

Anabasis: “The March of the Ten Thousand” into Modernity

İsmail Keskin

Abstract

The *Anabasis* of Xenophon is a classic of Ancient Greek literature which is also perceived as a historical text. This article examines the long march of *Anabasis* into modernity, and raises issues of the instrumental function of translation in historical representation through an analysis of the various translations/appropriations of this text. The study provides a detailed evaluation of the terms “canon” and “classic” from antiquity to modernity and their relationship to issues of representation, summarisation and translation. As a general theoretical framework for these observations, an etymology of the word “genealogy” in Nietzsche and Foucault is provided. After situating Xenophon and his work in their original context, the uses of *Anabasis* by three different modes of historiography in different periods and sites of modernity are examined: the history textbooks written for Anglo-Saxon pupils in the late-19th century; the translation of *Anabasis* in a series of “Greek Classics” as part of a post-WWII translation mission by the Turkish state; and finally in the Marxist-nationalist legitimation of the founding of a national identity and the construction of a national past in different phases of the Kurdish nationalist movements.

Key Words: *Anabasis*, modernity, translation, representation, classics, book-summarisation, memory, education.

Introduction

When do we translate texts? The answer is quite simple and revealing; we translate texts when we need them. Why, then, do we need classics? Just to get a taste of history and literature? Or do we also have other reasons? Xenophon’s *Kyroy Anabasis* is a well known classic of Ancient Greek literature which is also perceived as a historical text, and it thus gives us a chance to concentrate on the issues of historical representation and the instrumental function of translations. This article will take *Anabasis* as a case study, examining its long march into modernity, through its various translations/appropriations, and attempt to answer to the question of why and to what purposes *Anabasis* has been translated.

The study will begin with a detailed evaluation of the terms “canon” and “classic” from antiquity to modernity and their relationship to issues of representation, summarisation and translation. The study will then provide a short, general introduction to Xenophon and his work. At this point, as a general theoretical framework for these observations, an etymology of the word “genealogy” in Nietzsche and Foucault will be provided. The following sections will examine the uses of *Anabasis* by three different modes of historiography in different periods and sites of modernity. The first section will examine the place of Xenophon and his works within the history syllabi written for Anglo-Saxon pupils in the late-19th century. The second will deal with the translation of *Anabasis* into Turkish (through second languages) as part of a series of “Greek Classics” with its genesis in a conscious, post-WWII translation mission by the Turkish state. The next section will refer to an interesting publication as a primary source; the Ankara People’s House Libraries and Publications Committee’s (*Ankara Halkevi Kütüphanesi ve Neşriyat Komitesi*) 1943 *Book-Summarising Contest*. The last case will be that of the Marxist-nationalist approach to *Anabasis*, and an examination of how the historical narrative in this classical text has been turned into a legitimation of the founding of a national identity and the construction of a national past. In this section, two books from different phases of the Kurdish nationalist movement will be used as main sources; *The Passage of the Ten Thousand through Kurdistan: Anabasis (Onbinlerin Kürdistan’dan Geçiş: Anabasis)* (1970) and *Kurds in Scientific Language* (2004).

In terms of methodology, the translations, translators’ prefaces and notes will be checked for possible distortions. Long excerpts from the prefaces and annotations of the various editors and translators will be used, since most of the work will depend on comparative analysis of these texts.

1. “A Classic,” Historical Representation, Genealogy and Translation

According to Carlo Ginzburg, “Continuity of words does not necessarily mean continuity of meanings.”¹ To deal with a classical text and its reuse in modernity, it is necessary to deal with some key concepts first. The idea of change and the idea of permanency can be seen as purely philosophical matters. Yet the idea of “progress,” as a key question of modernity, stands just in between two things: firstly, a change for the better, while, secondly, the preservation of a “virtuous core”; in other words, a thornless rose (or seedless grape). For a modern text, issues of change, permanency and progress are much more complex; modernity accepts and desires change, yet refuses to see change as total. Modernity declares that it is “scientific” more than eidetic or phenomenological. Yet, in the area of practice, the whole system turns into total discrepancy, and scientific method

turns into an eidetic one, in which experiment is impossible. History turns into an instrument which helps to frame the present through genealogy. As a matter of functionality, the canon or classic turns into an object or statement of “science” through history, most especially when it is summarized by “professionals” for the use of pupils as part of a modern education. Take, for example, this statement on didactics by Helene Adeline Guerber in her preface to her *The Story of the Greeks* (1896):

A knowledge of ancient history is of very great value. The classic legends are almost equally worth studying because of the prominent part they play in the world’s literature. These tales make deep impressions on the minds of children, and the history thus learned, almost in play, will cling to the memory far more tenaciously than any lessons subsequently conned.²

We need to pay attention to some particular words here: “classic legends,” “world’s literature,” “deep impression,” “minds of children,” “the history thus learned” and “cling to the memory.”

Firstly, the word “classic” deserves more detailed scrutiny, since the rest of the article will depend on a work so described. It derives from the Latin *classicus*, which means “belonging to the first class” and “of the highest class,”³ so “classical text” refers to a text which is distinguished or honoured. Yet an evaluation of the word “canon” and its semantic odyssey offers very important clues to understanding the idea of a “classic.” It comes from the Greek word *kanôn*, which literally means carpenter’s rod or rule.⁴ In the fourth century B.C., Polycrates, a Greek sculptor, carved a statue named *The Canon* which established artistic proportions for representation of the human figure. Thus the word gained the meaning of a “model,” and in the third century B.C., Dionysius of Halicarnassus used the word for the first time to describe written works. In his *Letter to Pompeius*, he used the word to mean a model or exemplar, mentioning Herodotus as the best canon of Ionic historiography and Thucydides of Attic. Independently of this usage, in the third and second centuries B.C., the librarians and scholars in Alexandria, led by Aristophanes of Byzantium, had begun to make selective lists of the poets they judged most deserved to be edited and studied. However, they did not use the word *kanôn*, but *enkrithentes*, which literally means “judged in,” to refer to the authors which they chose. Cicero translated this as *classici*, a term borrowed from political and military “classes”. Quintilian called the Greek lists *ordo* or *numerus*, summarized them, and added a list of major Latin writers.⁵

This reference to the word (and the concept) “classic” contains clues about other “selected” words, such as representation, impression, memory

and history. Learning history from legends and using it as an instrument of memory is even older than the Greek classics. In Hittite historiography, which is nearly a millennium older than the Greek classics, we find similar records; texts declaring their worth to be remembered.

No-one had crossed the Euphrates, but I, the Great King Tabarna, crossed on foot, and my army crossed it [after me(?)] on foot. Sargon [(also) crossed it]; he defeated the troops of [Hahhum] and [did not] burn it down, nor did he show the smoke to the [Storm] God of Heaven. I, the Great King Tabarna, destroyed Hassuwa and Hahhum and burned them down with fire and [showed] the smoke to the [Storm] God of Heaven. And the king of Hassuwa and the king of Hahhum I harnessed to a wagon.⁶

As Gutterbrock states⁷, Hattusili's account shows us that the stories of Sargon – the great Akkadian king – were known to the Hittite King Hattusili, as he even mentioned the campaign of Sargon, which occurred seven centuries earlier than Hattusili's reign.

So what makes the legacy of the past so strong? For Antonio Gramsci, forms of cultural production – especially narrative – play a crucial role in convincing people of the truth of a certain preferred view of the world, thereby securing their consent to being ruled by the group or class whose particular preferred perspective the text represents.⁸ At this point, history and canon come very close to each other. George A. Kennedy offers canon formation as a natural human instinct: an attempt to impose order on multiplicity, to judge what is best out of many options, and preserve traditional knowledge and values against the erosion of time and influences from outside the culture. According to Kennedy, “canons reflect the conservative, hierarchical structure of traditional societies.”⁹ Similarly to Gramsci, Kennedy also explains why some songs and myths attain greater authority than others through their perpetuation by priests or chiefs as in the interests of cultural continuity and social control.¹⁰ The priest or chief of oral cultures can be replaced with the historian or history teacher of modernity.

