

ARRIAN'S LITERARY DEVELOPMENT

THERE is relative agreement among modern scholars that the bulk of Arrian's literary activity came late in his life. What has become the standard theory was evolved by Eduard Schwartz, who maintained that it was only after the end of his public career that Arrian turned to writing.¹ According to this hypothesis the *Περίπλους Εὐξείνου Πόντου* of 131/2 A.D. was a tentative preliminary monograph, which was followed in 136/7 by a work of similar genre, the *Τέχνη τακτική*.² It was when he retired to Athens that Arrian devoted himself exclusively to writing, beginning with the modest *Cyneticus*, avowedly only a supplement to Xenophon's famous work, and developing his technical skills in the *Lives* of Dion and Timoleon. Then by a natural progression he moved to a longer work, the extant *Anabasis Alexandri*, and this period of preparation ended with the eight books of the *Bithyniaca*, the work on which he had set his heart and directed his studies. With the *Bithyniaca* Arrian reached full maturity as a writer, and thereafter he devoted himself to more massive historical works, the *Parthica* in seventeen books, and the history of the Successors, τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον, in ten. According to Schwartz, then, Arrian's literary production has two important features. It began late in his life after an exacting military career, and it displays a logical progression from modest, specialized monographs to fully-fledged historical works of increasing length and complexity.³ Modern scholars have tended to accept both these tenets. The relative order of the later works has been variously manipulated, but the logical progression from monograph to history remains. There has, moreover, been a tendency to date Arrian's historical works very late; the *Anabasis* has even been associated with Lucius Verus' Parthian expedition of 165, when Arrian must have been well advanced in his seventies.⁴

There has been, however, at least one dissentient voice. In 1899 Friedrich Reuss argued powerfully that the *Anabasis* is a work of Arrian's youth, at least composed before his consulship in A.D. 129 or 130.⁵ This dating runs totally

¹ E. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1230-6 (= *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber* [Leipzig, 1957], 130-40). This classic survey is the basis of most later accounts of Arrian's life and career, such as K. Hartmann, *Flavius Arrianus und Kaiser Hadrian* (Programm, Augsburg, 1907); Christ-Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*⁶ (Munich, 1924) ii (2). 746-51; Stein, *PIR*² F 219 (up-to-date account of the epigraphic *testimonia*). The editions of the *testimonia* of Arrian's life by Roos (*Flavius Arrianus: Scripta Minora et Fragmenta* [2nd edn.: Leipzig, 1968], lviii-lxv) and Jacoby (*FGrH* 156 T 1-7) also follow the lines laid down by Schwartz. In what follows I shall refer to the *testimonia* and fragments of Arrian in Roos's edition, where there are marginal references to Jacoby.

² For these dates, see *Periplus* 17. 3 (reference to the death in 131/2 of Ti. Julius Cotys, king of the Cimmerian Bosporus) and *Tact.* 44. 3 (20th regnal year of Hadrian).

³ See particularly his exposition at *RE* ii. 1235; 'Auf die Dauer genügte das dem wackeren Manne nicht, und er empfand den unwiderstehlichen Trieb, etwas Bleibendes, das über die ephemere Broschüre hinausging, zu schaffen.'

⁴ G. Wirth, 'Anmerkungen zur Arrianbiographie', *Historia* xiii (1964), 209-45, argues that the *Anabasis* and *Indica* were composed sometime after 147. E. Bowie, *Past & Present* xlv (1970), 24-7, argues for the first half of the 160s. P. A. Stadter, *GRBS* viii (1967), 160-1, repeats that the *Anabasis* and *Indica* were late works, composed after Arrian's retirement to Athens, as does E. Gabba, *RSI* lxxi (1959), 373.

⁵ F. Reuss, 'Arrian und Appian', *Rheinisches Museum* xlv (1899), 446-65 (esp. pp. 455-61); cf. von Domaszewski, *SB Heidelberg* xvi (1925/6), Abh. 1, pp. 5-6 (similar conclusion but weaker arguments).

against both Schwartz's tenets. The *Anabasis*, according to Reuss, is an early work which preceded the technical monographs. Now the divergence is complete and instructive. It stems from the inadequacy, in particular the defective quality, of our data on the public career and published works of Arrian. We have only scanty notices about Arrian's life, and they readily lend themselves to over-hasty hypotheses. The published writings are better attested, but it is important how varied and scattered the testimonia are. We only know of the *Lives* of Dion and Timoleon from Photius' summary of the preface to the *Bithyniaca*, and it is clear that these monographs had been lost by Photius' time.¹ The enigmatic *Life* of the bandit Tilliborus is mentioned in passing by Lucian as a parallel to his own work on Alexander of Abunoteichos;² no other source so much as hints at the existence of the biography. It remained for Brinkmann and Herter in 1924 to show that 'Arrianus', author of the physical fragments excerpted by Stobaeus, was none other than Arrian the historian.³ There was probably a plethora of works, major and minor, which have escaped the notice of posterity,⁴ and it is rash to build on the assumption that our knowledge of Arrian's works is anything near complete. Similarly nothing is known of Arrian's career in Rome, apart from the consulship and legateship of Cappadocia. None the less, his earlier *cursus* has bulked large in considerations of the chronology of his works. There has been an implicit assumption that extensive literary activity and progress through the senatorial *cursus* are mutually exclusive. Arrian, it is thought, did not enjoy the leisure for extended composition until his retirement from public life. This hypothesis is at best *a priori*, and it runs counter to the ancient tradition that Arrian was primarily a man of letters. It seems to me that the tradition of the life of Arrian is more easily comprehensible if he is allowed to pursue his literary activities throughout his life. That at any rate is Arrian's own claim in the *Cynegeticus*: ἀμφὶ ταῦτ' ἀπὸ νέου ἐσπουδακώς, κυνηγέσια καὶ στρατηγίαν καὶ σοφίαν.⁵ The passage makes most sense if one understands the three activities to have been practised consistently throughout his life; *σοφία* can hardly have been a late interest. These considerations, I think, justify a fresh examination of Arrian's literary development, which may shed new light on the relationship between his historical works and his career as a Roman senator.

I

It is as a philosopher that Arrian is celebrated in late antiquity. Both Photius and the *Suda* transcribe a virtually identical life, derived ultimately from the fourth-century sophist, Heliconius of Byzantium.⁶ Here Arrian is introduced as ὁ φιλόσοφος, and both versions go on to say that he owed his public offices, in particular his consulship, to the distinction of his παιδεία.⁷ This is a far cry

¹ Phot. *cod.* 93, p. 73 b 4 ff. = *Bithyniaca* F 1. 2 (Roos).

² Lucian, *Alexander* 2 = T 24 (Roos).

³ Brinkmann and Herter, *Rh. Mus.* lxxiii (1924), 373–401. Wilamowitz had already argued (*Hermes* xli [1906], 157 f.) that the works were the product of the second century A.D.; cf. Roos, *Opera Minora*, xxvii f.

⁴ Phot. *cod.* 58, p. 17 b 22 = T 2 (Roos) φασι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἕτερα γράφειν, ἃ οὐπω εἰς ἡμετέραν ἀφίκετο γνῶσιν.

⁵ *Cyneget.* 1. 4 = T 19.

⁶ Phot. *cod.* 58, p. 17 b 11–20; *Suda* s.v. Ἀρριανός = T 2. The *Suda*'s information is qualified as coming from Heliconius, and this datum was certainly taken over from his immediate source, the *Onomatologos* of Hesychius. Cf. *Suda* s.v. 'Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος; Wentzel, *Hermes* xxxiii (1898), 275; G. Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 507.

⁷ Phot. 17 b 15–17 διὰ τὸ τῆς παιδείας ἐπίσημον ἄλλας τε πολιτικὰς ἀρχὰς ἐπιστεῦσθαι,

from modern theories that Arrian achieved prominence as a *vir militaris*, and the evidence of Photius and the *Suda* has been dismissed as fantasy, an inept speculative construction upon Arrian's early years with Epictetus.¹ Certainly the authority of neither Photius nor the *Suda* is very high. One might compare the *Life* of Dio Chrysostom, which again seems excerpted in both works.² Both versions contain data which are independent of the extant corpus of Dio's works and are very suspect in themselves. The orator is said to have been so highly honoured by Trajan as to ride with him in the βασιλείον ὄχημα, and to have taken his solemnity of bearing so seriously that he gave declamations clothed in a lion skin. These are anecdotes which were presumably of common currency in the third and fourth centuries A.D.,³ and they might be *ben trovato* rather than true. The statement that Arrian was promoted because of his παιδεία falls into the same category and needs substantiation before it can be accepted.

But there is evidence elsewhere that Arrian's military and cultural activities were concomitant. Themistius represents him as a philosopher in action. He was not allowed to compose treatises on bravery and sit idly at home, but was promoted μέχρι τοῦ στρατηγίου, penetrating to the Caspian Gates and expelling the Alani from Armenia.⁴ For Themistius, then, Arrian was primarily a philosopher, but he was also employed as a general—much the same emphasis as we find in the *Life* given by Photius and the *Suda*. But once more we are dealing with a fourth-century source of doubtful reliability. Themistius classes Arrian with Q. Iunius Rusticus (cos. II A.D. 162), the noted Stoic honoured by Marcus Aurelius,⁵ and he patently conflates the two men. Both, he says, achieved the honour of *consul ordinarius*. This statement is certainly true of Rusticus, whose second consulship was eponymous, but not of Arrian, whose single consulship (129 or 130) was suffect.⁶ Again Themistius claims that both men crossed the Caspian Gates and conquered the Alani. Here he must be ascribing to Rusticus a triumph identical to Arrian's celebrated success against the Alani during his legateship of Cappadocia.⁷ But one thing is certain. Themistius thought of both men as simultaneously practising philosophy and holding high positions of state. It would have been impossible for him to have so conflated their careers, had he not thought of them as parallel.

καὶ εἰς τὸ τῶν ὑπᾶτων ἀνέβη τέλος. *Suda* καὶ ἀξιωματῶν μεταλαβὼν καὶ μέχρις αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὑπατεύσαι, καθὰ φησιν Ἐλικώνιος, διὰ τὴν τῆς παιδείας δεξιότητα.

¹ Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 228; Bowie, *Past & Present* xlvi (1970), 24. The tradition was accepted by Reuss, *Rh. Mus.* xlv (1899), 456.

² Phot. *cod.* 209, p. 165 a 31 ff.; *Suda* s.v. Δίων ὁ Πασικράτους.

³ Philostratus, *VS* 1. 7 (p. 8 Kayser) repeats the anecdote of the βασιλείον ὄχημα in his different, but equally sensational, *Life* of Dio.

⁴ Themistius, *Orat.* 34, pp. 451–2 (Dind.) = T 13; cf. Themistius 17, p. 262.

⁵ Marcus, *Medit.* 1. 7; SHA, *Marcus* 3. 3; Dio. 71. 35. 1; Them. *Orat.* 13, p. 212 (Dind.). For biographical details see *PIR*² I. 814.

