

# Arrian in Baetica

*A. B. Bosworth*

MUCH INTEREST and perplexity has been generated by a Greek metrical inscription recently discovered in Cordoba in southern Spain.<sup>1</sup> The interest lies in the fact that it is a dedication to Artemis erected by a proconsul Arrianus. Given the rarity of Greek inscriptions in Spanish territory, there is an almost irresistible temptation to identify the dedicant as the celebrated L. Flavius Arrianus, historian, philosopher and devotee of the chase.<sup>2</sup> But there is a major problem. The inscription is brief, a mere two couplets long, and it is relatively undamaged. Yet the second couplet seems harsh and uncomfortable, and no interpretation hitherto offered has given adequate sense. To say the least, it is implausible that one of the greatest stylists of the second century would have composed verses which are either ungrammatical or wildly forced. A new interpretation is both possible and necessary. I wish to propose a new approach, which is both supported by the extant work of the historian Arrian and which, if correct, is only compatible with his authorship of the epigram.

The inscription consists of two couplets cut in nine lines. The reading is perfectly clear except for the damage caused by two deep indentations on the stone. There are also a number of leaves inserted

<sup>1</sup> First published by A. Tovar, "Un nuevo epigrama griego de Cordoba," in *Estudios sobre la obra de Amerigo Castro* (Madrid 1971) 401–12 with photograph between pages 408 and 409 [hereafter, TOVAR]. There have been three subsequent contributions to the problem: M. Fernández Galiano, "Sobre la nueva inscripción griega de Cordoba," *Emerita* 40 (1972) 47–50 [hereafter, GALIANO]; M. Marcovich, "The Epigram of Proconsul Arrian from Cordoba," *ZPE* 12 (1973) 207–09 [hereafter, MARCOVICH]; W. Burkert, "Nochmals das Arrian-Epigramm von Cordoba," *ZPE* 17 (1975) 167–69 [hereafter, BURKERT]. For brief comment see J. & L. Robert, *BullEp* 1973, no.539; W. Eck, *RE* Suppl. 14 (1974) 120 s.n. FLAVIUS 44; *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.1 (Berlin 1974) 165 n.20a, 202 n.217.

<sup>2</sup> Of the writers cited in n.1 only Marcovich (209) expresses serious doubts about the identification. Eck considers it "nicht unmöglich" on two grounds: the rarity of the cognomen Arrianus in senatorial families and the fact that the epigram is in Greek. Greek inscriptions from the Spanish provinces are extraordinarily rare (seven instances only in *IG* XIV.2 2538–44); and, Eck considers, only a senator of Greek extraction would erect an epigram in Greek in Baetica.

between words; they apparently occur at random and have merely a decorative function. In the following transcription I leave the controversial portion of verse 3 without supplements and append an *apparatus criticus*.

Κρέσσονά σοι χρυσοῖο καὶ ἀργύρου ἄμβροτα δῶρα, ⚭  
 \* Ἀρτεμι, καὶ θήρης πολλὸν ἀρειότ[ερα]. ⚭  
 Μουσάων ⚭ .[. .]θρωγ [. .]ε καρήατι δῶρα κομί[ζ]ειν ⚭  
 εἰς θεὸν· οὐχ ὅσιη δαίτορας ἀλλοτρίων ⚭  
 Ἄρριανὸς ἀνθύπατος

---

ξ[χ]θρῶ<ι> με Tovar, ξ[χ]θρῶι γε Galiano, [κα]θρῶ<ι> δὲ Marcovich,  
 [ῥεῖ]θρωγ δὲ Burkert.

