Great Satraps' Revolt—began in Persia against Artaxerxes II (Diod. Sic. 15.90–92; see also Xen., *Cyr.* 8.8.4).

In the encomium dedicated to the death of Agesilaus II, Xenophon lists his diplomatic successes, including the liberation of the city of Sestos, besieged by Cotys (Xen., *Ages.* 2.26). This event is dated between 362–360 BC.

The panegyric also contains a problematic passage where Cotys is referred to as “archon of Paphlagonia” (Xen., *Ages.*3.4).

The account pertains to Agesilaus’ campaign in the autumn of 395 BC in Hellespontine Phrygia (see Xen., *Hell.* 4.1.1–41; *Hell. Oxy.* 16–17). However, in *Hellenica*, Xenophon names a different ruler of Paphlagonia (Xen., *Hell.* 4.1.3), calling the archon Otys (Ὀτυς).

In this context, it appears that the *Agesilaus* passage contains a scribal error—a conclusion supported by Yu. Tsvetkova in her study *Одриси и перси: политически взаимоотношения по времето на Котис I (384–360 г. пр. Хр.)* (“Odrysians and Persians: Political Relations in the Time of Cotys I”), rather than a deliberate distortion of the name—a common practice of Xenophon’s in *Anabasis*.

Of interest is A. Orachev’s suggestion regarding the phonetic similarity between the names Cotys (Κότυς) and Otys (Ὀτυς), as well as the possibility of confusion or omission of the definite article (ὁ), creating the conditions for a misrepresentation of the name.

Medosades — The Envoy of Seuthes. While passing through Asia Minor Thrace, Xenophon and the mercenaries reached Chrysopolis in Chalcedon, located at the mouth of the Thracian Bosphorus (Xen., *An.* 6.6.38). During a seven-day stay, while selling off the collected booty, a certain Medosades (Μηδοσάδης), envoy of Seuthes, arrived with an offer to Xenophon to assist in transferring the army (Xen., *An.* 7.1.5–6). The Athenian replied that he intended to resign from command and therefore “there is no need to pay either me or anyone else.” This same information is repeated during the preliminary negotiations between Seuthes and Xenophon (Xen., *An.* 7.2.24).

Their next meeting took place in the mercenary camp near Selymbria (Xen., *An.* 7.2.10), where Medosades arrived by sea and promised Xenophon “the coastal fortified settlements” of Seuthes (Xen., *An.* 7.2.28). They met a third time in the tower of Seuthes near Perinthus, where Xenophon clarified Medosades’ role (Xen., *An.* 7.2.23).

The last episode involving Medosades takes place in the plain near Selymbria, about 30 stadia (approximately 5 km) from the sea (Xen., *An.* 7.5.15). The mercenaries were quartered in villages from which they procured provisions. These villages were the personal property of Medosades—given to him by Seuthes—and he was forced to watch as “the Greeks plundered the food in his villages” (Xen., *An.* 7.7.2).

Abrozelmes or Hebryzelmes — Lost in Translation. The name Abrozelmes (Ἀβροζέλμης) appears only once (*hapax legomenon*) in Xenophon’s corpus (Xen., *An.* 7.6.43).

The personal name is thoroughly analyzed in S. Yanakieva’s article *За името на Севтовия преводач* (Xen. *Anab.* 7, 6, 43). Here, we will focus on the translation of the term ἐρμηνεύς, which in nearly all editions is taken to mean “interpreter.” In certain contexts (see e.g. Xen., *An.* 4.5.34; 7.2.19), ἐρμηνεύς clearly denotes a person performing the role of a translator. This may also be the case in Xen., *An.* 7.6.8, although the text makes it clear that Seuthes spoke Greek very well.

In other parts of *Anabasis* (see e.g. Xen., *An.* 1.2.17; 1.8.12), however, the term ἑρμηνεύς likely has the meaning of trusted person, diplomatic advisor, intermediary, or even “dragoman” (in the later Oriental tradition). For example, Cyrus the Younger’s “interpreter” — Glus — after the claimant’s death, was appointed by Artaxerxes as Persian admiral, thus holding a high position in the Persian administration.

This supports the hypothesis that Seuthes’ “interpreter” — Abrozelmēs and Hebryzelmes — might be the same person. There is also a possibility that Xenophon deliberately distorted the name Hebryzelmes — a device for which there are multiple parallels in the text of *Anabasis*.

The Story of Miltocythes the Thracian. In the autumn of 401 BC, even before the mercenary units had fully assessed the operational situation following the death of Cyrus the Younger, a group of 300 Thracian peltasts and about 40 cavalrymen, commanded by Miltocythes the Thracian, defected to the victor—Persian King Artaxerxes II (Xen., *An.* 2.2.7–8).

From this passage, it is not entirely clear whether this was an individual act by Miltocythes or an organized transfer of his troops. The fact that Xenophon was subsequently forced to urgently form a new cavalry unit (after the generals were seized by Tissaphernes) indirectly confirms that Miltocythes’ entire cavalry force had defected to the Persians.

The mention of this Miltocythes in *Anabasis* may be linked to a Thracian aristocrat of the same name, killed roughly four decades later in the Thracian Chersonese—the region from which, according to Xenophon, Clearchus recruited his mercenaries for Cyrus the Younger’s army.

Xenophon and Thrasybulus. At the end of the 6th century BC, Miltiades the Younger married Hegesipyle, the daughter of the Thracian king Olorus (Hdt. 6.39), opening the gates of Thrace to Athens. A century later, this tradition was continued by Seuthes, who promised Xenophon the hand of his daughter and the best of his fortified coastal settlements — Byzantium (Xen., *An.* 7.2.38).