The question of classics and humanism is outside of this essay's contextual boundaries. That said, since our discussion concerns a reproduction of an Ancient Greek classic, we can state that each reproduction – mostly by translation – creates a new text. That is why we need to differentiate between ancient, renaissance and modern humanism, as well as the intended meaning of the classical text in each case.

2. Nietzschean Genealogy and Critical History

Ginzburg questions the continuity of words by challenging them with the continuity of their meanings. He offers the following example of the word "myth":

We often speak of "myth," in general and specifically: 'the myths of the new generation,' 'the myths of the peoples of Amazon.' We have no hesitation in applying the term 'myth' to phenomena very distant from each other in both space and time. Is this a manifestation of ethnocentric arrogance?¹¹

Genealogy, as an area of study dealing with "thousands of years" stands at the very heart of the Ginzburg's discussion of the meanings of words. The word "genealogy" deserves detailed examination. The word is a combination of two Greek words: *γενεά/genea* and *λογία/logia*. The word *γενεά* is a quite difficult word, with multiple meanings, including family, origin, birth, age, period, race, human types, child or descendant.¹² Thus, along with the second word *λογία*, genealogy can be understood as the study of any of the objects given as *γενεά*'s meaning. This word started to be used for "the study of family ancestries and histories"¹³ as early as the 12th century.

For Friedrich Nietzsche, a philosopher with a strong background in philology, the term genealogy supplies abundant etymological possibilities for his idea of the continuous change of the meaning and associations of words through interpretation. Appropriately, the meaning of the word genealogy has been understood in a totally differently way following the demolition of its previous meaning by Nietzsche and its reconstruction on that foundation by Foucault. While genealogy as a "search for origins" was usual in the history of philosophy, Nietzsche's destruction of that edifice, or rather, to be more precise, his removal of the notion of the origin as the central support of the genealogical operation, created a brand new area of work. Nietzsche reduced the notion of genealogy to an erudite study of sources in a critical way. He totally excluded or disavowed the study of and search for origins, which could be understood, by a traditional philosopher, as destroying the base of a building and forcing it to hang to sky.

According to Nietzsche, any thing, person or event has to be construed as a matter of historical, cultural, or practical interpretation, and beneath the series of interpretations, there is nothing/no thing.¹⁴ This continuous series of interpretations of whatever exists, are actually *re*interpretations. Nietzsche states the unstable character of "form" and "meaning" very clearly: "The form is fluid but the "meaning" is even more

so...”¹⁵ Interpretation could be seen as a tool of power and it can be said, for Nietzsche, that there are no given facts, only interpretations. Even the subject is not a given fact, since “it is something added and invented and projected behind what there is.”¹⁶

These statements could be seen as a pure matter of philosophical conjecture and their connection with historiography could seem vague. Yet, the notion of “active forgetfulness”, links the two very well. According to Nietzsche, the ability to forget is the essential condition for happiness, for any kind of action, and even for life. So the human task should be to develop the capacity to forget.¹⁷ For Nietzsche, every civilization has its own “plastic power”; its own way of actively and creatively interpreting its own past. In Nietzsche’s words;

I mean by plastic power the capacity to develop out of oneself, in one’s way, to transform and incorporate into oneself what is past and foreign, to heal wounds, to replace what has been lost, to recreate broken moulds.¹⁸

This plastic power has necessary preconditions, such as a limited horizon and an actively invented perspective on the world¹⁹, which also suggests a need for active forgetting; in making a new interpretation, rejection of all previous interpretations is necessary. This model offers us three types of history; “monumental history”, “antiquarian history”, and “critical history.” The use of these histories also reveals if they are life-enhancing or life-destroying. According to Nietzsche, each history has for the ability to be both. However, he holds some reservations about monumental and antiquarian histories. He states that the destructive capacity of monumental history blossoms in the soil of “the man who recognizes greatness but cannot himself do great things.”²⁰ The danger of antiquarian history comes from its overt stress on the antique and rejection or persecution of everything new or evolving. This conservative approach imprisons life, more than conserving or preserving it. On the other hand, the last history is based on the Nietzschean notion of genealogy:

If he is to live, man must possess and from time to time employ the strength to break up and dissolve a part of the past. ... The best we can do is to confront our inherited and hereditary nature with our knowledge, and through a new, stern discipline combat our inborn heritage and [implant] in ourselves a new habit, a new instinct, a second nature, so that our first nature withers away.²¹

So, as we can see, monumental history builds, antiquarian preserves and critical history destroys. As Michael Mahon accurately states, “our generation is the result of the crimes of previous generations, and although the facticity of this is unchangeable, we can critically reinterpret our past and create an alternative one in which we would prefer to have originated.”²²

So we can think of Nietzschean genealogy as an indicative history of the present. The genealogist trails the history of the present in order to undermine its self-evidence and to open up possibilities for the enhancement of life. It is Foucault who links Nietzschean genealogy into the scheme of this study. According to Foucault, “in our time, history is that which transforms documents into monuments.”²³

3. Xenophon and *Anabasis*

Xenophon was the son of Gryllus, an Athenian, from the deme, or parish, of Erchia.²⁴ We do not know the exact date of his birth; if we believe his ancient biographer Diogenes Laertius, his birth can be placed a little after 430 BCE.²⁵ We know that Xenophon was in his mid-twenties when his friend Proxenus asked him to join Cyrus’ army as a mercenary, as he states in the second book that he was younger than Proxenus, who died on this campaign when he was thirty years old.²⁶ Xenophon, initially an unranked mercenary in the army who eventually became a general, later chronicled this adventurous campaign with the title of *Kyroy Anabasis* (henceforth *Anabasis*).

In the title of the book, *Anabasis* means “march up-country”. The book narrates the fortunes of an army of Greek mercenaries who become involved in a secession dispute in the great Persian Empire. The Persian King, Darius, had two sons; the elder was named Artaxerxes, and the younger Cyrus. When Darius became ill and died, both of his sons lay claim to the throne. Artaxerxes claimed the throne on the grounds that he was the eldest son. Cyrus’ claim to the throne rested on the fact that he was the first son born after Darius’ ascension to the throne. In 465 B.C., Artaxerxes ascended the throne, and Cyrus had to bear this injustice, though he secretly started to assemble armies against Artaxerxes to dethrone him and take power. Since he was the satrap of Sardes and a very close ally of the Spartans, he entered an agreement with a Lacedaemonian exile named Clearchus, and assembled an army of Hellenes, which numbered as many as 12, 000 men. With an army of 100, 000 barbarians and 12, 000 Hellenes, they marched against King Artaxerxes. Artaxerxes stood against them with an army of approximately one million barbarians. They battled in Cunaxa and even though the Hellenes defeated every army that they faced, Cyrus was killed and their ranks broken. They found themselves in foreign lands without a cause to fight for. As a result, they made a decision to turn back to Hellas, and they followed the path

uphillup country to the Euxine Sea (the Black Sea). Ten thousand men managed to turn back to Hellas after two years of adventurous campaign.