The reading of the third verse is now certain. The letters ΘΡΩ appear clearly, but the following two letters are obscured by superficial damage to the stone. In April 1975 I had the privilege of examining two squeezes of the inscription, which Professor P. A. Stadter had obtained. It seemed clear that the first of the doubtful letters was a Ν cut aslant to the right, as tends to happen in this inscription. The second letter remained obscure, but the traces were reconcilable with a Δ. Happily W. Burkert has reported exactly the same reading from his personal examination of the stone in Cordoba. We therefore have an assured reading of ΘΡΩΝΔΕ,<sup>3</sup> preceded by an indentation in the stone with space for two or possibly three letters. At the extreme left of the indentation the squeezes report a slightly curving line, which may be a trace of the first missing letter, but equally it may be mere damage to the stone. Tovar had reported it as a dubious E, but Burkert saw no sign of any such letter.<sup>4</sup> The possibilities for supplements are therefore very limited. What is needed is a noun or adjective ending in -θρων and no more than seven letters long. There are very few candidates.<sup>5</sup> The supplement [ῥεῖ]θρωγ δὲ occurred independently to Burkert and myself. It is perhaps a trifle long, but the letters

<sup>3</sup> The reading was first reported by Ana Maria Vicent and acknowledged by Tovar in his *editio princeps* (Tovar 406; cf. Burkert 168 n.5).

<sup>4</sup> Burkert 168: "Dagegen ist von einem—in dieser Inschrift stets runden—E vor der Einarbeitung keine Spur zu erkennen."

<sup>5</sup> In addition to the supplements cited in the *apparatus* the reader is invited to experiment with βάθρον, λάθρα, βλάθρον, κερθός, πλέθρον, αἰθρος, κλήθρον, ἄθρον, τέρθρον, ὄρθρος, κυθρός, λίθρος, ἐρυθρός, νωθρός (cf. C. D. Buck & W. Petersen, *Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* [Chicago 1945] 325f).

are narrow and they may have been squeezed together. One of the vowels could have been cut in a smaller script, as happens elsewhere on the stone. In that case the reading of the second couplet must be:

*Μουσάων [ρεί]θρων δὲ καρήατι δῶρα κομί[ζ]ειν  
εἰς θεὸν οὐχ ὀσίη δαίτορας ἄλλοτρίων.*

It is regrettable that Burkert after inferring what I believe to be the correct reading came to a totally unacceptable interpretation of the couplet. He translates: “vom strömenden Quell der Musen Gaben auf dem Haupt zur Gottheit zu bringen, ist denen verwehrt, die Fremdes vernichten.” This involves two implausibilities. Arrian is represented offering his verses (“gifts from the streams of the Muses”) *on his head*, as a symbolic ὑδροφόρος. Secondly, the poem seems to say that those who destroy what is alien are forbidden to bring gifts of poetry to the goddess. It is difficult to attribute any sense to this. Burkert’s interpretation that those who offer the traditional offerings to Artemis (“Vernichtungsoffer”) are to abstain from dedicating poetry is extremely strained<sup>6</sup> and a very clumsy contrast with the first couplet. There is, however, an alternative. The supplement is consistent with an entirely different translation: “I offer you, Artemis, immortal gifts, better than gold or silver and far preferable to the spoils of the chase. It is impious for the fountainhead of the Muses to bear as gifts to the goddess the consumers of others.”

The first couplet is relatively straightforward. There are no syntactical problems, apart from the minor difficulty of the omission of the verb of dedication; and the context is plain. The author of the poem is offering Artemis a tribute of verse instead of the regular dedications after a hunt. It was a widespread custom to offer Artemis a portion of the spoils.<sup>7</sup> The most striking evidence is provided by a series of inscriptions erected at Leon in Tarraconensis by Q. Tullius Maximus, legionary legate of VII Gemina in the last years of Antoninus

<sup>6</sup> The difficulty of interpreting δαίτορας as people who offer “Feuer-Vernichtungsoffer” is compounded by the strain of interpreting ἄλλοτρίων as a reference to the objects of sacrifice. Why should offerings of sacrificial animals be ἄλλότρια? Nothing is gained by Burkert’s reference to Epictetus’ definition of τὰ ἄλλότρια as everything that is not wholly under our control (*Diatr.* 4.1.129). If δαίτορας ἄλλοτρίων is to be interpreted by reference to Epictetus it can only mean “those who destroy what is not their own”: *i.e.* the people who eliminate τὰ ἄλλότρια and achieve the state of self-sufficiency which is Epictetus’ ideal.

<sup>7</sup> Verg. *Ecl.* 7.29–30; Stat. *Theb.* 9.589–91. Cf. J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines* (BEFAR 171, Paris 1951) 508–10. For typical epigrams commemorating the dedication of spoils see *Anth.Pal.* 6.111–16.