The next candidate on this list is Thrasybulus (Θρασύβουλος, ca. 450–389 BC) — the liberator of Athens from the tyranny of the Thirty. Posthumously, Xenophon called him a “worthy man” (Xen., *Hell.* 4.8.31), and Cornelius Nepos even placed him first among distinguished men (*Nep., Thr.* 1.1). Thrasybulus is the subject of R. Buck’s monograph *Thrasybulus and the Athenian Democracy. The life of an Athenian statesman*.

Like Xenophon, at the end of the first decade of the 4th century BC, Thrasybulus considered a dynastic marriage with one of Seuthes’ daughters. The information comes from the epilogue of Lysias’ speech *Against Ergocles* (Lys. 28.5), in which we learn that Ergocles advised Thrasybulus to seize Byzantium and marry the daughter of Seuthes.

This information is of exceptional interest but has not received the attention it deserves in Bulgarian historiography.

Iphicrates and Menestheus — Son-in-Law and Grandson of a Thracian King. Iphicrates (Ἰφικράτης, 5th–4th century BC) is known not only as a mercenary commander but also as a military reformer. The Athenian’s fame rose in 390 BC during the Corinthian War when he destroyed a Spartan mora (about 600 men). A little later, Iphicrates was replaced by Chabrias

and then entered the service of Cotys in Thrace (cf. Isoc. 2.6; Polyaeus 3.9.4; 3.9.33; 3.9.41; 3.9.46; 3.9.50; 3.9.60; 3.9.62).

Iphicrates remained a symbol of military cunning and ingenuity. Xenophon, in the fourth book of *Hellenica*, describes the actions of Anaxibius in the region of the Hellespont (389 BC), including his heroic death as a result of one of Iphicrates' military tricks (Xen., *Hell.* 4.8.31–39). Additionally, Xenophon attributes to Iphicrates the use of his favorite stratagem — placing lights in front of military camps at night (Xen., *Hell.* 6.2.29), possibly borrowed from the Thracians.

In the 380s or early 370s BC, Iphicrates married a daughter (*Nep.*, *Iph.* 3.4; *Ath.* 4.6–7) of Cotys, with whom he had several children — Menestheus (Μενεσθεύς), Iphicrates, and (probably) a daughter. Cornelius Nepos preserves an interesting passage from Menestheus (*Nep.*, *Iph.* 3.4), which deserves careful analysis and further research, in which Menestheus comments somewhat cryptically that his father is responsible for Menestheus being Thracians while his mother is responsible for his being an Athenian.

3.1.3 Who is hiding behind the mask of Sosias in ancient comedy?

A reference from the economic treatise *Ways and Means* by Xenophon has been insufficiently analyzed in modern research. In it, the Xenophon reports how Nicias, son of Niceratus, leased out 1,000 slaves to Sosias the Thracian (Σωσίας ὁ Θραξ) at the Laurion silver mines (Xen., *Vect.* 4.14). The information is recorded by Xenophon with the clarification that it was obtained orally, because it was heard (“πάλαι ... ἀκηκόαμεν”). The location is the famous silver mines of Laurion in southern Attica, where many Thracian slaves also worked.

After a chronological gap of about half a millennium, Xenophon's account is recalled in Book VI of *Deipnosophistae* by Athenaeus of Naucratis. He provides no new information beyond Xenophon, but it is worth noting that the two authors use different words for “slave”: Xenophon uses ἄνθρωπος, while Athenaeus writes οἰκέτης. In the 12th century, Eustathius of Thessalonica refers to the account again in his *Commentaries on the Iliad and Odyssey*. Beyond these three texts, there are no other direct literary references to Sosias the Thracian.

Nicias, son of Niceratus, was born in the 470s BC. He became one of the most influential Athenian politicians of the Peloponnesian War period, elected strategos at least six times consecutively after 427/6 BC. His wealth was proverbial, frequently cited by ancient authors as one of the largest in Greece. His estate was valued at around 100 talents, most of it in silver (Lys. 19.47).

Sosias himself remains an enigmatic figure, and so far, no dedicated studies have been written about him. D. Detschew includes the name Sosias in *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*. This passage of Xenophon is also mentioned in *Hrestomatia po istorija na stariya svyat* by H. Danov, but only as an example of slave labor in the mines. Among Bulgarian authors, only V. Velkov gives more attention to Sosias in his study on Thracian slaves in Greek poleis, unequivocally identifying him as a slave.

In this regard, Velkov follows the interpretation of S. Lauffer in *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*, who argues that many of the slaves in those mines were Thracians, as they were

known throughout Antiquity as skilled miners. Lauffer was apparently the first to connect Xen., Vect. 4.14 with another passage in Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.5.2), although only one of these is included in Volume II of *ITT2*.

The name Sosias represents a piece of the puzzle of the “blank spots” in the history of Ancient Thrace, as the name, although of Greek etymology, is recorded without a patronymic but with the addition of Θρᾷξ — an ethnic or locational marker. It is important to note that in all of Xenophon’s works, only three persons are designated with ὁ Θρᾷξ — Sosias the Thracian, Seuthes the Thracian, and Miltochites the Thracian. A good parallel here is the record in the *Suda* that the father of Dionysius the Thracian (Διονύσιος ὁ Θρᾷξ) was named Teres. This confirms the Thracian origin of Sosias, and although foreign scholarship pays more attention to him than Bulgarian historiography does, there is still no consensus on his status: some researchers leave it as unknown, others claim he was a slave or freedman, and others — a metic.

Dating Sosias’s activity is also problematic. The likely terminus post quem is the period when Nicias inherited his estate and entered politics, shortly before the Peloponnesian War (431 BC). The terminus ante quem seems to be his departure from Athens (with Alcibiades and Lamachus) for the so-called Sicilian Expedition in 415 BC.