The work consists of seven books; as is customary with other Ancient Greek texts, the *books* under the main title may be interpreted as chapters or smaller volumes of the larger work. They do not bear separate titles; rather, they are named book I, book II, book III, etc.²⁷ *Anabasis* is a literary text with very distinct narration and rhetoric, though it has also been seen and treated as a history, which is very much open to discussion. In the *Anabasis*, Xenophon uses very simple and clear Attic Greek, which contributes to its modern usage as an elementary text for students of Ancient Greek.²⁸

4. Anabasis in the Early 20th Century Anglo-Saxon World: “Ancient Greece: Wonderland for Western Kids”

The classics are those books about which you usually hear people saying: ‘I’m rereading...’, never ‘I’m reading...’²⁹

The use of “classics” in modern education can be understood only by understanding the relationship between pupils and their education. To understand the value of pupils and education for modern nations, Ernst Gellner’s model for nationalism can be useful. According to Gellner, in industrial societies, human beings are useful only insofar as they are educated. Because education is expensive, the value of offspring in industrial society is not so high, and, if reproduction is unplanned, it becomes a burden on economic growth. Also, a homogenized unique culture (high culture) and a common dialect of the unique language are prior necessities for industrialized and urbanized society. In this way, people from different backgrounds and regions of the state can talk about something common and above their local issues, which is context free and impersonal, and can understand each other easily without the difficulties entailed by different local dialects. Under such conditions, culture becomes an important target of state policy. In other words, culture becomes the state and the state becomes culture. Every single member of such a state should share the same culture – high culture – and the only way to acquire this standardized skill is through formal schooling. Furthermore, religion has gradually lost its functional value in the nation state, since the modern state sets itself up as the protector of a culture, not a faith. Thus, the canons of the church give way to the “secular classics” of antiquity. In order to prove the possibility and reality of “progress” and “culture,” nation states need to locate their ancestors (no matter how tenuously or inconsistently). As Stathis Gourgouris states, “In every nation, antiquity coexists with modernity, but also with infinity; no nation can imagine its death. But it can imagine an existence before its

historical birth, an ancestral essence.”³⁰ The rally for a genealogy of “the West” and the extensive toils in creating a “Western canon” can be understood as a part of these systemic requirements. Classics readers and anthologies vary in their contents and approaches to suit different historical needs and tastes; yet common to all is a simplification and distortion of the material when summarising a text to show its framework by the channel of genealogy.

In the late-19th century, the Anglo-Saxon education system strictly adopted Ancient Greek and Latin classics. Colleges stipulated their own canons, derived from the classics, as prerequisite knowledge for accepting students. The Harvard catalogue for 1874-1875 is a good example of this. Knowledge of both ancient Greek and Latin were required for admission, and works that had to have been studied were also specified. In this way, colleges also controlled high school curricula; their expectations of candidate students automatically obliged high schools to adopt those classics. As an example, the minimum expectation in Greek at Harvard in 1874 was Xenophon’s *Anabasis* I-VI, and Homer’s *Iliad* I-II; in Latin, at a minimum, Ceasar’s Gallic War I-II, six orations of Cicero and his *Cato Major*, and Virgil’s *Aenid* I-IV.³¹ On the other hand, the role of “classics” cannot be reduced to the high school and university levels in the late-19th and early-20th century Anglo-Saxon education. The goal of creating “a canon of common ideals” created a sphere for a canonical genealogy. A “Scientific” past became a part of fairy tales, and myths became scientific history insofar as they could be made to serve this genealogic zeal.

Mary Macgregor exemplifies such tendencies in her preface to *The Story of Greece*:

DEAR LITTLE JOYCE,—One of the reasons why this book is to be your very own is that the story it tells begins in Wonderland, and that is a land in which you and all other little people wander at will.

(...) The ancient Wonderland of Hellas, of which this story tells, was unlike your Wonderland in this, that men and women dwelt in it as well as boys and girls, and they, too, saw and heard its secrets. And this was because, in a way not known to-day, each had kept the heart of a little child.

(...) More even than these things the Hellenes saw. For across lone hillsides, through busy fields, in sacral groves and flower-sweet meadows, radiant figures sped. And the simple folk catching glimpses of these flitting forms said one to the other, ‘The gods have come to live among us.

Their presence it is that makes the earth so fair, so wonderful.' As the years passed and the Hellenes grew older, sterner times came. Cities sprang up on hillsides and by riverbanks, and the gods were seldom seen. Men went to war, battles were lost and won.

But never, in victory or in defeat, did the people lose their early love of beauty, or that strange, dreamy sense of wonder, which from the beginning was ever plucking at their hearts. They longed to fulfill their dreams of beauty, they wished to re-shape the world.

(...) Before the glory of Greece faded, Europe had learned from her to follow truth, to love beauty.³²

Macgregor underlines three important points: First, ancient Hellas was the golden age of mankind; second, the code, explained as "follow truth ... love beauty," was a channel by which the legacy of Ancient Hellas was bequeathed to Europe; and lastly, though Ancient Greece has waned, Europe has succeeded her through that legacy. However, at the very beginning of her utopian depiction of Ancient Hellas, Macgregor was proved to be wrong, even in her own century.

From the sentence; "The ancient Wonderland of Hellas, of which this story tells, was unlike your Wonderland in this, that men and women dwelt in it as well as boys and girls..."³³ we can appreciate the author's pragmatic intention; to welcome women into the possible new, modern golden era by situating women and girls in Ancient Hellas. On the other hand, not only within Ancient Greek society, but as late as the late 19th century, women had no place in classics education in Europe. If we check the preface of an elementary ancient Greek textbook, *Easy Selections Adapted from Xenophon*, first published in 1876 by Clarendon Press, we see that the author, James Surtees Phillipotts, states that "These 'Easy Selections' are adapted for boys who are only just beginning Greek."³⁴

It is very important to catch the common sense among the books that were published concurrently in the early 20th century. Not only was there the issue of women demanding their full acceptance into society, but many other factors get carried into the scene as a part in the education of the children of the West.

Frances Younghusband's translation of the *Anabasis* further exemplifies this point. Again, this translation was addressed primarily to young readers. Her intended audience is stated in the preface, in which she asked Henry Graham Dakyns, the translator of one of the most popular

editions of *Anabasis* in English for “adults,” to write *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand*, published in 1891, because it was destined:

I think, no less than its predecessors, *The Myths of Hellas*, *The Tale of Troy*, and *The Wanderings of Ulysses*, to become a favourite with those youthful readers, to whom it is primarily addressed. Indeed, *considering the nature of the history*, older persons may perhaps find an interest in it.³⁵

The words “myth”, “tale” and “wandering” in these titles are very reflective and allusive. The relationship between the signifier and the signified determines the border between *Geschichte* and *Historie*; that is, as Pierre Nora explains, the “intellectual operation that renders it intelligible” and the “lived history,” respectively.³⁶ To make this clearer, the signifiers of myth, tale and wandering can only become “accepted” as part of history insofar as their signifieds are part of a particular genealogy. For history, in its traditional form, *The Myths of Hellas*, *The Tale of Troy*, and *The Wanderings of Ulysses* can be documented, studied “archeologically,” and this process accepted as science, yet *The Myths of Persia*, *The Tales of Babylon*, and *The Wanderings of Sinbad* cannot. Foucault explains this situation: “The document is not the fortunate tool of a history that is primarily and fundamentally memory; history is one way in which a society recognizes and develops a mass of documentation with which it is inextricably linked.”³⁷

At this point, Youngusband’s work is very important since its main concern is *Anabasis/The Retreat of the Ten Thousand*. She translates from C. Witt’s German version of *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand* and makes some corrections by way of Dakyns’ English version.³⁸ However, though she insists that she has endeavoured to reproduce accurately Witt’s text in simple English – without either addition or omission – this is hardly apparent from the text, which is a selective summary and abridgement of the *Anabasis*, rather than a full translation. Summarisation engenders selective perception throughout the text. Moral lessons, classification of the characters, races and cities within the book and even dichotomies can be found added to the text, which we can hardly name as “translation work”. In Youngusband’s *Retreat*, every character and event can be found in dichotomised categories of good and evil, civilized and savage, etc. The most important two of these are, within Hellas, Athenians vs. Spartans, and within the ancient world, Hellas vs. Persia. There is also frequent mention of race in the book:

That remarkable personage, who in spite of his Spartan leanings was a thorough Athenian at heart—found himself on a sudden called upon to play the part of a leader: and

played it to perfection. But if he deserved well of his countrymen and fellow soldiers by his service in the field, he has deserved still better of all later generations by the vigor, not of his sword, but of his pen.

