BLACK SEA VARIATIONS: ARRIAN'S *PERIPLUS*

> Comme tous les Grecs, il n'a pas pu ne pas embellir ce qu'il a touché. On retrouve en lui cet éminent esprit d'une race privilégiée qui dans les sujets les plus arides fait pénétrer l'art et même la poésie. ... même en quittant ... le Périple d'Arrien, nous pouvons dire comme Fuséli en quittant les marbres du Parthénon: 'Ah! les Grecs, les Grecs, c'étaient des dieux.'
>
> H. Chotard, *Le Périple de la Mer Noire par Arrien*[1]

***

Arrian's *Periplus maris Euxini* (*Circumnavigation of the Euxine*) is an ambitious and unusual work. Written in the 130s AD in the form of a letter to the emperor Hadrian, who had himself visited the Black Sea a few years earlier, it was a literary complement to a report Arrian made in Latin, as governor of Cappadocia, on Rome's military position in the Black Sea. It is also unusual in its form: unlike most *periploi*, which are marked by continuity of movement and by a highly repetitive style, it is discontinuous both in its spatial movement and in its narrative style. It treats the whole length of the Black Sea coast, but it does so in three anti-clockwise strips. First Arrian narrates, in the first person, a journey he had himself made from Trapezus to Sebastopolis (1–11). Then he gives an impersonal account of the coast from Byzantium to Trapezus (12–16). He then fills in what remains with a similarly impersonal account of the coast from Sebastopolis to Byzantium (17–25).

This article will seek to explain some of the unusual elements in Arrian's *Periplus* by exploring its engagement with earlier historiographical images of the Black Sea. While glancing at Arrian's allusions to Herodotus, it will concentrate – in keeping with Arrian's own emphasis – on allusions to the final books of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which recount the Ten Thousand's journey by foot and boat along the south shore of the Black Sea in 400 BC and their subsequent adventures on the northern shore, above

[1] Chotard (1860) 229–30. I would like to thank the anonymous referees, Lynette Mitchell and Andrea Capovilla for their comments. All references to Arrian are to the *Periplus maris Euxini*, unless otherwise stated. Translations follow, with some alterations, Liddle (2003); Silberman (1995) is a good recent French edition of Arrian's work, with a more reliable translation than Liddle's. Translations of Herodotus and Xenophon's *Anabasis* are (at times adapted) from Waterfield's Oxford World's Classics editions; translations of Arrian's *Anabasis* and Procopius are from the Loeb editions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Byzantium. Examining references to Xenophon in the *Periplus* will show how Arrian creates an impression of the Black Sea coast as a storied landscape, shaped by earlier Greek narratives,[2] and how this presentation of space is itself part of Arrian's construction and exploration of his identity as a member of a Greek cultural and political elite in a period of Roman imperial control.[3] I shall suggest in particular that Arrian's allusions operate at several distinct levels. On the one hand, they are early evidence for his construction of an authorial persona based on Xenophon that was further elaborated in some of his later works (see below). Yet the fact that the allusions in the *Periplus* often misrepresent Xenophon suggest that Arrian was not simply bolstering his own position but also challenging the educated reader to look beyond the surface reference and analyse the artifice of his self-presentation. And his construction of a Xenophontic authorial persona is further complicated by the way in which he uses a shared Black Sea setting as part of an unresolved dialectic between temporal continuity and discontinuity.

The centrality of Xenophon to Arrian's self-construction has often been stressed by modern scholars. Arrian in some sense adopted Xenophon as a name: in the *Periplus* he alludes to him once as 'that Xenophon' (2.3) and once as 'the elder Xenophon' (13.6); in the *Cynegeticus* he alludes to Xenophon as his 'namesake' (1.4, 16.6, 22.1); and in *Order of Battle against the Alans* he twice seems to refer to himself as 'Xenophon' (10, 22).[4] And like Xenophon he wrote works on hunting, philosophy and military tactics, and used *Anabasis* as the title for a seven-book account of a Greek expedition into Asia. Scholars have also brought out how Arrian defined himself in relation to Xenophon by attempting to surpass him. The *Periplus*, an early work, goes beyond the versatile Xenophon in its generic range. In other works Arrian proclaimed the superiority of his material: in his *Anabasis* he insists that Alexander's expedition was a finer military achievement than Xenophon's retreat (1.12.3), while his stress in the

[2] Cf. Smyth (2008) 157: 'his *Periplus* is primarily of interest for us because of its constant reminders of the classical past that invested even those distant shores with narrative.' King (2004) 52–4 situates Arrian's account within the broader history of the Black Sea in antiquity.

[3] Cf. Swain (1996) 242–8 and Madsen (2009) 68–70, 79–81, 119–23 for different perspectives on Arrian's Roman, Hellenic and Bithynian identities.

[4] Cf. *Cyn.* 5.6, where 'Xenophon the Athenian' is Arrian himself (and he has a dog with one of the names recommended at Xen. *Cyn.* 7.5, cf. Hutchinson (2009) 207); also *Cyn.* 16.7, 21.2, 30.2 for 'that Xenophon' and 3.5 for 'the Xenophon of old'. See Stadter (1967) for the view that Xenophon was formally one of Arrian's names (though this view is not supported by existing inscriptional evidence: Swain (1996) 246); cf. also Ameling (1994). Arrian also cites Xenophon at *Tact.* 6.3, 29.8, while at *Tact.* 1 he distinguishes the military writer Clearchus from the Clearchus who served with the Ten Thousand; none of these allusions is found in the parallel passages in Aelian's *Tactica* (cf. Stadter (1978) 125, though he does note at 122 n. 20 that the Xenophontic allusion at 29.8 also occurs in a military lexicon).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cynegeticus (1.4–2.4, 16.7) on Xenophon's lack of familiarity with the Celtic hound implies a reflection on Arrian's own positioning in space and time, as an elite participant in the advantages bestowed by the Roman empire.[5]

While Arrian's broad use of Xenophon as a literary model has frequently been noted, detailed analysis of the verbal texture of Arrian's interaction with Xenophon has been attempted less often. The use of the Xenophontic paradigm in Arrian's literary self-projection was reinforced by many detailed correspondences. There are many verbal echoes in the *Anabasis* and *Indike*, for instance.[6] This paper will attempt a close reading of Xenophontic references in the *Periplus* in order to demonstrate how our understanding of Arrian's general self-positioning can be enriched by detailed verbal study. The second half of the paper will explore how supposed constants and variations in the cities, sanctuaries and peoples of the Black Sea littoral since Xenophon's time contribute to Arrian's imperial imagining of the Black Sea as remote frontier. In the first half, I will discuss the sort of image Arrian constructs both for himself and for Hadrian through spatial parallelisms with Xenophon; I will start by suggesting that Arrian's loaded use of Xenophon may even help to explain the work's unusual structure.

Structuring the periplus

Arrian's *Periplus* is unorthodox not just in the strange discontinuity in its three sections (as mentioned earlier), but also in the location where the first of those sections begins:

> Arrian, to the Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, greetings. To Trapezus we came, a Greek city, as that Xenophon says, settled on the sea, a colony of the Sinopeans, and gladly we looked down on the Euxine Sea from the same spot as both Xenophon and you. (1.1)

[5] Cf. Stadter (1980) 53–4 (also 59 on Arrian's stress at 24.2–3 on the superiority of Libyan horses in hunting wild asses to the horses used at Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.2–3); Goldhill (2006) 150.

[6] E.g. Arrian's account of the rumours that Alexander has died of his wounds received in his assault on the Malli (*Anab.* 6.12.1–2) is modelled on Xenophon's accounts of the news of Aegospotami at Athens (*Hell.* 2.2.3) and the position of the Greeks after the execution of the generals (*Anab.* 3.1.2); Arrian's reference to the city of Ninus as 'once great and prosperous' (*Ind.* 42. 3: μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα; cf. also *Anab.* 2.13.8, 5.8.2, 6.21.5) adopts a Xenophontic formula (*Anab.* 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 1.2.20, 1.2.23, 1.4.1, 1.4.11, 1.5.10, 2.4.28, 4.7.19); also strongly reminiscent of Xenophon are the parasangs at *Anab.* 1.4.4 (placed programmatically near the start of the work precisely because Arrian was not going to use parasangs later?) and the verb ἐξελαύνει used for the start of Alexander's move to Asia at *Anab.* 1.11.3 (cf. Rood (2010) 57 on the Xenophontic use of this verb, with n. 22 for other uses in Arrian). Contrast the view of Bosworth (1993) 275 that the 'direct contribution of Xenophon to the Alexander history is limited'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the *periplus* tradition, it was usual to begin accounts of the Black Sea at the Bosporus. Arrian's decision to start his account at Trapezus may seem determined by the fact that he himself reached the coast there, but it would have equally been possible for him to place his personalised account of the voyage from Trapezus to Sebastopolis in between two more impersonal sections. Arrian's personal experience is no more satisfactory as an explanation of the discontinuous structure of the whole treatise: once the decision to start with his own voyage had been made, he could have given a continuous anti-clockwise account that both started and ended at Trapezus. One of the leading modern scholars of the *Periplus* is led to the conclusion that its 'bizarre and maladroit' structure must have been necessitated by Arrian's having to put the personal letter to Hadrian, with its description of his own journey, at the start.[7]