Another important indirect reference to Sosias is found in the Socratic dialogue *Memorabilia* (Xen., *Mem.* 2.5.2.), where Xenophon describes a conversation between Socrates and Antisthenes, which he personally witnessed. The dialogue discusses the value of friendship and the price of slaves. It relates to the direct account mentioned earlier because it adds information for a better interpretation. Although the overseer’s name isn’t mentioned, it is stated that he was a slave purchased by Nicias. It is also noteworthy that Antisthenes, Socrates’ interlocutor here, was himself of mixed status — his mother being a Thracian slave, as Diogenes Laertius reports (Diog. Laert. 6.1). This supports Lauffer’s earlier hypothesis that Sosias the Thracian and the unnamed overseer in Xen., *Mem.* 2.5.2 are the same person — a view accepted by most scholars studying mining, metallurgy, or slavery.

Significantly, Xenophon’s accounts refer to hearsay — “we have indeed heard...” (Xen., *Vect.* 4.14) and “they say that...” (Xen., *Mem.* 2.5.2) — which implies that these were familiar urban legends of his time, requiring no clarification even decades later. This directs attention to the texts of Attic comedy, whose plots in the 5th century BC were inspired entirely by the political life and contemporary issues of Athens. Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes are among the brightest representatives of Old Attic Comedy. However, only 11 of Aristophanes’ comedies have survived. In the earliest of his works, slaves are nameless, but in *Wasps* (422 BC), a slave character named Sosias appears (Ar., *Vesp.* 1).

Here, the observations of S. Sobolevsky in *Аристофан и неговото време* are valuable, as he extensively analyzes the depiction of slaves in Aristophanes’ comedies. Sobolevsky notes that the portrayal of slaves in Old Comedy reflects real life, with secondary roles allowing them to be shown as they were in reality. Aristophanes’ slave characters do not bear random names — most suggest their origin, such as Tratta (Θρᾷττα — “Thracian woman”) and Syra (Σύρα — “Syrian woman”). Sobolevsky brilliantly observes that there is no difference in

speech between active slave characters (like Xanthias and Sosias) and free Athenians — linguistically and culturally. This suggests they were either Greeks or “barbarians” raised in a Greek environment from early childhood. Slave characters like Midas, Phryx, Thratta, Syra, and Lydos appear only briefly and have no lines. For Sobolevsky, the prototype of Sosias remains unclear, unlike that of Xanthias. This is understandable if we assume that Sosias was not a generic stock character but based on a real person.

Little has survived from Middle Comedy, but in the second half of the 4th century BC, Theophrastus, Aristotle’s successor as head of the Lyceum, wrote *Ethikoi Charakteres*, sketches of 30 human types. Although Aristotle and Theophrastus are better known for their scientific works, most of their literary writings are lost. These character sketches had a significant influence on New Comedy and were likely written for Menander, a student of Theophrastus. In sketch XXVIII, *The Slanderer* (Κακολογίας), there are references to someone named Sosias (Theophr., *Char.* 28).

The slander follows the political rhetoric pattern of the time: first defaming the parents, then attacking the target himself. The slanderer hints that the person’s father bore the common slave name Sosias (Σωσίας), later served as a mercenary under the name Sosistratus (Σωσίστρατος), and registered in the deme as Sosidemus (Σωσίδημος), each a two-part name but with different suffixes. B. Bogdanov, commenting on this, writes: “Sosias — a traditional slave name, which, according to the slanderer, he tries to hide.” This name progression illustrates the career path of nouveau riche parvenus (νεόπλουτοι) — a former slave who gained freedom, bought his citizenship, and climbed the social ladder. The translation by A. Balabanov is particularly telling.

It is also no coincidence that Sosias was married to a “noble Thracian woman.” The Greek text gives the name as “Κρινοκοράκα” — a compound of “lily” (κρίνον) and “raven” (κόραξ). Bogdanov translates this as “White Raven,” but more likely, the combination of the lily’s white and the raven’s black refers to the tattoos or body markings worn by noble Thracian women (Hdt. 5.6).

In New Comedy, the plots shifted toward domestic drama. Menander is the only author whose comedies have survived. In his works, Sosias is a slave or servant character who cleverly assists his master in love affairs. His character was later adopted by Plautus and Terence, who translated and adapted Menander’s plays into Latin, introducing Sosias into Roman comedy.

3.1.4 The Teacher of the “Mad Socrates” and the Mother of the Gods

According to Diodorus Siculus, the accusers of Socrates were killed without trial (Diod. Sic. 14.37.7), but it is more likely that this refers only to Meletus, while Anytus was sentenced to exile (see Diog. Laert. 2.43; 6.10). According to the version preserved by Diogenes Laertius, the shift in public opinion after the philosopher’s death was due to Antisthenes (Ἀντισθένης), who, shortly after the execution, led a group of foreigners (seeking to meet the philosopher) to the house of Anytus and sarcastically told them they did not need Socrates, for this man surpassed him both in intellect and virtue (Diog. Laert. 6.10).

The ancient tradition portrays Antisthenes as a serious and gloomy philosopher, always wrapped in a ragged cloak, through the holes of which — as his teacher Socrates jokingly remarked — his vanity peeked out (Ael., *VH* 9.35). Antisthenes was the founder of Cynicism and the teacher of Diogenes of Sinope. According to surviving accounts, he was the son of an Athenian and a Thracian (Sen., *Constant.* 18; Diog. Laert. 2.31; 6.1.) or Phrygian (Clem. Al., *Strom.* 1.15) slave woman, which also necessitates the inclusion of Xenophon's information about him in Appendix No. 2.

The report of the Phrygian origin of Antisthenes' mother is given by Plutarch (Plut., *De exil.* 17) and Clement of Alexandria (Clem. Al., *Strom.* 1.15), but it is most likely a late interpolation of the Cynic's own words (in response to comments about his ancestry), namely that the mother of the gods is Phrygian (Diog. Laert. 6.1). This is also confirmed by the earliest preserved account found in *De Constantia Sapientis* by Seneca (Sen., *Constant.* 18), which states that Antisthenes' mother was from Thrace.