The incidents, albeit they took place in the broad noonday of Grecian history, are as thrilling as any tale told by the poets in the divine dawn of the highly gifted Hellenic race. The men themselves who play so noble a part are evidently true descendants of the Homeric heroes. If they have fits of black despondency, the cloud is soon dispelled when there is need for action, and by a sense of their own dignity. The spirit of their forefathers, who fought and won at Marathon and Salamis and Plataeae, has entered into them. They enter the lists of battle with the same gaiety. They confront death with similar equanimity. Buoyancy is the distinctive note of the Anabasis.

But there is another side to the matter. These Xenophontine soldiers are also true *enfants du siecle*. They bear the impress of their own half century markedly: and it was an age not by any means entirely heroic. It had its painful and prosaic side.

‘Nothing,’ a famous Frenchman, M. Henri Taine, has remarked in one of his essays entitled *Xénophon*, ‘is more singular than this Greek army—which is a kind of roving commonwealth, deliberating and acting, fighting and voting: an epitome of Athens set adrift in the centre of Asia: there are the same sacrifices, the same assemblies, the same party strife, the same outbursts of violence; today at peace and tomorrow at war; now on land and again on shipboard; every successive incident serves but to evoke the energy and awaken the poetry latent in their souls.’

How does this happen? It is due, I think, to the Ten Thousand to admit: It was so, because in spite of personal defects they were true to themselves. ‘The Greeks,’ as the aged Egyptian priest exclaimed to Solon, in another context, ‘are always children.’³⁹

Here again, as in the previous author’s work, wishes for the British Empire are displaced to the utopian Ancient Greek world, as well as Ancient

Greek characters. This is revealed more clearly in Younghusband's chapter on "Hellas."⁴⁰

Beyond the great Persian Empire, on the other side of the Hellespont, was the little country of Hellas, or Greece. The Hellenes, or Greeks, as they are often called, were a race of men who had for centuries trained themselves in the art of noble thinking and noble living, and they looked down with some scorn on their less cultivated neighbours, to whom they gave, one and all, the name of Barbarians.

In many respects Hellas was a complete contrast to Persia. The country was a very small one, and it was further divided into a number of tiny states, each with a free government of its own, and independent of all the rest. To the Hellene citizen, the one supreme necessity of life was freedom, and consequently in almost all the states the government was in the hands of men chosen by the people. Now and again a monarchy would be established in one or other of the states, but it never lasted long, and in their horror of tyrants, the Hellenes were apt to overlook the advantages of a firm, stable government.

It is true that in Hellas there were many slaves, but they formed a class apart and were in no sense citizens. The citizens themselves were free, and the Hellenes were convinced that honour, courage, and high-mindedness can only flourish among free men. It was their greatest pride to recall the battles fought by their countrymen in former days against the Barbarians of Persia, when, although outnumbered by ten to one, a handful of free men had put to flight a host of slaves.⁴¹

If it is remembered that the date is still 1891, it is easier to see the "whys" behind the rhetoric here. Hellas is presented as a utopian land surrounded by less cultivated neighbours and its place in relation to the great line of civilizations around Mesopotamia, including the Persian, is not deemed worthy of discussion. On the other hand, the idea of an "island" of civility within the barbarian crowds could help Anglo-Saxon children to situate themselves.

Another helpful distinction made by the author is the issue of freedom and slaves. As understood from the excerpt above, slavery contradicts neither freedom nor citizenship. The child (the boy) who has

access to books, and therefore has the privilege of education granted to him as part of his citizenship, does not need to think of the rest of the world over which his country enjoys the privileges of imperial hegemony, such as the Indians on the streets of Calcutta. Freedom is his privilege and the virtues that are raised from it can be owned only by him.

The last book to be examined from this genre is Margaret Bertha Synge's book published in 1909; *On the Shores of Great Sea*. This book is valuable for its theme and method of presentation. It is the first book of the collection called: *The Story of the World for the Children of the British Empire*. Its chronology is also noteworthy: *On the Shores of the Great Sea: From the Days of Abraham to the Birth of Christ*.⁴² The forty-five chapters within the two-hundred-page book summarize the history of a given chronology as a British history teacher would wish, similarly to the previous works, but with a very important extra detail; this time, the genealogy is not only that of "pagan" antiquity but also of "Christian" history. The most striking point of Synge's work is that it offers a hybrid genealogy; that is, it unexpectedly welcomes "pagan" episodes within the stories of the Judeo-Christian prophets. The date and the book's audience indicate a very important step in inventing a "Western tradition"; a tradition which blends ancient Greek values, Roman law and Christian faith, serving this cultural trinity to the pupils.

5. Translation of Classics as a Prospectus for the "Westernisation" of a Nation

The reuse of *Anabasis* as a text within modernity has varied over time and geographically. For the Anglo Saxon world in the late 19th century, it was a "site of memory" about the "childhood" of the West. The text was used directly as teaching material, a reading exercise for learners of ancient Greek, as well as building material for a construction of "the myth of West," with various ideological agendas, such as imperialist or racist. Western artists and scientists, during their re-discovery of the "East", also "re"-named⁴³ it. Re-translation and re-popularisation of the Ancient Greek and Roman classics in the "Western world," with racist, nationalist and imperialist agendas, devised a retarded sense of history which believes in progress but refuses change.

Turkey's concurrence with *Anabasis*, as a country which shares a geography with the main route of the "ten thousand," is a very interesting one. The foundation of the Turkish Republic systematized the genealogy studied for the Turkish nation. The issue of the "origins of the Turks" had been studied during different periods, though it was systematized under the title of *The Outlines of Turkish History* by state-sponsored historian Afet İnan during the early Republican Period. Yet, soon after its publication, her thesis

about the "Turkishness" of Asia Minor was criticized for not including the Ancient Greek and Roman periods thoroughly. In 1933, Franz Miltner, a member of the Turkish Ministry of Education's Commission for the Preservation of Monuments, stated this situation as follows:

The Turkish nation, for the last couple of years, has given great importance to ancient history and ancient works. But even concerning that, there are some people who accept only the works belonging to the Hittite, Seljukid and Ottoman periods as Turkish works. I think this is a mistake. According to this thesis, Turks lived in Anatolia only in the time of the Hittites, Seljukids and Ottomans, but a gap exists between Hittites and Seljukids. This gap is more or less two thousand years (...)

On this point, for a Turkish intellectual, there is a great and important duty. This duty is to find documents proving that Turks were living in Anatolia amongst Hittites and Seljukids for a period of two thousand years.

The fall of the Hittites doesn't also mean the fall of the Turks who have lived in Anatolia since times unknown to history. Hittite is not the name of a nation but the name of a state. Thus there were other states built with names other than Hittite, for example when the Seljukids fell and the Ottomans replaced them. The nation was same but the government had been changed. So, couldn't the same thing have happened after the Hittite's fall? Of course it could. But those who have studied Hittite works, because they did not take this fact into account, did not search for the documents that verify this. We have to search for documents that will support this theory. To achieve this, it requires a lot of research, a lot of reading, and a lot of exploration.

So now, where can we find such documents? We will find those documents among the works that are left from the states which existed in Anatolia in between the Hittites and Seljukids.

All kinds of epigraphs, vases, reliefs, statues, pots, ruins, etc., that belong to the Ancient Greek, Hellenistic, Roman

and Byzantine periods will provide us with those important documents essential for Turkish history.