The allusion to Xenophon at the start of the work offers a more positive way of explaining the structure of the *Periplus*. The opening passage glances at (what is now at least) the most famous passage in the whole of the *Anabasis* – Xenophon's account of the weary Greeks shouting 'Thalatta! Thalatta!' as they first catch sight of the sea (4.7.21).[8] This strong opening gesture is maintained in the rest of the work: Arrian refers to Xenophon more often than to any other mythical and historical characters, and these references appear in each of the work's three parts. The first part (1–11) includes allusions to a sacrifice Xenophon made (2.3) and to his account of the Colchians and the Drillae (11.1). The second part (12–16), where Arrian treats in reverse the coastline along which Xenophon's Greeks travelled, includes even more frequent allusions to Xenophon (12.5, Calpes Limen; 13.6, Bithynian Thracians; 14.4, Armene; 16.3, Cotyora). And the final part (17–25) also has one prominent Xenophontic allusion near the end (25.1–2, on Salmydessus): 'the elder Xenophon mentioned this place, and says that it was up to this point that the army of the Greeks which he himself led came, when it did its final service with Seuthes the Thracian' (all that remains after this indirect closural marker is some ten lines on the coast from Salmydessus to Byzantium). As well as including references to Xenophon in all its three parts, then, Arrian's *Periplus* is straddled by references to the extremes of the Ten Thousand's

[7] Silberman (1993) 286 ('bizarre et maladroit'). The structure of the work has often been cited against the authenticity of the last two parts: for references and discussion, see Silberman (1993) 277 n. 2, 287–90.

[8] See Rood (2004) on the reception of this passage, esp. index, s.v. 'Arrian' (mainly on modern attempts to find the exact spot where the Greeks saw the sea); Whitmarsh (2011) 52 detects a more distant allusion in Chariton. On Arrian's allusion, see Liddle (2003) 91; Hutton (2005) 268–9; Smyth (2008) 157–9 (and also 162–3 for a comparison with the National Park Service website on the Lewis and Clark National Trail); also Falconer (1805) 28–9, who strangely suggests that Arrian was referring to the view that Xenophon would have had of the sea from the site of the athletic games held after the army's arrival at Trapezus. All subsequent references to Xenophon will be to the *Anabasis* unless otherwise stated.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contact with the Black Sea (Trapezus and Salmydessus); it also manages to include every major site (though not every major tribe) mentioned by Xenophon (even if only to say that Xenophon mentioned it).[9] Rather than seeing the structure as maladroit, we may see it as an experimental adaptation of the generally rigid spatial form of the *periplus*, with the pervasive allusions to Xenophon one of the most striking unifying elements.[10]

The formal unity of Arrian's work is also complicated by the opening allusion to Xenophon. When Arrian starts by comparing his joyful sight of the sea with Xenophon's, he employs an adjective (ἄσμενοι, 'gladly') used with particular frequency by Xenophon in the *Anabasis*.[11] Besides this general Xenophontic resonance, the adjective has a distinctive narrative dynamic. It is commonly applied to travellers who are glad of the prospect of an end to their toils: Xenophon had used it of the Ten Thousand's joy at the sight of hills that promised relief from the Persian cavalry, and again of their joy at the sight of a plain after struggling through the Carduchian mountains (3.4.24, 4.3.1). The use of ἄσμενοι also looks back to Odysseus' narrative of his adventures in the *Odyssey*: three times Odysseus speaks of the gladness felt by himself and his surviving companions as they escaped death (9.63, 9.566, 10.134: ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο).[12] Arrian himself was well aware of the word's association: in the *Indike*, he uses it in a sentence closely modelled on Xenophon's description of the Ten Thousand's relief on making it through the Carduchian mountains.[13] By using at the start of his work an adjective associated with a break from toils, he points up the artifice involved in his opening gesture towards Xenophon's sight of the sea.

[9] Stadter (1980) 37.

[10] Bosworth (1993) 244.

[11] ἄσμενοι: 3.4.24, 4.3.1, 4.5.22, 6.3.24, 6.6.3, 7.2.9, 7.6.6, 7.6.8 – a higher frequency than in the extant remains of any earlier author; for the sake of comparison, this form occurs seven times in Xenophon's other works (four times in *Hell.*, three in *Cyr.*), seven times in Herodotus, and four times in Thucydides. Cf. also the singular ἄσμενος at *Anab.* 2.1.16, 5.6.22.

[12] The 'welcome sight' motif is also markedly Odyssean: cf. the clustering of ἀσπάσιος and ἀσπαστός at 5.394–8 (of the adrift Odysseus' sight of land and children's feelings for a sick father) and 23.233–9 (of a swimmer's welcome sight of land and Penelope's welcome sight of Odysseus).

[13] Compare *Ind.* 33.3 (Nearchus and his sailors 'had a welcome rest from their numerous hardships, remembering the miseries they had endured by sea and on the coast of the Fish-eaters and reflecting on the desolation of the country, the bestial nature of the men, and their own difficulties': ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν πόνων ἄσμενοι ἀνεπαύοντο, μεμνημένοι ὅσα κακὰ ... πεπονθότες ἦσαν) with *Anab.* 4.3.1 (the Ten Thousand 'rested here, glad to be able to see the plain and the river ... they could cast their mind back over all the hardship they had endured': ἀνέπνευσαν ἄσμενοι ... πολλὰ τῶν παρεληλυθότων πόνων μνημονεύοντες ... ἔπαθον κακὰ ὅσα ...). These sentences also recall the frequent grouping of κακά with parts of πάσχειν in the *Odyssey*, e.g. 1.4, 5.377, 13.90–2 (where Odysseus forgets his troubles in his sleep).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Arrian's use of ἄσμενοι looks forwards as well as backwards. In the *Odyssey* and the *Anabasis*, as also in tragedy (e.g. Eur. *HF* 725, *Tro.* 21), relief often proves to be transitory. For Arrian, too, the welcome sight of the sea proves to be ironic, despite the promise of the *pax Romana* symbolised by the statue that Hadrian had had set up at Trapezus. Arrian goes on to describe how he is caught in a dangerous storm at sea after leaving Trapezus. It is only after much suffering (πολλὰ παθόντες, 3.4) that he arrives at his destination. The retrospective and prospective force of Arrian's opening marks off his personalised journey-narrative from the impersonal presentation of space in the last two sections of the work. Arrian twists the usual boundaries of the *periplus*-genre to insert himself into an Odyssean and Xenophontic narrative of trials and endurance.[14] A similar literary flourish, as we shall now see, is involved in his self-positioning in relation to Hadrian at the start of the work.

Arrian, Hadrian and Xenophon

When Arrian announces at the start of his *Periplus* that he shares in Xenophon's pleasure at arriving at the coast ('gladly we looked down on the Euxine Sea from the same spot as both Xenophon and you'), his joy springs not merely from the sight of the sea, but also from the fact that his prospect was the same one enjoyed by Xenophon and by his addressee Hadrian – an emperor characterised by 'a weakness for literary tourism'.[15] By highlighting the spatial link that connects the travels of Xenophon and Hadrian, separated as they were by more than five hundred years, Arrian positions himself both as mediator between the distant Greek writer and the philhellene Roman emperor and as third in a sequence of Black Sea spectators. He simultaneously preserves the memory of Xenophon and uses that memory to glorify both himself and Hadrian.

Arrian further hints at Xenophon's famous seaward gaze when he reports on the statue of Hadrian set up in Trapezus itself. The statue, he writes, has a pleasing posture – 'it points out to the sea' – but it is badly worked. So he advises Hadrian to 'send a statue worthy to bear your name, in the same pose; for the place is very well suited to everlasting memory' (1.3–4). Why does Arrian think it so important that the statue points to the sea? Hadrian's pose has been interpreted as a gesture of power and domination in a far-

[14] Note also how Arrian's account of his sea-journey is embellished by a Homeric allusion (3.2) and a tragic citation (3.5).

[15] Birley (1997) 155.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

flung corner of the empire,[16] but within Arrian's text the limits of Roman control are firmly placed further east (17.2). Others claim that 'the statue was probably meant to point to the new harbour that Hadrian ordered to be built'.[17] But while this view may be a plausible interpretation of the historical statue, Arrian himself postpones mentioning the construction of the new harbour until much later in the *Periplus* (16.6 – see below). Arrian's suggestion that Trapezus deserves 'everlasting memory' also seems rather extravagant if it is only a new harbour that is at stake. Perhaps, then, he is claiming that Trapezus is an ideal place for a good statue because it was there that Xenophon reached the sea. And its posture must remain the same (or so Arrian wants us to think) because Hadrian's statue points to the sea that Xenophon saw.[18]

Arrian's opening focus on the sight of the sea contrasts with his lack of attention to the landscape of Trapezus itself. Within Trapezus the only landmarks he notes are man-made constructions – a temple of Hermes in addition to the statue of Hadrian. The vagueness of his account misled one nineteenth-century traveller into supposing that the temple and statue were placed at the spot where Xenophon saw the sea rather than within the city of Trapezus.[19] As the text stands, Arrian offers no evidence that he (or Hadrian) had in fact seen the sea from a spot close to where Xenophon had seen it – which was in the mountains some distance inland from Trapezus.