Ancient testimonies portray Antisthenes as always at Socrates' side. In Xenophon's *Symposium*, he is among Socrates' friends (together with Critobulus, Hermogenes, and Charmides) invited by Callias (Xen., *Symp.* 1.3), and in "Memorabilia" the sophist even complains that Antisthenes never leaves his side (Xen., *Mem.* 3.11.17). The legend that Antisthenes walked daily from Piraeus to Athens to see Socrates fits with tales of his devotion to his teacher (Xen., *Symp.* 8.4-6), as well as with his own statements (Xen., *Symp.* 4.44).

Antisthenes led an ascetic life. According to words attributed to him by Xenophon, he possessed not even a single obol, and the land he owned was barely enough for an athlete to dust himself with before a competition (Xen., *Symp.* 3.8). His poverty even became a subject of jokes (Xen., *Symp.* 5.8), but T. Gomperz has pointed out the contradiction that the famous asceticism and poverty of the Cynic do not align with reports that he studied with Gorgias, the most highly paid rhetorician in Athens. This suggests that Antisthenes may have suffered misfortune in adulthood, likely during the Peloponnesian War.

Antisthenes had a "complicated" character (Xen., *Symp.* 4.61-64; 6.8), was sharp-tongued toward his fellow citizens (Xen., *Symp.* 2.12-13), and loved to expose others (Xen., *Symp.* 4.2-4; 4.6; 6.5). In response to his caustic remark that Xanthippe was the meanest of all women ever born or yet to be born, Socrates famously replied that he endured her because this helped him deal with all other unbearable people (Xen., *Symp.* 2.10). This may serve as yet another example of the irony Xenophon weaves into his texts.

3.2 Thrace in Asia Minor (Xen., *An.* 6.4.1) and some related Thracian communities

3.2.1 Thrace in Asia Minor

In Book VI of *Anabasis*, Xenophon presents his account of Thrace in Asia Minor. Near Heraclea Pontica, the army of the mercenaries splits into three parts (Xen., *An.* 6.2.16), marking the end of the command of Chirisophus. The Arcadians and Achaeans — the largest group, numbering about 4,500 hoplites — take ships from the Heracleans and sail toward Calpe, a bay situated in the middle of Asia Minor Thrace (Xen., *An.* 6.2.17), intending to attack the Thracians known as Bithynians (Θρᾱκες Βιθυνοί). The Peloponnesians disembark during the night in the bay and set out to raid Thracian villages. The mercenaries seize loot, but many of

the local light-armed Thracians manage to elude the hoplites. The dispersed Thracian peltasts regroup and attack the withdrawing plunderers, managing to almost entirely annihilate two of their detachments (Xen., *An.* 6.3.4-5). The surviving mercenaries regroup but find themselves surrounded by the locals.

Meanwhile, Chrisophus arrives at the bay of Calpe, and Xenophon moves inland. The bay of Calpe lies on the seashore. The etymology of its name (Κάλπης λιμὴν) suggests that it is a naturally sheltered or enclosed bay, likely used as a safe harbor for ships during bad weather.

At this location, Xenophon makes an exceptionally passage, where he describes in great detail and precision the borders of this Thracian territory in Anatolia (Xen., *An.* 6.4.1-2).

Here, Xenophon once again contemplates founding an apoikia. This intention is evident from his detailed account of the site (Xen., *An.* 6.4.3-7). However, the plan does not materialize, as the army passes a resolution against founding a city.

Xenophon then leads a raid inland to procure provisions and bury the dead. Significant for the analysis of material culture is his remark that some of the bodies were buried on the spot without being moved, as more than five days had passed since their deaths. The rest were interred in a mass grave, while for those missing in action, a cenotaph was erected with wreaths laid in their memory (Xen., *An.* 6.4.9).

3.2.2 Phrygia

After the first quarter of the 7th century BC, Phrygia (Φρυγία) became an inland historical region in the western part of Asia Minor.

Brief overview of the information. References to Greater (or Major) and Lesser Phrygia in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in:

- *Anabasis* (Xen., *An.* 1.2.5-14; 1.2.19; 1.9.7; 5.6.19-24; 7.8.25-26).
- *Cyropaedia* (Xen., *Cyr.* 1.1.4; 1.5.3; 2.1.5; 4.2.30; 6.2.9-11; 7.4.8-11; 7.4.16; 7.5.14; 8.6.6-8).
- *Hellenica* (Xen., *Hell.* 3.1.10-28; 3.4.12-15; 3.4.26; 3.4.29; 4.1.1-28).
- *Memorabilia* (Xen., *Mem.* 2.1.10).

3.2.3 Mysia in Asia Minor

Asia Minor Mysia (Μυσία) is a historical region in northwestern Anatolia. Its exact borders cannot be precisely traced, but to the north, it reaches the Propontis and the Hellespont; to the south, it borders Lydia; to the west, the Aegean Sea; and to the east, Phrygia and Bithynia. According to Strabo, the Mysians (μυσοί) were Thracians who migrated to Anatolia (see, for example, Strab. 12.3.3).

Brief summary of the information. References to Asia Minor Mysia in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in:

- *Anabasis* (Xen., *An.* 1.2.10; 1.6.7; 1.9.14; 2.5.13; 3.2.23-24; 5.2.28-32; 5.6.19-24; 6.1.9-13; 7.8.7-24).
- *Hellenica* (Xen., *Hell.* 1.4.7; 3.1.10-28; 4.1.15-27).
- *Memorabilia* (Xen., *Mem.* 3.5.26).

3.2.4 Paphlagonia

Paphlagonia (Παφλαγονία) is a historical region in northern Anatolia.