⁶ His consulship is attested by two brick stamps—*CIL* xv. 244 and 552 (*Severo et Arriano cos.*). Arrian is attested in Cappadocia by 131/2 (*Peripl.* 17. 3), and in the years immediately preceding there is room for him among the suffects of 129 or 130 (Degrassi, *I fasti consolari*, 37).

⁷ Rusticus' earlier career is not known, apart from his first, suffect consulship in July 133 (*CIL* xvi. 76; *JRS* li (1961), 63), but it is most unlikely that he was legate of Cappadocia. At this period Cappadocia seems to have been held shortly after the consulship, and in the crucial decade after 133 that province was governed by Arrian until 137, and his successor, L. Burbuleius Optatus Ligarianus was in tenure after the accession of Antoninus Pius (*ILS* 1066).

Closer to Arrian's own time we have more specific evidence. His fellow countryman, Cassius Dio of Nicaea, is credited by the *Suda* with a *βίος Ἀρριανοῦ τοῦ φιλοσόφου*.¹ If the title is accurately reproduced in the *Suda*, it would seem that Dio thought of him primarily as a philosopher. It has been argued that there was rivalry between Dio and the older man.² Unlike Dio, Arrian had a distinguished military reputation. Worse, he was a highly reputed historian, and the younger man was forced to use his *Parthica* as the nucleus of his own account of the Parthian wars from Crassus to Trajan. The biography was therefore designed to build up an image of Arrian as a philosopher and to slur over his public career and historical works, so that Dio's own achievements could shine out unblurred by invidious comparisons.³ But this hypothesis is alarmingly *a priori* and in itself implausible. Elsewhere in his *Roman History* Dio did emphasize Arrian's military success against the Alani.⁴ The Flavius Arrianus mentioned in this passage is indeed not positively stated to be the celebrated historian, but Dio's original text is unfortunately not extant. The passage survives in Xiphilinus' epitome, and there is no telling what detail occurred in the original. Moreover, if Dio was concerned to obscure the military distinction of a rival, it is strange that he condescended to give space to his main triumph. If he could write a biography systematically misrepresenting Arrian's career, he was certainly capable of a deliberate omission in his continuous history. It is far better to suppose that his biography was a sincere tribute to a fellow Bithynian. As for the title, either the description of Arrian as philosopher is a late accretion, or Dio himself, like Themistius, thought of Arrian as a philosopher as well as historian and statesman. In the absence of any data about the content of the biography it is arbitrary and pointless to speculate about possible bias and distortion. But, whatever the verdict of Dio's biography, we have a brief characterization of Arrian in Lucian's *Alexander*, written some time after A.D. 180; καὶ Ἀρριανὸς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου μαθητῆς ἀνὴρ Ῥωμαῖος ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ παιδεία παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον συγγενόμενος.⁵ This is exactly the judgement of Themistius and of the *Life* reproduced in Photius and the *Suda*, that Arrian was both statesman and literary figure. Lucian, moreover, speaks of παιδεία, the word we find given in both Photius and the *Suda* as the ground for Arrian's promotion. παιδεία has an unfortunately wide range of meanings, and can encompass the whole range of literary and cultural activities. A letter of the Areopagus to the town council of Aezani, written in A.D. 156, praises M. Ulpus Eurycles for his patronage of Athenian culture. The language used is strikingly similar to Lucian's: παιδεῖται τε ὁμίλων καὶ πᾶσαν ἐναίρετον προαίρεσιν ἀποδεικνύμενος.⁶ This need mean no more than attendance at and patronage of sophistic and philosophical displays. Lucian too might be thinking of Arrian as only a patron of the arts, but the tone of the passage, a justification of a somewhat sensational and disreputable subject for biography, makes more sense if Lucian and his audience considered Arrian a leading literary figure. If a celebrated author and consular could write the biography of a bandit, there was ample excuse for Lucian's treatment of

¹ *Suda* s.v. *Δίων ὁ Κάσσιος* = T 1.

² G. Wirth, *Klio* xli (1963), 221–33. F. Millar, *Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 70, even doubts whether Dio did in fact write a formal biography.

³ Wirth, art. cit., especially pp. 230–1.

⁴ Dio 69. 15. 1 = Xiphilin. 251. 27–252. 1; Exc. Urb. 17; cf. Zonaras 11. 23–4.

⁵ Lucian, *Alexander* 2 = T 24.

⁶ *OGIS* 505. 8–9; cf. *PIR* V. 551 for Eurycles' subsequent career.

Alexander of Abunoteichos. Certainly his language lends no support to Schwartz's theory of Arrian the soldier turning late in life to literature.

In antiquity, then, the tradition about Arrian's life was that he was both a *vir militaris* and literary figure. The internal evidence of the extant works points in the same direction. I have already mentioned the introductory passage of the *Cynegeticus*, where Arrian claims that hunting, campaigning, and *σοφία* have been his interests from youth. There is something very similar in the *Anabasis* in the famous passage where Arrian defends himself from implied charges of presumption in having ventured upon a history of Alexander the Great.¹ The tone of the apology is striking. Alexander's campaigns have never been described by a writer of calibre equal to the subject-matter. The Macedonian Achilles has never found his Homer. This gap Arrian proudly declares that he will fill, for he considers himself pre-eminent in Hellenic letters, just as Alexander was pre-eminent in the art of war: *καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἀπαξιῶ ἐμαυτὸν τῶν πρώτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι, εἴπερ οὖν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις*. Here there has been some variation of interpretation, depending on whether *τῶν πρώτων* is taken as masculine or neuter plural. Does Arrian think of himself as not unworthy of first place in Greek letters, or not inferior to the first men in that field?² There is no doubt that, as Krüger thought, *τῶν πρώτων* must be taken as neuter plural.³ Arrian regards himself as worthy of *the prize* in Greek letters, not merely the equal of the best writers. This claim could not have been made unless Arrian had a fair volume of successful published work to his credit at the time that he wrote the *Anabasis*. Moreover, if we accept Photius' evidence at face value that the *Anabasis* was only Arrian's third essay in historical writing, preceded merely by the monographs on Dion and Timoleon,⁴ we can only assume that his earlier works, from which his reputation accrued, were primarily philosophical. We know of his edition of Epictetus' *Diatribae* and the *Encheiridion*, which summarized the most salient points of Epictetus' philosophy.⁵ The physical works may also be early, and there may well have been other treatises which have now vanished without trace.

Arrian was certainly a mature writer by the time he published the *Anabasis*, and in that work he implies that he has no need to describe his country or family, or to state what offices he has held: *ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἀναγράφω, ὅτι ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οἶδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσὶ τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο*. Arrian declares that family and offices are irrelevant; in his eyes what matter

¹ Arr. *Anab.* 1. 12. 4-5.

² In his edition of 1848 Krüger attributes the neuter plural interpretation to Raphelius and the masculine interpretation to Gronovius and Schmieder, himself opting for the former. Modern scholars have generally preferred the masculine plural; note the translations of Müller, Robson, and de Sélincourt. Bowie, *Past & Present* xlv (1970), 27, seems to prefer the neuter.

³ Arrian generally uses *οὐκ ἀπαξιοῦν* with an accusative and infinitive, as at *Anab.* 1. 12. 4 and 7. 20. 1. There are parallels in other authors for the use of the verb with accusative and genitive plural; Lucian, *Demonax* 3 (*καὶ ἀξίως ἐαυτὸν τῶν καλ-*

λίστων); [Arist.] *De Mundo* 391^a6; Xen. *Anab.* 3. 2. 7; *Cyrop.* 6. 4. 6. In all these cases the genitive, *τῶν καλλίστων*, must be understood as neuter plural. These parallels guarantee the interpretation of the Arrian passage. For the use of *τῶν πρώτων* to mean 'the first place', 'supremacy', see Dio 40. 2. 3, 42. 57. 1. As for the alternative interpretation, *οὐκ ἀπαξιοῦν ἐαυτὸν τῶν πρώτων* (<ἀνδρῶν>), I can only say with Krüger, *vereor ut Graece dicere licuerit*.

⁴ Phot. *cod.* 93, p. 73 b 11 ff. φαίνεται δὲ τετάρτην γράφων τὴν τῆς πατρίδος ἀφήγησιν = *Bithyniaca* F 1, 3.

⁵ Cf. T 4 (Roos).

are his *λόγοι*. These are his family and *ἀρχαί* and have been ever since his youth.¹ I shall return to this crucial passage later, but for the moment all that I wish to emphasize is that Arrian declares that his chief preoccupations since youth have been *λόγοι*. But what exactly is meant by this vague expression, *οἷδε οἱ λόγοι*? Generally the phrase is taken to mean 'this particular treatise'.² Arrian indicates that he has concentrated since youth on the person of Alexander and in particular on the *Anabasis*. There are parallels in Herodotus, who refers to individual parts of his history as *λόγοι*—*λόγοι Ἀσσύριοι, Λιβυκοί*, etc.³ But I think it very unlikely that Arrian is claiming a lifelong preoccupation with Alexander. In the first place it contradicts the preface to his *Bithyniaca*, where, according to Photius, he stated that his first historical ambition was to compose a work about his motherland, Bithynia; the *Anabasis* was only a *parergon*, one of the works he undertook for practice in handling non-contemporary material.⁴ There is another point. Elsewhere in the *Anabasis* Arrian never uses the plural to denote the entire work.⁵ In the *Indica*, however, he does describe the work as a whole: *οὗτός μοι ὁ λόγος ἀναγεγράφθω, φέρων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐς Ἀλέξανδρον*.⁶ Here the singular *λόγος* refers to an entire work. It is the only unequivocal example of Arrian's usage, and in the *Anabasis* passage we must understand him to refer to a plurality of works. In other words, what Arrian is saying is that his family and offices have always been *these works of his*, his literary production. The sequence of thought now becomes much more natural. Arrian's literary works have always been his main preoccupation; therefore he considers himself supreme in Hellenic letters. Concentration on a single work could hardly have qualified him for the supremacy he claims. In the *Anabasis*, as in the *Cynegeticus*, Arrian states explicitly that his literary activities have been continuous since his youth. What is more, he adds that his reputation lies in literature, not in public life. That is exactly the emphasis of the later biographical tradition.

There is other, epigraphical, evidence. An inscription of Corinth records one of the many honours paid by the local dynast, L. Gellius Menander, and his son, Gellius Justus.⁷ The person honoured is a Roman dignitary, *legatus pro praetore* of Cappadocia under Hadrian. The inscription is sadly fragmentary, but the restoration of Cappadocia is certain. At the head of the surviving portion of the inscription are four enigmatic letters, *ιοσοφ*[, which the first editor tentatively restored as *φιλ]όσοφ[ον* . . . In 1967 G. W. Bowersock suggested that the person honoured was none other than the historian, Flavius Arrianus,⁸ who was legate of Cappadocia between 131/2 and 137, and who

¹ One cannot, of course, lay stress on the wording *ἀπὸ νέου*. This need not mean that Arrian was writing in his old age, as some have thought (Kornemann, *Die Alexander-geschichte des Königs Ptolemaios* i. 36; Wirth, *Historia* xlii [1964], 223-4). The expression merely means 'right from childhood' (cp. Plat. *Gorg.* 510 d; Arist. *NE* 10. 1179^b31), and could easily be used by a man in his early thirties.