The focus on Xenophon's sea is strengthened by the words Arrian uses for the pose of Hadrian's statue. When Arrian writes that the statue 'points to' (ἀποδείκνυσιν) the sea, he uses a compound form of a verb that is used in a number of his descriptions of landmarks: at Apsarus (once called Apsyrtus), 'the tomb of Apsyrtus is pointed out (δείκνυται)' (6.3); further on, as one enters the River Phasis, 'the anchor of the Argo is pointed out (δείκνυται)' (9.2); further still, 'a summit of the Caucasus ... was pointed out (ἐδείκνυτο), where, legend has it, Prometheus was strung up by Hephaestus, as instructed by Zeus' (11.5). The omnitemporal (present) tenses found in the first two passages contrast with the narrative (imperfect) tense used in the third passage (itself a strong close to the overtly autobiographical first section of Arrian's account). What unites the three passages is the use of the language of display in connection with myth: in each case it is a mythological landmark that is generally (or was actually) pointed

[16] Brilliant (1963) 130; Calandra (1996) 136 n. 5.
[17] Birley (1997) 155.
[18] Cf. Weber (1907) 266 n. 976: 'Die Erinnerung an diesen Augenblick will also Hadrian festhalten in der Statue.'
[19] See Rood (2004) 145–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

out.[20] So by applying the (admittedly standard) language of display both to the sea to which Hadrian's statue in Trapezus points and to physical remnants and landmarks associated with the Argonauts and Prometheus, Arrian may be suggesting that Xenophon's sea has the resonance of these mythical remnants.

The mythical resonance is further reinforced by the technique Arrian adopts to bring out the spatial link with Hadrian: 'we looked down ... from the same spot (ὅθενπερ) as both Xenophon and you.' Arrian here uses a relative clause to assimilate his own experience to that of two earlier travellers. This 'where' technique could be used for both historical and mythical events: Polybius' account of the Bosporus includes incidental references both to Darius (4.43.2) and to the travels of Jason and Io (4.39.6, 43.6).[21] But the mythical era was particularly attractive for writers seeking to elevate more recent achievements: when Diodorus Siculus, for instance, recounted the arrival of Xenophon's Ten Thousand at the Black Sea, he wrote that 'they held a gymnastic contest at the place at which people say that the *Argo* and Jason and his men put in' (14.30.3). Xenophon himself had adopted a similar technique when he described how the Ten Thousand briefly sailed along the Black Sea coast further to the west: 'As they sailed along they saw the Jasonian headland, where the *Argo* is said to have been moored ... And they moored by the Acherusian Chersonese, where Heracles is said to have descended for the dog Cerberus' (6.2.1–2). By alluding to two paradigms of heroic toil and travel, Xenophon asserts a claim to a place in the Greeks' geographical imagination.[22] Arrian himself later uses the same technique to offer an image of the Black Sea as an Argonautic arena (6.3: tomb of Apsyrtus; 9.2: the *Argo*'s anchor; 16.2:

[20] For other mythical relics in the Black Sea area, cf. Hdt. 4.82 (footprint of Heracles); Xen. *Anab.* 6.2.2, Plin. *HN* 27.4 (signs of Heracles' descent to the underworld); Timonax *ap.* schol. *ad* Ap. Rhod. 4.1217 (quoted in Braund (1986) 39: garden called Jasonioi where Jason landed, Medea's marriage chamber). For further examples in Arrian, cf. *Bithyniaca* fr. 22 and 40 Roos (the Alybe of the Homeric catalogue, with traces of silver-mining still visible, and the laurel (*daphne*) on the spot where Daphne fled Apollo); also fr. 35 (hill in the Propontis that is the tomb of Briareos); *Anab.* 7.13.6 on the satrap of Media showing (ἔδειξεν) women to Alexander in the guise of Amazons. On the use of the present tense, cf. Horsfall (1985) 202: 'No cicerone is necessarily implied. The sites are open to view to those who contemplate them.'

[21] Cf. Dowden (1992) 123 on Pausanias' mention of the tomb of Anthemocritus (1.36.3): 'the past, both historical and mythical (for there is no distinction), continues to live in the landscape of the present'; though note that Polybius does distinguish in the passages cited between what 'the myths say' (φασι ... οἱ μῦθοι) about Io and what 'they say' (φασι) about Darius (and also Jason). I will use 'myth' in our sense of the term.

[22] Note further Argonautic links at 4.6.4 (the river Phasis) and 5.6.37 ('the grandson of Aietes' as king of the 'Phasiani': the king's own name is not given), though positive Argonautic associations are disrupted by the dispute over alleged plans to sail to Phasis and settle there (5.6.36, 5.7.1, 5.7.7). Some editors delete the reference to the Jasonian headland owing to a geographical error, but this error could be Xenophon's – and the main point holds whether the passage is interpolated or not.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jason's Point; 25.3: the *Argo*'s passage through the Clashing Rocks) as well as a Xenophontic one: as a recent editor notes, the mythological reminiscences seem to form a 'prestigious backdrop' in an account 'haunted' by 'the recollection of Xenophon'.[23] This twin focus on Xenophon and the Argonauts also overshadows other possible historical and mythical associations that Arrian could have attached to the Black Sea – notably the Pontic kingdom of Mithridates and his entanglements with Lucullus and Pompey (a major concern for Strabo, himself a native of the Pontic region[24]) and the travels of Io, which provided an explanation for the name of the Bosporus (as Arrian himself noted in his *Bithyniaca* (fr. 36 Roos)). The contrast with Strabo may owe something to the fact that the Mithridatic wars were much more recent and topical for Strabo, but it also reflects the broader Second Sophistic trend to look back more to the classical than to the Hellenistic period.[25]

While Arrian's spatial focus at the opening of the *Periplus* suggests a close identification with (and between) Hadrian and Xenophon, his identification with Xenophon is complicated by his account of the time he spent at Trapezus. He reports that 'I also sacrificed an ox there – not like that Xenophon in Calpes Limen (who, lacking sacrificial victims, took an ox from a waggon), as the Trapezuntines themselves had provided a victim of not ignoble stock' (2.3). As with the reference to Celtic hounds in the *Cynegeticus*,[26] Arrian seems here to be constructing a narrative of improvement: thanks to the generosity of the people of Trapezus, he did not share Xenophon's difficulties (he pointedly uses a noun – *aporia* – that is a leitmotif in Xenophon's *Anabasis* – where it describes the Greeks' repeated difficulties – as well as in his own – where Alexander constantly seeks out difficulties in order to display his own heroism[27]). But Arrian's narrative of improvement is (playfully?) disingenuous. We might have expected a contrast with the sacrifice the Ten Thousand made when they

[23] Silberman (1993) 305 ('de même que le souvenir de Xénophon hante cette description, les réminiscences mythologiques en forment comme l'arrière-plan prestigeux', my trans.). Braund (1986) 38–9 offers a persuasive stronger reading of how Arrian's use of myth in the *Periplus* forms 'part of contemporary government and diplomacy' in that it 'structures the world and makes sense of it'.

[24] See Clarke (1999) 230–6.

[25] The classic discussion is Bowie (1974), with 191–4 on Arrian. Arrian shows a particular interest in the period between the march of the Ten Thousand and 320 BC: note his *Anabasis*, *Affairs after Alexander*, *Dion* and *Timoleon*, and allusions to Iphicrates and Epaminondas at *Tact.* 1.1, 11.2. Note, however, Stadter (1980) 167 on his strong engagement with the Roman present in the *Parthica*; and also that the *Bithynica* covered the Hellenistic period (though this is very poorly represented in the extant fragments).

[26] See n. 5.

[27] Cf. Jacob (1991) 28–31 on the *aporia* motif in Arrian's *Anabasis*. Note also (with Tonnet (1988) i. 241) that for the sacrifice Arrian adopts instead of Xenophon's σφαγιάζεσθαι the rarer βουθυτεῖν – the only use in his extant works of a verb used once by Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.3.14).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arrived at Trapezus, not with a sacrifice they made further along the coast. Xenophon's Greeks had, as a group, performed a decent sacrifice at Trapezus, partly with victims provided by the inhabitants of Trapezus as well as by the neighbouring Colchians, thereby fulfilling their vows to Zeus the Saviour, Heracles and other gods (4.8.23–5). The Greeks also celebrated their arrival at the sea by holding athletic competitions. Arrian focuses instead on a later sacrifice that was clearly exceptional: it was done in a hurry, in response to news of an attack on a section of the Greek army that had gone out to get provisions (6.4.25). Arrian's distortion of the rhetoric of space sets up a tension between continuity and distance from the experiences of 'that' Xenophon.