Brief summary of the information. References to Paphlagonia in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in:

- *Agesilaus* (Xen., *Ages.* 3.4).
- *Anabasis* (Xen., *An.* 1.8.5; 2.5.12-13; 5.4.13; 5.5.6-25; 5.6.1-10; 6.1.1-6; 6.1.9-13; 6.1.14-15; 7.8.25-26).
- *Cyropaedia* (Xen., *Cyr.* 1.5.3; 2.1.5; 6.2.9-11; 8.6.6-8).
- *Hellenica* (Xen., *Hell.* 4.1.2-16; 4.1.17-28).

3.2.5 Mossynoeci

Cerasus (modern Giresun) and south of Cotyora. The ethnonym is likely an exonym with a meaning close to "wooden tower" in Ancient Greek.

Brief summary of the information. References to the Mossynoeci in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in:

- *Anabasis* (Xen., *An.* 5.4.1-34; 5.5.1).

3.3 Orchestra

Like the title of the section "Images and Masks", this reference to classical theatre serves solely a structural and stylistic function, without aiming at historiographical interpretation.

3.3.1 Settlements and Economy

Xenophon first encountered Thracian settlements along the Black Sea coast of Asiatic Thrace. These were the villages (*kōmai*) of the Bithynian Thracians, into which the Peloponnesians came after disembarking in the gulf of Calpe. The nearest villages were located thirty stadia from the shore (approximately 5 km). Armed detachments were sent against the undefended, unwall settlements, with two detachments assigned to the larger ones. These detachments likely consisted of about 400–500 soldiers each (given that the total Peloponnesian force numbered 4,500 hoplites, commanded by ten strategoi), which indirectly gives us some sense of the scale of the settlements attacked. Some must have been considerable in size if they required the dispatch of two detachments (probably around 1,000 men). The surprise attack allowed the mercenaries to seize substantial plunder—mainly slaves and livestock (Xen., *An.* 6.3.3)—although many of the lightly armed Thracians managed to escape the hoplites. Xenophon provides significantly more information about Thracian settlements in Europe.

3.3.2 The Religion of the Thracians

Despite his interest in theology and divination, Xenophon provides extremely scant information regarding the religious beliefs and customs of the Thracians. The only phrase that could be interpreted as reflecting a religious mindset is Seuthes' expression, "if the god wills" (ἢν θεὸς θέλῃ; Xen., *An.* 7.3.43). This impersonal phrase is common within the Hellenic cultural sphere and does not reveal any specific features of Thracian religiosity.

Additionally, in *Hellenica* (Xen., *Hell.* 2.4.11), while describing the advance of Thrasybulus and the Athenian exiles toward Piraeus in 403 BC, Xenophon notes that after a failed attempt to hold back Critias and the Spartan garrison, the rebels retreated toward Munychia — a hill located on the eastern part of the Piraeus peninsula. During this advance, the supporters of the Thirty Tyrants reached the Hippodamus marketplace and the road leading to the sanctuary of Munychian Artemis and the temple of Bendis (*Βενδίδειον*). This last reference is particularly significant, as it clearly attests to the existence of the cult of the Thracian goddess in the port city.

Xenophon's interest in Artemis is well attested throughout his works, which is why the mention of the temple of Bendis might also be perceived as incidental.

The Thracian war dance examined in the next section, "The Banquet of the Thracians," could also be interpreted in a religious context.

3.3.3 The Banquet of the Thracians

Plutarch mentions two symposia of Xenophon — one Socratic and one Persian (Plut., *Mor. Quaest. conv.* 2.1.2). The first is the refined dialogue *Symposium*. No work by the "Attic Muse" dedicated to Persian banquets is known, although Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* clearly shows his interest in the subject. Plutarch's comparison is reminiscent of the method he uses in composing his famous paired biographies. Surprisingly, however, the Socratic symposium is not contrasted with the Thracian one, despite the fact that Xenophon's corpus contains a much fuller account of a Thracian banquet (Xen., *An.* 6.1.5–6; 7.2.21–38; 7.3.15–39).

This omission is remedied by Athenaeus, who not only gives special attention to the Thracian symposium (Ath. 4.35 [151a–e]), but also combines two of its key episodes (Ath. 1.27). Thus, the symposium in *Corpus Xenophonticum* can be analyzed through references to a triad of customs — Hellenic, Thracian, and Persian.

The Thracian symposium unfolds in several episodes in *Anabasis*. The first takes place on the southern coast of the Black Sea, where envoys from the archon of Paphlagonia arrive at the mercenaries' camp. In honor of the guests, a banquet is held, attended only by the most distinguished (*δικαιοτάτους*). Guests and hosts dine reclining on camp beds, drinking wine from horn cups (Xen., *An.* 6.1.1–4). After the libations, the Thracians perform a dance accompanied by a flute. They stage a mock duel with *machairai*, in which one fighter is "killed" and falls, while the victor takes his weapon and exits the scene singing of Sitalces, after which the "corpse" is dragged away (Xen., *An.* 6.1.1–4).

This dance is a *hyporchema*. The term usually refers to a type of choral lyric accompanied by a war dance — the *pyrrhiche* (πυρρίχιος), but here it denotes a combined dance and song. It might be tempting to assume that the “Song of Sitalces” is a Thracian victory song commemorating the deeds of the Odrysian king Sitalces. Xenophon tells of a similar tradition in *Cyropaedia* — songs praising Cyrus the Great (Xen., *Cyr.* 1.2.1). There is also the possibility that this is a Thracian name for a *paean*, derived from the epithet of Apollo Sitalcas (Paus. 10.15.2), potentially linked etymologically to σῖτος (grain) and ἀλαλκεῖν (to protect).

The next episode occurs at the tower of Seuthes near Perinthus, during Xenophon’s first audience with the dynast. Xenophon is admitted into the *tyrsis* with only two attendants and, following Thracian custom, after an embrace and handshake with Seuthes, they toast with a horn. The meeting is formal, serving as preliminary negotiations for hiring the army, and concludes successfully with guarantees exchanged (Xen., *An.* 7.2.21–38).