² Bowie, art. cit., 26-7: 'To me this work represents my country and my family and my public offices.'

³ Hdt. 1. 184, 2. 161. 3, 5. 36. 4, 7. 93.

⁴ Phot. *cod.* 93 p. 73 b 11-18; see my

discussion, p. 179.

⁵ In the *Anabasis* he usually refers vaguely to the work as a whole as a *συγγραφή* (*Prooem.* 3, 6. 28. 6, 7. 3. 1, 7. 30. 3).

⁶ Arr. *Ind.* 43. 14.

⁷ J. H. Kent, *Corinth* viii, pt. 3 (The Inscriptions 1926-1950 [Princeton, 1966]), nr. 124, pp. 55-6; *[φιλ]όσοφ[ον]* | *[πρεσ]βευτήν [Αὐτοκράτορος] | Κα[σ]α[ρος] Τραια[νοῦ] Ἀδρ[ιαν]οῦ* | *[Σ]εβα[σ]τοῦ ἀντι-στ[ράτηγ]ον [τῆς] | ἐπαρχ[ίας τῆς Καππαδ]ο-κ[ίας] . . .*

⁸ G. W. Bowersock, *GRBS* viii (1967), 279-80.

was also friendly with a Lucius Gellius (the recipient of his letter announcing the publication of Epictetus' *Diatribae*).¹ If this identification is accepted, and there is no plausible alternative, we must accept it as fact that Arrian had a reputation as a philosopher by the time of his legateship of Cappadocia (the inscription was erected in Hadrian's lifetime, almost certainly during the legateship).² In that case there is contemporary corroboration both of Arrian's statements about himself and of the later biographical tradition. The figure of Arrian the philosopher, far from being an inept late fabrication, appears quite authentic.³ There is now striking confirmation in a newly published inscription from Athens.⁴ An L. Flavius Arrianus is honoured and described as consular and philosopher. Undoubtedly this individual is Arrian, the pupil of Epictetus, historian, and citizen of Athens.

There remains the argument, implicit or explicit, that intensive literary production was incompatible with the demands of the Roman *cursus honorum*. Such an argument seems incongruous when one thinks of such men as the Elder Cato, Cicero, or the Elder Pliny, all of whom found the leisure in exacting public careers for very substantial bodies of writing. But it might be that Hadrian demanded exceptional standards of professionalism, and worked his men too hard for them to maintain other activities. Certainly it has been thought offensive that he should have promoted anyone *διὰ τὸ τῆς παιδείας ἐπίσημον*, as the Photian *Life* alleges was the case with Arrian. We need parallels for this procedure, but I think it can be shown that the imperial service under Hadrian was not as rigorous as is sometimes supposed.

In the first place there are clear examples of individuals who held important senatorial posts under the Antonines and yet published extensively. The great jurist, Salvius Iulianus, is a case in point. He was consul in 148 and successively legate in Lower Germany and Spain. His earlier career is perfectly documented by inscriptions.⁵ His progress was normal and no sinecure. Between the praetorship and consulship he was prefect of both the military and Saturnian treasures, posts which the Younger Pliny observes were very taxing and time-consuming.⁶ None the less, Salvius' published output was prodigious. Apart from his celebrated redaction of the praetor's edict he published instalments of his vast *Digesta* throughout his life. The chronology of his works is far from certain,⁷ but undoubtedly his edition of the edict came in the latter years of Hadrian's reign, and at least sixty-four of the ninety books of the *Digesta* had been

¹ For the *epistula ad L. Gellium* see Roos, *Opera Minora*, 196.

² Hadrian is named with his imperial titles; he is not as yet *Θεὸς Ἀδριανός*.

³ The first line of the inscription might have read *[φιλόσοφον καὶ συγγραφέα]*. This supplement gives an adequate line length and is consistent with other dedications to literary figures, which tend to name all the genres in which the man honoured was prominent; cf. *IG* ii.2 3704. 12 *Τίτος Φλαύιος Γλαῦκος Μαραθῶν | ποιητῆς καὶ ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος*.

⁴ *Α Φλ. Ἀρριανὸν ὑπατικὸν φιλόσοφον*. The inscription was first published by D. Peppas-Delmouzou, *AAA* iii (1970), 377-80, and the *praenomen* modified by J. H. Oliver, *GRBS* xi (1970), 338.

⁵ The full *cursus* is given by the celebrated Pappus inscription: *CIL* viii. 24094 = *ILS* 8973 = Smallwood nr. 236. He was *consul ordinarius* in 148 (*CIL* xvi. 95), *curator aedium sacrarum* in 150 (*CIL* vi. 855), and proconsul of Africa in 168/9 (A. Merlin, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* xliii (ii) (1941), 93-122). G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 32 f., dates his tenure of L. Germany to 150-2, and places him in Spain in 161-4.

⁶ *ILS* 8973: *trib. pl., praef. aerar. Saturni, item mil., cos.*; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10. 3a. 1 (cf. 3. 4. 3); *Paneg.* 91. 1.

⁷ For a sceptical account of the problems involved, see F. Serrao, *Atti del III Congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina* (Rome, 1957), 395-413.

completed before the death of Pius.¹ What is more, Hadrian recognized his juristic ability very early, and, while Salvius was his quaestor, he doubled his salary *propter insignem doctrinam*.² This strongly resembles the terminology of Photius and the *Suda*.

But jurists were not unique in reconciling their professional studies with the exactions of the *cursus*. There is an inscription recording honours paid by the city of Patrae to the Pergamene historian, A. Claudius Charax (suff. 147).³ The inscription diligently records the career of Charax, noting every stage between quaestorship and consulship, and it seems that it was erected in honour of the latter distinction. No honours are subsequently recorded, and it is very unlikely that after his accelerated promotion between quaestorship and praetorship and his wide experience at the praetorian grade Charax was left to vegetate.⁴ It is by far the most likely hypothesis that he had just enjoyed his consulship when he was honoured by the citizens of Patrae.⁵ Now the inscription names him τὸν συγγραφέα, and the reason for the honour must be that he had given Patrae prominent and respectful treatment in his universal history.⁶ Charax, then, had published work before or during his official career.⁷ The same is probably true of Dio's contemporary, Asinius Quadratus. A man of that name, proconsul of Achaëa and consul designate, is honoured by the Olympic council for his services to Olympia καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ.⁸ It is tempting to identify this proconsul with the historian, Asinius Quadratus,⁹ and to suppose that the Eleans were acknowledging honorific literary treatment. There is, then, some evidence that literary figures of the second century A.D. could and did publish substantial works before or during their passage through the *cursus*. There is no reason why Arrian should not have done the same.

¹ Eutrop. 8. 17 (redaction of praetor's edict); *Dig.* 4. 2. 18 (citation from Book 64 of Iulianus' *Digesta*, referring to Antoninus Pius as still living).

² *ILS* 8973 *cui divos Hadrianus soli salarium duplicavit propter insignem doctrinam*.

³ Chr. Habicht, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* ix/x (1959/60), 109–25. The most accessible edition of the inscription is *SEG* xviii. 557. This document gives the *cursus* of Charax from quaestorship to suffect consulship. The date of his suffect consulship, 147, was already known from the *Fasti Ostienses* (*I.I.* xiii. 1. 207). The scanty extant fragments of his universal history are edited by Jacoby (*FGrH* 103). The *Suda* (*FGrH* 103 T 1) cites an introductory epigram, which proves that Charax, like Arrian, held a priesthood in his native city.

⁴ M. Pompeius Macrinus Theophanes, who like Charax was successively legionary legate and governor of Cilicia, moved on to a priesthood (*XVvir s.f.*) and the proconsulate of Africa (*IG* v. 2. 151 = Smallwood nr. 232). Unlike Charax he had received no marks of favour in the earlier part of his *cursus*.

⁵ For a similar decree honouring a legate of Cilicia on his promotion to the consulship, cf. *ILS* 8827 = *OGIS* 576 (C. Etrilius

Priscus).

⁶ Habicht, art. cit. 111, suggests that the Pergamene historian was favourably impressed by the help afforded the Attalids during the hostilities with Antiochus III by a contingent from Achaëa (*SIG*³ 606; cf. *Liv.* 37. 20. 1, 39. 9).

⁷ Like Arrian in the preface to the *Bithyniaca* he refers to himself as a priest in his native city (εἰμὶ Χάραξ ἱερεὺς γεραρῆς ἀπὸ Περγάμου ἀκρῆς). He clearly mentioned no office held at Rome, otherwise the detail would have been taken up by the source of the *Suda*, which was greedy for biographical information (*FGrH* 103 T 1).

⁸ *SIG*³ 887 = *FGrH* 97 T 2. The man is here named Γ' Ἀσίνιον Κουαδράτον.

⁹ Two other inscriptions of the period of Caracalla mention a consular named C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (*IG* xii. 7. 267; *Forsch. Ephes.* iii. 127, nr. 40). Scholars have used Occam's razor and identified the historian, Asinius Quadratus, with the consul designate honoured at Olympia and the consular, C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus; cf. *PIR*² A 1244–6; Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Severo a Carino*, nr. 29 (pp. 21–2); Habicht, art. cit. 111.

But is there anything to suggest that Arrian was promoted because of his literary accomplishments? At least one parallel case may be adduced. According to Philostratus, the sophist Dionysius of Miletus was honoured by Hadrian for his *σοφία* to such an extent that he was appointed procurator of important provinces, adlected to the public horse, and made a member of the Museum at Alexandria.¹ If Dionysius could be promoted for his performances as a sophist, there is no reason why Arrian should not have been helped in the senatorial *cursus* by his literary achievements. Both Arrian and Hadrian patronized Epictetus at Nicopolis,² and it is quite feasible that Hadrian was ready and willing to advance the career of a former acquaintance.³ But there is a difference between civil administration as procurator and the governorship of a major military province. Arrian must have had military experience before his appointment as legate of Cappadocia.⁴ That experience, however, may have come relatively late in life. Once more there is a Hadrianic parallel. C. Iulius Severus of Ancyra was the descendant of kings and tetrarchs, and nephew of no less than four consulars.⁵ Not surprisingly, we find him filling all the local offices with the munificence expected of a wealthy dynast. He is attested *ἀρχιερεύς, ἄρχων, ἀγορανόμος, ἀγωνοθέτης*, and he had reached prominence in Ancyra by 114, for in that year he afforded hospitality to Trajan's armies on their way east. But Severus remained a local figure, and the first we hear of higher things is his sudden adlection to tribunician rank by Hadrian. The adlection came after he had held all the local magistracies,⁶ and he may have been relatively advanced in age, say his mid thirties. After the praetorship came a period as legate to the proconsul of Asia by the special recommendation of Hadrian himself. The next stage was the legateship of the IV Scythica under Publicius Marcellus, governor of Syria in 132.⁷ Hitherto Severus had had no military experience. He seems to have been pitchforked from his position of gilded leisure at the head of the provincial ladder into the hectic middle course of the senatorial *cursus*. Severus' military apprenticeship appears to have been as legionary legate, and this in turn was his preparation for the tenure of a major frontier province, Lower Germany, which he held under Antoninus Pius. Arrian too might have been adlected into the middle reaches of the *cursus* and gained his military experience as legionary legate.⁸ His claim

¹ Philostr. *VS* 1. 22. 3 (p. 36 Kayser). This statement about Dionysius' multiple procuratorships is confirmed by an inscription of Ephesus honouring Διονύσιον | [τὸν] ῥήτορα καὶ σοφιστὴν καὶ | [δῖ]ς ἐπίτροπον τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ (*Forsch. Ephes.* iii. 133, nr. 47; [7pl]s is a possible supplement in the last line). ² SHA, *Hadr.* 16. 10.