Arrian's identification with Xenophon changes in other ways as the *Periplus* proceeds. The opening sentence ('we looked down on the Euxine Sea from the same spot as both Xenophon and you') is the only occasion Arrian applies the 'where ...' technique to Xenophon (and even here the relative clause of place is applied not to mere mention of a place name, but to a narration of a parallel action). In the later stages of the *Periplus*, it is as a writer that Arrian engages with Xenophon. A personal engagement with his literary model was already present in Arrian's focus on the spot where Xenophon (rather than the Ten Thousand as a whole) saw the sea. And after those initial allusions to Xenophon's sight of the sea and to his sacrifice at Calpes Limen, Arrian refers to places or peoples as mentioned by Xenophon, not directly to what the Ten Thousand did in those places.

Arrian's later mode of allusion allows for a variety of effects. His allusions can be extremely brief: 'From Lepte Point to Armene, 60 [stades]; there is a harbour. Xenophon also mentioned Armene' (14.4). But often comparison between what Arrian reports about Xenophon's account and Xenophon's own words reveals interesting complexities. Take Arrian's reference to Xenophon's account of Calpes Limen: 'Of Calpes Limen, of the nature of the place and of its mooring, of the spring there of cold, pure water, and of the forest, infested with wild beasts, of shipbuilding wood near the sea, the elder Xenophon spoke' (12.5). This sentence could be read as an implicit comment on the relative rareness of such topographic descriptions in Xenophon's work: it has generally been thought that Xenophon's account of Calpes Limen (6.4.3–6) has a utopian aspect, designed to suggest its suitability as the site for a colony.[28] Arrian also, however, slips into his report of Xenophon's account one element that was not in the original: those wild beasts in the nearby woods. The author of a modern *Cynegiticus* picks out a detail that would have made the site of Calpes Limen even more appealing to his main literary model.

[28] Cf. Dillery (1995) 89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Arrian's work implies a hierarchy between noteworthy (mythical or historical) deeds (such as the voyage of the Argo) and noteworthy writers (such as Xenophon). As such, it supports the claim that Arrian made in the second preface of his *Anabasis*, which is pointedly placed in the context of Alexander's visit to Troy: 'the march up into Asia of the Ten Thousand with Cyrus against King Artaxerxes, the sufferings of Clearchus and those captured with him, and the descent to the sea of those Ten Thousand under the leadership of Xenophon, are, thanks to Xenophon, far better known to the world than Alexander and Alexander's exploits' (1.12.3, trans. Brunt). Arrian's depiction of the Black Sea similarly suggests that the very fact that Xenophon mentioned a place is noteworthy: it was not worth commenting on the fact that Strabo had mentioned Armene. Implicitly, Arrian stakes his own claim (as the new Xenophon) to be a worthy commemorator of the actions of Alexander – or the emperor Hadrian.

And yet the positive trajectory from one Xenophon to another is also threatened by the sort of discontinuity that Arrian asserts between his own sacrifice at Trapezus and Xenophon's sacrifice at Calpes Limen. That discontinuity does not simply create a gap between Arrian and 'that Xenophon': by historicising Xenophon Arrian opens up his own writings, his own status as the new Xenophon, to future historicising. And, as we shall see in the next section, the tension set up by Arrian's opening flourish is maintained as he surveys the places and peoples Xenophon records the Ten Thousand passing through – and introduces at the same time a pointed allusion to Herodotus' construction of imperial space.

Rivers, cities and sanctuaries

In the course of the second section of his *Periplus*, Arrian arrives at the site where the river Halys flows into the sea: 'This river', he writes, 'was of old the border (ὅρος) between the kingdoms of Croesus and of the Persians, and now flows under the Romans' control – not from the south, as Herodotus says, but from the direction of the rising sun ...' (15.1). Arrian here alludes to the description of the Halys near the start of Herodotus' work: Croesus 'ruled over all the various peoples who live west of the River Halys, which flows from the south (between where the Syrians and the Paphlagonians live) and in the north issues into the sea which is known as the Euxine Sea' (1.6.1). Yet later Herodotus had given a more complex account of the river's flow: 'the boundary (οὖρος) between the Median and Lydian empires was the Halys, which rises in the mountains of Armenia, flows through Cilicia, and then continues with Matiene to the north and Phrygia to the south; after leaving these countries behind, its course takes it north' (1.72.2). Arrian's (mis)reading puts Herodotus in his place.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At the same time, Arrian shows how Roman power has put the Halys in its place: '... And there, where it flows into the Euxine, it marks the border of the fields (ὁρίζει ... ἔργα) of the Sinopeans and the Amisenians' (15.1). The river that once divided two great empires now divides a Greek city from its neighbour. It now flows past ἔργα that are the worked fields of Homeric and Hesiodic verse rather than the catchword for Herodotean monumentality.[29] The Halys keeps on rolling, but it is now a fallen marvel in its own right.[30]

A similarly complex play on the intersections of time and space is found in Arrian's frequent allusions to Xenophon in this section. Let us first return to his description of Trapezus: 'a Greek city, as that Xenophon says, settled on the sea, a colony of the Sinopeans' (1.1: πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα ... Σινωπέων ἄποικον). Arrian's opening echoes (with some exact correspondences) Xenophon's first mention of Trapezus in the *Anabasis*: 'They came to the sea to Trapezus, a Greek city settled on the Euxine Pontus, a colony of the Sinopeans in the land of the Colchians' (4.8.22: πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα ... Σινωπέων ἄποικον).[31] By offering a brief localisation of the city as well as its foundation-history, both Arrian and Xenophon not only use a formula common in ancient geographical writing (and especially common in *periploi*), but also imply by their recourse to this formula that arrival at Trapezus signifies arrival at an ordered Greek realm. A sense of Hellenism is more overtly evoked by the description of Trapezus as a 'Greek city' (πόλις Ἑλληνίς): this phrase is another geographical formula, but one that is typically found not in descriptions of cities in mainland Greece, but in colonial settings where the parameters between Greeks and non-Greeks are most blurred.[32] Modern historians note that describing Trapezus as a Greek city is 'over-simplified and inconsistent', since it neglects the fact that its population must have been mixed. But it was precisely 'the (potentially threatening) presence of Colchians all around that defined the Greekness of the city': 'both Xenophon and Arrian explicitly focus on its Greekness in a barbarian context.'[33] This sense of Trapezus as an outpost of Hellenism is particularly pronounced in Xenophon's work, where the city is explicitly located 'in

[29] ἔργα in the sense of 'tilled lands' is rare in post-Homeric Greek: LSJ cite just Hdt. 1.36 (twice used of the Mysians' lands, ravaged by a mighty stag: Powell's lexicon lists these as the only uses of the word in this sense in Herodotus) and a papyrus (admittedly second-century AD, i.e. coeval with Arrian).

[30] For rivers as a Black Sea marvel, see Hdt. 4.82.

[31] The same phrase is also used of Trapezus in Photius' summary of Arrian's *Affairs after Alexander* (fr. 1a.5 Roos).

[32] Cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 140 and Kacharava (2005) 10 on Ps.-Scylax.

[33] Braund (1994) 133; cf. also 135: 'An inclusive (rather than an exclusive) conception of Hellenism was particularly desirable against a Persian empire which encompassed much that was, like Trapezus itself, Greek enough.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the land of the Colchians', and its Greekness further emphasised by contrast with the many non-Greek cities of the Asian interior, themselves described in equally formulaic but notably different ways.[34]

The continuity between Xenophon's and Arrian's Trapezus is disturbed by Arrian's focus on physical changes at Trapezus. When Arrian returns to Trapezus at the end of the second section of the work, he mentions that the city has a new harbour under construction: 'There you are building a harbour; for before, there was a mooring where one could only ride at anchor in the summer.' The blessing of the harbour that is being constructed at what was once a mooring (πάλαι ... ὅρμος) is emphasised by contrast with the staccato sequence of moorings (ὅρμος ναυσί at e.g. 16.3, 16.4, 16.5) found earlier in Arrian's account. By highlighting the evolving civic landscape of Trapezus, Arrian seems to construct the same narrative of progress as in his account of his sacrifices at Trapezus.

Other physical changes at Trapezus disrupt Arrian's positive projection of progress since Xenophon's day. Arrian stresses right at the start of the work that Hadrian is also building new altars. But while he notes that these 'are already set up', he complains that they are 'in rather rough stone, and as such the inscribed letters are not particularly clear'; besides this, 'the Greek inscription is also inaccurately carved, as it was written by barbarians' (1.2). Arrian here complicates his initial (Xenophontic) portrayal of Trapezus as a 'Greek city' by applying a *topos* generally used of old inscriptions[35] to a new inscription being set up in a spatially marginal location. It is as if his own response (restoring the Greekness of the inscription) is a way of combating barbarism – though what he is restoring is not the ancient Greek past but the Roman present.[36] And yet Arrian's complaint about the original inscription also activates a sense of the impermanence of memory. With time all inscriptions become like Hadrian's was at its inception. Arrian's subtle hint at changes over time undermines the surface attempt to establish a strong spatial continuity between Arrian, Hadrian and Xenophon. It undermines, too, the claim that the pose of Hadrian's statue by the harbour at Trapezus sheds a suitable lustre on a place 'very well suited to everlasting memory' (1.4). By a common self-referential turn, the locus of commemoration is displaced from the physical statue to Arrian's own writing.