The third scene of the Thracian symposium takes place the following day, when Seuthes leads the mercenaries half a day’s march from Perinthus to villages (stocked with provisions) for encampment. After setting up camp, the strategoi and lochagoi are invited to a banquet in one of Seuthes’ villages.

Outside the doors, as the guests wait to be admitted, Heracleides of Maroneia offers protocol advice (Xen., *An.* 7.3.16–20), reflecting the customs of Thracian royal courts as described by Thucydides (Thuc. 2.97.4). Xenophon refers to Heracleides with the neutral “a certain,” but centuries later Athenaeus calls him a flatterer (κόλαξ) (Ath. 252a). At this banquet, only the most distinguished (κράτιστοι) Thracians, strategoi, lochagoi, and proxenoi from various cities are present (Xen., *An.* 7.3.21).

Unlike the Greek custom of reclining, the guests sit in a circle, and three-legged tables — about twenty — are brought in, laden with meat and large sour loaves of bread skewered onto spits. The tables, according to Thracian custom, are placed mostly in front of the guests. Seuthes himself breaks the loaves before him and distributes them, doing likewise with the meat, leaving only a symbolic portion for himself (Xen., *An.* 7.3.21–23).

This act of Seuthes parallels other instances Xenophon describes as instruments of power. In *Anabasis*, for example, Cyrus the Younger sends his friends delicacies or bread with the message (Xen., *An.* 1.9.26): “Cyrus liked this and wants you to try it too.” Similarly, in *Agesilaus*, Xenophon recounts how, according to Lycurgus’ legislation, the Spartan *archēgetēs* received a double portion at the communal table — only to give one away in honor (Xen., *Lac.* 15.4).

One mercenary refuses to break and share his bread, and this display of greed prompts Xenophon’s valuable commentary on the size of a Thracian loaf — containing about three *choenices* of grain (ca. 3.282 liters), equivalent to a three-day ration for a slave in ancient Greece (and half that for a female slave).

The three-legged tables are discussed by Athenaeus, and if the text he cites really belongs to Hesiod, then such tables are mentioned in written sources as early as the 7th century BC (Ath.

2.32). The *mensa tripes* appears not only in comic literature but is also commented on by Pollux (s.v. X.80) and used by Horace (Hor., *Sat.* 1.3.13).

3.4 List of some geographical realities in the *Corpus Xenophonticum*

Bizante (Βισάνθη) – a settlement founded by the island of Samos, probably modern-day Rodosto (or Tekirdağ).

Mentions of “Bizante” in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 7.2.38, 7.5.8). This is also one of the fortified settlements probably referred to in (Xen., *An.* 7.7.48-50), though the toponym is not explicitly mentioned.

The information refers to the political history of ancient Thrace at the end of 400 and the beginning of 399 BC.

Ganos (Γάνος) – a Thracian fortress in Propontis.

A mention of “Ganos” in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* is found in “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 7.5.8). This is also one of the fortified settlements probably referred to in (Xen., *An.* 7.2.38, 7.7.48-50), though the toponym is not explicitly mentioned.

The information refers to the political history of ancient Thrace at the end of 400 and the beginning of 399 BC.

Delta (Δέλτα) – an area north of Byzantium.

Mentions of the so-called “Thracian Delta” in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 7.1.33, 7.5.1).

The following word formations are used to denote the toponym:

- Δέλτα καλούμενον τῆς Θράκης (Xen., *An.* 7.1.33).
- Θρᾶκας εἰς τὸ Δέλτα καλούμενον (Xen., *An.* 7.5.1).

One of the references relates to the early political history of ancient Thrace (Xen., *An.* 7.5.1), and the other to the actions of the mercenaries in Thrace in 400 BC (Xen., *An.* 7.1.33).

Euxine Pontus (Εὐξεινος Πόντος) – present-day Black Sea, bordering Europe and Asia.

Mentions of the Black Sea in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in five works:

- In “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 4.8.22, 5.1.15, 5.6.15, 5.6.19-20, 5.7.7, 5.7.15, 6.1.16, 6.2.4, 6.5.20, 7.1.1, 7.1.24, 7.5.12).
- In “Hellenica” (Xen., *Hell.* 1.1.22, 2.2.1, 4.8.27, 4.8.31, 5.1.28).
- In “Cyropaedia” (Xen., *Cyr.* 8.6.21, 8.8.1).
- In “Oeconomicus” (Xen., *Oec.* 20.27).
- In “Constitution of the Athenians” (Xen., *Ath. pol.* 2.6-7).

Three lexemes are used to denote the hydronym:

- Πόντος (Xen., *An.* 5.1.15, 5.6.15, 5.6.19-20, 5.7.7, 5.7.15, 6.1.16, 6.2.4, 6.5.20, 7.1.1, 7.5.12; Xen., *Hell.* 1.1.22, 2.2.1, 4.8.27, 4.8.31, 5.1.28; Xen., *Ath. pol.* 2.6-7).
- Εὐξεινος Πόντος (Xen., *An.* 4.8.22; 5.1.1; Xen., *Cyr.* 8.6.21, 8.8.1).
- Εὐξεινος (Xen., *Oec.* 20.27).

The mentions most often relate to the retreat of the mercenaries along the southern coast of the Black Sea (Xen., *An.* 4.8.22, 5.1.1, 5.6.15, 5.6.19-20, 5.7.7, 5.7.15, 6.1.16, 6.2.4, 6.5.20, 7.1.1). Some references relate to the economy and finance, especially the organization of the customs (tithe) for ships exporting grain from the Black Sea (Xen., *Hell.* 1.1.22, 4.8.27,

4.8.31, 5.1.28) and maritime trade (Xen., *Oec.* 20.27; Xen., *Ath. pol.* 2.6-7). Those concerning the political history of ancient Thrace and Hellas may be (Xen., *An.* 5.1.15; Xen., *Hell.* 2.2.1; 4.8.27), and of Persia (Xen., *Cyr.* 8.6.21, 8.8.1). Those of a geographical nature (Xen., *An.* 5.7.7, 6.5.20, 7.5.12), and ethnological (Xen., *An.* 6.2.1-2).