³ Arr. *Peripl.* 2. 4 suggests that the historian had been especially favoured by Hadrian.

⁴ Cf. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1230-1; Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 228.

⁵ *IGR* iii. 173 = *OGIS* 544 = Smallwood 215. This inscription gives Severus' municipal offices only; for details of his family and *cursus* see Münzer, *RE* x. 811-30; *PIR*² I. 573.

⁶ *IGR* iii. 174 = Smallwood 216: μετὰ πάσας τὰς ἐν τῷ ἔθνει φιλοτιμίας καταταγέντα εἰς τοὺς δημάρχους (δημαρχικούς—*IGR* iii. 175) ὑπὸ θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ.

⁷ *IGR* iii. 174-5 (cf. *AE* 1923, nr. 4). Publicius Marcellus was legate in Syria in 132, as is attested by an inscription of Palmyra *SEG* xv. 849; cf. Dunant, *Mus. Helv.* xiii (1956), 216 ff.). It is highly probable that Severus' son, C. Iulius Severus (cos. 155), was tribune under him in the IV Scythica (*IGR* iii. 172). The date is at least consistent. Service as a military tribune in 132 would place him in his early forties in 155, just right for the consulship (cf. Münzer, *RE* x. 817; *PIR*² I. 574). In that case the father was old enough to have a twenty-year-old son when he served as legate.

⁸ Similarly A. Claudius Charax seems to have had his first military experience as legate of II Augusta in Britain (*SEG* xviii. 557) and M. Pompeius Macrinus Theophanes as legate of VI Victrix in L. Germany (*IG* v (2). 151; cf. *IGR* iv. 96).

to have seen the rivers Inn and Save could indicate a Pannonian legion,¹ but the autopsy was most probably as a passing traveller. Arrian's knowledge of the north is defective and not altogether accurate.²

II

So far I have argued that there is no cogent reason to reject the ancient tradition that Arrian was famous primarily as a literary figure and owed his promotion to his *παιδεία*. But we need more positive evidence. Is there any reason for dating any of Arrian's major works to the period before his career as a Roman senator? It can, I think, be shown that the *Anabasis* is a relatively early work, and, if the *Anabasis* is brought forward, the rest of the sequence of historical works must follow.

Now it has been almost universally assumed that the *Anabasis* was composed in Arrian's years of retirement in Athens, where he is attested archon in an ephobic catalogue of A.D. 145/6.³ In various passages of the *Anabasis* he displays precise knowledge of the city,⁴ and it has been inferred that he was a citizen of Athens at the time of composition.⁵ That is a rash assumption. Arrian nowhere in the *Anabasis* states explicitly that he was a citizen of Athens, and other hypotheses are admissible. Athens was the principal university city of the Greek world, and it is only to be expected that Arrian spent some time there during his attendance at Epictetus' lectures. It is important that most of the local knowledge he displays is in the context of the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, restored by Alexander from Persepolis. *καὶ νῦν κεῖνται Ἀθήνησιν ἐν Κεραμεικῷ αἱ εἰκόνες, ἧ ἄνιμεν ἐς πόλιν, καταντικρὺ μάλιστα τοῦ Μητρώου, (οὐ) μακρὰν τῶν Εὐδανέμων τοῦ βωμοῦ. ὅστις δὲ μεμύηται ταῖν θεαῖν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι, οἶδε τοῦ Εὐδανέμου τὸν βωμὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ δαπέδου ὄντα.*⁶ This passage proves that Arrian was an initiate of the Eleusinian mysteries, for it shows him locating the statues of the tyrannicides by a reference to the altar of Eudanemus, known, he says, to all initiates.⁷ But initiation into the mysteries does not prove

¹ Arr. *Ind.* 4. 15-16.

² For instance, his statement that the tributaries of the Danube are small and rarely navigable is erroneous. Pliny knew of sixty tributaries, over half of which, he says, were navigable (*NH* iv. 79; cf. iii. 147 f.). Similarly inaccurate are Arrian's repeated statements that the Danube has five mouths (*Anab.* 1. 3. 2; 5. 4. 1; *Ind.* 2. 5; *Peripl.* 24. 2). This is a reflection of the more ancient tradition (Hdt. 4. 48; Ephorus, *FGH* 70 F 157; Scymn. 773). From Augustus' time the regular figure for the mouths of the Danube was seven (Strabo 7. 3. 15 (305); Ovid, *Tristia* 2. 189; Stat. *Silv.* 5. 2. 136-7; Mela 2. 8); cf. Brandis, *RE* iv. 2118-9.

³ *IG* ii². 2055. For the dating see Kolbe, *Athenische Mitteilungen* xlv (1921), 131 ff. (esp. p. 148).

⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 3. 16. 8, cf. 7. 19. 2, 1. 16. 7, 7. 13. 5.

⁵ Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1237; *PIR*² F 219 (p. 139); Roos, *Opera Minora*, lxiv; Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 224-5.

⁶ Arr. 3. 16. 8.

⁷ Much unnecessary confusion has been generated by Arrian's reference both to a *βωμὸς τῶν Εὐδανέμων* and a *βωμὸς τοῦ Εὐδανέμου*. It has been assumed that Arrian was referring to two distinct altars, the first at Athens and the second at Eleusis, and that Arrian mentions the Eleusinian altar to elucidate his reference to the more obscure altar at Athens (Roscher, *Lexicon der gr. und röm. Mythologie* i. 2654; Wachsmuth, *RE* vi. 893-4; R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora* iii (Princeton, 1957), 94, nr. 260). But this makes gibberish of the passage. Arrian is locating the statue group of the tyrannicides by co-ordinates which he thinks will be progressively more familiar to his readers. He refers first to the area of Cerameicus, which extended from the north-west of the Acropolis to the Dipylon Gate; next to a particular landmark; the Metroon; and finally to the altar of the Eudanemi, which he claims will be familiar to any initiate. If Arrian is referring to one altar under slightly different names, the passage makes perfect sense, but if he means us to understand two

Arrian a citizen of Athens. Since the Persian Wars the mysteries had been open to all Hellenes,¹ and, since Sulla, prominent Romans had become initiates. One need think only of Cicero, Atticus, Augustus, and Hadrian himself.² Arrian, moreover, was priest of Demeter and Kore at Nicomedia, and nothing is more natural than that he should have taken the earliest opportunity of submitting himself for initiation in the most celebrated rites of the goddesses he served. What is more, Arrian displays the same precise knowledge of Athens in a work unequivocally written before his retirement there. In the *Periplus*, composed during his legateship of Cappadocia, he reveals personal knowledge of Pheidias' statue of Rhea in the Metroon.³ The references to Athens in the *Anabasis*, then, merely show that Arrian was well acquainted with the city. They have no force in determining at what period the work was written.

There is little else autobiographical in the *Anabasis*. Arrian speaks from first-hand knowledge of the coast of Amphilochoia and Ambracia, as he does in the *Indica*,⁴ and one must assume that the acquaintance came during his student period at Nicopolis. Both works were therefore written after his time with Epictetus. This is fairly trivial evidence, confirming what we should have guessed. There is, however, a far more important argument from silence, which suggests that at the time of composition Arrian had no knowledge of the topography of Rome. After his account of the Granicus he adds a note, perhaps from Aristobulus, about the famous equestrian statues cast by Lysippus in honour of the Macedonians who fell in the first attack.⁵ He adds the detail that they are standing at Dium (*ἐν Δίῳ ἐστᾶσιν*). Now this statue group had been looted in 148 B.C. by Metellus Macedonicus, and transferred to Rome, where it formed the chief glory of the portico he erected in honour of his victory.⁶ Arrian, however, speaks as though the statue group were still at Dium, and it must be assumed either that he was transcribing his source with the utmost carelessness, or that he had no idea that this monument of Lysippus had been one of the sights of Rome for the past two and a half centuries.⁷ It is also

altars, he is behaving most perversely, first referring to a very obscure altar in the *agora* and then adding a gratuitous footnote that any initiate will know the altar of the same hero at Eleusis. *Obscurum per obscurius*: Arrian could hardly have been more misleading. There can be no doubt that Arrian is referring to a single altar, which was located in the *agora* immediately to the north-west of the Acropolis. There is no difficulty in the double nomenclature. We hear of a *genos* of the Eudanemi at Athens, whose activities were connected in some way with the Mysteries (Dion. Hal. *Deinarch.* 11 [p. 315. 1 Radermacher]). Nothing is more natural than that this *genos* should have administered the cult of their eponymous hero, and that the same altar should be called both 'altar of Eudanemus' and 'altar of the Eudanemi'. What is more, the altar was in just that quarter of the city which would be traversed by the mystic procession to Eleusis. On the fifth day of the festival the *ἱερά* were taken from the Eleusinion in Athens for the first stage of the journey to Eleusis (G. E.

Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* [London, 1961], 246-7). Now the Eleusinion was on the southern boundary of the *agora* just below the Acropolis—exactly where Arrian locates the statue group and altar of Eudanemus (3. 16. 8 ἡ ἀνιμεν ἐς πόλιν; cf. Thuc. 2. 15. 6 for this use of πόλις). I conclude that the altar was on the Sacred Way in the vicinity of the Eleusinion, where every initiate would pass.

¹ Hdt. 8. 65. 4.

² Plut. *Sulla* 26. 1; *SIG*³ 1125 (for the date, c. 74 B.C., cf. Cichorius, *Römische Studien*, 187); Cic. *de Leg.* 2. 14. 35 (Cicero and Atticus); Dio 51. 4. 1, 54. 9. 10 (Augustus). For Hadrian's activities in 124/5 see SHA, *Hadr.* 13. 1; Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (1936), 5-8.

³ Arr. *Periplus* 9. 1.

⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 2. 16. 6; *Ind.* 41. 2.

⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 1. 16. 4; cf. Plut. *Alex.* 16. 16 (*FGrH* 139 F 5); Just. 11. 6. 13.

⁶ Vell. 1. 11. 4; Pliny, *NH* 34. 64.