The concern with variation over time seen in Arrian's account of Trapezus reappears in his attention to changes in cities' names. When he comes to Apsarus, he

[34] Note e.g. how non-Greek cities are described as μεγάλη coupled with εὐδαίμων (see n. 6) and with ἐρήμη (1.5.4, 3.4.7).

[35] E.g. Thuc. 6.54.9, Dem. 59.76, Lucian *VH* 1.7, Paus. 6.15.8.

[36] Cf. Anderson (1989) 177.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

summarises some of the content of his separate Latin report to Hadrian (based on his inspection of the garrison there, including 'its weapons, the walls, the trench, the sick, and the food supplies that were there', 6.2) and focuses instead on the mythological associations of the site's former name: 'It is said that Apsarus was once called Apsyrtus; for it was there that Apsyrtus was killed by Medea ... The name was subsequently corrupted by the barbarians who live around there.' He goes on to remark that 'many other names were corrupted' in the same way: 'they say that Tyana in Cappadocia was named Thoana after Thoas, king of the Tauri' (6.3–4). The focus on barbarians as responsible for the name-shift from Apsyrtus to Apsarus mirrors the threat to Hadrian's inscription at Trapezus.

Arrian also evokes this sense of impermanence in his accounts of some of the Greek cities that Xenophon visited. When he comes to mention Pharnaceia, he notes that 'it was once called Cerasus, this too a colony of the Sinopeans' (16.4). Here the allusion to Xenophon's account of Cerasus (5.3.2, including the detail of its foundation) is implicit. It follows directly on, however, from an overt allusion to Xenophon's account of Cotyora: 'Xenophon mentioned this as a polis, and says that it was a colony of the Sinopeans; now it is a village, and not a large one at that' (16.3). Arrian here leaves it to his readers to explain the change on Cotyora's fortunes. A nineteenth-century geographer was tempted to speculate that the city 'might never have recovered from the effects of the visit of the Ten Thousand' – who had stayed there for forty-five days, taking supplies from the Paphlagonians and from the local Greek inhabitants (5.5.6).[37] Modern historians prefer to explain the depopulation of Cotyora as caused by the foundation of Pharnaceia from the inhabitants of Cotyora and Cerasus.[38] Arrian offers instead a sense of alternation and transience that recalls Herodotus' famous explanation of why he will mention both small and large cities: 'most of those settlements which were important in the past have diminished in significance by now, and those which were great in my own time were small in times past ... human happiness never remains long in the same place' (1.5.4). The same sense of transience appears at other points in Arrian's account without reference to Xenophon: when he comes to Theodosia on the north coast, for instance, he calls it 'a deserted city' (πόλιν ἐρήμην), noting that 'it used to be a Greek city, Ionian, a colony of the Milesians, and there is mention of it in many works' (19.3–4).[39]

Arrian's focus on cities with Xenophontic associations also contributes to his broader spatial definition of the Black Sea littoral. The alternation of Greek cities and

[37] Rennell (1816) 260.

[38] Bosworth (1993) 245 with n. 108.

[39] For this theme in Pausanias, cf. Porter (2001) 73–4; Pretzler (2007) 145.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

native tribes that marks Xenophon's route along the south side of the Black Sea from Trapezus to the Bosporus is implicitly set in opposition to the wilder shores on the north side. With the help of an emphatic false closure, Arrian's introduction to the final section of his *Periplus* stresses that the north coastline is an area beyond Roman control – but also an area that may not remain that way: 'Thus, then, is the voyage sailing to the right from Byzantium to Dioscouris, the camp where the Romans' control ends when on sails to the Pontus on the right. But when we heard that Cotys, king of what is called the Cimmerian Bosporus, had died, I decided that it was my duty to explain the voyage as far as the Bosporus to you, so that, if you were planning something with regard to the Bosporus, you would be able to plan it without being ignorant of the voyage' (17.2–3). And as he proceeds to describe the coast, the city of Theodosia proves to be just the first in a series of sites (cities, harbours, islands) or stretches that are described as 'deserted' (ἔρημος: 19.4, 20.2, 20.3, 21.2, 24.1). Two of these deserted areas, moreover, are described as 'nameless' (ἀνώνυμος: 20.2, 20.3) – areas lacking, that is, not just in the defining quality of a name, but also in the stories that give resonance to a place-name; areas that evoke the distant past, a period of negation before differentiation through naming has occurred.[40] And yet Arrian also hints at the possibility that these wild places, these once inhabited cities, may acquire or return to history – under Roman control.[41]

Mediating between the more civilised south coast and the more savage north is the section that Arrian sailed along in the opening section of the *Periplus*. Arrian there describes how after getting into great difficulty in a storm they 'arrived at Athens: for there is in the Euxine Sea a place so named', and were then forced by the storm to stay there for two days (3.4–4.1). This knowing account emphasises the remoteness of the east side of the Black Sea by implicitly opposing the small-scale Athens ('for there is ...') to the famous city of culture championed by Arrian's addressee Hadrian.[42] And Arrian's own adventures at sea endow this unfamiliar Athens with narrative: 'for it turns out that it was destined (ἐχρῆν γὰρ ἄρα) that we should not sail past Athens in the Euxine like some deserted and nameless anchorage (ἔρημον καὶ ἀνώνυμον)' (5.3). Arrian here archly applies to his trifling troubles at sea a model

[40] Cf. Hdt. 4.45.4 for the once 'nameless' continents; 2.52.1 for the nameless gods worshipped by the Pelasgians. Cf. 'nameless' islands at Ps.-Scylax 21 (in Adriatic); Arr. *Anab.* 1.19.4.

[41] Stadter (1980) 40 sees the focus on 'deserted' cities as an incentive to Hadrian to take action.

[42] Cf. the story pattern of a confusion between small and large homonyms in oracles (e.g. Hdt. 3.64.4, Thuc. 3.96.1, Paus. 8.11.10–12; also perhaps Arrian, *Bithyniaca* fr. 65 Roos). Contrast Procopius' attempt to disassociate the two: 'named Athens, not, as some suppose, because colonists from Athens settled there, but because a certain woman Athenaea in early times ruled over the land' (8.2.10). Cf. also n. 4 for Arrian's own later Athenian identity (he lived there after his service in Cappadocia).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of causation that Herodotus had applied to the downfall of the Lydian king Candaules (1.8.2) and that he himself applies elsewhere to the grand succession of empires (*Anab.* 2.6.7: 'for it was destined (ἐχρῆν γάρ) that the Persians should forfeit the sovereignty of Asia to Macedonians, just as Medes had lost it to Persians, and Assyrians even earlier to Medes'). The same sense of historical destiny, we are led to believe, ensured that this humble Athens lurking east of Trapezus was not a mere blank in Arrian's imaginative Pontic geography – unlike the 1,200 'deserted and nameless' stades between the harbour of the Isiaci and the mouth of the Ister (20.3).

If Arrian's allusion to the Black Sea Athens hints at Hadrian's image as champion of the famous Athens, then this delicate flattery is given a poignant twist in the long digression in the final section of the *Periplus* – a description of an island off the first mouth of the Danube (21–3). Unlike the long nameless stretch that precedes it in Arrian's account (20.3), this island has three names, Achilles' Island, Achilles' Racetrack, and Leuce (White) Island – for 'it is said that Thetis set it up for her son, and that Achilles lives there' (21.1). Arrian further explains that Achilles himself appears to those who sail by the island in their dreams or even when they are awake (23.1). The timeless atmosphere is reinforced by mention of a temple of Achilles which has 'a wooden statue of ancient workmanship' (21.1) – in contrast to the new statue of Hadrian that is to be set up at Trapezus. There is also a Golden Age hint in Arrian's account of how the temple is cleaned every day by the sea-birds that drip water on the temple and then wipe it with their wings.[43] This self-regulating desert island seems immune from the depredations of time. Even when the realities of the present do intrude in the mention of inscriptions praising Achilles, 'some in Latin, some in Greek' (21.2), the balance between Latin and Greek still stands out by contrast with Arrian's earlier account of how Hadrian's Greek inscription at Trapezus was threatened by barbarism. And this balance is reinforced by Arrian's hint at the recent death of Hadrian's beloved Antinous, gently evoked via Achilles' love for Patroclus – 'the love and friendship because of which he chose to die after his favourite' (23.4). Arrian extracts the White Island not just from time but also from space, blurring the cult of Achilles the lover with the cults set up across the Greek world by Hadrian for Antinous the beloved.[44]

[43] Contrast Apollo's temple at the centre of the earth, Delphi, where Io has to keep birds off (Eur. *Ion* 106–108, 144–83). On the Black Sea cult of Achilles, see West (2003), 162–5; Burgess (2009) 126–31.