Xenophon uses Pontus only as a name for the Black Sea, and not for the territories adjacent to its southern part, as is the case during the Hellenistic period and later.

Neonteichos (Νέον τεῖχος) – a fortress located near Bizante.

A mention of the settlement in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* is found in “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 7.5.8). This is probably also one of the fortified settlements referred to in (Xen., *An.* 7.2.38, 7.7.48-50), though the toponym is not explicitly mentioned.

The information refers to the political history of ancient Thrace at the end of 400 and the beginning of 399 BC.

Salmidesos (Σαλμυδησσός) – a toponym on the western coast of the Black Sea.

A mention of “Salmidesos” in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* is found in “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 7.5.12-14). The information refers to the political history of ancient Thrace at the beginning of 399 BC, but is accompanied by geographical and ethnographic information.

Thracian Chersonese (Χερρόνησος) and Hellespont (Ελλήσποντος) – present-day Gallipoli Peninsula and the Dardanelles Strait.

Mentions of the Thracian Chersonese or Hellespont in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* are found in 4 works:

- In “Anabasis” (Xen., *An.* 1.1.9; 1.3.3-4; 2.6.1-5; 5.6.25).
- In “Hellenica” (Xen., *Hell.* 1.1.1-22; 1.1.35-36; 1.2.11; 1.2.13-16; 1.3.8; 1.3.10; 1.3.17; 1.5.11; 1.5.17; 1.6.19-22; 1.7.1-2; 2.1.17-30; 2.2.5; 3.2.6-11; 3.4.10-11; 4.2.6-8; 4.3.1-3; 4.3.17; 4.8.3-6; 5.1.1; 5.1.6-7; 5.1.6-7; 5.1.25-27).
- In “Agesilaus” (Xen., *Ages.* 1.14; 2.1; 2.11).
- In “Cyropaedia” (Xen., *Cyr.* 2.1.5; 4.2.30).

To the political history of Hellas and ancient Thrace can be attributed (Xen., *Ages.* 1.14; 2.1; 2.11; Xen., *An.* 1.1.9; 1.3.3-4; 2.6.1-5; 5.6.25; 7.8.1-6; Xen., *Hell.* 1.1.1-22; 1.1.35-36; 1.3.8; 1.3.10; 1.3.17; 1.5.11; 1.5.17; 1.6.19-22; 1.7.1-2; 2.2.1-5; 2.1.17-30; 2.2.1-5; 3.2.6-11; 3.4.10-11; 4.2.6-8; 4.3.1-3; 4.3.17; 4.8.3-6; 5.1.1; 5.1.6-7; 5.1.6-7; 5.1.25-27), to Persia (Xen., *An.* 1.1.9; 1.3.3-4; 2.6.

Main Conclusions. Among Xenophon’s various works, and in the context of Thrace, one can discern internal references, consistent structural models, and literary devices that call for both intertextual and detailed comparative analyses.

The information on the Anatolian Thracians spans two centuries (6th–4th centuries BC), has been only partially studied, and still needs to be conceptually and historiographically integrated — not only into Thracological research. The separate sections on Asian Mysia, Paphlagonia, Greater (Major) and Lesser (Hellespontine) Phrygia, as well as on some other ancient communities presumably close to the Thracians in cultural and ethnic terms, serve mostly an informative purpose, requiring targeted future studies.

On the other hand, the information on the European Thracians and their political, social, and cultural affairs not only complement what we know from Herodotus and Thucydides. They also provide uniquely informative and historiographically significant accounts from a keen observer and gifted writer. Xenophon recounts based on his travels and, as a rule, describes matters observed in situ. This is why he presents a number of Thracian realities unknown from other sources and even shares his valuable observations on power relations and debated royal practices of the late 5th and early 4th centuries BC.

By “king of the Thracians,” Xenophon refers to rulers of the Odrysian dynasty, and his conclusion (Xen., Cyr. 1.1.4) is striking — that despite their significant numbers and resources, the Thracians belonged to those peoples who did not pursue expansionist policies but sought to impose and preserve their authority within the borders of their own territories. In other words, according to Xenophon, the Thracian kings harbored no imperial ambitions toward neighboring non-Thracian communities. However, this observation requires further research.

Numerous information reveal how Hellenic culture penetrated and influenced, as well as borrowed from, the Thracian social environment — at various levels: from the adoption of the Greek language (Seuthes speaks Greek; the Thracians from the villages attacked by Xenophon address and threaten him in Greek) to the introduction of certain everyday and luxury items from the polis world into the rural Thracian setting (e.g., the melinophagi collecting remains from shipwrecks). This subject area also demands future study, particularly regarding the potential to investigate “Thracian” realities in painted luxury black- and red-figure pottery.

Xenophon’s personal observations and historical-geographical excursions make it possible to establish that the Thracians applied military tactics that had parallels, similarities, and differences with Persian, Scythian, and Illyrian practices. This allows him to clearly highlight the techniques of the Thracian peltasts and, in general, their combat methods both on flatlands and in mountainous terrain.

Xenophon’s observations on Thracian daily life hold a special place — his descriptions of Thracian villages, houses, and barns, as well as of foods, drinks, and feasting customs, are invaluable for ethnologists. At the same time, his rather detailed descriptions of the seized Thracian herds and available foodstuffs are not gratuitous; they aim to show the Greeks the great potential for both plunder and trade.

Xenophon’s information undoubtedly attest to wealthy Thracian villages where plenty of barley, wheat, and various other foodstuffs could be found. The information on their bread rations shows that, by the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th century BC, they had not only a developed livestock economy but also a relatively good grain production.