Pius.<sup>8</sup> Maximus had dedicated a precinct and shrine to Artemis near his legionary headquarters in order to ensure good luck in the chase. In addition to the dedicatory poem there survive three metrical inscriptions, each commemorating the offering of a portion of the spoils: boars' teeth, stags' antlers and a bear skin.<sup>9</sup> In our epigram the author declines to offer the spoils of the hunt (*θήρη*)<sup>10</sup> but presents his verse as an offering far preferable. He also claims that his poem is a gift better than gold or silver. It was admittedly a regular conceit to compare the gift of a poem favourably with the gift of precious objects.<sup>11</sup> But the author may have a more precise meaning. In Arrian's *Cynegeticus*, the work he wrote late in life to update Xenophon's information about hunting dogs,<sup>12</sup> there is a passage about dedications to Artemis (33ff). Arrian does indeed advise the aspiring huntsman to offer a portion of the spoils (*ἀπαρχὰς τῶν ἀλισκομένων*); but what he himself practices is the Gallic custom of setting up a hunting chest. For each kill a proportionate monetary offering is made, and from the proceeds a festival is held in honour of Artemis.<sup>13</sup> There is an obvious relevance to the epigram. The author refrains from an offering of money as well as from the offering of the spoils; and he represents his verse as preferable to both.

We move now to the difficulties of the second couplet, which centre on two portentous phrases. In the first place *Μουσάων [ῥεί]θρων. . . καρῆατι* must be taken as a single expression: "the head of the Muses' streams." The image of poetry as the streams of the Muses is a commonplace of poetry from Pindar to Callimachus.<sup>14</sup> The author, however, goes further and represents himself as the source of the Muses'

<sup>8</sup> CIL II 2660=ILS 3259-60=Inscr. lat. de la España rom. (1971) no.5753. For the date of Maximus' legateship see Groag, RE 7A (1948) 1315f; G. Alföldy, *Fasti hispanienses* (Wiesbaden 1969) 121 [hereafter, ALFÖLDY].

<sup>9</sup> e.g. ILS 3259: *dentes aprorum quos cecidit Maximus | dicat Dianae, pulchrum virtutis decus.*

<sup>10</sup> For this use of *θήρα* (*pro praeda venatu capta*) Stephanus adduces Eur. *Bacch.* 1144; Longus 74.7. See also Xen. *Cyn.* 6.13: *καὶ εὐξάμενον τῶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμει . . . μεταδοῦναι τῆς θήρας* (cf. 12.7).

<sup>11</sup> *Anth.Pal.* 6.325, 329. Cf. Marcovich 208-09.

<sup>12</sup> The *Cynegeticus* was written ca A.D. 145, when Arrian was a resident of Athens (*Cyn.* 1.4). For translation and brief commentary see D. B. Hull, *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago 1964) 161-64.

<sup>13</sup> *Cyn.* 34.1-35.1. Cf. Aymard, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 505-06. The Gallic festival mentioned by Arrian still apparently existed in Symmachus' time (*Ep.* 4.18: *natales canum dies; festa venatica*).

<sup>14</sup> Pind. *Nem.* 7.12 *ῥοαῖσι Μουσῶν* (cf. *Isthm.* 7.19; *Ol.* 6.83). See also the examples cited by R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus I* (Oxford 1949) p.11.

streams. This use of *κάρρα* as a stream-head is not found elsewhere, although it is a common use of *caput* in Latin.<sup>15</sup> It is a logical use, however, and we do find *κεφαλή* used explicitly to denote the source of a river. The usage occurs in Herodotus, an author who served as the principal stylistic model of Arrian the historian.<sup>16</sup> Our writer therefore represents himself as the fountainhead of the Muses. It is possible that by “the streams of Muses” he means more than mere poetry; the preserve of the Muses included all the products of *παιδεία*.<sup>17</sup> In that case the language is peculiarly appropriate to L. Flavius Arrianus, who was commemorated in his lifetime as a philosopher and who, according to the ancient biographical tradition, won promotion *διὰ τὸ τῆς παιδείας ἐπίσημον*.<sup>18</sup> What is more, the singularly boastful tone of the epigram finds an exact parallel in the famous autobiographical passage of Arrian’s history of Alexander. His name he claims is a household word and he has no hesitation in claiming primacy in the field of Greek letters (*οὐχ ἀπαξιῶ ἐμαυτὸν τῶν πρώτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι*).<sup>19</sup> The extravagance of the claim is comparable with the extravagance of the epigram.