[44] See e.g. Stadter (1980) 38–9. The setting of the island opposite one of the mouths of the Danube may also evoke the symmetry between the Danube and the Nile (where Antinous drowned) in the Greek geographic tradition (e.g. Hdt. 2.33–4, 4.50).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Peoples

The tension between geographical variation and stability seen in Arrian's account of the cities of the Black Sea coast is even more apparent in the way he describes the tribes that lived around those cities. His account may be helpfully approached via the polemical remarks of the sixth-century historian Procopius, who starts his eighth book by announcing his intention to recount the recent invasion of Colchis by a Persian army under Chorianes, then pauses to offer a lengthy account of the allegedly obscure Black Sea area. Procopius does acknowledge that this area had been treated by many earlier writers, but he rebukes them for their inaccuracy over names:

> some of these writers, for example, have stated that the territory of the Trapezuntines is adjoined either by the Sani, who at the present day are called Tzani, or by the Colchians, calling another people Lazi ... . And yet neither of these statements is true. For in the first place, the Tzani live at a very great distance from the coast as neighbours of the Armenians in the interior ... . In the second place, it is impossible that the Lazi should not be the Colchians, because they inhabit the banks of the Phasis River; and the Colchians have merely changed their name at the present time to Lazi, just as nations of men and many other things do. ... a long period of time has elapsed since these accounts were written, and has brought about constant changes along with the march of events, with the result that many of the conditions which formerly obtained have been replaced by new conditions, because of the migration of nations and successive changes of rulers and of names. (8.1.8–11)

The most prominent of the authors Procopius has in mind here are Xenophon and Arrian. Both writers had claimed that the Colchians were neighbours of Trapezus (*Anab.* 4.8.22; *Peripl.* 11.1), and for Arrian this claim was part of his broader delineation of the Black Sea as a Xenophontic space: the Colchians, he wrote, 'border on the Trapezuntines, just as Xenophon says' (11.1). By asserting a continuity between the Black Sea as experienced by Xenophon and as he has himself experienced it, Arrian resisted the sort of temporal distancing adopted by Procopius. Indeed, his very use of the term 'Colchians' hints at a longer temporal continuity – for mention of Colchians cannot help but evoke their role in the Argonautic saga. In another of his works Arrian himself conveys a good sense of the Colchians' deep temporal associations as he draws on Xenophon's account of his Black Sea travels in an argument about another famous local tribe, the Amazons:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Nor do I myself think that the race of Amazons survived at that time, or even before Alexander, or Xenophon would have referred to them as he referred to Phasians and Colchians and other barbarian races which the Greeks met either when starting from Trapezus or before they reached Trapezus, where they certainly would have met Amazons too if any had still remained. (*Anab.* 7.13.4)[45]

It is precisely the Argonautic link that explains why Arrian picks out the Phasians and Colchians as opposed to the other Black Sea races encountered by Xenophon: the Phasians and Colchians, he implies, could at least be viewed as survivors from the distant past, unlike other tribes who were not core parts of the Argonautic legend. Procopius in his turn picked up Arrian's hint when he advanced the Colchians' Argonautic associations against Xenophon's and Arrian's view that they were the neighbours of Trapezus: if the Colchians had lived near Trapezus, Procopius objected, then it would follow that once Jason had captured the Golden Fleece, 'he actually did not flee towards Hellas and his own land, but backward to the Phasis River and the barbarians in the most remote interior' – and that, he implies, would have been absurd (8.2.15). Procopius preferred to keep the Colchians near the River Phasis at the price of accepting that they had changed their name.

As with his portrayal of cities, Arrian's image of Black Sea tribes becomes more complex as he proceeds. Immediately after citing Xenophon in support of his localisation of the Colchians, he adds: 'And the people he records as being most warlike and hostile towards the Trapezuntines, he calls Drillae, but I think they are actually Sanni. For they too are very warlike, even to this day, and are hostile to the Trapezuntines, live in fortified places, and are a tribe without a king' (11.1–2). Arrian's argument here is slightly oblique. He may be suggesting that Xenophon simply gave the Sanni the wrong name. He may on the other hand be adopting the approach Procopius took with the Colchians and assuming that the Drillae have changed their name. At any rate, the mere fact that Arrian takes the trouble to argue for this identification suggests that he was aware of its uncertainty: Strabo (12.3.18) had earlier equated the Sanni not with the Drillae but with the Macrones (another tribe mentioned by Xenophon).

Arrian's focus on changes in peoples' names is revealing of ancient conceptions not just of time (as Procopius brings out) but also of space. Changes in tribal names were familiar results of changes of political fortunes: in discussing the complex onomastics

[45] Colchians also appear in Arrian as part of his own army in the *Order of Battle against the Alans* (7), and again at *FGrH* 156 F 109.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the tribes of the Troad, Strabo makes the point that different rulers 'have confounded together some tribes and sundered others' (12.4.6). Such changes were also, however, seen as a particular hallmark of barbarians. Arrian, as we have seen, connected name-changes with barbarians in discussing the shift from Apsyrtus to Apsarus (6.3–4).[46] And Strabo made the same point in discussing the modern Chaldaei, whom he identified with the ancient Chalybes as well as with the Halizoni, 'from Alybe far away', in the Homeric catalogue: 'names undergo many changes, and particularly among the barbarians' (12.3.20). The fluidity of identity in these marginal locations contrasts with the greater stability in the nomenclature of more central areas of the Mediterranean, where large-scale shifts of name (from Pelasgia to Hellas, from Oenone to Aegina, from Trinacria to Sikelia) tend to be located in the distant past.

There is also a strong spatial presupposition in Arrian's argument that Xenophon's Drillae are the same as the Sanni. The term 'warlike' (μάχιμος) that Arrian applies to them is typically used in Greek ethnographic discourse of non-Greek tribes living in remote, often mountainous, locations.[47] By basing his argument on a continuity in their character ('they too are very warlike'), Arrian further characterises the Sanni/Drillae as beyond history, locked into their warlike character, and locked by that character in a different sort of temporal system – to use Johannes Fabian's terms, a state of 'allochrony'.[48] This idea of a lack of change over time (what Fabian calls a 'denial of coevalness') reinforces the sense of timeless foreign customs that is commonly conveyed in ethnographic writings by the use of the present tense. But it also marks the Sanni/Drillae as peripheral in space, removed from the dynamic progress of the centre – like the peoples at the fringes of the Greek world where the once universal custom of carrying arms in public has survived (Thuc.1.5.3). Whether called Drillae or Sanni, the non-Greek neighbours of Trapezus have stayed the same for five hundred years.

Arrian's literary play on ethnographic continuity also nakedly exposes the imperialist implications of this temporality. The unchanging nature of the Sanni/Drillae is set against a future where the very issue of their identity might become irrelevant: 'They were also formerly liable for tribute to the Romans, although, being pirates, they are not anxious to pay their tribute. But nowadays, god willing, they will be, or we will

[46] Cf. also Arrian's comment on how the Lazi changed the Greek fort-name Cotiaeon to Cotais, 'destroying the *harmonia* of the word because of ignorance of the language' (FGrH 156 F 109 = Procopius 8.14.48).

[47] E.g. Thuc. 1.110.2, 2.81.4, 2.98.4, 3.94.4, 3.108.4, 4.125.1, 6.90.3; Ar. Ach. 153; Plb. 1.2.6, 15.3.5, 16.4, 18.41.7; Diod. 1.4.7, 4.17.2, 17.98.1; Arrian *Anab.* 1.3.1, 1.28.2, 2.7.5.

[48] Fabian (1983) 32. Cf. how Falconer (1805) 53 writes that the accounts by Xenophon and Arrian 'agree very well with those given of the modern predatory inhabitants of these countries'; also how the account of the Black Sea Chalybes and Mossynoecians at Ap. Rhod. 2.1000–8 and 1020–5 draws on *Anab.* 5.5.1–2 and 5.4.33–34, thereby projecting this ethnographic timelessness back to the era of the Argonauts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exterminate them' (11.2). Arrian here destabilises the notion of continuity by confidently anticipating a change in the immediate future – though it is also the very continuity in the behaviour of the warlike Sanni/Drillae that drives him to action: in Bosworth's words, 'he would complete the pacification which the Ten Thousand had failed to impose.'[49]

Arrian's engagement with Xenophon's ethnography is similarly complex in the case of other inhabitants of the Black Sea coast. When he comes to the Bithynian Thracians, for instance, he again alludes to Xenophon's account, but he fails to indicate whether these Thracians have changed since Xenophon described them:

> Up to here live Bithynian Thracians, of whom Xenophon also made mention in his writings, to the effect that they were the most warlike people (μαχιμώτατοι) in Asia, and that it was in their territory that the Greek army suffered most of their hardships after the Arcadians had been separated from the portion of Chirisophus and Xenophon. (13.6)

The fact that Arrian posits a continuity of identity without explicitly positing a continuity of character is particularly pointed given Arrian's own Bithynian origins (he was from the Greek city of Nicomedia in Bithynia). And comparison of Xenophon's original account makes Arrian's technique seem still more cryptic. Xenophon certainly stresses the troubles endured by the Arcadian detachment, but Arrian nonetheless exaggerates the relative scale of their suffering. And Xenophon does not refer to the Bithynians as 'the most warlike people in Asia'. The one generalising comment he offers is in his review of the lack of Greek cities between Heracles and Byzantium: 'there is no other friendly or Greek town between these two places, only Bithynian Thracians, whose treatment of any Greeks who fall into their hands as a result of shipwreck or whatever is said to be horrendous' (6.4.2). The language Arrian uses of the Ten Thousand's sufferings in Bithynia is in fact closer to the language Xenophon uses of their sufferings at the hands of the Carduchians (4.3.1 – see n. 13).