⁷ Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 231, argues

remarkable how little Arrian seems to know or care about Cappadocia. Alexander is allowed to pass through in a single paragraph. There are no incidents, no geographical details, only the bare statement that Sabictas was left behind as satrap.¹ This brevity may be due to the source; Curtius at this point is equally laconic.² But it is striking that Arrian apparently took no trouble to search out details from subsidiary sources. The discussion of the geography of the Caspian Sea is also very tentative. In particular, Arrian is content to refer to *ὁ πλείων λόγος* for confirmation that the Armenian Araxes flows into the Caspian.³ But it was common knowledge that the Araxes flowed into the Caspian; at least it had been since the Thessalian writers on Alexander.⁴ It seems hardly credible that a man who had been legate of Cappadocia and operated in the Caspian Gates should have needed to appeal to majority opinion for a fact of geography so elementary.

We revert now to the principal autobiographical passage in the *Anabasis*, where Arrian proudly asserts his supremacy in Greek letters. He declares that he has no need to prove his distinction by citing his country, family, or offices.⁵ It is his *λόγοι* that make him the peer of Alexander in the field of literature. Once more the terminology repays investigation. Arrian has no need to record his name, country, family—οὐδ' εἰ δὴ τινα ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ ἐμῶντοῦ ἡρῶα. The qualification is interesting; Arrian declares he has no need to mention what offices he has held in his own city.⁶ There is no reference whatsoever

that Arrian found it embarrassing to mention the depredations of Metellus in the *Anabasis* where he is generally enthusiastic towards Rome. But in that case why did Arrian even mention Lysippus' statue-group in this context? It is not germane to his narrative, and, if he was so careful of Roman sensibilities, he could easily have omitted all reference to it.

¹ Arr. *Anab.* 2. 4. 2.

² Curt. 3. 1. 24, 4. 1. He seems to be drawing ultimately on the same source as Arrian.

³ Arr. 7. 16. 3. cf. Reuss, *Rh. Mus.* (1899), 459; von Domaszewski, *SB Heidelberg* xvi (1925/6), Abh. i, p. 5.

⁴ Strab. 11. 14. 13 (531); *FGH* 139 F 1. Here Strabo has no doubts about the course of the Araxes (11. 14. 3), nor has the Elder Pliny (*NH* 6. 26). After the campaigns of Pompey the only problem was whether or not the Araxes flowed into the Caspian independently of the Cyrenus (Plut. *Pomp.* 34. 4; App. *Mithr.* 103, 480).

⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 1. 12. 5.

⁶ This fact has been an embarrassment to upholders of a late date for the *Anabasis*. Bowie, art. cit. 27, omits the crucial passage altogether. Stadter, *GRBS* viii (1967), 161, mistranslates ἐν τῇ ἐμῶντοῦ as 'in my life'. Wirth, art. cit. 224, resorts to interpretation, claiming that there is a sharp distinction between πατρίς and ἡ ἐμῶντοῦ, the first designating Arrian's homeland, Bithynia,

and the second his adopted city, Athens. I fail to see here any more than a simple case of *variatio*. If Arrian meant to draw a distinction here between his birthplace and his city of residence, he could hardly have expressed himself more obscurely. No uninformed reader could be expected to infer that there was a distinction implied here. The same objection is valid against the alternative suggestion, that Rome is what Arrian intended to denote by his expression ἐν τῇ ἐμῶντοῦ. Arrian's passion for *variatio* was such that he was almost incapable of using the same word twice in close proximity; compare 1. 12. 8, where ὑπαρχος is patently used as a variant for σατράπης, which occurs in the previous phrase. Similarly, 1. 12. 5 is unintelligible unless the expressions, πατρίς and ἡ ἐμῶντοῦ, denote the same object. Now it is clear that Greeks of the second century A.D. tended to regard their birthplace rather than Rome as their πατρίς. Appian explicitly contrasts Rome with his πατρίς, Alexandria (*praef.* 15. 62). Dio also regards Nicaea as his πατρίς (76. 15. 3, 80. 5. 3); Italy he describes merely as τήνδε τὴν γῆν, ἣν κατοικοῦμεν (F 1, 3). The same is true of Arrian, who composed his *Bithyniaca* explicitly as a gift for his πατρίς, Nicomedia (*Bithyniaca* F 1, 1 and 3). In the *Anabasis* too the probability is overwhelming that Arrian used πατρίς and ἡ ἐμῶντοῦ as variants to describe his birthplace, Nicomedia.

to the Roman *cursus*, a striking omission in the context. At this period writers went out of their way to stress their achievements in Roman service. Dio's history approximates to autobiography more and more as it draws to its close.¹ Even Appian insists upon his long years as *causidicus* at Rome and his final procuratorship.² Indeed it would have suited Arrian's context admirably to have hinted at his career at Rome. What he is saying is that it is his literary achievements, not distinguished birth or career, that qualify him to document the *Life* of Alexander. It would have made his point still more striking if he had asserted that the distinctions he had achieved at Rome were irrelevant, that even his standing as consul and consular was nothing in comparison with his literary reputation. In fact Arrian explicitly restricts his *ἀρχαί* to Nicomedia, and there is no point in the restriction unless his public offices hitherto had been local. In that case the passage was written before Arrian's senatorial career began. What is more, the passage, unless it is totally disingenuous, indicates that Arrian had amassed a substantial body of published work. How otherwise could he have laid claim to supremacy in Greek letters? Arrian had a reputation as a writer—otherwise the passage is meaningless—and his reputation was assured before his senatorial career began. No doubt Arrian, like Iulius Severus of Ancyra, was adlected to aedilician or tribunician rank relatively late and made up the lost ground quickly.³

There is little corroborative evidence in the *Anabasis*. There are references to Rome, but they prove nothing. The discussion of Alexander's prediction of Rome's greatness could have been written by almost anyone, as could the note on the equestrian government of Roman Egypt.⁴ Nor is the description of the Roman method of constructing a river bridge of boats proof positive that Arrian had experience with the Roman army.⁵ He merely describes the technique as *ταχυτάτη ὧν οἶδα*. There is no hint that he had actually seen it performed, and the description could be taken from an author he had read (either technical or historical), just as the description of Xerxes bridging the Hellespont is taken explicitly from Herodotus.⁶ In the *Suda* there is an excerpt from a historical source, almost certainly Dio, which gives a description of Roman bridge-building in the context of Avidius Cassius' Parthian campaign.⁷ The description is uncannily similar to that in Arrian, but there are significant additions which point strongly to a common source.⁸ Both versions seem to

¹ Cf. Millar, *Cassius Dio*, 7 ff.

² App. *Prooem.* 15. 62 Ἀππιανὸς Ἀλεξ-ανδρεὺς, ἐς τὰ πρῶτα ἤκων ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ δίκαις ἐν Ῥώμῃ συναγορεύσας ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων μέχρι με σφῶν ἐπιτροπεύειν ἤξιώσαν. cf. Herodian 1. 2. 5. By contrast Claudius Charax, like Arrian, mentioned his priesthood at Pergamum but did not hint at a career in Rome (see p. 170 n. 7).

³ Compare the case of C. Iulius Philopappus, a member of the deposed royal house of Commagene (*PIR*² I. 151). He was archon at Athens shortly before 87/8, but it was not until the reign of Trajan that he was adlected to praetorian rank. He then moved immediately to the consulship and a priesthood (*ILS* 845).

⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 7. 15. 5 (cf. 7. 1. 3), 3. 5. 7.

⁵ Arr. 5. 7. 3-5. This passage has been

taken as irrefragable evidence that Arrian had extensive military experience. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1237; von Domaszewski *SB Heidelberg*, 6.

⁶ Arr. 5. 7. 2; cf. Hdt. 7. 33-6.

⁷ *Suda* s.v. ζεύγμα = Dio 71. 2. 3 (cf. Boissevain, *Hermes* xxv [1890], 338 n. 1).

⁸ The version in the *Suda* adds that the boats used were generally flat-bottomed and is rather more explicit that they were launched upstream from the intended crossing place. Unlike Arrian, the *Suda* ends with a description of the ship nearest the enemy bank, equipped with towers, archers, and catapults. Arrian ends with a purple passage, describing how despite the noise the Roman discipline was unimpaired (5. 7. 5; some of the colour seems borrowed from Thucydides 7. 70. 6-7). But apart from

follow a standard account, but there is one notable addition in Arrian. Whereas the *Suda* (or Dio) speaks of exercises regularly carried out on the Danube, Rhine, and Euphrates, Arrian adds the Tigris to the list. It may be that he was writing under the immediate impact of Trajan's successful bridging of the river in 115, when this method was speedily and effectively employed.¹ But, whatever the force of this argument, it is certainly the case that the bridge-building passage in the *Anabasis* is no evidence that Arrian had military experience at the time of composition.

There is little else to give any indication of the date at which the work was written. Literary reflections are not helpful for the present argument, for all provable borrowings from the *Anabasis* are too late to shed much light on the dating. It can be shown that Appian made use of Arrian both in his account of the portents announcing Seleucus' future greatness and in the comparison between Caesar and Alexander which ends book II of the *Emphyilia*.² In both passages it has been denied that Appian drew from Arrian, and instead claimed that both writers drew independently from Aristobulus.³ This theory, if true, would have important consequences for our views of Appian's qualities as a researcher, but unfortunately it is impossible. I cannot here examine all the passages brought into the dispute. Space allows only for discussion of the two crucial passages which prove Appian's dependence on Arrian. In the first place Arrian gives a full description of an incident which occurred during Alexander's Euphrates voyage in 323. The king's crown was blown away by a sudden gust and was retrieved by a sailor.⁴ Here Arrian gives three alternative versions. First, the majority of authors, he says, maintain that the sailor, who had placed the crown upon his head, was executed on the advice of the seers, but Aristobulus claimed that he was given a symbolic beating and recompensed with a talent. Next Arrian produces another discrepancy between Aristobulus, who said that the protagonist in the incident was a Phoenician sailor, and certain unspecified authors, who identified him as Seleucus and interpreted the retrieving of the crown as a portent of Alexander's imminent death and Seleucus' future greatness. Appian reproduces this sequence exactly albeit briefly.⁵ He gives the background exactly as it appears in Arrian and presents the same three versions. The discrepancy between Aristobulus and the rest over the fate of the sailor is given very briefly, for it is the identification with Seleucus that primarily interests him. What matters is that the variants Appian gives are exactly the variants in Arrian, and it must be that Appian's version is here a précis. The only alternative, that these variants occurred earlier in Aristobulus, is impossible. Arrian could not make it clearer that he is contrasting Aristobulus with the majority opinion (οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ . . . λέγουσι . . . Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ . . .), and it is perverse to suppose that he is merely repeating criticism which had already occurred in Aristobulus. The same argument applies to the contrast between Aristobulus and the authors who made Seleucus the hero of the piece. Arrian could not make it more explicit that he is contrasting variant sources. In fact what we have here seems not a broadside by

these variants the two descriptions are virtually identical and must stem from a common source.

¹ Dio 68. 26. 1-2.