The second difficulty lies in the obscurity of the terminal phrase, *δαίτορας ἀλλοτρίων*. *δαίτωρ* is *haraux* and it has been alternatively derived from *δαίομαι* | *δαίνυμι* and *δαίζω*.<sup>20</sup> In either case the sense must be something like “consumers of what belongs to others.” This

<sup>15</sup> TLL III 409–10 s.v. CAPUT III.A 2; cf. Fronto, *ad M. Caes.* 4.3.4 (57.10 VdH): *M. Tullium qui caput et fons Romanae facundiae cluet*.

<sup>16</sup> Hdt. 4.91.2: *Τεάρου ποταμοῦ κεφαλαί* (cp. 4.89.3: *ἐπὶ Τεάρου . . . τὰς πηγὰς*). For Arrian’s dependence on Herodotus see H. R. Grundmann, “Quid in elocutione Arriani Herodoto debeat,” *Berliner Studien für class. Philologie und Archaeologie* 2 (1885) 199ff, and, briefly, Bosworth, CQ 24 (1974) 56f.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Arr. *Cyn.* 35.2: *θύουσι . . . καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ παιδείας Μούσαις*.

<sup>18</sup> Two recently discovered inscriptions dating from Arrian’s lifetime explicitly name him *φιλόσοφος*; G. W. Bowersock, GRBS 8 (1967) 279f; D. Peppas-Delmouzou, AAA 3 (1970) 377–80 (see now E. Kapetanopoulos, AAA 6 [1973] 301–04). Writing shortly after A.D. 180 Lucian described him as *ἀνὴρ Ῥωμαίων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ παιδεία παρ’ ὄλον τὸν βίον συγγενόμενος* (*Alexander* 2). For the ancient biographical tradition see Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 58; *Suda* s.v. Ἀρριανός (T 2: A. G. Roos, ed. *Arriani Scripta Minora* [BT, Leipzig 1968] lviii–lix). Cf. Bosworth, CQ 22 (1972) 166f.

<sup>19</sup> *Anab.* 1.12.5. On this passage see G. Schepens, *AncSoc* 2 (1971) 262–63; Bosworth, CQ 22 (1972) 167.

<sup>20</sup> The form attested from *δαίζω* is *δαίτωρ*, Aesch. *Suppl.* 798; cf. *δαίξανδρος Hymn. Is.* 54= IG XII.5 739); and from *δαίνυμι* the form is *συνδαίτωρ* (Aesch. *Eum.* 351). I incline towards the second derivation; there is the exact analogy of *ψαίτωρ*, a form used in the *Palatine Anthology* (6.295.2) and clearly derived from the root *ψάω* | *ψαίω* (cf. Marcovich 208 for further examples).

phrase, I think, must be taken in apposition to δῶρα. Arrian declares that it is improper for him, the fountainhead of the Muses, to offer the goddess the spoils from beasts of prey. The periphrasis is difficult, but once more Arrian's *Cynegeticus* casts some light. In his description of the scale of payments to the hunting treasury he remarks that one pays three times more for a fox than for a hare—ὅτι ἐπιβουλον τὸ χρῆμα καὶ τοὺς λαγῶς διαφθείρει (*Cyn.* 34.1). The destructive nature of the fox is given as the reason for its higher value, ὡς ἐπὶ πολεμίῳ ἀλόντι. The fox was the prime example of a 'consumer of what belongs to others', and the author of our epigram may be referring to a hunt which resulted in a bag of foxes. But any predatory animal would fit the description. In the second couplet, then, the sense of the first is continued. The immortal gifts of poetry are far preferable to the spoils of the chase; and, in any case, when those spoils come from predatory beasts it is improper for a man inspired by the Muses to offer them to the goddess. It is an extravagant conceit; but the basic theme, that the Muses should keep aloof from what is destructive and offer what is peculiarly theirs, is paralleled elsewhere. The Neronian poet, Leonidas of Alexandria, declares that his Muse will sacrifice a poem for the Emperor's birthday; for the sacrifices of Calliope must be bloodless.