Why is Arrian so elusive about (Xenophon's account of) the Bithynians? Bosworth has argued that it is through 'local pride' that Arrian 'exaggerates the importance of the native Bithynians'.[50] And yet in the case of the Sanni, Arrian's description of non-Greeks as 'most warlike' suggested an image of a primitive, lawless tribe in need of imperial control. In the case of the Bithynians, by contrast, Arrian says nothing about their present state. Evocation of Xenophon's experiences in Bithynia may be designed

[49] Bosworth (1993) 245; cf. Silberman (1995) 33 n. 78.
[50] Bosworth (1993) 246; so too Tonnet (1988) i. 240.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to suggest a contrast with a more controlled present. At the same time, Bosworth's suggestion that Arrian's account of the Bithynian Thracians is instinct with local pride is not unreasonable. If so, it would be a reflection of Arrian's imperialist nostalgia as he looks back to the Bithynians' barbaric heyday from the security of the Roman present.[51]

Arrian's treatment of Xenophon is again oblique when he deals with the Thracians who live on the north shore of the Black Sea. Near the end of the *Periplus*, when he comes to Salmydessus, Arrian notes that Xenophon 'wrote a lot about the place's harbourlessness, saying that ships come to land there driven by storms, and that the neighbouring Thracians fight among themselves over the shipwrecks' (25.2). Here Arrian further gestures towards Xenophon by using the extremely rare noun ἀλιμενότης ('harbourlessness'): the only earlier occurrence of this noun in extant Greek literature is in Xenophon (though in the *Hellenica* rather than the *Anabasis*).[52] How, then, does his report match Xenophon's account of Salmydessus in the *Anabasis*? Xenophon certainly starts by stressing the difficulty of sailing in this area – but his account has a twist that Arrian conceals:

> A lot of ships sailing into the Euxine run aground and are wrecked there, because there are extensive shoals in the sea. The Thracians who live in this region set up marker-stones and each group of them plunders the wrecks that fall within their plot. It was said that in times past, before they set up these markers, they often used to kill one another on their plundering raids. Discoveries there include large quantities of all the kinds of items which shipowners transport in wooden chests, such as couches, boxes, and wooden scrolls. (7.5.12–14)

We see from Xenophon's account that the behaviour that Arrian casts Xenophon as describing in his own present belonged to the past. Arrian falsely implies that Xenophon presents these Thracians as timeless barbarians – and some modern

[51] For the concept of imperialist nostalgia, see Rosaldo (1989) 68–87 (defined on p. 87 as 'people's longing for what they themselves have destroyed' – or been complicit in destroying). Cf. Wolfe (2006) 100–101, 105 on the contrast between Arrian's wilder and Pliny's more ordered images of Bithynia; and Corsten (2006) on the shift from Thracian to Greek and Roman names in elite Bithynian inscriptions between the Hellenistic and Roman eras.

[52] *Hell.* 4.8.7. The only later occurrence on the *TLG* database is in a later *Periplus* of the Black Sea that is largely direct citations from Arrian's. Strabo 7.6.1 applied the adjective ἀλίμενος to Salmydessus; cf. also Aesch. *PV* 726–7 for its difficulty for ships. Arrian also mentions Salmydessus as a dividing-point at *Affairs after Alexander*, fr. 1a.7 Roos.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars have followed his lead.[53] But Xenophon in fact stresses that the Thracians found a way of settling their disputes over shipwrecks. He offers a positive image of their rational organisation of space.[54]

It is not just by alluding to Xenophon that Arrian creates a sense of remote and timeless barbarism. On one occasion, when treating an area on the north coast that the Ten Thousand had not visited, he alludes to Herodotus – and a subtle shift of technique creates an even greater sense of remoteness: ' to Nitike, where a Scythian tribe used to live of old, of whom the writer Herodotus makes mention. He says that they are all eaters of fir-cones; and still the same opinion holds about them' (18.1–2).[55] This ethnographic comment is in keeping with Arrian's portrayal of the wildness of the north coast. And that sense of wildness is reinforced by the fact that Arrian does not even reveal if this tribe still existed. A positive statement about the continuing existence of the tribe is elided in favour of a statement about the fact that their reputation is still the same – as if they live on merely by virtue of what is said about them.

⋆ ⋆ ⋆

'dans l'itinéraire d'Arrien, les Muses et Rome ne sont pas séparables.'
P. Vidal-Naquet, 'Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes'[56]

We have seen that Arrian alludes to Xenophon and Herodotus throughout his *Periplus* with notably different effects. His distortions could be the result of simple citation from memory – the sort of slip that would naturally arise from ancient reading methods.[57] But this explanation does not sit easily with Arrian's well-attested

[53] E.g. the remarks of Detienne, cited by Dobrov (2001) 201 n. 65:
Thracians had the reputation of being the most bloodthirsty and wild of all barbarians. Everyone knows, as Xenophon testifies, that on the shores of the Black Sea, they will even kill each other to get hold of the effects of shipwrecked Greeks but they leave on the shore, as valueless goods, boxes full of written papyrus rolls.
cf. Detienne (2003) 132.

[54] Cf. Xenophon's earlier emphasis on the orderly distribution of villages among the barbaric-seeming Mossynoecians (5.4.31).

[55] Alluding to Hdt. 4.109.1; 'eaters of lice' is an alternative translation, favoured by Falconer (1805) 77, who notes parallels with contemporary 'savages', and Rennell (1831) ii. 323, drawing on his own observations of the 'vulgar' in Britain.

[56] Vidal-Naquet (1984) 322.

[57] The explanation of Tonnet (1988) i. 242 (in tension with his good observations on Arrian's use of recherché Xenophontic vocabulary). Cf. how Arrian's *Cynegeticus* combines some studied carelessness in its summaries of the sequence of Xen. *Cyn.* (note esp. οἶμαι, 'I think', at 2.4) with detailed intertextuality (see Stadter (1976)).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attachment to Xenophon and with the sort of allusive literary game that we saw earlier in Arrian's play on Xenophon's sight of the sea or in his use of the rare Xenophontic noun 'harbourlessness'. Nor does this explanation posit as flattering an image of the *Periplus*' addressee – and one of the points of writing the account as a letter was to create an image of a cultured Hadrian that would be pleasing both to Hadrian himself and to his Greek subjects.[58] Rather, by evoking Xenophon the writer, Arrian brought out how his sense of the Black Sea was shaped by previous narratives; and by distorting Xenophon he constructed a new narrative based on his own relationship to the Greek literary tradition.

The variety of modes through which Arrian engaged with his literary antecedents suggests a self-consciousness about the status of geographic and ethnographic discourse.[59] Just as his *Periplus* explores different ways of mapping space, so too it interrogates (while perpetuating) the cultural fictions of ethnography. Reflection on Arrian's own place in space and time is implicit in the allusions to Xenophontic ethnography that are scattered through the *Periplus*. His observations on the shifting fortunes of cities and peoples stage indirectly the 'continuity-in-difference'[60] that was one of the hallmarks of Greek self-construction under the Roman empire: he self-consciously holds a mirror up to his own attempt to define himself as both a new and an improved Xenophon, while also naturalising that authorial pose by integrating it in a larger picture of historical mutability.

The Black Sea tribes also posed a cognitive challenge for Arrian: how did the accounts of different authors at different periods relate to each other – and to the actual inhabitants of the Black Sea coast that Arrian himself could observe? His treatise rose to this challenge by using ethnography as a means of displaying his powers of reasoning: as we saw above, he based an argument about the identity of the Drillae on the character of the contemporary Sanni. And, however unsatisfactory his categorisation of the inhabitants of the Black Sea, his account would itself become part of a tradition, capable of being incorporated into an anonymous Byzantine *periplus*,[61] but also of being challenged in its turn by Procopius.