For that reason, the new Turkish scientists have to give importance to old (ancient) and new (modern) Greek and Latin.⁴⁴

As can be seen from the excerpt given above, Miltner not only criticizes the inclusion of the Hittites into the Turkish genealogy, but also criticizes the exclusion of the Ancient Greek, Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine heritage. This is a very important contribution for two reasons: firstly, it offers unity to the Turkish thesis through bridging it with the heritage which is shared with the “West,” and; secondly, it suggests the inclusion of Ancient Greek and Latin into education. This is a very important detail since the early republican period was heavily affected and enthused by the trend of “looking for relatives in the East” and it ignored the Greco-Roman heritage.

History, as Foucault states, turns into a form of concerted carnival after recruiting itself in the search for origins.⁴⁵ At that point, the idea of genealogy gains “representative value.” To understand this representative value, an etymology would be helpful, which Frank Ankersmit offers:

The etymology of the word “representation” will give us access to its ontological properties: We may “re-present” something by presenting a substitute of this thing in its absence. The real thing is not, or no longer available to us, and something else is given us in order to replace it. In this sense it can be said that we have historical writing in order to compensate for the absence of the past itself.⁴⁶

Miltner verifies this, by stating that the two thousand years of linkage is lost simply because “those who have studied Hittite works did not take this fact into account, [that even though the Hittite State collapsed, people kept living under the suzerainty of other states with different names] they did not search for the documents which could verify this.”⁴⁷ According to this formula, it can be said that to find something is a requirement of looking for something. This very pragmatic approach to archaeology and history is not of course Miltner’s invention. He was just introducing the dilettantish slippage between history, archaeology and genealogy which was very fashionable in Europe at that time.

As a matter of fact, this understanding was not new to republican historiography either. In the pages of a preface of unusual length which was canonised in republican historiography shortly after its publication, *Türk*

Tarihinin Anahatları (Outlines of Turkish History), İnan bridges Turkish history back over the nine thousand years preceeding her age. In order to achieve this, first she locates the "homeland" as a given fact. She locates the Turkish homeland as Asia, from the Aegean Sea to the Sea of Japan, and, moreover, she refuses to accept Europe as another continent and identifies it as a further projection of Asia.⁴⁸ After locating the Turks, she relocates them through migrations to settle them in every single historical people. As a sociologist educated in 1930s Europe, she understands society as composed by culture, race, language and religion. She reserves the last section of her preface to correct the "false information" known about the Turks and she legitimizes her book by referring to "European science" in attaching records of the French intellectual Leon Cahun's 1873 conference on *The Turanian Source of the Dialect that Permeates into Aryan Languages in France*⁴⁹; an article which supports her thesis at both the theoretical and practical levels.

However, early republican historiography's reluctance towards the "Western classics" and its ambition to create a brand new set of genealogies was to be changed by the footsteps of the Second World War. The "Translation Collection" project was one of the first "cultural" performances of the second president of the Turkish Republic and new "national chief," İsmet İnönü. As can be seen from the citation given below, pursuit of a racial genealogy was no longer a matter for discussion. Turkey at this time accepted a set of rules instead of trying to create its own game. As a "nation," it sought its place among "Western" nations, and also accepted the Ancient Greeks as a starting point for "art and mind."

To translate the masterpieces of the nations that have come through the Ancient Greeks within the sphere of art and mind is to promote the best instruments for the ones who want to serve the culture of the Turkish nation and take their place within it.⁵⁰

The modern Turkish state was founded upon a radical program of social change and transformation. The ideologues that prepared the background for that "modernizing mission" were mostly Durkheimian positivists who put forward two urgent prerequisites for the state's modernisation: culture, which is genuine for the nation but improvable, and civilization, which can be gained through education.

Culture, as understood from the excerpt above, was something devisable, so every contribution for the progress of culture was a contribution to the state. In a period of strict statism, it was natural for the state to perceive the translation of world literature as its own mission. We can understand this more clearly if we cite from the famous preface of the then Turkish Minister

of Education, Hasan Ali Yücel, which was published in every book of that translation collection, including the Turkish translation of *Anabasis*:

The necessary mission of our publishing program is to publish hundreds of translations for the collection of *Translations from World Literature* on each anniversary of our republic and reach the number of five hundred books translated and gifted to the intellectuals of our country by the hand of the state at the end of five years.

I would like to make it known, with all my heart, that the person who gave us the order and the courage to start this broad program and “the first reader” of our translation collection has been our President, İsmet İnönü. We accept it as national duty to realize the desires of our national chief, who is thinking that even the translation of five hundred books is not enough for five years.⁵¹

The author of this introduction highlights the concept of the “intellectual”. In Turkish, the word for intellectual is *aydın*, which literally means “enlightened”. As mentioned above, it was more than natural for the positivist mentality to see the mission of saving the layman with culture and education as the duty of the enlightened citizen.

As a matter of fact, Hasan Ali Yücel’s translation collection reflects a “real” attempt at the “Westernisation” of the Turkish Republic. It is very important to underline one particular point here: the first fifteen years of the Republic witnessed radical changes that formed the necessary background for this translation project. Yet, real steps were taken in the second period since the rules of the game had become accepted during this period. As mentioned already, the first period was inspired by Western trends, yet it also faced eastwards and had clear nationalist demands on the table. It was offering a brand new order of the “genealogy of the nations” and was quite assertive. On the other hand, the second period was quite cautious and accepted the new rules of the post-war game. It was also modern since it used all the modern “vehicles” of the time. Even though most of the translations of the collection arrived via third languages, and mostly through French and German, the “scientific nature” and exaggerated tone of positivism can still be easily perceived, as we shall see.

6. *Anabasis* and its Uses in Modern Turkey:

Xenophon’s *Anabasis* was the sixty first book translated for Yücel’s translation collection in 1944. It was translated by Hayrullah Örs from A.

Forbinger’s German language version, with comparison to Paul Masqueray’s French version. However, Örs’ translation of *Anabasis* had already been published in 1939 by Remzi Publishing as *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand (On Binlerin Ric’ati)*⁵².

Anabasis, in the Ancient Greek original, contains very strong, rhetorical language and is therefore very susceptible to being used as a text that promotes a nationalist agenda. The text references numerous people, places and struggles which simplifies the task of nationalists striving to mythologize their cultural origins, as an historic genealogy. However, Örs’ translation, preface and annotations make no such claims. From those translations, one would expect the editor to ascribe claims of “Turkishness” to at least one of the historical tribes that are referred to in the book’s notes and appendices. Yet, the editor makes no such assertions; it seems that the effects of the Sun-language theory had started to abate by this point.

Rather, Örs conveys himself as an exacting scholar and strict positivist. In the preface and notes, he examines Xenophon by all scientific means and seems very pleased when he catches any inconsistencies. Yet, as we shall see again later in the Marxist/Nationalist approach, falsification of Xenophon also becomes a virtue of being scientific.⁵³ In his preface, Örs criticizes Xenophon with his two fatal mistakes, which cannot be tolerated by an enlightened positivist scholar: his alliance with the Spartans against the Athenians, and his religious personality, which, according to Örs, also affects his works:

But [he] was neither a complete historian nor a philosopher. He wrote many pieces. Yet, those were superficial works that were written for practical means. Xenophon believed and valued dreams and omens too much, and testified as much in his works...⁵⁴

On the other hand, Örs values *Anabasis* as Xenophon’s best work, exactly for the same reason; that is, its simplicity and adventurous nature.