θύει σοι τόδε γράμμα γενεθλιακαῖσιν ἐν ὤραις,  
 Καῖσαρ, Νειλαίη Μοῦσα Λεωνίδεω·  
 Καλλιόπης γὰρ ἄκαπνον αἰεὶ θύος, εἰς δὲ νέωτα,  
 ἦν ἐθέλης, θύσει τοῦδε περιεσώτερα.<sup>21</sup>

On my interpretation the epigram runs naturally and relatively smoothly. The second couplet is somewhat forced, but hardly more so than Hadrian's epigram in honour of Trajan's dedication to Zeus Kasios, which Arrian considered worth quoting in his *Parthica*.<sup>22</sup> The poem is a typically mannered production of the second century, and it may well be complicated by allusions to earlier literature which are

<sup>21</sup> *Anth.Pal.* 6.321. For discussion and appreciation of Leonidas' poetry see Geffcken, *RE* 12 (1925) 2031–33.

<sup>22</sup> *Anth.Pal.* 6.332 (cited by Arr. *Parthica* fr.36 Roos). In the poem *λίτα* is used in the Homeric sense 'cloths' but with unique quantities; and Hadrian refers to the forthcoming Parthian war with the pretentious phrase *δῆρην Ἀχαιμενίην* (v.8). For what it is worth, Arrian speaks as a connoisseur of epigrams, dismissing the dedicatory poem on the Macedonian spoils offered at Tyre as *οὐχ ἄξιον μνήμης* (*Anab.* 2.24.6). That alone rules out Arrian's authorship of the famous epigram to the Sphinx (É. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine* [Paris 1969] no.129); the Arrianus who composed that poem was incapable of writing consecutive elegiac couplets.

now lost to us. What seems clear is that the poem was written by the famous Arrian. His *Cynegeticus* is the best commentary on its subject matter; and the claim to be the fountainhead of the Muses fits excellently the literary pretensions expressed by Arrian the historian. The conclusion seems inescapable that Arrian was proconsul of Baetica during the reign of Hadrian.

The known facts about Arrian's career supply only a rough terminus for this proconsulate. There is only one surely dated post in his *cursus*, the legateship of Cappadocia, where he is attested in office in A.D. 131. Cappadocia at this period was a province usually conferred after the consulship, and, since the consular *fasti* for 127 and 128 are complete and do not contain Arrian's name, his consulship is usually and plausibly dated to 129 or 130.<sup>23</sup> Arrian, then, will have governed Baetica at some time in the 120s. There is ample room in the provincial *fasti* to accommodate him. Of the proconsuls of that period only P. Tullius Varro is unimpeachably attested. His suffect consulship fell in 127; and it was preceded by the prefecture of the *aerarium Saturni*, usually held for a three-year term.<sup>24</sup> He will have been proconsul of Baetica in or before 124. The only other name which can be assigned to Baetica during the 120s with any degree of probability is C. Cassius Agrippa. If his name is correctly restored in an inscription of Nicaea, it must be assumed that he governed Baetica immediately before his suffect consulship in 130.<sup>25</sup> The restoration, however, is tenuous and has been doubted.<sup>26</sup> Nothing therefore prevents our dating Arrian's proconsulate of Baetica to a year in the vicinity of A.D. 125. We have no means of knowing whether he progressed from it directly to the consulship or, like P. Tullius Varro, he held an intermediate praetorian post.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> For the dating of Arrian's tenure of Cappadocia see W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Vestigia 13, Munich 1970) 204 n.373, 215 n.418. The consulship is attested on brick stamps from Rome (CIL XV 244, 552; T 7 Roos). For further discussion see my forthcoming study "Arrian and Rome" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang* (supra n.1) II. 4.

<sup>24</sup> ILS 1047; cf. Alföldy 167; Eck, *op.cit.* (supra n.23) 195 n.346.