Arrian's descriptions of the various non-Greek peoples along the Black Sea coast were more than exercises in cultural and intellectual self-positioning. As an instrument of cognitive control, his account was subservient to imperial power: his allusions to

[58] Cf. Hodkinson (2005). Note that Hadrian also had a work on infantry tactics dedicated to him by Arrian (cf. *Tact.* 32.3), but nothing else is known about this work.

[59] Cf. similarly the use of the Ionic dialect in the *Indike*, with Lightfoot (2003) 93–5.

[60] Konstan (2006) xi. Cf. Stadter (1978) 128 on the homology in Arrian's *Tactica* between Rome's military adoption of non-Roman customs and Arrian's own literary experimentation.

[61] See Diller (1952) 102–46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his practical Latin report remind us that his light literary hand had an iron glove beneath it. His evocation of a sense of the spatial remoteness of the eastern and northern parts of the Black Sea also maps out the quasi-global extent of Roman power. Besides this, Arrian's literary flourishes can be seen as linked with his own political ambitions. As Whitmarsh observes, his successful career suggests 'the inflexibility of the formula associating Greeks with culture and Romans with power': 'as a forum for the display of elite ambition, *paideia* could certainly complement the progress of the individual's career.'[62] The Muses and Rome were inseparable; Arrian's two worlds could easily blend into one.

Arrian hints at the same time at possible changes in the future. These hints are particularly strong when the changes touch on the familiar historiographical theme of the succession of empires – as we saw with his account of the river Halys. The fact that the symbolic power of the river that once marked the boundaries of the Median and Lydian empires had now been eclipsed was a strong assertion of Roman power. That imperial assertion cannot be separated from the thought that Roman power would follow the course taken by those empires before it – but that very idea of transience (or at least the unavoidable dialectic between transience and permanence) was itself integral to the rhetoric of empire.[63] The Black Sea variations that run as a thematic thread through Arrian's *Periplus* should not, then, merely be read as a *jeu d'esprit*, part of his deft creation of an allusive literary persona. Arrian's work is an exercise in style, but his very experimentality is part of a complex meta-reflection on his own temporal positioning in relation to the Roman empire – a self-reflexivity that both challenges and flatters the emperor Hadrian and his circle of Greek and Roman readers.

TIM ROOD
ST HUGH'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

[62] Whitmarsh (2005) 14.
[63] Cf. e.g. Purcell (1995) on the famous scene of Scipio's tears at the fall of Carthage.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

WORKS CITED

Ameling, W. (1984) 'L. Flavius Arrianus Neos Xenophon', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 4, 119–22.

Anderson, G. (1989) 'The *pepaideumenos* in action: sophists and their outlook in the early empire', *ANRW* 2.33.1, 79–208.

Birley, A. R. (1997) *Hadrian: the restless emperor*, London.

Bosworth, A. B. (1993) 'Arrian and Rome: the minor works', *ANRW* 2. 34. 1, 226–75.

Bowie, E. L. (1974) 'The Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', in M. I. Finley (ed.) *Studies in ancient society*, London, 166–209 [revised from *P&P* 46 (1971) 3–41].

Braund, D. (1986) 'The Caucasian frontier: myth, exploration and the dynamics of imperialism', in P. Freeman, D. Kennedy (eds.) *The defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, Oxford, 31–49.

—— (1994) *Georgia in antiquity: a history of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia*, Oxford.

Brilliant, R. (1963) *Gesture and rank in Roman art: the use of gestures to denote status in Roman sculpture and coinage*, New Haven.

Burgess, J. S. (2009) *The death and afterlife of Achilles*, Baltimore.

Calandra, E. (1996) *Oltre la Grecia: alle origini del filellenismo di Adriano*, Naples.

Chotard, H. (1860) *Le périple de la Mer Noire par Arrien*, Paris.

Clarke, K. (1999) *Between geography and history: Hellenistic constructions of the Roman world*, Oxford.

Corsten, T. (2006) 'The rôle and status of the indigenous population in Bithynia', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.) *Rome and the Black Sea Region: domination, Romanisation, resistance*, Aarhus, 85–92.

Detienne, M. (2003) *The writing of Orpheus: Greek myth in cultural context*, Baltimore and London.

Diller, A. (1952) *The tradition of the minor Greek geographers*, Lancaster, PA, and Oxford.

Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the history of his times*, London.

Dobrov, G. (2001) *Figures of play: Greek drama and metafictional poetics*, Oxford.

Dowden, K. (1992) *The uses of Greek mythology*, London.

Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and the other: how anthropology makes its object*, New York.

Falconer, T. (1805) *Arrian's voyage round the Euxine sea, translated and accompanied with a geographical dissertation*, Oxford.

Flensted-Jensen, P. and Hansen, M. H. (1996) 'Pseudo-Skylax' use of the term "polis"', in M. H. Hansen, K. Raaflaub (eds.) *More studies in the ancient Greek polis*, Stuttgart, 137–68.

Goldhill, S. (2006) 'Artemis and cultural identity in Empire culture: how to think about polytheism, now', in D. Konstan, S. Said (eds.) *Greeks on Greekness: viewing the Greek past under the Roman empire*, Cambridge, 112–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hodkinson, O. (2005) review of Liddle (2003), *Scholia Reviews* 14, 4.
Horsfall, N. (1985) 'Illusion and reality in Latin topographical writing', G&R 32, 197–208.
Hutchinson, G. O. (2009) 'Read the instructions: didactic poetry and didactic prose', *CQ* 59, 196–211.
Hutton, W. (2005) *Describing Greece: landscape and literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*, Cambridge.
Jacob, C. (1991) 'Alexandre et la maîtrise de l'espace. L'art du voyage dans l'*Anabase* d'Arrien', *QS* 34, 5–40.
Kacharava, D. (2005) '*Polis hellenis* in the Black Sea area', in D. Kacharava, M. Faudot, E. Geny (eds.) *Pont-Euxin et polis: polis hellenis et polis barbaron*, Besançon, 9–31.
King, C. (2004) *The Black Sea: a history*, Oxford.
Konstan, D. (2006) 'Introduction', in id., S. Said (eds.) *Greeks on Greekness: viewing the Greek past under the Roman empire*, Cambridge, ix–xii.
Liddle, A. (ed.) (2003) *Arrian: Periplus Ponti Euxini*, London.
Lightfoot, J. L. (ed.) (2003) *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess*, Oxford.
Madsen, J. M. (2009) *Eager to be Roman: Greek response to Roman rule in Pontus and Bithynia*, London.
Porter, J. I. (2001) 'Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic', in S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, J. Elsner (eds.) *Pausanias: travel and memory in Roman Greece*, Oxford.
Pretzler, M. (2007) *Pausanias: travel writing in ancient Greece*, London.
Purcell, N. (1995) 'On the sacking of Carthage and Corinth', in D. Innes, H. M. Hine, C. B. R. Pelling (eds.) *Ethics and rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*, Oxford, 133–48.
Rennell, J. (1816) *Illustrations, (chiefly geographical,) of the history of the expedition of Cyrus, from Sardis to Babylonia, and the retreat of the Ten Thousand Greeks, from thence to Trebisonde and Lydia*, London.
—— (1831) *A treatise on the comparative geography of western Asia*, 2 vols, London.
Rood, T. C. B. (2004) *The sea! The sea! The shout of the Ten Thousand in the modern imagination*, London and New York.
—— (2010) 'Xenophon's parasangs', *JHS* 130, 51–66.
Rosaldo, R. (1989) *Culture and truth: the remaking of social analysis*, Boston.
Silberman, A. (1993) 'Arrien, "Périple du Pont Euxin": essai d'interprétation et d'évaluation des données historiques et géographiques', *ANRW* 2.34.1, 276–311.
—— (ed.) (1995) *Arrien: Périple du Pont-Euxin*, Paris.
Smyth, M. (2008) *Religion, culture, and sacred space*, New York.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Stadter, P. A. (1967) 'Flavius Arrianus: the new Xenophon', *GRBS* 8, 155–61.
—— (1976) 'Xenophon in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*', *GRBS* 17, 157–67.
—— (1978) 'The *Ars Tactica* of Arrian: Tradition and Originality', *CP* 73, 117–28.
—— (1980) *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.
Swain, S. (1996) *Hellenism and empire: language, classicism, and power in the Greek world, AD 50–250*, Oxford.
Tonnet, H. (1988) *Recherches sur Arrien: sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, 2 vols, Amsterdam.
Vidal-Naquet, P. (1984) 'Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes', in P. Savinel (trans.) *Arrien: Histoire d'Alexandre*, Paris, 311–94.
Weber, W. (1907) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus*, Leipzig.
West, S. (2003) '"The most marvellous of all seas": the Greek encounter with the Euxine', *G&R* 50, 151–67.
Whitmarsh, T. (2005) *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford.
—— (2011) *Narrative and identity in the ancient Greek novel: returning romance*, Cambridge.
Wolfe, G. (2006) 'Pliny's province', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.) *Rome and the Black Sea region: domination, Romanisation, resistance*, Aarhus, 93–108.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001305 Published online by Cambridge University Press