This book is the most joyfully readable book of Xenophon. In it, he narrates the adventures that he took part in, the different people that he met, the brave wars that they fought in, and the various people who took their places in that strange mercenary army; all with a great simplicity and taste.⁵⁵

7. The 1943 Ankara People's House Book-Summarising Competition

The use of translated material exemplifies the enthusiasm of states for promoting "culture," disseminating it, and assessing measurable, cultural outputs. First, culture is promoted by ordering a translation mission for the western classics; then, this cultural mission is disseminated by promoting it with education; finally, the educational output of the strategy is assessed with examinations and/or competitions. At this point, what better way to give a precise evaluation of the translation mission than a book-summarising competition?

As mentioned earlier, summarisation is a necessary part of the idea of a "classic" and may be the only part that has not changed in nature from antiquity. A summary of a work reflects the selective demands of the discursive system. Organizing a book-summarising competition and encouraging the submission of abstracts from the "new generation" of the Republic, actually means ideological quality control for the output of the education system. This is because every summary reflects students' choices from the given text and the committee's choice of the winning abstract actually means the committee's choice of their preferred student.

In 1943, the Ankara People's House⁵⁶ Libraries and Publications Committee announced a book-summarising competition for university and high school students. Their aim was to promote reading among young adults. The books selected for summarisation were quite interesting: two Ancient Greek Classics and one nationalist novel were selected; Plato's *Socrates' Apology*, Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and Halide Edip Adivar's novel, *Shirt of Flame*.⁵⁷ Hayrullah Örs, translator of *Anabasis* and *Socrates' Apology* into Turkish, sat as one of the judges of the competition, as did the future Prime Minister of Turkey, Nihat Erim, as well as Niyazi Berkes, Azra Erhat, Enis and Behiç Koryürek.

The competition was won by a high school student, Ferit Okay, who won with his abstract of *Anabasis*. Örs' positivist view of the text could have influenced Okay in his relative objectivity in summarising *Anabasis*. His intervention in the text is perceptible in the parts of *Anabasis* that are incommensurable with positivism, such as religious sacrifices, omens and oracles; low-key criticism can be seen with careful reading. Another noteworthy detail from his summary is his nomination of the Ancient Greeks and Persians; for these two he uses the national nouns *Yunanlılar* and *İranlılar* respectively, derived from the names used for Turkey's modern neighbours, Greece (*Yunanistan*) and Iran (*İran*). Hayrullah Örs' translation can be seen as partly responsible for this confusion. In the translation, the word used for Greeks is very consistent, and Örs uses the word *Helen* for the Greeks and *Hellas* for Greece, as in the original text. On the other hand, the

situation with Persians and Persia differs. He uses the word *Persli* for Persians, as in the original text, but uses *Iran* for the country, where the original places Persia.

8. The Nationalist/Marxist Reading of Anabasis: the "Passage" of the Ten Thousand through Kurdistan

Until the Loeb Classical Library came onto the stage in the 1922, providing translation of classics alongside the original texts, the most common translation of *Anabasis* into English was Dakyns' translation, which contains many ideological distortions. Dakyns translation of the term barbarian is particularly problematic. In twenty-two places, he uses the word Asiatic, a racial designation, where the original text supplies the word "barbar" and its different variations.⁵⁸ Dakyn's translation of τό τε βαρβαρικόν καί τό Ἑλληνικόν⁵⁹ meaning "(armaments) which belong to the barbarians and the Hellenes" exemplifies this point. Dakyns translates it as "his Asiatic and his Hellenic armaments."⁶⁰ Another questionable translation is the word the word *Carduchi* as Kurd and *Carduchia* as Kurdistan. This is one of the most important problems of the translation of *Anabasis*. In the original text, the words "Kurd" and "Kurdistan" do not exist. The word used for the people living in the lower domains of Armenia is Καρδούχοι.⁶¹ Dakyns makes an additional comment in a footnote on the issue:

See Dr. Kiepert, "Man. Anc. Geog." (Mr. G. A. Macmillan) iv. 47. The Karduchians or Kurds belong by speech to the Iranian stock, forming in fact their farthest outpost to the West, little given to agriculture, but chiefly to the breeding of cattle. Their name, pronounced Kardu by the Ancient Syrians and Assyrians, Kordu by the Armenians (plural Kordukh), first appears in its narrower sense in Western literature in the pages of the eye-witness Xenophon as {Kardoukhoi}. Later writers knew of a small kingdom here at the time of the Roman occupation, ruled by native princes, who after Tigranes II (about 80 B.C.) recognised the overlordship of the Armenian king. Later it became a province of the Sassanid kingdom, and as such was in 297 A.D. handed over among the regiones transtigritanae to the Roman empire, but in 364 was again ceded to Persia.⁶²

Even in the case that this explanation supplies a proper relationship between the Ancient Carduchians and the modern Kurds, which is always open to discussion, as is true for all of the ancient people, kinship is limited if two and half millennium stand in between. To treat ancient people as close

relatives and adopt their history as yours helps nothing, but rather creates ideological perversions such as racism or nationalism.

The situation with the 1911 publication of the Encyclopaedia Britannica is even worse:

Xenophon became the leading spirit of the army; he was elected an officer, and he it was who mainly directed the retreat. Part of the way lay through the wilds of Kurdistan, where they had to encounter the harassing guerrilla attacks of savage mountain tribes, and part through the highlands of Armenia and Georgia. After a five months' march they reached the Black Sea.⁶³

The layman or a student of secondary education who read this article and saw the illustration depicting the Hellenes with Mausers and bayonets (fig. 1), could be led to believe the above interpretation. Put another way, the depictions of Guerilla Kurds attacking the Greeks could be a good inspiration for a striking topic for cheap newspaper bulletins side by side with the stories of aliens preparing to invade the Earth.

*The Passage of the Ten Thousand through Kurdistan: Anabasis (Onbinlerin Kürdistan'dan Geçişi: Anabasis)*⁶⁴ is the third book in Komal Publications' history collection. The book, compiled by an anonymous translator and editor, includes summaries of the *Anabasis* based on the English translation by Carleton Lewis Brownson for the Loeb Classical Library. It compares them with the Arabic translation of the text, published in a journal called *The Brotherhood* in Baghdad, as well as summarising all of book four, which is predominately concerned with the Carduchians.⁶⁵

Even the title of the book itself is surprising. It is the "passage" of the ten thousands, not return or retreat, as in the titles of other translations. Even the word "passage" tells us a lot about how an ancient text is being perceived as part of a mythologised "national past" and considered within the borders of "national pride," since "aliens" could be permitted to pass through the fatherland, but not to march in.

The book tries to apply a Marxist approach to analyzing the text, but its high nationalist tone prevents it from being objective in a Marxist context. It thus falls into a romantic paradigm and exaggerates reflections of nationalism to the text. The translator (or more precisely "author") tries to be objective, and to take referee position, yet his nationalist inclinations dominate his Marxist objectivity. The text explains nations within the borders of Marxist terminology, yet nationalist sentiments and signifiers dominate the Marxist methodology.