<sup>25</sup> AE 1950. 251. Cf. Alföldy 168; Eck, *op.cit.* (supra n.23) 202 n.370.

<sup>26</sup> H.-G. Pflaum, *ArchEspArq* 39 (1966) 15-21, argues convincingly that the *nomen* of the man honoured is uncertain and the *cognomen* of the father is not Agrippa. In that case no grounds remain for dating the inscription to the Hadrianic period.

<sup>27</sup> Alföldy 273 gives a table of the known posts held by senators immediately after the proconsulate of Baetica. In the Flavian period L. Antistius Rusticus held the prefectship of the *aerarium Saturni* after his proconsulate (AE 1925. 126=MW 464), and C. Cornelius Gallicanus went on to become imperial legate of Lugdunensis (AE 1962. 288; ILS 2118=MW 361; cf. Alföldy 160).

The information that Arrian governed Baetica is singularly unhelpful for the interpretation of his work. Apart from scattered and commonplace references to Spain and the Spaniards there is only one passage where his experience in Baetica is a relevant factor. That is the curious excursus devoted to the proof that the god Melqart of Tyre, identified by the Greeks as Heracles, was in fact older than the Argive Heracles and unrelated to him (*Anab.* 2.16.1–6). Arrian goes so far as to claim that the legends of Heracles in the far west have to do with the Tyrian Heracles. In addition to the rationalisations of Hecataeus he mentions the famous temple of Heracles/Melqart at Gades and observes that Heracles was worshipped there in the Tyrian mode. Now Gades belonged to the province of Baetica; and it is possible that Arrian drew on his experience as governor to provide material for the excursus.

Various factors indicate the contrary. In the first place Arrian merely infers that Heracles worshipped in the far west was the Tyrian Heracles.<sup>28</sup> He does not speak explicitly of direct knowledge, as he does a few lines later when he observes in parenthesis that the cattle of Epirus are still excellent (*οἶδα δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐς τοῦτο*, 16.6). More importantly he locates the temple *ἐν Ταρτησσῶ* and speaks of Tartessus as a Phoenician foundation. That is doubly incorrect. Tartessus was the Greek name for the native kingdom at the mouth of the R. Guadalquivir, which had been exploited as a Phoenician market since the days of Hiram I and Solomon. Gades was a later Phoenician settlement quite independent of the kingdom of Tartessus. Herodotus names both, but there is no indication that he considered them related.<sup>29</sup> Now Tartessus was penetrated by Phoenician merchants in the late seventh century B.C., and it was relatively familiar to the Greek world until the Carthaginians intervened (*ca* 500), destroying the native kingdom and shutting off the area to Greek commerce.<sup>30</sup> Subsequently knowledge of the far west was sketchy, but Gades and Tartessus were still regarded as separate. The fourth-century source used by Ps.-Scymnus lists them as separate *emporía*.<sup>31</sup> The Second Punic War

<sup>28</sup> *Anab.* 2.16.4: *δοκῶ ἐγὼ τὸν Τύριον εἶναι Ἡρακλέα.*

<sup>29</sup> Hdt. 1.163; 4.152.2 (Tartessus); 4.8 (Gades—mentioned precisely in the context of Heracles and the cattle of Geryon).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. A. Schulten, *Tartessos*<sup>2</sup> (Hamburg 1950) 44ff; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford 1948) 343f.

<sup>31</sup> [Scymnus] 161, 164. The Greeks continued to refer to the R. Guadalquivir by the name Tartessus (Arist. *Met.* 1.13 350b2; cf. Stesichorus fr.7 Page).