² App. *Syr.* 56. 288-91; *BC* 2. 152. 639 ff. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1245 took it as self-evident

that Appian had read the *Anabasis*; Reuss, art. cit. 446-50 argued at length for the borrowing.

³ Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 210-20.

⁴ Arr. 7. 22. 2-5 = Jacoby, *FGrH* 139 F 55.

⁵ App. *Syr.* 56. 288-91.

Aristobulus against unscrupulous romanticism in other writers, but a deliberate lie, exculpating Alexander from a brutal and superfluous execution. It is of a piece with his procedure elsewhere of modifying—tactfully and mendaciously—unpalatable facts.¹ Here as elsewhere his apologetic struck Arrian as inconsistent with the general tradition, and Arrian points out the variant. Now the variant is reproduced by Appian in very similar terminology, and it can only be that his original was Arrian.

An even more instructive case is the account of the engineering works constructed by Alexander at the confluence of the Euphrates and the Pallacotta canal. Here we can compare the versions of Aristobulus preserved by both Arrian and Strabo.² The problem facing Alexander was that the mouth of the Pallacotta was marshy and porous, so that it was difficult to prevent the water of the Euphrates being dissipated when the river was not in flood. Alexander therefore constructed a new channel thirty stades south of the old mouth, where the ground was stony and capable of forming an effective dam, easily removable at flood-time. Appian follows Arrian's account very closely; Alexander, he says, reached the confluence of the Euphrates and Pallacotta *ὅς τὸν Εὐφράτην ὑπολαμβάνων ἐς ἑλὴ καὶ λίμνας ἐκφέρει καὶ κωλύει τὴν Ἀσσυρίδα γῆν ἄρδεσθαι*.³ The language is almost exactly what we find in Arrian, but there is an important difference. Arrian says that the Pallacotta *would* prevent the irrigation of Assyria if it *were* not blocked. He goes on to say that the business of damming the mouth took the united efforts of 10,000 men over two months.⁴ Alexander's channel was essentially a labour-saving device. Now Appian seems to have mistaken the force of the potential and assumes that the Pallacotta canal did regularly divert the water of the Euphrates. This mistake would have been impossible had Appian been working from the full text of Aristobulus, which gave full details of the complicated system of dams and sluices which regulated the flow of the Euphrates.⁵ Appian's main concern is with the Chaldaean prophecies of Alexander's death and the King's disregard of them, and in Arrian's account the works at Pallacotta lead on to a reference to the prophecies. It is this reference that Appian has taken up, and the context is given in a very sketchy and inaccurate précis. Strabo's excerpt from Aristobulus, however, continues with details of the imminent invasion of Arabia, for which the Pallacotta mouth was salient. This material recurs in Arrian, but

¹ Compare his version of the death of Callisthenes (Arr. 4. 14. 3 = *FGrH* 139 F 33), and his apology for Alexander's notoriously intemperate drinking habits (Arr. 7. 29. 4 = *FGrH* 139 F 62).

² Arr. 7. 21. 1–7; Strab. 16. 1. 11 (741).

³ App. *BC* 2. 153. 644. There is a slight divergence between Appian and Arrian in their spelling of the name of the canal. Appian's manuscripts read *Παλλάκοττα*, while the consensus in Arrian is *Πολλάκοπα*. This is no problem. The name of the canal is represented in Babylonian documents most regularly as Pal-lu-kat (Meissner, *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* i [1896], 183 ff.), and the spelling in the manuscripts of Pliny, *NH* 6. 30 oscillates around *Pollaconta*. Appian's form is the most

correct, but that does not disprove the hypothesis that he drew from Arrian. All our extant manuscripts of the *Anabasis* are known to be copies of Roos's codex A (cf. Roos, *Anabasis*, v–xi), and a corruption in this, the archetype, would naturally have been passed on to all surviving manuscripts. The corruption of -ττ- into -π- is very easy.

⁴ Arr. 7. 21. 3–5.

⁵ The details are given in Strabo 16. 1. 9–11 (740 f.); all his account of Alexander's operations on the Euphrates seems taken from Aristobulus. The details are extracted by Arrian, but distributed over his narrative. His description, for instance, of the demolition of the Euphrates cataracts is placed much earlier (Arr. 7. 7. 7 = Strab. 16. 1. 9).

it is remoulded and placed much earlier in the narrative.¹ Unlike Aristobulus, then, Arrian went on from the engineering plans at Pallacotta to the Chaldaean prophecies, and Appian followed him.² Neither the misunderstanding of the problem at Pallacotta nor its use as the context of the Chaldaean prophecies is explicable unless Appian was working from the text of Arrian.

Thus Appian knew and used the *Anabasis*, and Arrian's work must have been the authoritative history of Alexander at the time he wrote. But Appian's *Historia Romana* was written late in the author's life, and published after his long-delayed procuratorship, in all probability between 161 and 163.³ This is consistent with all but the most extreme datings of the *Anabasis*. Even on Schwartz's hypothesis that the *Anabasis* was one of the first fruits of Arrian's retirement in Athens there is no difficulty in its use by Appian. There is no other certain case of literary imitation or borrowing from the *Anabasis* in the early second century A.D.,⁴ except perhaps the enigmatic Amyntianus, who dedicated his work to Marcus Aurelius and promised that his writing would be worthy of Alexander's achievements.⁵ This recalls Arrian's famous boast in the *Anabasis*, and it might be that Amyntianus was consciously setting himself up in opposition. But, even so, the statement merely gives us a *terminus ante quem*, which we had in any case from Appian. We remain dependent on internal evidence for the dating of the *Anabasis*, and the evidence is unanimous that it was an early work, written before the start of Arrian's senatorial career.

III

If the *Anabasis* is a relatively early work, there are important consequences for the chronology of Arrian's literary production. We have fairly detailed evidence of his preparation for historical studies in Photius' excerpt of the preface to the *Bithyniaca*.⁶ This evidence deserves to be taken seriously, for in all probability it is a fairly full summary of what Arrian in fact said. Elsewhere Photius shows considerable interest in the lives of the Greek historians of the Empire, and reproduces with commendable exactness what data they give about themselves and their work. In the case of Dionysius of Halicarnassus he reproduces almost in full the biographical data at the beginning of the Roman history. He gives the limits of the work, which ended where Polybius began, at the 128th Olympiad. He continues: ἡκμασε δ' οὗτος ἐπὶ τῶν Αὐγούστου χρόνων, καταπλεύσας εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἅμα τῷ καταλυθῆναι τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον . . . διατρίψας δέ, ὡς φησὶν, ἔτη δύο καὶ εἴκοσι. In this period, says Photius, Dionysius

¹ Strab. 16. 1. 11 (741) = *FGrH* 139 F 56; Arr. 7. 19. 6–20. 2.

² Arr. 7. 22. 1 = App. 2. 153. 644–5. For discussion of the context, see Reuss, art. cit. 448–50.

³ For the *terminus post quem* see M. Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften*, iii. 291. Appian seems not to know of Marcus' reintroduction in 163 of Hadrian's division of Italy into regions (*BC* 1. 38. 172; cf. *SHA*, *Marcus* 11. 6), or of Verus' conquests in 165 (*Prooem.* 4); cf. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 216.

⁴ Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 235 ff., argues that Lucian's criticism of the luxurious fantasies of the Verus historians in his treatise πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν is a

veiled criticism of Arrian's *Anabasis*. Unfortunately there is no overt reference to Arrian in the entire treatise, and Wirth's examples of attacks on specific portions of the *Anabasis* are most unconvincing. There is absolutely no reason to think that the objects of Lucian's attack are not those he explicitly states them to be.

⁵ Phot. *cod.* 131, p. 97 a 10 ff. = *FGrH* 150 T 1 προσφωνεῖ δὲ τὸν λόγον τῷ αὐτοκράτορι Μάρκῳ καὶ ἀπαγγέλλεται μὲν ἀξίως εἰπεῖν τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεων. Cf. Arr. 1. 12. 4–5.

⁶ Phot. *cod.* 93, p. 73 a 32 ff. = *Bithyniaca* F 1.

learned Latin thoroughly and prepared the material for his work.¹ This is almost a direct transcript of Dionysius' original. The same is true of Photius' treatment of Diodorus Siculus. Once more he gives an almost verbatim transcript of what Diodorus has to say about his life and preparation for his work.² The treatment of Cassius Dio is very similar. Here Photius gives only a superficial sketch of the outline of the history, but ends with a very detailed summary of Dio's later career, all apparently excerpted from the last two books.³ Photius even cites the Homeric quotation which ended the work. In the case of Appian, moreover, Photius has managed to take up the single sentence of biographical information let fall in the Roman history.⁴ The sketch of Arrian's *Bithyniaca* falls into the same pattern. As was the case with Dio, Photius has little interest in the content of the work, and gives only a bald statement of the chronological limits. What interests him is the author, and he excerpts, in all probability completely, what Arrian has to say about himself. It is safe to assume that we have an accurate summary of the original.

Arrian states that he intended the *Bithyniaca* to be a gift for his homeland, and explains that he was born and educated at Nicomedia and held the priesthood of Demeter and Kore. There is nothing about his career as a senator, but Arrian is explicitly writing the history of his native province and could have felt that a reference to his position at Rome was irrelevant. But other considerations show that the *Bithyniaca* was not a very late work. According to Photius, Arrian felt obliged to give an apology for his slowness. From the moment he had ventured to write, he had set his heart on the history of his homeland, but the preparation for the work had prolonged the time of composition because of his insufficiency.⁵ Now Arrian's deficiencies were presumably not stylistic, for in the earlier *Anabasis* he boasts proudly of his supremacy in Greek letters.⁶ It was probably the laborious business of collecting facts which consumed the time. A continuous history of Bithynia would require a formidable amount of collection and collation of authorities. The scattered nature of the evidence would make the composition of the initial rough draft, the *ὑπόμνημα*,⁷ a much more arduous task than would be the case with a compact period where the same sources could be used throughout. During this prolonged period of preparation Arrian produced other historical works. These Photius lists:

φαίνεται δὲ τετάρτην γράφων τὴν τῆς πατρίδος ἀφήγησιν. μετὰ τε γὰρ τὰ περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Τιμολέοντα καὶ Δίωνα, μετὰ τὰς περὶ αὐτοὺς ἱστορίας, ἦδε αὐτῷ ἡ συγγραφὴ ἐξεπονήθη.

μετὰ¹ τε . . . Δίωνα M, om. A post μετὰ² add. γάρ A²

Here Photius infers that the *Bithyniaca* was Arrian's fourth historical work, and in the following sentence he gives the reasons for his calculation. Arrian stated in the preface that he had already written his works on Alexander, Dion, and

¹ Phot. *cod.* 83, p. 65 a 2 ff. = Dion. Hal. 1. 7. 2.

² Phot. *cod.* 70, p. 35 a 14-26 = Diod. 1. 4. 1-7 (Photius rearranges the order of his original but keeps very faithfully to the terminology).