The word *kadim* ("ancient") is one of the most frequent words in the text and is always printed in bold characters. *Kadim halklar* ("ancient

peoples") could be taken as a code to advocate solutions to contemporary problems by the channel of thousand-year-old pseudo-legacies. Another good example is the sedentary/nomad contradiction. According to Xenophon, the Karduchians were a sedentary people living in small villages; if so, what do they have to do with the largely nomadic Kurds of today? Then the author's reasoning starts to work, and a solution is narrated: "Kurds, after many ages, as a result of different conditions, adopted a nomadic life."⁶⁶ The whole interpretation of the text in this fashion demonstrates a means to establish imagined connections between ancient and modern cultures. The small villages mentioned in Xenophon's text thus become the starting point of the *aşiret* system, a sedentary order within a normally nomadic society. The author even uses this connection to legitimize his point about the sedentary ancestors/nomadic descendents dilemma, and criticizes the *aşiret* system itself as a necessity of his referee position. Yet this referee position does not continue very far, and nationalist sentimentality dominates once more as the translator/editor concludes his/her preface; "Let us also state that, according to Xenophon, the Karduchs are also an irresistible, warrior tribe."⁶⁷

In the summary of the first three books, the translator turns his attention to creating monumental narratives from the fragments that he hunts for in the text. This ambition reaches its peak with the summary of the third book and its endnotes. Xenophon's *Anabasis* turns into a eulogy to the courage, warrior-skills and love of freedom and independence of the Karduchians, with frequent mention of the identity between Karduchs and Kurds. Added to this, the translator/editor also adds an endnote to Xenophon and links the Karduchians to another ancient people, the Medians, and tries to suggest a relationship between the Medians and Karduchians as the true ancestors of the Kurds. Neither Xenophon's work nor the mentioned work supposed to be a translation of it gives any reference to or indication of such a relation. Nevertheless, the translator/editor represents *Anabasis* as a genealogy text of the Kurds.⁶⁸

The fourth book of *Anabasis*, which is said to be given in its "complete and precise" translation, has many problems. Independently of the original text, in the translation the Karduchians start to bear a closer resemblance to the present day inhabitants of the area, demonstrating modern rituals such as chanting anthems. For example, the following phrase does not even exist in the original text: "The Karduchians started to chant anthems that are peculiar to themselves while moving from hill to plane."⁶⁹

A more contemporary text including *Anabasis* as a reference text is, Edip Polat's *Kurds in Scientific Language (Bilim Dilinde Kürtler)*. This interesting text, which assertively claims itself to be "scientific," does not really give a proper bibliography. The following quotation is supposed to be taken from *Anabasis*:

As is well known to all, there was a Karduch state in history, and they are accepted as ancestors of the Kurds. When a homeland for the Kurds has been talked about, it has sometimes it been called the Land of the Karduchs. The one who first used the word Karduch in written language was the Greek philosopher and scientist, Xenophon. In his book, called *Anabasis*, or *Return of Ten Thousand*, he mentions the Karduchs and the Land of the Karduchs as such: "...There was only one road left; we had to pass through Karduchi lands to go to the Black Sea." The author of that sentence, written two thousand, four hundred years before, speaks of the belligerence of the Karduchs in this same book: the Karduchs were independent at that time, and the Karduch people were very belligerent. "The same amount of soldiers who remain to us died in the war which broke out between us and the Karduchs. We reached the Black Sea with very few soldiers remaining, and from there we reached our Homeland."⁷⁰

It is clear that author has never read *Anabasis*; even the worst translations do not perpetrate this much distortion. It is also not clear whether he in fact ever held the book in his hands, since there is no proper citation format, no publication house, no page numbers, nothing,⁷¹ only the name of the author and the book. As can also be understood from the title of book, the ten thousand soldiers who return to their native Hellas were around twelve thousand at the beginning. Just like in the publication of Komal, strong exaggeration and distortion is made to stress a contemporary political agenda.

Conclusion

In conclusion, let us repeat the questions we asked at the beginning of our essay: "when do we translate texts?" and "why do we need classics?" or "what are the uses of the classics?" All the examples we have examined produced within the different phases and sites of Modernity somehow unite with each other at the point of distorting individuals' minds and creating pseudo realities. Some of them follow antiquarian history in Nietzsche's terms, and try to enroot the foundations of the new order within antiquity, conceived as an absolutely correct, untouchable and unrivalled past, just like in the cases of 19th century Anglo Saxon textbooks and the Turkish State's translation mission of the 1940s. Some of them follow monumental history – again a term borrowed from Nietzsche – and create a monumental past and monumental ancestors, trying to create "worthy ancestors" as a claim to be a "worthy nation," as in Millner's speech at Konya People's House, or Komal's

"translation" of the *Anabasis*, or Polat's *Kurds in Scientific Language*. Common to both is a focus on genealogy as searching for origins; either of "nations" or of "values". Their trust in "history" comprises their structural foundations. This paper has questioned their faith in history and translation, and applied another work of genealogy: the genealogy of secondary sources, tracing all possible connections to furnish a genealogy of the power relations between text, author, story and narration. Rather than genealogy as "the search for origins,"⁷² Foucaultian genealogy "rejects the metahistorical deployment of ideal signification and indefinite teleologies."⁷³ This is also the answer to the post-modernist obsession with the text, as a reflection of all those abuses of texts and translations as a path to the search for origins.

Illustrations



Figure 1. Illustration for the article “Xenophon” in the 1911 *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Notes

- ¹ Carlo Ginzburg, *Wooden Eyes Nine: Reflections on Distance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 25.
- ² Helene Adeline Guerber, *The Story of the Greeks* (New York: Eclectic School Readings, 1896), xi.
- ³ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *Harpers' Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
- ⁴ Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).
- ⁵ Jan Gorak, *Canon vs Culture: Reflections on the Current Debate* (New York: Garland Publishing, 2001).
- ⁶ H. G. Gütterbock, "'Hittite Historiography: a Survey' in Perspectives on Hittite Civilization" in *Selected Writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*, ed. H.A Hoffner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 173.
- ⁷ Ibid. 173.
- ⁸ David Herman, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* (London ; New York : Routledge, 2005), 235.
- ⁹ George A. Kennedy, "The Origin of the Concept of a Canon and Its Application to the Greek and Latin Classics" in *Canon vs. Culture: Reflections on the Current Debate*, ed. Jan Gorak (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 2001), 105.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ Carlo Ginzburg, *Wooden Eyes Nine Reflections on Distance* (New York: Columbia University Press), 25.
- ¹² Π. Χ Δορμπαράκι, *Επίτομον λεξικόν της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσης* , Αθήνα: Βιβλιοπωλειον της Εστιας, 2005, 193.
- ¹³ "Genealogy," <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/genealogy>, (accessed May 02, 2009).
- ¹⁴ Michael Mahon, *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power and the Subject* (New York: SUNY Press, 1992), 96.
- ¹⁵ Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals: A Polemic. By Way of Clarification and Supplement to My Last Book, Beyond Good and Evil*, trans. Douglas Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 58.
- ¹⁶ Nietzsche, *The Will to Power: Der Wille Zur Macht*, trans. Walter Arnold Kaufmann, ed. R. J. Hollingdale, (New York: Vintage Books, 1968).
- ¹⁷ Michael Mahon, *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject*, New York: SUNY Press, 1992), 96.
- ¹⁸ Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale, trans. Reginald John Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 75-6.

-
- ¹⁹ Michael Mahon, *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject* (New York: SUNY Press, 1992), 97.
- ²⁰ Ibid. 98.
- ²¹ Nietzsche "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life" in *Untimely Meditations*, ed. D. Breazeale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 75-6.
- ²² Michael Mahon, *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject* (New York: SUNY Press, 1992), 100.
- ²³ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge Press, 2002), 8.
- ²⁴ J.K Anderson, *Xenophon* (London: Gerald Duckworth&Company Limited, 1974), 10.
- ²⁵ Ibid. 9.
- ²⁶ Xenophon, *Anabasis*, original text with trans. Carleton L. Brownson, (London: The LOEB classical library 1922), Book 2, 6.20.
- ²⁷ Βιβλίον Α, Βιβλίον Β, Βιβλίον Γ as greek numeric system depends on letters.
- ²⁸ J. Surtees Phillpotts, *Easy Selections Adapted from Xenophon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
- ²⁹ Italo Calvino, *Why Read the Classics?* (London: Vintage Classics, 2000), 3.
- ³⁰ Stathis Gourgouris, *Dream Nation, Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece* (California: Stanford University Press 1996), 15.
- ³¹ George A. Kennedy, "The Origin of the Concept of a Canon and Its Application to the Greek and Latin Classics" in *Canon vs Culture: Reflections on the Current Debate* ed. Jan Gorak (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 2001), 112.
- ³² Mary Macgregor, *The Story of Greece* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1914), ix.
- ³³ Ibid.
- ³⁴ J. Surtees Phillpotts, *Easy Selections Adapted from Xenophon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), iv. Emphasis added.
- ³⁵ See H.G. Dakyns' foreword to *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand by Xenophon*, trans. Frances Younghusband, German trans. by Karl Witt, (New York: Longmans Green: 1891), vii. Emphasis added.
- ³⁶ Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," in *Histories French Constructions of the Past*, ed. Jacques Revel and Lynn Hunt (New York: The New Press, 1984), 633.
- ³⁷ Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge Press, 2002), 7.