brought a change. As they penetrated Spain, the Romans became progressively more familiar with Gades. Polybius and Poseidonius both gave descriptions of the temple of Heracles/Melqart which are summarised by Strabo;<sup>32</sup> and the Punic ritual used in the worship there is described in detail by Silius Italicus.<sup>33</sup> Tartessus was now a distant memory. Writers assumed, wrongly, that Tartessus had been an earlier name of Gades.<sup>34</sup> It is possible that Arrian was here perversely archaising, introducing an obsolete name to add a flavour of mystery, in the same way that he refers to his fellow Bithynians by their archaic name of *Θραῦκες Βιθυννοί*.<sup>35</sup> But, if that was the case, he was not consistent; for he twice refers to the city of Gades in later excursions, and in both cases he gives it its conventional Greek name of *Γάδειρα* (3.30.9; 7.1.2). There seems no alternative to the assumption that Arrian's information about the worship of Heracles/Melqart in the far west is derivative, probably taken from his narrative source, Aristobulus. Now Aristobulus wrote after the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.), at a time when Spain was a distant, almost legendary land. He could be excused for confusing Gades with Tartessus. The error is far harder to explain in Arrian if he had been proconsul of Baetica before he wrote his history of Alexander. After the proconsulate he must have had accurate knowledge of Gades and the ceremonial of the worship of Melqart; and one would have expected him to have added eyewitness details comparable to those he gives for the location of the statue group of the tyrannicides in the Athenian *agora*.<sup>36</sup> Instead he has reproduced the inaccurate and brief account of his source.

The ignorance of the geography of Baetica in the history of Alexander is paralleled by ignorance of Arrian's other known province, Cappadocia, in which he spent at least six years. The most striking instance probably comes in his reproduction of Eratosthenes' criticisms of the Alexander historians who transferred Prometheus' place of punishment from the Caucasus to the Hindu Kush.<sup>37</sup> Arrian remains

<sup>32</sup> Strabo 3.5.7–9 (172ff); cf. *FGrHist* 87 F 53.

<sup>33</sup> *Sil. Pun.* 3.17–31.

<sup>34</sup> *Sall. Hist.* 2.5; Avienus, *De ora mar.* 85; 267–69. Cicero (*Cato Maior* 69) describes the fabulous Arganthonius as king of Gades not Tartessus.

<sup>35</sup> *Anab.* 1.29.5: *διὰ τῆς Θρακῶν τῶν Βιθυνῶν χώρας*; cf. *Periplus* 13.6. In his specific work on Bithynia he apparently termed his countrymen simply *Βιθυνοί* (*Bithyniaca* fr. 20, 22–23, 25, 27 Roos).

<sup>36</sup> *Anab.* 3.16.8; cf. Bosworth, *CQ* 22 (1972) 172–73; D. M. Lewis, *CR* 24 (1974) 186–87.

<sup>37</sup> *Anab.* 5.3.2; cf. Strabo 15.1.8 (688).

unconvinced by the arguments (*ἐν μέσῳ κείσθων*); but he supplies no arguments of his own. In particular he says nothing about his voyage in the Black Sea in 131/2 during which he was shown the precise peak in the Caucasus where Prometheus was said to have been chained.<sup>38</sup> It is moreover a passage where Arrian is explicitly criticising his source. His autopsy was undeniably relevant; yet he seems perversely to ignore it. There are other occasions when he reveals ignorance of Cappadocia surprising in a consular legate of the province, and this ignorance is one of the strongest reasons for dating the history of Alexander to an early stage of Arrian's career.<sup>39</sup> The new information about the proconsulate of Baetica provides a corroborative argument from ignorance. If it is accepted, the work cannot have been composed later than the early 120s.<sup>40</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA  
December, 1975

<sup>38</sup> *Periplus* 11.5: *καὶ τοῦ Καυκάσου κορυφή τις ἐδείκνυτο -- ἵνα περὶ ὁ Προμηθεὺς κρεμασθῆναι . . . μυθεύεται.*

<sup>39</sup> In the discussion of the homeland of the Amazons (*Anab.* 7.13.4–6) there is no hint that Arrian had any first-hand knowledge of the mouth of the Thermodon (*Periplus* 15.3; *cf.* *Bithyniaca* fr.48). Arrian even has to refer to *ὁ πλείων λόγος* for the simple geographical fact that the Armenian river Araxes flows into the Caspian (*Anab.* 7.16.3). These are surprising statements if Arrian had spent six years in Cappadocia before he wrote his monograph on Alexander (*cf.* *CQ* 22 [1972] 174).

<sup>40</sup> I am most grateful to Professor P. A. Stadter for allowing me access to his private material and for discussing the problems of the inscription with me.