³ Phot. *cod.* 71, p. 35 b 10-21 = Dio 80. 5. 1; 79. 7. 4; 80. 1. 2-3, 5. 2-3.

⁴ Phot. *cod.* 57, p. 17 a 13-15 = App.

Prooem. 15. 62.

⁵ Phot. *cod.* 93, p. 73 b 14-18 = *Bithyniaca* F 1, 3.

⁶ *Anab.* 1. 12. 5, cf. *Prooem.* 3.

⁷ For this procedure see Lucian, πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν 47-8; Cic. *ad Att.* 2. 1. 1-2; Arr. *Epist. ad L. Gellium* 2; G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (1956), 85 ff.

Timoleon. This sentence is clearly excerpted from Arrian's original, for it goes on without a grammatical break to the apology for his delay in publication. It is necessary that these three works were explicitly mentioned by Arrian; otherwise Photius could never have inferred that it was the fourth in order of composition. I have argued this at length because of a recent suggestion that the reference in Photius to Arrian's work on Alexander is a scribal interpolation.¹ In the manuscript A there is a lacuna. The whole crucial phrase *μετά τε γάρ . . . Δίωνα* is omitted. The hypothesis proposed is that the reading of A is correct and that Arrian merely referred in his preface to the biographies of Dion and Timoleon. The addition of the three names in the rival tradition is seen as a scribal interpolation. But the reference to Alexander would require far more than the usual degree of erudition on the part of the scribe, who presumably would have added the names of Timoleon and Dion out of the context and thrown in the reference to Alexander out of his head. It is far more probable that the variant in A comes from simple omission. The scribe's eye passed from the first *μετά* to the second, and it was left to a corrector to 'repair' the resulting anacolouthon by inserting the *γάρ* required by the sense. What is more, if Arrian had mentioned only the *Lives* of Dion and Timoleon, Photius would have had no reason to infer that there were three earlier works. We need three names explicitly mentioned, and these are given by the rival tradition in manuscript M. The unavoidable conclusion is that the text of A is lacunose.²

We must assume then that Arrian's work on Alexander had been published by the time that the *Bithyniaca* appeared. But there must not be too long an interval. Arrian's statements clearly imply that his primary object was the *Bithyniaca* and that the *Anabasis* came out in the period of preparation for the major work. Now the *Anabasis*, I have argued, came out relatively early in Arrian's life, before his senatorial career had begun. The *Bithyniaca* cannot have been much later, and, though there is no proof that Arrian had not yet entered the senate, the strong emphasis on Bithynia as his *πατρίς* and his close identification with the province indicates that as yet he did not think of himself primarily as a Roman senator.³ The rest of Arrian's historical writings cannot be dated. Fragments survive of the *Parthica* and of the work on the

¹ Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964) 227. Once he has dismissed any reference to the *Anabasis* in Photius, he is able to argue for the sequence *Parthica*–*Anabasis*–*Bithyniaca*.

² If there is a scribal interpolation in this passage, I prefer, with Bekker, to identify it as the phrase *μετά τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦς ἱστορίας*. It is otiose and hinders the flow of the passage, just the sort of marginal gloss that a scribe would insert to explain the neuter expression *μετὰ τὰ περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Τιμολέοντα καὶ Δίωνα*. Such elucidation of the obvious is more characteristic of scribal marginalia than the highly sophisticated interpolation required by Wirth's theory. I am arguing for a double corruption, first the intrusion of a marginal gloss into both the principal manuscripts of Photius, and then the omission in A only of the first *μετὰ* phrase. It is a complex corruption but

neither improbable nor implausible.

³ Cf. Millar, *Cassius Dio*, 190–1. Gabba, *RSI* lxxi (1959), 373. The strong Greek flavour, coupled with the presupposition that the *Bithyniaca* was a work of Arrian's old age, led Gabba to suppose that Arrian was writing in disillusionment after virtual dismissal by Antoninus Pius ('*Arriano perde ai nostri occhi tutto il suo aspetto di cittadino romano*'). This theory that Arrian ended his public career under a cloud goes back to Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1231, and has been widely accepted (cf. Wirth, *Historia* xiii [1964], 508–9). There is, however, no positive evidence for the hypothesis, and the noticeably Greek colour of the *Anabasis* and *Bithyniaca* is far more easily explained on the assumption that they were written before Arrian's career at Rome got into full swing.

Successors, both of them major productions and composed after the *Bithyniaca*, but there is no way of dating them exactly. There is only the fact that the *Parthica* went no further than the campaigns of Trajan; the siege of Hatra was described in the final book, Book 17.¹ There was certainly no description of the Parthian war of Lucius Verus and Avidius Cassius, so that we are afforded a *terminus ante quem* of A.D. 165.² But this gives us very wide limits; the work could have been composed at almost any time in the previous thirty years. As for the work on the Successors there are no grounds even for conjecture.

IV

So far I have argued that much of Arrian's activity as a writer, in particular the *Anabasis*, can be dated to his younger days, before adlection to the senate. There is no reason to suggest that his historical works were the product of his retirement in Athens. Indeed some recent theories presuppose a most extraordinary late efflorescence on Arrian's part. If the *Anabasis* was written, as has been supposed, about A.D. 165, Arrian had still to write most of his large-scale works—8 books of the *Bithyniaca*, 10 of the history of the Successors, and 17 of the *Parthica*. In the 160s Arrian must have been well over seventy, and it is a highly peculiar phenomenon if he took to concentrated composition so late in life. The only parallel case which occurs to me is that of the composer Janáček, most of whose most celebrated works were written in his seventies. But Janáček had been a musician all his life, and his final works are the consummation of a long professional career. It is not a fair analogy to the hypothesis of Arrian's turning to history in his old age.

But how long did Arrian live? He was certainly dead by the time Lucian wrote his *Alexander*, shortly after A.D. 180,³ but Lucian might be writing a considerable period after his death. There is nothing in the context to indicate how much time had elapsed. Arrian is attested archon in Athens in 145/6,⁴ and over twenty years later a Flavius Arrianus of Paeania is twice recorded as *prytanis*, in 166/7 and 169/70.⁵ It has therefore been assumed that Arrian survived until the middle years of Marcus Aurelius. But doubts may be voiced here. Arrian was suffect consul about 130, presumably when he was in his mid forties. He must have been born about 85. In 166/7 he would have been an octogenarian, a very extraordinary age for serving in the *βουλή*. Our prosopographical evidence is pretty full for Athens in the mid second century A.D., and in particular there are detailed, if lacunose, lists of *prytanies*. The evidence is unanimous that men tended to perform the two spells as *prytanis*, which at this period seem to have been routine, in their thirties and forties, and membership of the *βουλή* appears to have been a stepping-stone to higher things.⁶

¹ Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀρραι = *Parthica* F 17.

² F. A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian Wars*, 202–4, argues that the *Parthica* was produced under Hadrian and retailed the official view of the campaign.

³ Lucian, *Alexander* 2; the date is supplied by the reference to θεὸς Μάρκος at *Alexander* 48.

⁴ *IG* ii². 2055.

⁵ *IG* ii². 1773, 1776.

⁶ The list of *prytanies* for the year 167/8 is fairly detailed (*IG* ii². 1774), and many of the men named can be identified. None of

their ephebes fall before 142/3 and none much after 150. Among the colleagues of the Flavius Arrianus, *prytanis* in 166/7 was a Claudius Xenocles, who is known to have been ephebe in 154/5 (*IG* ii². 1773. 16; cf. 2067. 40); in other words he was born at the time when Arrian the historian held praetorian rank at Rome. For general details about the Athenian *prytanies* in the Empire, see D. J. Geagan, 'The Athenian Constitution after Sulla', *Hesperia*, Suppl. xii (1967), 75 with n. 52.

It would be extraordinary for a man to have reverted to membership of the prytanies after having held the prestigious eponymous archonship, yet that we are expected to believe was the case with Arrian. The most probable hypothesis is that Arrian, like other consular immigrants to Athens, was given the eponymous archonship as an honour and an opportunity to display his civic munificence, and then excused further participation in the local magistracies.¹ Indeed after the consulship at Rome and the eponymous archonship at Athens simple membership of the βουλή would have been an intolerable anticlimax. The Flavius Arrianus who was prytanis in 166 and 169 was then not the historian, but most probably a younger son or even grandson of the same name. We know nothing of a family of Arrian, but naturally silence is no evidence that he was childless. Indeed there is an Athenian dedication of the early third century in honour of an initiate at Eleusis, a certain Clementiane.² She is described as ἐκγονον ἡδὲ θύγατρα δυοῖν ὑπάτων Ἀρριανῶν | οἱ σοφία πλοῦτον καὶ γένος ἡγλάϊσαν. Clementiane was daughter and granddaughter of two consulars, both named Arrianus, who, the dedication states, added lustre to their lineage by their σοφία. Now it is not an inevitable conclusion that the two consuls Arrianus are the historian and a son.³ The *fasti* of the second and third centuries include at least three other consuls with the same *cognomen*.⁴ But the tribute paid to the σοφία of the men makes an identification with the historian very tempting, as does the connection with Eleusis.

There is no reason to identify Arrian the historian with Arrian the prytanis, and, once the identification is discarded, no reliable evidence remains of the length of the retirement at Athens. Photius and the *Suda* indicate that the historian survived until the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but their text is very abbreviated and slightly ambiguous.⁵ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Ἀδριανοῦ καὶ Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ Πίου καὶ Μάρκου τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου is Photius' terminology, and there are various ways of interpreting it. 'In the time of Marcus' is not necessarily equivalent to 'in the reign of Marcus', and it could be maintained that the original biography of Heliconius referred only to the period in Antoninus' reign when Marcus was heir presumptive and had the tribunician power.⁶

¹ Compare M. Ulpius Eubiotus, a distinguished consular of the early third century A.D., who after his consulship was honoured in Athens with the eponymous archonship, and enjoyed the additional distinction of having his sons serve under him as θεσμοθέται (*IG* ii². 3697–3702). There is no suggestion that he held any Athenian magistracy other than the archonship. Similarly C. Iulius Philopappus is attested archon and agonothetes shortly before 87/8 (*IG* ii². 3112; for the date see Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* [1920], 98–100). He cannot have been in residence long. Josephus, *BJ* 7. 240–3 indicates that his family spent long periods in Sparta and Rome after their expulsion from Commagene in 72. There is no record of any magistracy other than the archonship held by Philopappus.

² *IG* ii². 4251–3 = T 25 (Roos).

³ As argued by Graindor, 'Marbres et

textes antiques d'époque impériale', *Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté de philosophie et lettres : Université de Gand*, Fasc. 50 (1922), 49–52. Stein, *PIR*² F 219 (p. 138) is more sceptical.

⁴ L. Annius Arrianus (cos. 243); L. Claudius Arrianus (inc. ann.); Arrianus Aper Veturius Sabinus (inc. ann.).

⁵ Phot. *cod.* 58, p. 17 b 12; *Suda* s.v. Ἀρριανός = T 2 (Roos).