³⁸ This is also clear from the foreword to Youngusband's translation: "I am glad to take the opportunity of expressing my very grateful thanks to Mr. Dakyns for his kindness in forwarding this attempt to interest English children in the writings of an author to whom he has himself given so many hours of sympathetic study. And I hope that many readers of this little book may be stimulated to the effort of studying for themselves the works of *the great historian* in the original Greek."

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Fatherland of the Hellenes.

⁴¹ Frances Youngusband, trans. *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand by Xenophon*, German trans. by Karl Witt (New York: Longmans Green: 1891).

⁴² M. B. Syngge, *On the Shores of the Great Sea* (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1909), 115.

⁴³ Aristotle's *Poetika* and its reuse in modernity can be given as an example here. *Poetika* was a small booklet by Aristotle "naming" the art of words. Modernity has created a huge amount of paraphrases to "re-name" the art of words.

⁴⁴ C.H.P. Konya Halkevi Dil, Edebiyat, Tarih Araştırmaları, No:1 (Konya: Selçuk Matbaası: 1934), 5. My translation.

⁴⁵ Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1977), 161.

⁴⁶ F.R. Ankersmit, *Historical Representation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 11.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Afet İnan, *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları-Methal Kısmı* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931), 1.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 75, 86.

⁵⁰ See İsmet İnönü's preface to *Anabasis* by Xenophon, trans. Hayrullah Öz, (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1944). My translation.

⁵¹ See Hasan Ali Yücel's preface to *Anabasis* by Xenophon, trans. Hayrullah Öz, (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1944). My translation.

⁵² Hayrullah Örs, trans. *On binlerin ric'ati* by Xenophon, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1939).

⁵³ Örs, trans, *On binlerin ric'ati* by Xenophon, (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1944) 373, 374.

⁵⁴ Ibid. II.

⁵⁵ Ibid. III.

⁵⁶ People's Houses (*halkevleri*) functioned as local state institutions for modernizing society.

⁵⁷ Ankara Halkevi Kütüphane ve Neşriyat Komitesi. *1943 Kitap Hülasa Etme Müsabakası*, (Ankara: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), 10, 20.

- ⁵⁸ Xenophon, *Anabasis* trans. H.G Dakyns, (The Project Gutenberg e-book August 13, 2008 EBook #1170), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1170/1170-h/1170-h.htm>, (accessed December 11th, 2008), Book I, part II.
- ⁵⁹ Xenophon, *Anabasis*, original text with trans. Carleton L. Browson, (London: The LOEB classical library, 1922), Book 2, 2.1.
- ⁶⁰ Xenophon, *Anabasis*, trans. H.G Dakyns, (The Project Gutenberg e-book August 13, 2008 EBook #1170), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1170/1170-h/1170-h.htm>, (accessed December 11,2008), Book I, part II.
- ⁶¹ Xenophon, *Anabasis*, original text with trans. Carleton L. Browson, Book 4, 6.1.
- ⁶² Xenophon, *Anabasis*, trans. H.G Dakyns, Book 5.1.
- ⁶³ See "Xenophon" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, ed. Hugh Chisholm, (England: Cambridge University Press, 1911).
- ⁶⁴ Xenophon, *Onbinlerin Kürdistan'dan Geçişi Anabasis*, no trans. id, (İstanbul: Komal Yayınları, 1977), 14.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid. 14-5.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid. 11.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid. 13.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid. 24-6.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid. 45.
- ⁷⁰ Edib Polat, *Kürt Coğrafyasının Flora ve Faunasına Giriş : Bilim Dilinde Kürtler* (İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2004), 72. My translation.
- ⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁷² Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (New York: Cornell University Press), 139.
- ⁷³ Ibid.

Bibliography

- Anderson, J.K. *Xenophon*. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1974.
- Ankara Halkevi Kütüphanesi ve Neşriyat Komitesi, *1943 Kitap Hülase Etme Müsabakası*. Ankara: Maarif Matbaası, 1943.
- Ankersmit, F.R. *Historical Representation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Calvino, Italo. *Why Read the Classics?* London: Vintage Classics, 2000.
- Charlton, T. Lewis and Charles, Short. *Harpers' Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

- C.H.P Konya Halkevi Dil, Edebiyat, Tarih Arařtırmaları, No:1, Konya: Selçuk Matbaası, 1934
- C.H.P Konya Halkevi Dil, Edebiyat, Tarih Arařtırmaları, No:2, Konya: Selçuk Matbaası, 1934
- Edib, Polat. *Kürt Coğrafyasının Flora ve Faunasına Giriř: Bilim Dilinde Kürtler*. İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2004.
- Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- . *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge Press, 2002.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *Wooden Eyes Nine: Reflections on Distance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Gorak, Jan. *Canon vs Culture: Reflections on the Current Debate*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2001.
- Gourgouris, Stathis. *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece*. California: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Guerber, Helene Adeline. *The Story of the Greeks*. New York: Eclectic School Readings, 1896.
- Gütterbock, H. G. "Hittite Historiography: a Survey in Perspectives on Hittite Civilization." in H.A Hoffner (ed.) *Selected Writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Herman, David, John Manfred and Marie-Laure Ryan. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- İnan, Afet. *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları-Methal Kısmı*. İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931.
- Jacks, L.V. *Xenophon: Soldier of Fortune*. London: Charles Scribber's & Sons, 1930.

-
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Macgregor, Mary. *The Story of Greece*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1914.
- Mahon, Michael. *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject*. New York: SUNY Press, 1992.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life." In *Untimely Meditations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . *On the Genealogy of Morals: A Polemic. By Way of Clarification and Supplement to My Last Book, Beyond Good and Evil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *The Will to Power*. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- . *Untimely Meditations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," in *Histories: French Constructions of the Past*. ed. Jacques Revel and Lynn Hunt, New York: The New Press, 1984.
- Phillpotts, J. Surtees. *Easy Selections Adapted from Xenophon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Synge, M. B. *On the Shores of Great Sea*. London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1909.
- Xenophon. *Anabasis*. Original text with trans. Carleton L. Browson, The LOEB Classical Library, London: 1922. V. 1 and V. 2.
- . *Anabasis*. trans. H.G. Dakyns, (The Project Gutenberg e-book August 13, 2008 EBook #1170), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1170/1170-h/1170-h.htm>.
- . *On Binlerin Ric'ati*. trans. Hayrullah Örs, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1939.

-----, *Anabasis*. trans. Hayrullah Öz, İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1944.

-----, *Onbinlerin Kürdistan’dan Geçişi Anabasis*. no trans. İstanbul: Komal Yayınları, 1977.

-----, *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand*. trans. Frances Younghusband, New York: Longmans Green: 1891.

Π. Χ Δορμπαράκι, *Επίτομον λεξικόν της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Αθήνα: Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστιας, 2005.

Illustration Sources

Figure 1. “Xenophon” in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, ed. Hugh Chisholm (England: Cambridge University Press, 1911).

İsmail Keskin is an MA student in the Department of History at Boğaziçi University.