Finally — though not least — Xenophon’s information can be used for more detailed analyses of the so-called prestige economy of the Odrysians. They indeed outline the existence of market relations but, overall, highlight the specifics of the “royal economy,” where — in a Persian model — taxes and duties played a significant role, alongside the custom of purposefully offering “gifts” to the rulers.

Conclusions

The information provided by Xenophon, son of Gryllus, about ancient Thrace and the Thracians is multifaceted and encompasses various aspects of Thracian life, culture, and politics, both in Anatolia and in European Thrace. The compiled catalogue in Appendix II of the extracted information illustrates this best. It could serve as a systematic reference not only for specialized researchers but also for anyone interested in ancient history, philosophy, archaeology, and ethnography of Antiquity — and in particular, ancient Thrace.

The multifaceted nature of Xenophon's information predetermined the structure of the third and final chapter of this dissertation, with the thematic variety of the information necessitating an entirely source-critical approach with a historiographical focus. In this way (in harmony with the previous chapters), some of the less frequently discussed aspects of Xenophon were highlighted. However, the choice of chronological framework — the time when Xenophon's works were written — is conditional. The use of his predecessors (Herodotus and Thucydides, as well as some ancient authors known only through fragments) and especially the nature of Xenophon's reception in ancient and medieval literature actually required analyzing information from an exceptionally broad chronological span — from the 4th century BC to the 14th century AD.

Many of the narratives still await in-depth study, analysis, and integration into ancient historiography and, accordingly, into Thracology. That is why the path to a historiographical synthesis of the source information necessarily required the compilation of a summarized list of important information, which can cautiously be called the *Corpus Xenophonticum Thracorum*. In this collection, direct information on Thrace and the Thracians can be distinguished, as well as indirect information (including available information on the population of Anatolian Mysia, Paphlagonia, Greater and Hellespontine Phrygia, and some other ancient communities presumably close to the Thracians in cultural and ethnic terms).

General observations from the compiled list of catalogued information show that only in three of Xenophon's fifteen works — namely, *Apology of Socrates*, *Hipparchicus*, and *Hiero* — there is no information referring to Thrace and the Thracian world. In contrast, twelve of Xenophon's texts contain information on Thrace. By comparison, *ITT2* used seven of Xenophon's works. This fact attests to the relatively consistent interest of the "Attic Muse" in Thracian realities. It should be emphasized that a significant part of the systematized information was conveyed *ex autopsia*, which makes them first-rate sources for the study of Thracian history — politically, culturally, and in terms of daily life and ritual practices.

Self-Assessment of the Contributions of the Dissertation

1. The available ancient and medieval sources on the life, activity, and works of Xenophon of Athens have been selected and analyzed. They are presented in a catalog format and bilingual edition (Appendix 1), allowing clarification of disputed points in his biography.
2. In the first chapter, the traditionally accepted late datings of Xenophon's birth are rejected, and an early dating is defended with new arguments. After refining the chronology, the year 442/1 BC is proposed as the most likely date of Xenophon's birth.
3. In the second chapter, for the first time, the existing historiographical information on the individual works in the *Corpus Xenophonticum* is summarized and systematized. This enables the refinement of numerous debated hypotheses and lays a foundation for future paleographical and text-critical studies.
4. The proposed dating of 442/1 BC for Xenophon's birth serves as an additional argument supporting his authorship of the *Athenian Constitution*, considered a product of his early (youthful) writings.
5. All references concerning both European and Anatolian Thracians have been extracted from the *Corpus Xenophonticum*. These are presented in bilingual format (Appendix 2). The resulting informationbase may assist future research in the field of Thracology.
6. The catalog of Xenophon's testimonies serves as the basis for the third chapter, where a systematic overview is given of nearly all references provided by the "Attic Muse" regarding ancient Thrace and the Thracians. The various topics are grouped, analyzed, and commented on in three main sections.
7. The existing information on Sosias have been analyzed. This Thracian slave was purchased for the unprecedented price of one Attic talent. For the first time, this enigmatic figure is linked to a "mask" from Old Attic Comedy, and a text by Theophrastus allows for new insights regarding his ethnic origin, social, and legal status.
8. The information on the Thracian origin of Antisthenes (on his mother's side) has been examined. Based on a text by Cicero, the so-called "Phrygian version" — a later interpolation of the Cynic's own words — is rejected.
9. Attention is drawn to translation discrepancies in a passage from Xenophon (Xen., *An.* 7.5.1), where "the Odrysian Teres (some ancient)" is interpreted as "Teres, son of Odrysus (some ancient king)." This reading affects whether a ruler-eponym of the Odrysian Kingdom may be added to or excluded from the dynasty's stemma.
10. The possibility is considered that the so-called "Song of Sitalces" is not a Thracian victory song dating back to the time of the Odrysian ruler Sitalces, but rather the Thracian name for a paean.
11. The information in Xenophon's works concerning various geographical realities associated with ancient Thrace and the Thracians have been synthesized.

Publications on the Dissertation Topic

Articles in Academic Journals:

1. "On the Tracks of Sosias the Thracian in ancient literature (По следите на Созий Тракиец в античната литература)" *Thracia*, (forthcoming).
2. "When was Xenophon born? New Arguments and Returning to the Sources (Кора е роден Ксенофонт? Завръщане към изворите и нови аргументи)," *ISTORIYA-HISTORY: Bulgarian Journal of Historical Education* 25(3), 2025, pp. 276-292.

Articles in Collected Volumes:

1. "Following the Footsteps of a Mysian Dance Described by Xenophon (По следите на един мизийски танц, описан от Ксенофонт)," *Jubilaus* 8-2. Sofia: University of Sofia, St. Kliment Ohridski, 2021, pp. 159–170.