⁶ On 1 Dec. 147 Marcus received tribunician power (renewed on 10 Dec.), supplemented by proconsular imperium outside Rome and the *ius quintae relationis* (*I.I.* xiii. 1. 207; SHA, *Marcus* 6. 6). From that time onwards he was virtual co-regent with Antoninus (cf. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* [London, 1966], 134–5). The *Suda* interestingly claims that Arrian was at Rome ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ καὶ Μάρκου καὶ Ἀντωνίνου, and this inversion of the chronological order has been variously emended ((καὶ Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ

The last datable incident in Arrian's life remains the archonship of 145/6, and we have no means of telling how long he afterwards survived. For what it is worth, Eusebius' chronicle dated Arrian to 148/9,¹ and there is at least a chance that this reflects a tradition that he died in that year. But this is over-speculative. All that we can say is that nothing of Arrian's life and work can be securely dated after the reign of Antoninus Pius, and that the ancient *testimonia* provide no decisive reason for placing his death in the reign of Marcus. We cannot assume that Arrian enjoyed a very long period of retirement in Athens, certainly not sufficient for the forty-two books of history which are usually attributed to this period.

The evidence, then, strongly suggests that Arrian's historical works were composed throughout the course of his adult life. He composed the *Anabasis* before his senatorial career at Rome began, and the subsequent works could easily have been written during his progress through the *cursus*. This hypothesis requires the additional assumption that Arrian worked simultaneously in different genres of literature. There is no difficulty here. Arrian was celebrated in antiquity as a philosopher, and one would expect a fairly steady output throughout his life. It is only prejudice which represents his edition of Epictetus' *Diatribae* as his first literary essay.² The letter to L. Gellius gives no hint that Arrian felt himself a beginner. He merely says that what he is publishing are private *ὑπομνήματα*, copies of which had been circulated without his knowledge and approval.³ There is no cogent reason to regard the letter as an elaborate *recusatio*, giving a disingenuous apology for what was in fact an elaborate literary composition.⁴ I prefer to take Arrian literally and assume that the *Diatribae* were indeed merely the transcript he himself had made for his own use. The edition of Epictetus could have been concurrent with all manner of other activities. The same is true of the *Periplus* and *Tactica*. Both these works spring from Arrian's experience as legate of Cappadocia. In the first case Arrian expanded a routine report of a journey of inspection into a regular geographical description of the coast of the Black Sea, and combined his own experiences with the rewriting of a standard geographical handbook in a bizarre and somewhat clumsy manner.⁵ After his description of his journey to Dioscurias Arrian moves immediately to the geographical handbook, enlivening it with literary allusions, mostly to Xenophon. The same procedure is followed in the *Tactica*. Arrian transcribes faithfully the dry tactical pamphlet of Aelian, embellishing it with consistent reference to Xenophon, and ends with his own eyewitness description of the regular cavalry manoeuvres of the Roman army.⁶ In both these monographs Arrian adds a little from his own

Πίου) καὶ Μάρκου τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου—Jacoby and Roos; cf. Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 506–7). It could just be that the original dated Arrian to the reign of Hadrian and the joint reign of Marcus and Antoninus Pius.

¹ T 22 (Roos); Jerome dates Arrian to the 12th regnal year of Pius, the Armenian version to the 11th.

² cf. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1232.

³ *Ep. ad L. Gellium* 2–4 αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασιν ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν γραφάμενος ὑπομνήματα εἰς ὕστερον διαφυλάξαι τῆς ἐκείνου διανοίας καὶ παρηγοίας . . . τοιαῦτα δ' ὄντα οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως

οὔτε ἐκόντος ἐμοῦ οὔτε εἰδότης ἐξέπεσον εἰς ἀνθρώπους.

⁴ As argued by Th. Wirth, *Mus. Helv.* xxiv (1967), 149–61.

⁵ Cf. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1232–3; H. F. Pelham, *Essays on Roman History* (1911), 220–6. The *Periplus* falls neatly into two halves, the report to Hadrian ending at 11. 5, to be followed immediately at 12. 1 with the transcription of the geographical treatise.

⁶ Cf. Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1233. Fr. Kiechle, *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission des deutsch. archäol. Inst.* xlv (1964), 108–14,

experience to a strangely routine transcription of regular textbooks. But there is no reason to argue that these works are Arrian's first tentative literary essays, apprentice works composed as preparation for history. The subject-matter and the peculiar blend of autopsy and transcription seem to me more characteristic of a man already accustomed to literary activity. In my view Arrian selected the more interesting aspects of his legateship to entertain a public already familiar with his work. There is no evidence internal or external that they were intended only as preliminary studies for more extended compositions.

After my earlier demonstration of the defective nature of the biographical evidence it would be rash to be too precise in matters of dating. Nevertheless for the sake of clarity I shall end this paper with a brief statement of my view of Arrian's career and literary development. He was born about A.D. 85, and educated in Nicomedia, where he held the priesthood of Demeter and Kore and perhaps went through the local *cursus honorum*. In 108, or thereabouts, he went to Nicopolis to sit at the feet of Epictetus.¹ During his stay in mainland Greece he will have travelled extensively, submitting himself for initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries and perhaps acting in the *consilium* of C. Avidius Nigrinus, legate of Achaëa.² The subsequent years were spent in basically literary pursuits, during which Arrian produced philosophical works and his

argues that there were reasons other than antiquarianism for this resuscitation of Hellenistic tactical theory, and suggests that phalanx tactics were reintroduced to counter the barbarian cavalry hordes which menaced the eastern frontier. The opening of the *Tactica* is lost and there is no means of proving the theory; but, for what it is worth, Arrian does claim a utilitarian function for the *Periplus* (17. 3).

¹ For this dating see F. Millar, *JRS* lv (1965), 142. The crucial peg is the identification of the Maximus who appears in Epictet. 3. 7. 3 and 10 as διορθωτής καὶ κριτής . . . τῶν Ἑλλήνων, with the *corrector* Sex. Quintilius Valerius Maximus, recipient of Pliny 8. 14 (written in 108).

² A. Plassart, *Fouilles de Delphes* iii (4) (1970), 38 ff. (nrs. 290 and 294). Plassart's discussion of Avidius Nigrinus' boundary regulations is now fundamental (see Magie, *RRAM* ii. 1453, n. 11, for earlier literature). In particular, his fragment 4961 (reproduced Pl. ix) contains the remnants of three names, each clearly punctuated: Jus Pollio, Q. Eppius, and Fl. [Arrianus]. The punctuation on this fragment plainly distinguishes Q. Eppius from Fl. Arrianus, and clearly two individuals are at issue. The composite Q. Eppius Fl. Arrianus, who figures in earlier editions of the stone, must therefore disappear from scholarship. The date of Nigrinus' activity cannot be fixed exactly, despite Plassart's arguments (p. 41). In the Latin text of the inscription Trajan is constantly described as *Optimus Princeps*, but unfortunately that is insufficient reason for

dating the dossier to autumn 114, when Trajan was voted the *agnomen*, *Optimus*. Trajan's full imperial titulature does not appear in any of the texts of Nigrinus' decisions, and *Optimus* is never used as a name. Throughout the emperor merely figures as *optimus princeps*, and Trajan had been so described, officially and unofficially, ever since the beginning of his reign (Pliny, *Pan.* 2. 7; 88. 4-6; *Ep.* 2. 13. 8, 4. 22. 1; Mattingly-Sydenham, *RIC* ii. 250 ff., nrs. 91 ff.). The vacillation of the Greek texts between μέγιστος αὐτοκράτωρ (nr. 293) and ἄριστος αὐτοκράτωρ (nr. 295) is easily explained. Trajan, like Otho, sometimes figures as *optimus maximusque princeps* (*ILS* 6675; cf. *ILS* 5947), and there is no problem in the appearance of both epithets individually in the Greek text of the Nigrinus dossier. The most probable date for Nigrinus' activity as *legatus pro praetore* in Achaëa remains the period immediately before his suffect consulship of 110, just the time at which Arrian is known to have studied with Epictetus (von Premerstein, *SB Bayer. Akad.* 1934, Abh. 3, p. 42 n. 3). The consensus of opinion, endorsed by Plassart (p. 46), is that the Flavius Arrianus of the *consilium* should be identified with Arrian the historian. Stein, *PIR*² F 219, doubted the identification: 'Neque facile Arrianus . . . qui imperatoris Marci aetate etiamtum prytanis Atheniensium fuit, sexaginta annis ante in consilio legati esse potuit.' True enough, but once one abandons the identification of the prytanis of 166/7 with Arrian the historian, these chronological difficulties disappear.

first essays in history—the lives of Dion and Timoleon. Some time after 115 the *Anabasis* appeared, to be followed shortly by the *Bithyniaca*. By 120 Arrian's literary pre-eminence was assured, and about this date Hadrian probably adlected him to the senate. In the next ten years he moved up the *cursus* and held the consulship about 130 and the legateship of Cappadocia between 131 and 137.¹ Nothing more is known of his public career in Rome, and we cannot say whether this service in Cappadocia was the summit of his promotion. All that we can say is that in 145/6 he was an honorary citizen of Athens. He held the eponymous archonship in that year and about this time wrote the *Cyngeticus*—the work in which he proclaims himself the fellow citizen of Xenophon. We do not know how long he lived in retirement in Athens or what work he produced in this last period. The *Parthica* and the history of the Successors were relatively late works, composed after the *Bithyniaca*, but we have no means of dating them at all exactly. They could have been written in Arrian's old age, but alternatively they could have appeared during the 120s in the earlier part of his senatorial career.² The imperial service and literary aspirations were, I have argued, not irreconcilable. Any reconstruction is speculative and hazardous, but one postulate is now certain. Arrian was not primarily a soldier and man of affairs who turned to literature only after retirement. On the contrary, his reputation in antiquity was primarily as a man of letters, and it was his literary merit which secured him Hadrian's favour and senatorial rank.

University of Western Australia, Nedlands

A. B. BOSWORTH

¹ For *testimonia* of the legateship of Cappadocia see T 8–17 (Roos); *PIR*² F 219. Arrian is last attested in the province in 137 (*IGR* iii. 111 = Smallwood 204); by the time of Pius' accession he had been replaced by L. Burbuleius Optatus Ligarianus (*ILS* 1066 = Smallwood 194).

² The mysterious *Ἀλανική* may be a late work, composed after Arrian's victory over the Alani in Cappadocia. This book seems to have contained a discussion of the Caspian Gates, where Arrian is known to have operated (*Themist. Orat.* 34, p. 451 D; Dio

69. 15. 1); cf. Lydus, *de mag.* 3. 53 = *Parthica* F 5. If this work included the extant *Ἑκταξίς κατὰ Ἀλανῶν* (so Schwartz, *RE* ii. 1233–4; Jacoby *FGrH* ii. D. 563), we should know for certain that it was composed after the legateship; but unfortunately it cannot be assumed that the *Ἑκταξίς* came from a historical work in the first place (Roos, *Opera Minora*, xxxi), and there is no certain extant fragment of the *Ἀλανική*. All that can be said is that the title strongly suggests composition after 135.